





**LIBRARY**  
OF THE  
Theological Seminary,  
PRINCETON, N. J.

*Case,* 1834  
*Shelf,* Benjamin, Joseph 1668 1728  
*Book,* Origines ecclesiastic

Jos. Addison Alexander

Bl.

Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a title or header, which is mostly illegible due to fading and blurring.

Small handwritten mark or signature on the left side of the page.

Small handwritten mark or signature at the bottom center of the page.



ORIGINES ECCLESIASTICÆ;  
OR THE  
ANTIQUITIES  
OF  
THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH,  
AND  
OTHER WORKS,  
OF THE  
REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.  
Formerly Fellow of University College, Oxford; and afterwards Rector of  
Headbourn Worthy, and Havant, Hampshire;  
WITH A  
SET OF MAPS OF ECCLESIASTICAL GEOGRAPHY,

TO WHICH ARE NOW ADDED,  
**SEVERAL SERMONS,**  
AND OTHER MATTER, NEVER BEFORE PUBLISHED,

The whole Revised and Edited, together with

**A Biographical Account of the Author,**

BY HIS GREAT GRANDSON,

**THE REV. RICHARD BINGHAM, B.C.L.**

Prebendary of Chichester, Vicar of Hale Magna,  
Incumbent of Gosport Chapel, and formerly Fellow of New College, Oxford

---

IN EIGHT VOLUMES.—VOL. III.

---

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR WILLIAM STRAKER,

433, WEST STRAND.

MDCCCXXXIV.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS  
50 EAST LEXINGTON AVENUE  
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10017  
LONDON: ROUTLEDGE AND KEGAN PAUL  
11 BEDFORD SQUARE, W. 1  
MILWAUKEE, WIS. 53233

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

# CONTENTS.

---

## BOOK X.

### OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE CATECHUMENS, AND THE FIRST USE OF THE CREEDS IN THE CHURCH.

#### CHAP. I.

*Of the several names of the Catechumens, and the solemnity that was used in admitting them to that State in the Church. Also of Catechising, and the time of their continuance in that Exercise.*

SECT. 1. THE reason of the names, Κατηχόμενοι, Novitii, Tyronas, &c.—2. Imposition of Hands and Prayer used in the first admission of Catechumens.—3. And Consignation with the Sign of the Cross.—4. At what Age Persons were admitted to be Catechumens.—5. How long they continued in that State.—6. The Substance of the Ancient Catechisms, and method of Instruction.—7. The Catechumens allowed to read the Scriptures.

#### CHAP. II.

*Of the several classes or degrees of Catechumens, and the gradual exercises and discipline of every Order.*

SECT. 1. Four Orders or Degrees of Catechumens among the Ancients.—2. First, the Εξωθόμενοι, or Catechumens privately instructed without the Church.—3. Secondly, the Ἀκροώμενοι, Audientes, or Hearers.—4. Thirdly, the Γόνοι κλίνοντες, or Genu-flectentes and Substrati, the Kneelers.—5. Fourthly, the Competentes or Electi, the immediate Candidates of Baptism.—6. How this last order were particularly disciplined and prepared for Baptism.—7. Partly by frequent Examinations, from which such as approved themselves, had the name of Electi, the Chosen.—8. Partly by Exorcism, accompanied with Imposition of Hands and the Sign of the Cross, and Insufflation.—9. Partly by the exercises of Fasting and Abstinence, and Confession and Repentance, &c.—10. Partly by learning the words of the Creed and Lord's-Prayer.—11. And the Form of Renunciation of the Devil, and Covenanting with Christ, with other Responses relating to their Baptism.—12. What meant by the Competentes going veiled before Baptism.—13. Of the Ceremony called, Epkphatha, or opening of the Ears of the Catechumens.—14. Of putting

Clay upon their Eyes, what meant by it.—15. Whether the Catechumens held a lighted taper in their hands in the time of Exorcism.—16. What meant by the Sacrament of the Catechumens.—17. How the Catechumens were punished, if they fell into gross Sins.—18. How they were treated by the Church, if they died without Baptism.—19. What opinion the Ancients had of the necessity of Baptism.—20. The want of Baptism supplied by Martyrdom.—21. And by Faith and Repentance, in such Catechumens as were piously preparing for Baptism.—22. The case of Heretics returning to the Unity of the Church: how far Charity in that case was thought to supply the want of Baptism.—23. The case of persons communicating for a long time without Baptism: how far that was thought to supply the want of Baptism.—24. The case of Infants dying unbaptised: the opinion of the Ancients concerning it.

### CHAP. III.

#### *Of the Original, Nature, and Names of the ancient Creeds of the Church.*

SECT. 1. Why the Creed called *Symbolum*.—2. Why called *Canon*, and *Regula Fidei*.—3. Why called *Mathema*.—4. Why called *Γραφή* and *Γράμμα*.—5. Whether that which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, was composed by the Apostles in the present form of words.—6. That probably the Apostles used several Creeds, differing in form, not in substance.—7. What Articles were contained in the Apostolical Creeds.

### CHAP. IV.

#### *A collection of several ancient Forms of the Creed out of the Primitive Records of the Church.*

SECT. 1. The Fragments of the Creed in Irenæus.—2. The Creed of Origen.—3. The Fragments of the Creed in Tertullian.—4. The Fragments of the Creed in Cyprian.—5. The Creed of Gregory Thaumaturgus.—6. The Creed of Lucian the Martyr.—7. The Creed of the Apostolical Constitutions.—8. The Creed of Jerusalem.—9. The Creed of Cæsarea in Palestine.—10. The Creed of Alexandria.—11. The Creed of Antioch.—12. The Roman Creed, commonly called the Apostles' Creed.—13. The Creed of Aquileia.—14. The Nicene Creed, as first published by the Council of Nice.—15. The Creeds in Epiphanius, completing the Nicene Creed.—16. The Nicene Creed was completed by the Council of Constantinople, Anno 381.—17. Of the use of the Nicene Creed in the Ancient service of the Church: and when it was first taken in to be a part of the Liturgy in the Communion-Office.—18. Of the Athanasian Creed.

### CHAP. V.

#### *Of the Original, Nature, and Reasons of that ancient discipline of concealing the Sacred Mysteries of the Church, from the sight and knowledge of the Catechumens.*

SECT. 1. The Errors and Pretences of the Romanists upon this Point.—  
2. This Discipline not strictly observed in the very first Ages of the

Church.—3. But introduced about the Time of Tertullian, for other Reasons than what the Romanists pretend.—4. This proved from a particular Account of the things which they concealed from the Catechumens. Which were, First, the Manner of administering Baptism.—5. Secondly, The Manner of administering the holy Unction or Confirmation.—6. Thirdly, The ordination of Priests.—7. Fourthly, The Liturgy, or Public Prayers of the Church, such as the Prayers for the Energumens, Penitents, and the Faithful.—8. Fifthly, The Manner of celebrating the Eucharist.—9. Sixthly, The Mystery of the Trinity, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer from the first Sort of Catechumens.—10. Reasons for concealing these Things from the Catechumens. First, That the Plainness and Simplicity of them might not be contemned.—11. Secondly, To conciliate a Reverence for them.—12. Thirdly, To make the Catechumens more desirous to know them.

---

## BOOK XI.

OF THE RITES AND CUSTOMS OBSERVED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

### CHAP. I.

*Of the several names and appellations of Baptism in the Primitive Church.*

SECT. 1. THE names of Baptism most commonly taken from the Spiritual Effects of it.—2. Hence Baptism called *Indulgentia*, *Indulgence* or *Absolution*.—3. And Παλιγγενεσία, *Regeneration*; and Χρίσμα, the *Unction*.—4. And Φωτισμός, *Illumination*.—5. And *Salus*, *Salvation*.—6. From the Nature and Substance of it, it was called *Mysterium*, *Sacramentum*, and Σφραγίς.—7. And *Character Dominicus*, the mark or character of the Lord.—8. Why called the Sacrament of Faith and Repentance.—9. The notation of the names, Baptism, Tinction, Laver. That they do not universally denote immersion.—10. Of some other names given to Baptism. The great Circumcision, Δώρον and Χάρισμα, the gift of the Lord, *Vaticum*, and *Phylacterium*, Τελείωσις, Μήσις, and *Symbola*.

### CHAP. II.

*Of the matter of Baptism: with an account of such Heretics as rejected or corrupted Baptism by Water.*

SECT. 1. Baptism wholly rejected by the Heretics called Ascodrutæ, and Marcossians, and Valentinians, and Quintillians.—2. And by the Ar-

chontici.—3. And the Seleucians and Hermians.—4. And Manichees and Paulicians.—5. What opinion the Messalians or Euchites had of Baptism.

### CHAP. III.

*Of the ancient form of Baptism: and of such Heretics as altered or corrupted it.*

SECT. 1. The usual form of baptising, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.—2. This form of Words generally thought necessary to be used in Baptism.—3. Whether Baptism in the name of Christ alone was ever allowed in the Church.—4. Of alterations made in the form of Baptism. First, By the Tritheists and Priscillianists.—5. Secondly, By the Menandrians.—6. Thirdly, By the Eleesians.—7. Fourthly, By the Sabellians and Moutanists.—8. Fifthly, By the Marcosians.—9. Sixthly, By the Paulianists.—10. Seventhly, By the Ennomians and others who baptised into the death of Christ.—11. Whether all the Arians were guilty of the same Innovation.—12. Whether any additions were made to the form of Baptism in the Catholic Church.

### CHAP. IV.

*Of the subjects of Baptism, or an account of what Persons were anciently allowed to be baptised. Where particularly of Infant-Baptism.*

SECT. 1. Why the question about the Administrators of Baptism is here omitted.—2. Who were anciently reckoned the proper subjects of Baptism. Where of the corrupt Custom of baptising inanimate things, as Bells in the Roman Church.—3. Baptism not to be given to the dead.—4. Nor to the Living for the Dead. Where of the Apostles meaning, of being baptised for the Dead, 1 Cor. xv. 29.—5. Proofs of Infant-Baptism from the ancient records of the Church.—6. From Clemens Romanus and Hermes Pastor.—7. From Justin Martyr.—8. And the Author of the Recognitions, contemporary with Justin Martyr.—9. From Irenæus.—10. And Tertullian.—11. And Origen.—12. And Cyprian, with the Council of Carthage under him.—13. Infant-Baptism not to be delayed to the eighth day, after the example of Circumcision. Nor till three Years, as Gregory Nazianzen would have had it.—14. Yet in some Churches it was deferred to the Time of an approaching Festival.—15. A resolution of some questions concerning Infant-Baptism. Whether children might be baptised, when only one Parent was Christian?—16. Whether the Children of excommunicated Parents might be baptised?—17. Whether exposed Children, whose Parents were unknown, might be baptised?—18. Whether the Children of Jews or Heathens might be baptised in any Case whatsoever?—19. Whether Children, born while their Parents were Heathen, might be baptised.

## CHAP. V.

*Of the Baptism of Adult Persons.*

SECT. 1. No Adult Persons to be baptised without previous Instruction, to qualify them to answer for themselves.—2. Yet Dumb persons allowed to be baptised in some certain cases.—3. And Energumens in cases of extremity.—4. No Slave to be baptised without the Testimony of his Master.—5. Yet baptism to be a Voluntary Act, and no one to be compelled to receive it by Force.—6. What Persons were rejected from Baptism; with a particular Account of some certain Trades and Vocations, which kept Men from it. Such were Image-making and Stage-playing.—7. Gladiators, Charioteers, and other Gamesters.—8. Astrologers and Practisers of such other curious Arts.—9. Frequenters of the Public Games and Theatre.—10. In what case the military Life might unqualify Men for Baptism.—11. Whether Persons might be baptised, who lived in the State of Concubinage.—12. The peculiar error of the Marcionites in rejecting all married Persons from Baptism

## CHAP. VI.

*Of the Time and Place of Baptism.*

SECT. 1. Why Adult Persons sometimes delayed Baptism by order of the Church.—2. Private Reasons for deferring Baptism against the Rules of the Church. First, Supinuity and Negligence of Salvation.—3. Secondly, An unwillingness to renounce the World, and submit to the Severities of Religion.—4. Thirdly, a fear of falling after Baptism.—5. Fourthly, Superstitious Fancies in reference to the Time and Place, and Ministers of Baptism.—6. Fifthly, A Pretence of following the example of Christ, who was baptised at Thirty Years of Age.—7. The solemn Times appointed for Baptism by the Church, were Easter, Pentecost, and Epiphany.—8. And in some Places the Festivals of the Apostles and Martyrs, and the Anniversary Days of the Dedication of Churches prevailed also.—9. No such stated Times in the Days of the Apostles.—10. How far these rules obliging in future Ages.—11. Baptism not confined to any Place in the Apostolical Ages.—12. But in after Ages confined to the baptisteries of the Church.—13. Except in the Case of Sickness, or with the Bishop's Licence to the contrary, upon some special Occasions.

## CHAP. VII.

*Of the Renunciations and Professions made by all Persons immediately before their Baptism.*

SECT. 1. Three Things required of all Persons at their Baptism, 1st, To renounce the Devil.—2. The form of this Renunciation, and the import of it.—3. The Antiquity of this Renunciation. By some derived from the Apostles.—4. This Renunciation made by Persons standing with their Faces toward the West. The reason of this Practice, with some other Ceremonies.—5. Why this Renunciation made three Times.—6. The second thing required of Men at their baptism, was a Vow of

Covenant of Obedience to Christ.—7. This Vow of Obedience made by turning to the East. And why.—8. The third thing required of the Party to be baptised, was a profession of Faith in the usual Words of the Creed.—9. This Confession made in the most solemn and public Manner.—10. With Hands and Eyes lifted up to Heaven.—11. Repeated three Times.—12. And subscribed with their own Hands in the Books of the Church, as some think.—13. The Use of all these Ceremonies and Engagements, to make Men sensible of their Obligation, and stedfast to their Profession.—14. Whether public and Particular Confession of Sins was required of Men at their Baptism.

## CHAP. VIII.

### *Of the Use of Sponsors or Sureties in Baptism.*

SECT. 1. Three Sorts of Sponsors in the Primitive Church. First, for Children.—2. Parents commonly Sponsors for their own Children.—3. Other sureties not bound to maintain the Children for whom they were Sponsors.—4. But only to answer for them to the several Interrogatories in Baptism.—5. And to be Guardians of their Spiritual Life for the Future.—6. The second sort of Sponsors for such Adult Persons as could not answer for themselves.—7. The third sort of Sponsors for all Adult Persons in general.—8. Whose Duty was, not to answer in their Names, but only to admonish and instruct them before and after Baptism.—9. This Office chiefly imposed upon Deacons and Deaconesses.—10. What Persons prohibited from being Sponsors.—11. But one Sponsor required, and that a Man for a Man, and a Woman for a Woman.—12. When first it became a Law that Sponsors might not marry a Spiritual Relation.—13. Why the Names of the Sponsors ordered to be registered in the Books of the Church.

## CHAP. IX.

### *Of the Unction and the sign of the Cross in Baptism.*

SECT. 1. Of the first Original of Unction in Baptism.—2. Of the Difference between this and Chrim in Confirmation.—3. The Design of this Unction, and the Reason of it.—4. The Sign of the Cross frequently used in the Ceremonies of Baptism. First in the admission of Catechumens; and Secondly, in the Time of Exorcism.—3. Thirdly, in this Unction before Baptism.—6. Fourthly, in the Unction of Confirmation.

## CHAP. X.

### *Of the Consecration of the Water in Baptism.*

SECT. 1. The Consecration of the Water made by Prayer.—2. An ancient Form of this Prayer in the Constitutions.—3. The Sign of the Cross used in this Consecration.—4. The Effects and Change wrought by this Consecration, the same as in the Bread and Wine is the Eucharist.—5. How far these prayers of Consecration reckoned necessary in the Church.



## CHAP. XI.

*Of the different Ways of Baptising by Immersion, Trine Immersion, and Aspersion in the Case of Clinic Baptism.*

SECT. 1. All Persons anciently divested in order to be baptised.—2. No Exception in this Case either with respect to Women or Children.—3. Yet matters were so ordered, as that no indecency might be committed.—4. Baptism usually performed by Immersion.—5. Yet Aspersion allowed in some extraordinary Cases.—6. Trine Immersion, the General Practice for several Ages. The Reason of this.—7. The Original of this Practice.—8. When first the Church allowed of any Alteration in it.

## BOOK XII.

OF CONFIRMATION, AND OTHER CEREMONIES FOLLOWING BAPTISM, BEFORE MEN WERE MADE PARTAKERS OF THE EUCHARIST.

## CHAP. I.

*Of the Time when, and the Persons to whom Confirmation was administered.*

SECT. 1. Confirmation anciently given immediately after Baptism, if the Bishop were present.—2. And this as well to Infants as Adult Persons. Which is evidenced first from some plain Testimonies.—3. And, Secondly, from the Custom of giving the Eucharist to Infants for many Ages.—4. Whence it appears, that Confirmation was not esteemed a proper Sacrament distinct from Baptism.—5. No, not when it was separate from Baptism, as in the case of Heretics, who were baptised out of the Church.—6. No Necessity of giving Confirmation to Infants now, any more than the Eucharist, from the example of the Primitive Church.

## CHAP. II.

*Of the Minister of Confirmation.*

SECT. 1. The Consecration of Chrism reserved only to the Office of Bishops by the Canons.—2. The Use of the Chrism divided between the Office of Bishops and Presbyters.—3. The other Ceremony of Imposition of hands reserved more strictly to the Office of Bishops.—4. Yet in some special Cases, Presbyters by Commission allowed to minister it also. As first, when Bishops particularly required their Presbyters to do it to such as were baptised in the Church.—5. Secondly, Presbyters might administer it to the Energumens, who were baptised at a distance from the Bishop's Church.—6. And, Thirdly, to such as were baptised in Heresy or Schism, in case they were in danger of Death.

## CHAP. III.

*Of the Manner of Administering Confirmation and the Ceremonies used in the Celebration of it.*

SECT. 1.—The first Ceremony of Confirmation was the Unction of Chrism.—2. The Original of this Unction.—3. The form and Manner of Administering it, together with the effects of it.—4. The second Ceremony of Confirmation was the Sign of the Cross.—5. The third and most noted ceremony of Confirmation, was Imposition of Hands; and the Fourth, prayer joined therewith.—6. The original of the Ceremony of Imposition of hands.—7. What Opinion the Ancients had of the Necessity<sup>s</sup> of Confirmation.—8. How they punished those that neglected it.

## CHAP. IV.

*Of the remaining Ceremonies of baptism following Confirmation.*

SECT. 1. Persons newly baptised, clothed in White Garments.—2. These sometimes delivered to them with a solemn Form of Words.—3. Worn eight Days and then laid up in the Church.—4. The ceremony of Lights and Tapers. What intended by it. And at whose Charge both these were provided.—5. The Kiss of Peace given to Persons newly baptised.—6. And a Taste of Honey and Milk in token of their New Birth.—7. Then they were required to repeat the Lord's Prayer.—8. And received into the Church with Psalmody.—9. And admitted immediately to the Communion of the Altar.—10. Of the Ceremony of Washing the Feet, retained in some Churches.—11. A general reflection upon the whole preceding Discourse, with Relation to the Practice of the Present Church.

## CHAP. V.

*Of the Laws against Rebaptisation both in Church and State.*

SECT. 1. But one Baptism, properly so called, allowed by the Church.—2. Only the Marcionites allowed Baptism to be thrice repeated.—3. What the Church did in doubtful Cases, not reckoned a Rebaptisation.—4. Nor when she baptised those, who had been unduly baptised before in Heresy or Schism.—5. Apostates never rebaptised in the Catholic Church.—6. What Heretics rebaptised the Catholics.—7. What Punishments were inflicted on Rebaptisers by the Laws of Church and State.

THE  
ANTIQUITIES  
OF THE  
CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

---

BOOK X.

OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE CATECHUMENS,  
AND THE FIRST USE OF THE CREEDS OF THE  
CHURCH.

---

CHAP. I.

*Of the several Names of Catechumens, and the Solemnity that was used in admitting them to that State in the Church. Also of Catechizing, and the Time of their Continuance in that Exercise.*

SECT. I.—The Reason of the Names, Κατηχέμενοι, Novitiosi, Tyrones, &c.

HAVING hitherto discoursed of the several orders of men which made up the great body of the Christian Church, and of churches themselves, or places of worship, and of the several districts into which the body diffusive was divided, I come now to consider the service of the Church, or its public offices and exercises, by which men were disciplined and trained up to the kingdom of Heaven. And to speak of these in their most natural order, it will be necessary to begin with the institution of the catechumens, who were the lowest order of men that had any title to the common name of Christians, and their instruction was the first part of the Church's service. Some things relating to these, have been already touched upon in speaking of the difference between them and the Πιστοί, or *perfect Chris-*

*tians*, in the first Book.<sup>1</sup> The office of the catechist has also been considered in speaking of the inferior orders of the clergy:<sup>2</sup> and the places of instruction, or catechetic schools, have been treated of in the account that has been given of the ancient churches.<sup>3</sup> So that, omitting these things, I shall only speak in this place of such rites and customs as were observed in the practice of the Church in training up the catechumens, and preparing them for baptism; premising something concerning the several names that were given them. They were called *catechumens* from the Greek words, *κατηχέω* and *κατήχησης*, which signify in general the instruction that is given in the first elements or rudiments of any art or science; but in a more restrained ecclesiastical sense, the instruction of men in the first principles of the Christian religion. Hence they had also the names of *Novitioli*, and *Tyrones Dei*, *new soldiers of God*, as we find in Tertullian<sup>4</sup> and St. Austin,<sup>5</sup> because they were just entering upon that state, which made them soldiers of God and candidates of eternal life. They are sometimes also called *Audientes*, *hearers*, from their instruction; though that name more commonly denotes one particular sort of them, such as were allowed to hear sermons only, but not to partake in any of the prayers of the Church: of which more hereafter in the following Chapter.

SECT. 2.—Imposition of Hands used in the first Admission of Catechumens.

I have already observed in another place,<sup>6</sup> that the catechumens, by virtue of their admission into that state, had some title to the common name of Christians also; being a degree higher than either heathens or heretics, though not yet consummated by the waters of baptism. And upon this account, they were admitted to this state not without some ceremony and solemnity of imposition of hands and prayer. Which appears evidently from what

<sup>1</sup> Book i. chap. iv. sect. 5.  
ehap. vii. sect. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Book iii. chap. x.  
<sup>4</sup> Tertul. de Pœnitent. c. vi.

<sup>3</sup> Book viii.  
<sup>5</sup> August. de

Fide ad Catechumen. lib. ii. c. i.

<sup>6</sup> Book i. chap. iii. sect. 3.

Sulpicius Severus<sup>1</sup> says of St. Martin,—“ that passing through a town where they were all Gentiles, and preaching Christ unto them, and working some miracles, the whole multitude professed to believe in Christ, and desired him to make them Christians: upon which he immediately, as he was in the field, laid his hands upon them, and made them catechumens; saying to those that were about him, that it was not unreasonable to make catechumens in the open field, where martyrs were used to be consecrated unto God.” Where we may observe, that to make Christians, and to make catechumens, is the same thing; and that this was done by imposition of hands and prayer. Which observation will help us to the right understanding of some obscure canons and difficult passages in ancient writers, which many learned men have mistaken. In the first council of Arles<sup>2</sup> there is a canon, which orders imposition of hands to be given to such Gentiles as in time of sickness express an inclination to receive the Christian faith. And in the council of Eliberis<sup>3</sup> there is another canon to the same purpose, which says, “ that if any Gentiles, who have led a tolerable moral life, desire imposition of hands, they should have it allowed them, and be made Christians.” Now the question is, what is here meant by imposition of hands, and being made Christians?—Mendoza<sup>4</sup> and Vossius,<sup>5</sup> take it for imposition of hands in baptism; and Albaspin<sup>6</sup> for imposition of hands in confirmation. But the true sense is no more than this imposition of hands used in making catechumens, which in some sort gave Gentile converts an immediate title to be called Christians. And so I find

<sup>1</sup> Sulpic. Vit. Martin. Dialog. ii. c. 5. p. 294. *Cuncti catervatim ad genua B. Viri ruere cœperunt, fideliter postulantes, ut eos faceret Christianos. Nec cunctatus, in medio ut erat campo, cunctos, impositâ universis manu, catechumenos fecit; cùm quidem ad nos conversus diceret, ‘ non irrationabiliter in campo catechumenos fieri, ubi solerent martyres consecrari.’* <sup>2</sup> Con. Arlat. i. c. 5. *De his qui in infirmitate credere volunt, placuit debere eis manum imponi.* <sup>3</sup> Con. Eliber. c. 39. *Gentiles si in infirmitate desideraverint sibi manum imponi, si fuerit eorum ex aliquâ parte vita honesta, placuit eis manum imponi et fieri Christianos.* <sup>4</sup> Mendoza, Not. in Con. Eliber. c. 39. <sup>5</sup> Voss. de Baptismo, Disp. 12. *Thes. v. p. 164.* <sup>6</sup> Albaspin. Not. in Con. Eliber. c. 39.

Valesius,<sup>1</sup> and Basnage,<sup>2</sup> and Cotelerius,<sup>3</sup> understand it. And this must be the meaning of that passage in Eusebius,<sup>4</sup> where, speaking of Constantine's prayers in the church of Helenopolis a little before his death, he says, "it was the same church where he had first been admitted to imposition of hands and prayer," that is, had been made a catechumen with those ceremonies; for no other imposition of hands can here be meant, since it is now agreed on all hands, that Constantine was not baptized until he had left Helenopolis, and was come to Nicomedia, a little before his death. By this also we may understand the meaning of those canons of the first general-council of Constantinople,<sup>5</sup> and the council of Trullo,<sup>6</sup> where speaking of the reception of such heretics as the Eunomians, and Montanists, and Sabellians, who had not been truly baptized, they say, "they should be received only as heathens," viz. the first day be made Christians, the second day catechumens, the third day be exorcized, then instructed for a considerable time in the church, and at last baptized. Here, being made Christians, evidently signifies no more than their being admitted to the lowest degree of catechumens by imposition of hands and prayer; after which came many intermediate ceremonies of exorcizing, catechizing, &c. before they were made complete Christians by baptism. So that, as Theodosius<sup>7</sup> observes in one of his laws, there were two sorts of men that went by the name of Christians, one called *Christiani ac Fideles, Christians and believers*, and the other *Christiani et Catechumeni tantum, Christians and catechumens only*; the former whereof were made so by baptism, and the other by imposition of hands and prayer. Which was a ceremony used in most of the offices of religion, in baptism, confirmation, ordination, reconcili-

<sup>1</sup> Vales. Not. in Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. iv. c. 61.

<sup>2</sup> Basnag.

Critic. in Baron. An. 44. p. 482.

<sup>3</sup> Coteler. Not. in Constitut. Apostol.

lib. vii. c. 39.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. de Vit. Const. lib. iv. c. 61.

<sup>5</sup> "Ενθα δὴ καὶ πρῶτον τῶν διὰ χειροθεσίας ἀρχῶν ἤξιετο.

<sup>6</sup> Con. Constant. i. c. 7.

<sup>7</sup> "Ὡς Ἑλλήνας δεχόμεθα, καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἡμέραν ποιῶμεν αὐτοὺς Χριστιανούς, τὴν δὲ δευτέραν κατηχεμένους, εἶτα τῇ τρίτῃ ἐξορκίζομεν αὐτοὺς—καὶ τότε αὐτοὺς βαπτίζομεν.

<sup>8</sup> Con. Trull. c. 95. Vide etiam Anonymi Epist. ad Martyrium Antiocheum, ap. Beveregii Pandect. tom. ii. p. 100.

<sup>9</sup> Cod.

Th. lib. xvi. tit. 7. de Apostat. leg. 2.

ling of penitents, consecration of virgins, curing the sick, and, as we have now seen, particularly in the first admission of new converts to the state of catechumens,

SECT. 3.—And Consignation with the Sign of the Cross.

Here also, as in most other offices of the Church, they used the sign of the cross. St. Austin joins all these ceremonies together, when he says,<sup>1</sup> “that catechumens were in some sort sanctified by the sign of Christ and imposition of hands and prayer;” meaning, that these ceremonies were used as indications of their forsaking the Gentile state, and becoming retainers to the Christian Church. The same rite is mentioned also by St. Austin in his Confessions<sup>2</sup> as used upon himself during his being a catechumen; but whether he means there his first admission, or his continuance in that state, is not certain. But in the life of Porphyrius, bishop of Gaza, written by his disciple Marcus, it is more plainly expressed: for that author, speaking of some new converts, says, “they fell down at the bishop’s feet, and desired the sign of Christ; upon which, he signed them with the sign of the cross,<sup>3</sup> and made them catechumens, commanding them to attend the Church: and so in a short time after, having first instructed them in the catechism, he baptized them.”

SECT. 4.—At what Age Persons were admitted to be Catechumens.

The circumstance of time here mentioned, may lead us in the next place to inquire, at what age persons were admitted catechumens? And how long they continued in that state before they were baptized? The first question concerns only heathen converts: for, as for the children of believing parents, it is certain, that as they were baptized in infancy, so they were admitted catechumens as soon as they were capable of

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Peccator. Meritis, lib. ii. c. 26. Catechumenos secundum quendam modum suum per signum Christi et orationem, manûs impositione puto sanctificari. <sup>2</sup> Aug. Confess. lib. i. c. 11. <sup>3</sup> Marcus Vit.

Porphyr. Prociderunt ad ejus pedes petentes Christi signaculum. Beatus verò cum eos signasset, et fecisset catechumenos, dimisit illos in pace, præcipiens eis ut vacarent sanctæ ecclesiæ. Et paulo post, cum eos catechesi instituisset, baptizavit.

learning. But the question is more difficult about Heathens. Yet I find in one of the Resolutions of Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, that children before they were seven years old might be catechumens: for he puts the question thus; "Suppose a child of seven years old,<sup>1</sup> or a man that is a catechumen, be present at the oblation, and eat of the eucharist, what shall be done in this case?—and the answer is, Let him be baptized." By which it is plain, he speaks of Heathen children, and not of Christians, who received not only baptism, but the eucharist in their infancy, by the rule and custom of the Church then prevailing, as will be shown in their proper place.

SECT. 5.—How long they continued in that State.

As to the other point, how long they were to continue catechumens,—there was no certain general rule fixed about that; but the practice varied according to the difference of times and places, or the readiness and proficiency of the catechumens themselves. In the apostolical age and the first plantation of the Church, we never read of any long interval between men's first conversion and their baptism. The history of Cornelius, and the Ethiopian eunuch, and Lydia, and the jailer of Philippi in the Acts of the Apostles, to mention no more, are sufficient evidence that in those days catechizing and baptism immediately accompanied one another. And there were good reasons for it; the infant-state of the Church, and the zeal of the converts both required it. But in after ages the Church found it necessary to lengthen this term of probation, lest an overhasty admission of persons to baptism should either fill the Church with vicious men, or make greater numbers of renegadoes and apostates in time of persecution. For this reason the council of Eliberis<sup>2</sup> appointed two years trial for new converts, that if in that time they appeared to be men of a good conversation, they might then be allowed the favour of

<sup>1</sup> Timoth. Alex. Resp. Canon. Q. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Eliber. c. 42. Eos qui ad fidem primam credulitatis accedunt, si bonæ fuerint conversationis, intra biennium placuit ad baptismi gratiam admitti.



baptism. Justinian, in one of his Novels,<sup>1</sup> appointed the same term for Samaritans, because it was found by experience, that they were wont frequently to relapse to their old religion again. The Apostolical Constitutions<sup>2</sup> lengthen the term to three years, but with this limitation, that if men were very diligent and zealous, they might be admitted sooner; because it was not length of time, but men's conversation and behaviour that was to be regarded in this case. The council of Agde, Anno 506, reduced the time for Jewish converts<sup>3</sup> to eight months, giving the same reason, why they made the time of probation so long, "because they are often found to be perfidious and returned to their own vomit again." In other places the time is thought by some to be limited to the forty days of Lent; for so some learned men conjecture from a passage or two in St. Jerom and Cyril's Catechetical Discourses. St. Jerom says,<sup>4</sup> "it was customary in his time to spend forty days in teaching catechumens the doctrine of the blessed Trinity." And St. Cyril seems to imply as much, when he asks the catechumens, "why they should not think it reasonable to spend forty days upon their souls,<sup>5</sup> who had spent so many years upon their own vanities and the world?" The time of Lent is not expressly mentioned in either place, but it seems to be intended, because in those ages Easter was the general time of baptizing over all the world. But I understand this only of the strict and concluding part of this exercise. In some cases the term of catechizing was reduced to a yet much shorter compass, as in case of extreme sickness, or the general conversion of whole nations. Socrates observes, that in the conversion of the Burgundians, the French bishop that converted them, only took seven days time to catechize them,<sup>6</sup> and on the

<sup>1</sup> Justin. Novel. 144. Per duos primum annos in fide instituantur, et pro viribus Scripturas ediscant, tuncque demum sacro redemptionis offerantur baptismati.

<sup>2</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 32. Ὁ μέλλων κατηχέισθαι, τρία ἔτη κατηχέισθω, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Agathen. c. 25. Judæi, quorum perfidia frequenter ad vomitum redit, si ad legem catholicam venire voluerint, octo menses inter catechumenos ecclesiæ limen introeant, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Hieron. Ep. 61. ad Pammach. c. 4. Consuetudo apud nos ejusmodi est, ut iis qui baptizandi sunt per quadraginta dies publicè tradamus sanctam et adorandam Trinitatem.

<sup>5</sup> Cyril. Catech. i. n. 5. p. 18.

<sup>6</sup> Soerat. lib. vii. c. 30.

eighth day baptized them. So in case of desperate sickness, the catechumens were immediately baptized with clinic baptism; as appears from the forementioned council of Agde, which though it prescribes eight months time for the catechizing of Jews, yet in case of extreme danger,<sup>1</sup> if their life was despaired of, it allows them to be baptized at any time within the term prescribed. Cyril of Alexandria,<sup>2</sup> in one of his Canonical Epistles, gives the same orders concerning catechumens who had lapsed, and were for their crimes expelled the Church, that notwithstanding this they should be baptized at the hour of death. St. Basil takes notice, that Arintheus, the Roman consul,<sup>3</sup> being converted by his wife, and in danger of death, was immediately baptized. And there are infinite numbers of such examples to be met with in ecclesiastical history, to verify the general observation which Epiphanius<sup>4</sup> makes upon the practice of the Church, “that such catechumens as were at the point to die, were always, in hopes of the resurrection, admitted to baptism before their death.”

SECT. 6.—The Substance of the ancient Catechisms, and Method of Instruction.

But excepting these cases, a longer time was generally thought necessary to discipline and train men up gradually for baptism; partly for the reason already mentioned, that some just experiment might be made of their conversation during that time; and partly to instruct them by degrees, first in the more common principles of religion, to wean them from their former errors, and then in the more recondite and mysterious articles of the Christian faith: upon which account they usually began their discourses with the doctrine of repentance and remission of sins, and the necessity of good works, and the nature and use of baptism, by which the catechumens were taught, how they were to renounce the devil and his works, and enter into a new covenant with God. Then followed the explication of the seve-

<sup>1</sup> Con. Agathen. c. 25. Quod si casu aliquo periculum infirmitatis intra præscriptum tempus incurrerint, et desperati fuerint, baptizentur.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril. Ep. Canon. ad Episc. Libyæ et Pentapol. ap Bevereg. Pandect. tom. ii. p. 178.

<sup>3</sup> Basil. Ep. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Epiphau. Hær. 28. Cerinthian. n. 6.

ral articles of the Creed, to which some added the nature and immortality of the soul, and an account of the canonical books of Scripture: which is the substance and method of St. Cyril's eighteen famous Discourses to the Catechumens. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions<sup>1</sup> prescribes these several heads of instruction, "Let the catechumen be taught before baptism the knowledge of the Father unbegotten, the knowledge of his only-begotten Son, and Holy Spirit; let him learn the order of the world's creation, and series of divine providence, and the different sorts of legislation; let him be taught why the world, and man, the citizen of the world, were made; let him be instructed about his own nature, to understand for what end he himself was made; let him be informed how God punished the wicked with water and fire, and crowned his saints with glory in every generation, viz. Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, and his posterity, Melchisedech, Job, Moses, Joshua, Caleb, and Phineas, the priest, and the saints of every age; let him also be taught, how the providence of God never forsook mankind, but called them at sundry times, from error and vanity to the knowledge of the truth, reducing them from slavery and impiety to liberty and godliness, from iniquity to righteousness, and from everlasting death, to eternal life. After these he must learn the doctrine of Christ's incarnation, his passion, his resurrection and assumption; and what it is to renounce the devil, and enter into covenant with Christ." These were the chief heads of the ancient catechisms before baptism: in which it is observable, there is no mention made of the doctrine of the eucharist, or confirmation, because these were not allowed to catechumens till after baptism; and the instruction upon the former points, was not given all at once, but by certain degrees, as the discipline of the Church then required, which divided the catechumens into several distinct orders or classes, and exercised them gradually according to the difference of their stations; of which I shall give a more particular account in the following Chapter.

---

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. c. 39.

## SECT. 7.—The Catechumens allowed to read the Holy Scriptures.

Here I shall only remark further, that they allowed them to read some portions of the Scripture; for the moral and historical books were thought most proper at first for their instruction; and the chief use of those, which are now called apocryphal books, was then to instil moral precepts into the catechumens. Upon this account Athanasius<sup>1</sup> says, “though they were not canonical books, as the rest of the books of the Old and New Testament; yet they were such as were appointed to be read by those who were new proselytes and desirous to be instructed in the ways of godliness: such were the Wisdom of Solomon, the Wisdom of Sirach, Esther, Judith, Tobit; to which he also adds, the book called, the Doctrine of the Apostles, and the Shepherd, that is, *Hermes Pastor*. The Author<sup>2</sup> of the Synopsis of the Holy Scripture also, under the name of Athanasius, has much the same observation, “that besides the canonical books there were other books of the Old Testament, which were not in the canon, but only read to or by the catechumens.” But this was not allowed in all Churches: for it seems to have been otherwise in the Church of Jerusalem, at the time when Cyril<sup>3</sup> wrote his Catechetical Discourses. For he forbids his catechumens to read all apocryphal books whatsoever, and charges them to read those books only which were securely read in the Church, viz. those books which the Apostles and ancient bishops, who were wiser than the catechumens, had handed down to them. Then he specifies particularly the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, all the same as are now in our Bibles, except the Revelations, because I presume it was not then read in the Church; and at last

<sup>1</sup> Athan. Ep. Heortastic. tom. ii. p. 39. “Ἐπὶν ἢ ἕτερα βιβλία τέτων ἕξωθεν ἢ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, τετυπωμένα δὲ παρὰ τῶν πατέρων ἀναγιγνώσκεσθαι τοῖς ἄρτι προσερχομένοις, ἢ βελομένοις κατηχεῖσθαι τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον· Σοφία Σολομῶνος, &c. ἢ Διδαχὴ καλεσμένη τῶν Ἀποστόλων, ἢ ὁ Ποιμην.”

<sup>2</sup> Athan. Synops. Scriptur. tom. ii. p. 55. “Ἐκτὸς τῶν κανονιζομένων ἕτερα βιβλία τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης, ἢ κανονιζόμενα μὲν, ἀναγιγνώσκόμενα ἔτι μόνον τοῖς κατηχεμένοις.”

<sup>3</sup> Cyril. Catech. iv. n. 22. p. 66. Πρὸς τὰ ἀπόκρυφα μηδὲν ἔχει κοινόν, &c. Ibid. p. 67. “Ὅσα ἐν ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ἀναγιγνώσκεται, ταῦτα μηδὲ κατὰ σαυτὸν ἀναγιγνώσκει.

concludes with this charge to the catechumens, "that they should not read any other books privately by themselves, which were not read publicly in the Church." From whence I conclude, that as the books which we now call apocryphal were not then read in the Church of Jerusalem, so neither were they allowed to be read by the catechumens, though they were read both publicly and privately in many other Churches. I know some learned persons are of a different opinion, and think that Cyril by apocryphal books, means not those which we now call apocryphal, viz. Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, &c. but other pernicious and heretical books, which were absolutely reprobated and forbidden to all Christians. But if that had been his meaning, he would not have said, that the canonical books were the only books that were read in the Church of Jerusalem, but would have distinguished, as other writers in other Churches do, between canonical, ecclesiastical, and apocryphal books, and have intimated that the ecclesiastical books were such as were allowed to be read in the Church, as well as the canonical, for moral instruction, though not to confirm articles of faith. Whereas he says nothing of this, but the express contrary, "that none but the canonical books were read publicly in the Church, nor were any other to be read privately by the catechumens." Which, at least, must mean thus much, that in the Church of Jerusalem, there was a different custom from some other Churches; and that, though in some Churches the catechumens were allowed to read both the canonical books and the apocryphal, or as others call them the ecclesiastical, yet in the Church of Jerusalem they were allowed to read only the canonical Scriptures, and no other. However it is observable, that no Church anciently denied any order of Christians the use of the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue, since even the catechumens themselves, who were but an imperfect sort of Christians, were exhorted, and commanded to read the canonical books in all Churches and the apocryphal books in some Churches for moral instruction. Nay, if we may believe Bede, they were obliged to get some of the Holy Scriptures by heart, as a part of their exercise and discipline, before they were baptized. For he

commends it as a laudable custom in the ancient Church,<sup>1</sup> that such as were to be catechized and baptized, were taught the beginnings of the four Gospels, and the intent and order of them, at the time when the ceremony of opening their ears was solemnly used; that they might know and remember what and how many those books were, from whence they were to be instructed in the true faith. So far were they from locking up the Scriptures from any order of men in an unknown tongue, that they thought them useful and instructive to the meanest capacities; according to that of the Psalmist, “Thy word giveth light and understanding to the simple:” and therefore they allowed them to be vulgarly read, not only by the more perfect and complete Christians, but even by the very catechumens, among whom, as St. Austin and others have observed, those were commonly the most tractable and the best proficient, who were the most conversant in the Holy Scriptures. For which reason they made it one part of the catechumens’ care to exercise themselves in the knowledge of them, and did not then fear that men should turn heretics by being acquainted with the word of truth.

## CHAP. II.

### *Of the several Classes or Degrees of Catechumens, and the gradual Exercises and Discipline of every Order.*

#### SECT. I.—Four Orders or Degrees of Catechumens among the Ancients.

THAT there were different orders or degrees of catechumens in all such Churches, as kept to the term of catechizing for two or three years together, is acknowledged on all hands by learned men: but what was the precise number of these orders, is not so certainly agreed. The Greek ex-

---

<sup>1</sup> Bede, de Tabernac. lib. ii. c. 13. tom. iv. p. 887. Pulcher in ipsâ ecclesiâ mos antiquitatis inolevit, ut his, qui catechizandi, et Christianis sunt sacramentis initiandi, quatuor evangeliorum principia recitentur, ac de figuris et ordine eorum in apertione aurium suarum solenniter erudirentur: quo sciant exinde ac meminerint, qui et quot sint libri, quorum verbis maximè in fide veritatis debeant erudiri.

positors of the ancient canons, usually make but two sorts, the Ἀτελέτεροι and the Τελειώτεροι, *the imperfect and the perfect, the beginners and the proficient*, who were the immediate candidates of baptism. So Balzamon<sup>1</sup> and Zonaras,<sup>2</sup> Alexius Aristenus<sup>3</sup> and Blastares; and in this opinion they are followed by many modern writers. Dr. Cave<sup>4</sup> makes no other distinction but this of the perfect and imperfect, and says of the imperfect “that they were as yet accounted heathens;” which, for the reasons given in the foregoing Chapter, I cannot subscribe to: for I have showed, that from the time that they received imposition of hands to make them catechumens, they were always both called and accounted Christians, though but in an imperfect state, till they were completed by baptism. Bishop Beverege<sup>5</sup> makes but two sorts of catechumens likewise, the Ἀκροώμενοι, and the Ἐυχόμενοι, or Γονυκλίνοντες, that is, *the hearers*, who only staid to hear the sermon and the Scriptures read, and *the kneelers or substrators*, who staid to receive the minister’s prayers and benediction also. Suicerus<sup>6</sup> and Basnage<sup>7</sup> go much the same way, dividing them into two classes, the *Audientes* and *Competentes*. Maldonate<sup>8</sup> adds to these a third class, which he calls *Catechumeni Pœnitentes*, such catechumens as were under the discipline and censures of the Church. Cardinal Bona<sup>9</sup> augments the number to four kinds, viz. the *Audientes*, *Genuflectentes*, *Competentes*, and *Electi*. And indeed it appears, that there were four kinds of them; yet not exactly the same as Bona mentions; for the *Competentes* and *Electi* were but one and the same order. But there was another order antecedent to all these, which none of these writers mention, which we may call the Ἐξωξόμενοι, that is, such catechumens as were instructed privately, and without doors, before they were allowed to enter the Church.

<sup>1</sup> Balzam. Not. in Con. Neocæsar. c. 5.

<sup>2</sup> Zonaras, *ibid.*

<sup>3</sup> Alex. Aristen. in Con. Ancyra. c. 14.

<sup>4</sup> Cave, Prim. Christ. lib. i.

c. S. p. 211.

<sup>5</sup> Bevereg. Not. in Con. Nicen. c. 14.

<sup>6</sup> Suicer.

Thesaur. tom. ii. p. 72.

<sup>7</sup> Basnag. Critic. in Baron. p. 484.

<sup>8</sup> Maldonat. de Baptism. c. 1. p. 79.

<sup>9</sup> Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. 16.

SECT. 2.—First, the Ἐξωθέμενοι, or Catechumens instructed privately without the Church.

That there was such an order or degree of catechumens as this, is evidently deduced from one of the canons of the council of Neocæsarea, which speaks of several sorts of catechumens, and this among the rest in these words;<sup>1</sup> “If any catechumen, who enters the Church, and stands amongst any order of catechumens there, be found guilty of sin; if he be a kneeler, let him become a hearer, provided he sin no more: but if he sin while he is a hearer, let him be cast out of the Church.” Here it seems pretty evident, that there was an order of catechumens not allowed to enter the Church, to which such of the superior orders as had offended were to be degraded by way of punishment, which the canon calls expulsion from the Church. Which does not mean utterly casting them off as heathens again, but only reducing them to that state in which they were before, when they first received imposition of hands to make them catechumens; which was a state of private instruction, before they were allowed to enter the Church. Maldonate calls these, the order of penitents among the catechumens; and Balzamon and Zonaras, on this canon, style them mourners; which expresses something of this order but not the whole: for there were catechumens privately instructed out of the Church, who were not properly mourners or penitents, as persons cast out of the Church by any censure, but they were such as never had yet been in the Church, but were kept at a distance for some time from that privilege, to make them the more eager and desirous of it. And till we can find a better name for these I call them from this canon, the Ἐξωθέμενοι, which is a general name, that will comprehend both this lowest order of catechumens privately instructed out of the Church, and also such delinquents of the superior orders as were reduced back again to it by way of punishment for their faults.

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Neocæs. c. 5. Κατηχόμενος, ἐὰν εἰσερχόμενος εἰς κυριακὸν ἐν τῇ τῶν κατηχόμενων τάξει σήκη, ἥτος δὲ ἀμαρτάνων, ἐὰν μὲν γόνυ κλίνων, ἀκροάσθω, μηκέτι ἀμαρτάνων, ἐὰν δὲ ἀκροώμενος ἔτι ἀμαρτάνη, ἐξωθείσθω.



SECT. 3.—Secondly, the Ἀκροούμενοι, *Audientes*, or *Hearers*.

The next degree above these, were the hearers, which the Greeks call Ἀκροούμενοι, and the Latins *Audientes*. Who were so called from their being admitted to hear sermons and the Scriptures read in the Church, but they were not allowed to stay any of the prayers, no, not so much as those that were made over the rest of the catechumens, or energumens, or penitents; but before those began, immediately after sermon, at the word of command then solemnly used, “*Ne quis Audientium, let none of the hearers be present!*” they were to depart the Church. As appears from the author of the Apostolical Constitutions<sup>1</sup> who orders the deacon to dismiss the hearers and unbelievers with that solemn form of words, before the liturgy or prayers of the Church began. Upon which account the council of Nice<sup>2</sup> calls them “ἀκροωμένους μόνον, *hearers only*,” to distinguish them from such catechumens as might not only hear sermons, but also attend some particular prayers of the Church, that were especially offered up for them, whilst they were kneeling upon their knees, and waiting for imposition of hands, and the minister’s benediction.

SECT. 4.—Thirdly, the Γονυκλίνοντες, or *Genuflectentes*, the *Kneelers*.

Hence arose a third sort of catechumens, which the Greeks call Γονυκλίνοντες, and the Latins, *Genuflectentes* and *Prostrati*, that is, *kneelers* or *prostrators*. These sometimes have the name of catechumens more especially appropriated to them, as in the forementioned canon of the council of Nice, which runs in these terms, “It is decreed by the great and holy synod concerning the catechumens that have lapsed, that they for three years shall be hearers only, and after that, pray with the catechumens again.” Hence that part of the liturgy which respected them, was particularly called Κατηχσμένων Εὐχὴ, *the prayer of the catechumens*, which came immediately after the bishop’s sermon, together with the prayers of the energumens and penitents, as we learn from the council of Laodicea,<sup>3</sup> which

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 5.  
Laod. c. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Nicen. can. 14.

<sup>3</sup> Con.

orders the method of them. And the forms of these prayers are recited both in the Apostolical Constitutions<sup>1</sup> and St. Chrysostom,<sup>2</sup> which I do not here insert, because they will have a more proper place in the liturgy of the Church. Together with these prayers they always received imposition of hands, kneeling upon their knees: whence the council of Neocæsarea<sup>3</sup> and others, distinguish them by the name of *Γονυκλίνοντες*, the kneelers; the prayer is called *Oratio Impositionis Manûs*, the prayer of imposition of hands, which was frequently repeated both in the public and private exercises of the catechumens.

SECT. 5.—Fourthly, the *Competentes* and *Electi*, the immediate Candidates of Baptism.

Above these was a fourth order, which the Greeks call *Βαπτιζόμενοι* and *Φωτιζόμενοι*; and the Latins, *Competentes* and *Electi*: all which words are used among the Ancients to denote the immediate candidates of baptism, or such as gave in their names to the bishop, signifying their desire to be baptized the next approaching festival. Their petitioning for this favour, gave them the name of *Competentes*; and from the bishop's examination and approbation, or choice of them, they were styled *Electi*. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his Catechetical Discourses,<sup>4</sup> always terms them *Φωτιζόμενοι*, which though it frequently signifies persons already baptized, or illuminated by the sacrament of baptism, yet in his style, it denotes persons yet to be baptized, or such as had only the illumination of catechetical instruction antecedent to baptism: and so the name, *Βαπτιζόμενοι*, in the author of the Apostolical Constitutions,<sup>5</sup> is taken, not for persons actually baptized, but for those catechumens who were desirous to be baptized; whence, in the same author, the prayer that is said over these catechumens in the Church, is called *Βαπτιζομενων* and *Φωτιζομενων Εύχη*, the prayer or those that went about to be illuminated and baptized: which also shows, that the *Substrati* and *Com-*

<sup>1</sup> Con. Laod. lib. viii. c. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Chrysost. Hom. ii. in 2 Cor.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Neocæs. c. 5.

<sup>4</sup> Cyril. Catech. 1, 2, &c.

<sup>5</sup> Constit.

Apost. lib. viii. c. 8.

*petentes* were different orders or degrees of the catechumens, contrary to what Mr. Basnage and some others have asserted, since different prayers, at different times in the Church, were offered up for them.

SECT. 6.—How this last Order were particularly disciplined and prepared for Baptism.

These *Competentes*, as I said, were so called from their petitioning for the sacrament of baptism, as we learn from St. Austin, who often gives this reason for it,<sup>1</sup> telling us, “that upon the approach of the Easter festival, it was usual for the catechumens to give in their names in order to be baptized, whence they were called *Competentes*, *petitioners* or *candidates* for baptism.” When their names were given in, and their petition accepted, then both they and their sponsors were registered in the books of the Church; as is noted by the author, under the name of Dionysius,<sup>2</sup> the Areopagite, who brings in the bishop commanding the priests to register both the catechumen and his sponsor, or susceptor, together: and in the council of Constantinople, under Mennas,<sup>3</sup> there is mention made of an officer in the Church, particularly appointed to this business, one whose appropriated office it was to register the names of those, who offered and presented themselves to baptism. These registers were called their diptychs; but as they had several sorts of diptychs, some for the dead and some for the living, these were particularly called *Δίπτυχα Ζώντων*, *the diptychs*, or *books of the living*, as is observed by Pachymeres,<sup>4</sup> in his comment upon the foresaid place of Dionysius.

SECT. 7.—Partly by frequent Examinations, in which such as approved themselves had the Name of *Electi*.

When their names were thus registered, then followed a

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Fide et Oper. c. 6. Cùm fontis illius sacramenta peteremus, atque ab hoc competentes etiam vocaremur, &c. Id. de Curâ pro Mortuis, c. 12. Paschâ appropinquante, dedit nomen inter alios competentes.

<sup>2</sup> Dionys. Hierarch. Eccles. c. 2. n. 4. p. 216. Ἰεράρχης ἀπογράφασθαι κελεύει τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τὸν ἄνδρα ἐξ τὸν ἀνάδοχον.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Constant. sub Menna. Act. v. tom. v. p. 224. Ὁ τῆς προσηγορίας τῶν εἰς τὸ βάπτισμα προσιόντων ἐγγράφην τεταγμένος.

<sup>4</sup> Pachymer. in Dionys. p. 234.

scrutiny or examination of their proficiency under the preceding stages of the catechetical exercises; and this was often repeated before baptism, according to the direction given in this case by the fourth council of Carthage.<sup>1</sup> They that were approved upon such examination, were sometimes called *Electi*, *the chosen*, as we find in the decrees of Pope Leo Magnus, who speaks of them under this appellation,<sup>2</sup> because they were now accepted and chosen as persons qualified for baptism at the next approaching festivals of Easter or Whitsuntide, which were the usual times of baptizing. Cardinal Bona makes these *Electi* a distinct order from the *Competentes*: but there seems to be no ground for such a distinction, because their exercises were all the same henceforward till they arrived at baptism.

SECT. 8.—Partly by Exorcism, accompanied with Imposition of Hands, and the Sign of the Cross, and Insufflation.

For as they were all examined, so they were all exorcized alike for twenty days before baptism. This custom is often mentioned by the ancient writers, both of the Greek and Latin Church. St. Austin more than once speaks of it as the common practice of the African Church; joining examination,<sup>3</sup> catechizing, and exorcism together, and telling us that the fire of exorcism, as his phrase is, always preceded baptism. We learn the same from Cyprian and the council of Carthage, held under him about the validity of heretical baptism; for there it is often said, that heretics and schismatics were first to be exorcized with imposition of hands, and then baptized,<sup>4</sup> before they could be admitted as true members of the Catholic Church. And we learn from thence

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carth. iv. can. 81. Crebrâ examinatione baptismum percipiant.

<sup>2</sup> Leo Ep. 4. ad Episc. Siculos, c. 5. In baptizandis in ecclesiâ electis, hæc duo tempora, de quibus locuti sumus esse legitima, &c. <sup>3</sup> Aug. in Psal.

65. Post ignem exorcismi venit ad baptismum. Id. de Fide et Oper. c. 6. Suis nominibus datis, abstinentiâ, jejuniis, exorcismisque purgantur. — Ipsis diebus quibus catechizantur, exorcizantur, scrutantur. <sup>4</sup> Con. Carth.

ap. Cyprian. p. 232. Censeo omnes hæreticos et schismaticos, qui ad catholicam ecclesiam voluerint venire, non ante ingredi, nisi exorcizati et baptizati prius fuerint. Ibid. p. 237. Primo per manûs impositionem in exorcismo, secundo per baptismi regenerationem, tuæ possunt ad Christi pollicitationem venire.

also, that the practice was so universal, that the heretics themselves did not omit it, though it was esteemed of no effect by the Catholics when done by them, but looked upon only as a mock-practice, where one demoniac<sup>1</sup> exorcized another, as Cæcilius à Bilta phrases it in the same council. Ferrandus Diaconus<sup>2</sup> also speaks of this exorcism, which immediately followed the scrutiny or examination of the *Competentes*. And the like testimonies may be seen in Petrus Chrysologus,<sup>3</sup> and the second council of Bracara,<sup>4</sup> for the practice of the Italic and Spanish Churches. In the last of which it is particularly specified, that these exorcisms shall continue for twenty days before baptism. Genadius of Marseilles<sup>5</sup> testifies not only for the French Church, but the universal Church throughout the whole world, that exorcisms and exsufflations were uniformly used both to infants and adult persons, before they were admitted to the sacrament of regeneration and fountain of life. And for the Greek Church in particular, though the author of the Apostolical Constitutions, for a peculiar reason, makes no mention of this ceremony, because he represents the business of an exorcist not as a standing and ordinary office in the Church, but as an extraordinary and miraculous gift of God,<sup>6</sup> as it was in the age of the Apostles; yet Gregory Nazianzen and Cyril of Jerusalem are undeniable evidences of the practice: for Nazianzen, in his oration upon baptism,<sup>7</sup> thus bespeaks his catechumen; “Despise not thou the medicinal office of exorcism, neither grow weary of the length or continuance

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carth. ap. Cypr. p. 230. Apud hæreticos omnia per mendacium aguntur, ubi exorcizat dæmoniacus, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Ferrand. Ep. ad Fulgent. de Catechizando Æthiophe, inter Fulgentii opera, p. 606. Celebrato solemniter scrutinio, per exorcismum contra diabolum vindicatur.

<sup>3</sup> Pet. Chrysolog. Sermon. 52. Hinc est quod veniens ex gentibus impositione manûs et exorcismis ante à dæmone purgatur. Vid. Sermon. 105.

<sup>4</sup> Con. Bracar. ii. c. 1. Ante viginti dies baptismi ad purgationem exorcismi concurrant catechumeni, &c.

<sup>5</sup> Gennad. de Dogmat. Eccles. c. 31. Illud etiam quod circa baptizandos in universo mundo sancta ecclesia uniformiter agit, non otioso contemplamur intuitu: cum sive parvuli sive juvenes ad regenerationis veniunt sacramentum, non prius fontem vitæ adeant, quàm exorcismis et exsufflationibus clericorum spiritus ab eis immundus abigatur.

<sup>6</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 26.

<sup>7</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. p. 657. Μὴ διαπτύσης ἔξορκισμῶν θεραπείαν. μηδὲ πρὸς τὸ μῆκος ταύτης ἀπαγορευσης. βάσυνός ἐστι ἐν αὐτῇ τῆς πίστεως χάρισμα γνησιότητος.

of it; for it is a proper trial of a man's sincerity in coming to the grace of baptism." Cyril in like manner bids his catechumen,<sup>1</sup> "to receive exorcism with diligence in the time of catechizing." For, whether it was insufflation or exorcism, it was to be esteemed salutary to the soul; for as mixed metals could not be purged without fire, so neither could the soul be purged without exorcisms, which were divine, and gathered out of the Holy Scriptures. He adds a little after, "that the exorcists did thus, by the power of the Holy Spirit, cast a terror upon the evil spirit, and make him fly from the soul, and leave it in a salutary state and hope of eternal life." Where we may observe two things that give great light in this matter. First, why it is so often called by the Ancients the fire of exorcism; because it purges the soul, and as it were fires the evil spirit from it. Secondly, that these exorcisms were nothing but prayers, collected and composed out of the words of the Holy Scripture, to beseech God to break the dominion and power of Satan in new converts; and to deliver them from his slavery by expelling the spirit of error and wickedness from them. Therefore Cyril<sup>2</sup> in another place calls them "*λόγοι εὐχῆς, the words of prayer,*" by which a devil or a demoniac, who could not be held in chains of iron by many, was often held by one, through the power of the Holy Ghost working in him; and the bare insufflation of an exorcist, was a fire of sufficient force to expel the invisible spirits. So that the whole business of exorcism, and the power of it, is to be resolved into prayer; some forms of which are now extant in the Euchologium or Rituals of the Greek Church,<sup>3</sup> published by Goar, and the Rituals of the ancient Gallican Church, published by Mabillon.<sup>4</sup> From whence also it appears, that the insufflation, and imposition of hands, and the sign of the cross, which was used at the same time, as we find in the writings of St Austin,<sup>5</sup> and St. Ambrose,<sup>6</sup> were only looked upon as decent ceremonies or concomitants of prayer; to whose energy, and not to

<sup>1</sup> Cyril. Præfat. ad Catech. n. 5. p. 7. Τὸς ἐπορκισμὸς δὲ χρὴ μετὰ σπασθῆς εὐὸν ἐμφυσηθῆς, κὼν ἐπορκισθῆς, σωτηρία σοι τὸ πρᾶγμα νόμισον εἶναι, &c. Vid. Catech. i. n. 5. p. 18. <sup>2</sup> Cyril. Catech. xvi. n. 9. p. 234. <sup>3</sup> Eucholog. p. 333. <sup>4</sup> Mabillon. Musæum Italic. tom. i. p. 323.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. Confes. lib. i. c. 11. Aug. de Symbol. lib. iv. c. 1.

<sup>6</sup> Ambros.

De iis qui initiantur, c. 4.

the bare ceremonies, the whole efficacy and benefit of this part of the catechumens' discipline is to be attributed. For though the ceremonies be sometimes only mentioned, yet prayer is always to be understood, and to be taken for the substance of the action, whilst the other were only the circumstances of it.

SECT. 9.—Partly by the Exercises of Fasting and Abstinence, and Confession, and Repentance.

During this same term of twenty days the catechumens were also exercised with abstinence and fasting, as a suitable preparation for their ensuing baptism. The fourth council of Carthage has a canon, which joins all these things together: "Let such, as give in their names to be baptized,<sup>1</sup> be exercised a long time with abstinence from wine and flesh, and with imposition of hands, and frequent examination, and so let them receive their baptism." In like manner St. Austin<sup>2</sup> puts abstinence, fastings, and exorcism together, and particularly mentions abstinence from the marriage-bed, during this time of preparation for baptism. So Socrates tells us,<sup>3</sup> when the Burgundians desired baptism of a French bishop, he first made them fast seven days. And when a certain Jewish impostor, who had been baptized by the Arians and Macedonians, came at last to Paul, the Novatian bishop, to desire the like favour of him, the same author observes,<sup>4</sup> that Paul would not admit him, till he had first exercised him with fasting many days, and taught him the rudiments of the Christian faith. These fastings are also mentioned by Justin Martyr and Tertullian, where they speak of men's preparation for baptism. "As many," says Justin Martyr,<sup>4</sup> "as believe the things to be true, which we teach, and promise to conform their lives to the law of our religion, first of all learn to ask pardon of their by-past

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carth. iv. c. 84. Baptizandi nomen suum dent, et diu sub abstinentiâ vini et carniû, ac manû impositione, crebrâ examinatione baptismum percipiant.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de Fide et Oper. c. 6. Sine dubio non admitterentur, si per ipsos dies quibus eandem gratiam percepturi, suis nominibus datis, abstinentiâ, jejuniis, exorcismisque purgantur, cum suis legitimis et veris uxoribus se concubituros profiterentur, atque hujus rei quamvis alio tempore licitæ, paucis ipsis solemnibus diebus nullam continentiam servaturos.

<sup>3</sup> Socrat. lib. vii. p. 30.

<sup>4</sup> Socrat. lib. vii. c. 17.

<sup>5</sup> Justin. Apol. ii. p. 93.

sins of God, by prayers and fastings, we joining our prayers and fastings with theirs." So Tertullian,<sup>1</sup> "they, that are about to receive baptism, must first use frequent prayers and fastings, and geniculations and watchings, and make confession of all their former sins, in imitation of John's baptism, taking it for a favour, that they are not obliged to make public confession of their flagitious crimes and offences." Whence we may conclude, that these confessions were sometimes public, and sometimes private, as directed by the wisdom of the Church. They, who would see more of this matter, may consult St. Cyril's Catechetic Discourses,<sup>2</sup> and Gregory Nazianzen's Oration about Baptism,<sup>3</sup> who to confession, and prayers, and fasting, add humicubations, and groans, and tears, and forgiving of enemies, as proper indications of a penitent mind, before men came to receive the seal of forgiveness at God's hand by the ministry of his Church.

SECT. 10.—Partly by Learning the Words of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer.

At this time also the *Competentes* were taught the words of the Creed, which they were obliged to get by heart, in order to repeat it before the bishop at their last examination before baptism. This part of catechizing was often performed by the bishop himself, as we may learn from those words of St. Ambrose,<sup>4</sup> where he thus distinguishes the *Competentes* from the other catechumens: "When the catechumens were dismissed, I recited the Creed to the *Competentes* in the baptisteries of the Church." This was done in some Churches twenty days before baptism; for so the second council of Bracara ordered<sup>5</sup> for the Spanish Churches.

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. c. 20. Ingressuros baptismum, orationibus crebris, jejniis, et geniculationibus, et pervigiliis orare oportet, et cum confessione omnium retro delictorum, ut exponent etiam baptismum Johannis. Tinguiebantur, inquit, confitentes delicta sua. Nobis gratulandum est, si non publicè confitemur iniquitates aut turpitudines nostras. Vid Tertul. de Pœnitent. c. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril. Catech. i. n. 5 et 6. p. 18 et 19.

<sup>3</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. de

Bapt. <sup>4</sup> Ambros. Ep. 33. ad Marcellinam Sororem, p. 158. Dimissis catechumenis, symbolum aliquibus competentibus tradebam in baptisteriis basilicæ.

<sup>5</sup> Con. Bracr. ii. c. 1. Ante viginti dies baptismi, catechumeni symbolum, quod est, 'Credo in Deum Patrem omnipotentem,' specialiter doceantur.



But the council of Agde, in France,<sup>1</sup> speaks only of eight days before Easter, appointing Palm-Sunday to be the day, when the Creed should be publicly taught the *Competentes* in all their churches. But perhaps we are to distinguish betwixt the public and private teaching of the Creed; and so one might be done privately twenty days before by the catechists in the baptisteries or catechetical schools, and the other publicly, eight days before, by the ministers of the Church. However this was, there was a certain day appointed for these catechumens to give an account of their creed, and that was the *Parasceue*, or day before our Saviour's passion, which the council of Laodicea<sup>2</sup> calls the fifth day of the great and solemn week, when such as were to be baptized, having learnt their creed, were to repeat it before the bishop or presbyters in the church. And this was the only day for several ages, that ever the Creed was publicly repeated in the Greek Churches, as Theodorus Lector<sup>3</sup> informs us, who says, it was used to be recited only once a year, and that was on the *Parasceue*, or *day of preparation* to our Saviour's passion, now called Holy Thursday: at which time the bishop was always wont to catechize the *Competentes* in the church. When they had learned the Creed, they were also taught the Lord's Prayer, which was not allowed ordinarily to the catechumens till immediately before their baptism. For this prayer was usually called *Ἐυχὴ Πιστῶν*, the *prayer of the faithful*, as being peculiarly used only by persons baptized, who were made sons of God by regeneration, and had a title, as such, to address God under the denomination of their father which is in Heaven; which catechumens, at least those of the first orders, could not so properly do: but when they arrived at this last degree of *Competentes*, and stood as immediate candidates of baptism, then this form was part of their instruction, and not before. As we learn from Ferrandus Diaconus, who speaks first of their repeating the Creed,

<sup>1</sup> Con. Agathen. c. 9. *Symbolum etiam placuit ab omnibus ecclesiis unâ die, id est, ante octo dies dominicæ resurrectionis, publicè in ecclesiâ competentibus prædicari.*

<sup>2</sup> Con. Laodic. c. 46. *"Ὅτι δεῖ τὸς φωτιζομένους τὴν πίστιν ἐκμανθάνειν, ἐν τῇ πέμπτῃ τῆς ἑβδομάδος ἀπαγγέλλειν τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἢ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις.*

<sup>3</sup> Theodor. Lector. lib. ii. p. 563.

and then learning the Lord's Prayer.<sup>1</sup> And the same is evident from Chrysostom, Austin, and Theodoret, of whom I shall have occasion to speak more particularly in Chap. v. Sect. 9. where I treat of the ancient discipline in concealing the sacred mysteries from the catechumens.

SECT. 11.—And the Form of renouncing the Devil, and covenanting with Christ, and other Responses to be used in Baptism.

Together with the Creed, they were also taught how to make their proper responses in baptism; particularly the form of renouncing the devil and his works, his pomps, his worship, his angels, his inventions, and all things belonging to him; and the contrary form of covenanting with Christ, and engaging themselves in his service; for though these acts in their highest solemnity did properly appertain to the substance of baptism itself; yet it was necessary to instruct the catechumens beforehand, how they were to behave themselves in these matters, that they might not, through ignorance, be at a loss when they came to baptism. And therefore the author of the Apostolical Constitutions<sup>2</sup> orders it to be one special part of the catechumens' instruction, just before their baptism, that they should learn what related to the renunciation of the devil, and covenanting with Christ. And these engagements they actually entered into, not only at their baptism, but before it, as a just preparation for it: "for," says that author, "they ought first to abstain from the contraries, and then come to the holy mysteries, having purged their hearts beforehand of all spot and wrinkle and habits of sin." And the same thing is intimated by Tertullian and Ferrandus, the deacon of Carthage. For Ferrandus says expressly,<sup>3</sup> that the catechumens, at the same time that they were exorcized, made their actual renunciation of the devil, and then were taught the Creed. And Tertullian

<sup>1</sup> Ferrand. Ep. ad Fulgent. de Catechizando Æthiophe. Ipsa insuper sancti symboli verba memoriter in conspectu fidelis populi clarâ voce pronuncians piam regulam dominicæ orationis accepit.

<sup>2</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. c. 39 et 40. *Μανθανέτω τὰ περὶ τῆς ἀποσταγῆς τῆ διαβόλης, καὶ τὰ περὶ τῆς συνταγῆς τῆ Χριστοῦ, &c.*

<sup>3</sup> Ferrand. Ep. ad Fulgent. inter Opera Fulgentii, p. 606. Per exorcismum contra diabolium vindicatur; cui se renunciare constanter, sicut hic consuetudo poscebat, auditurus symbolum, profitetur.

means the same thing, when he says, that this renunciation was made twice; first in the church,<sup>1</sup> under the hands of the bishop, and then again when they came to the water to be baptized. And hence it became one part of the ancient office of deaconesses, to instruct the more ignorant and rustic sort of women, how they were to make their responses at the time of baptism to such interrogatories as the minister should then put to them, as I have had occasion to show from a canon of the fourth council of Carthage,<sup>2</sup> in discoursing of the office of deaconesses in another place.<sup>3</sup>

SECT. 12.—What meant by the *Competentes* going veiled some time before Baptism.

Besides these parts of useful discipline and instruction, there were some other ceremonies of less note used toward the catechumens, which I must not wholly pass over. Among these was the ceremony of the *Competentes* going veiled, or with their faces covered, for some days before baptism: which custom is taken notice of by Cyril of Jerusalem,<sup>4</sup> together with the reason of it; “Your face” says he to the catechumens, “was covered, that your mind might be more at liberty, and that the wandering of your eyes might not distract your soul. For when the eyes are covered, the ears are not diverted by any impediments from hearing and receiving saving truths.” St. Austin and Junilius give a more mystical reason for it. For they suppose the catechumens went veiled in public, as bearing the image of Adam’s slavery after his expulsion out of Paradise; and that these veils being taken away after baptism<sup>5</sup> was an indication of

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Coron. Mil. c. 3. Aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesiâ sub antistitis manu contestamur nos renunciare diabolo, et pompæ et angelis ejus. <sup>2</sup> Con. Carth. iv. c. 12. Viduæ vel sanctimoniales, quæ ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur, tam instructæ sint ad officium, ut possint apto et sano sermone docere imperitas et rusticas mulieres, tempore quo baptizandæ sunt, qualiter baptizatori interrogatæ respondeant, et qualiter accepto baptismate vivant. <sup>3</sup> Book ii. chap. xxii. sect. 9. <sup>4</sup> Cyril. Præfat. ad Catech. n. 5. p. 7. Ἐσκέπασαι σε τὸ πρόσωπον, ἵνα σχολάσῃ λοιπὸν ἡ διάνοια. <sup>5</sup> Aug. Ser. 4. in Dominic. Octav. Paschæ, 155. de Tempore. Hodie octavæ dicuntur infantium: revelanda sunt capita eorum, quod est indicium libertatis. Habet enim libertatem ista spiritalis nativitas. Junil. de Partibus Divinæ Legis. lib. ii. c. 16. Bibl. Patr. tom. i. p. 15. Typum gerunt Adæ Paradiso exclusi—propter quod et per publicum capitibus tectis incedunt.

the liberty of the spiritual life, which they obtained by the sacrament of regeneration. However it be, the evidences are plain, that there was such a ceremony used to the catechumens; but, as Valesius<sup>1</sup> rightly observes, it did not respect them all, but only that order of them, that were peculiarly called the *Competentes*.

SECT. 13.—Of the Ceremony called Ephphata, or Opening of the Ears of the Catechumens.

Another ceremony of this nature, was the custom of touching the ears of the catechumens, and saying unto them *Ephphata, be opened*: which Petrus Chrysologus<sup>2</sup> joins with imposition of hands and exorcism; making it to have something of mystical signification in it, to denote the opening of the understanding to receive the instructions of faith. And St. Ambrose,<sup>3</sup> or an author under his name, describes the same custom, deriving the original of it from our Saviour's example, in saying *Ephphata, be opened*, when he cured the deaf and the blind. But this custom seems not to have gained any great credit in the practice of the Church; for besides these two authors, there is scarce any other that so much as mentions it; and whether it was used to the first or last order of the catechumens, is not very easy to determine.

SECT. 14.—Of putting Clay upon their Eyes. What meant by it.

The like may be said of another ceremony, which is mentioned in St. Ambrose, which was the custom of anointing the eyes with clay, in imitation of our Saviour's practice, when he cured the blind man by making clay of his spittle, and anointing his eyes with it, John, ix. 6. The design of

<sup>1</sup> Vales. Not. in Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. iv. c. 62. <sup>2</sup> Chrysolog. Serm. 52. p. 286. Hinc est quod veniens ex gentibus impositione manûs et exorcismis ante à dæmone purgatur; et apertionem aurium percipit, ut fidei capere possit auditum.

<sup>3</sup> Ambros. De iis qui initiantur, c. i. Quod vobis significavimus, cùm apertionis celebrantes mysterium diceremus, effeta, quod est, aperire.—Hoc mysterium celebravit Christus in Evangelio, cùm mutum curaret et surdum. Id. de Sacramentis, lib. i. c. 1. Mysteria celebrata sunt apertionis, quando tibi aures tetigit sacerdos et nares.

this ceremony, as that author explains it,<sup>1</sup> was to teach the catechumens to confess their sins, and to review their consciences, and repent of their errors, that is, to acknowledge what state and condition they were in by their first birth. St. Austin seems also<sup>2</sup> to refer to this practice in his discourse upon the blind man cured by our Saviour, where he says, the catechumens were anointed before baptism, as the blind man was by Christ, who was thereby perhaps made a catechumen.

SECT. 15.—Whether the Catechumens held a lighted Taper in their Hands in the Time of Exorcism.

Vicecomes<sup>3</sup> and Mr. Basnage<sup>4</sup> mention another custom, which was peculiar in their opinion to the African Church, viz. the use of a lighted taper put into the hands of the catechumens in time of exorcism, to signify, as Mr. Basnage explains it, the illustration of the Holy Ghost; or, as Vicecomes would have it, the power of exorcism in expelling Satan. But their observation, I think, is grounded upon a mere mistake, interpreting some words of St. Cyprian and St. Austin in a literal sense, which are only figurative and metaphorical. Cyprian speaking of the power of Christians over unclean spirits, says<sup>5</sup> among many other things, “that they could oblige them by their powerful stripes to forsake the persons they had possessed; that they could put them to the rack, and make them confess, and cry out, and groan; that they could scourge them with their whips, and burn them with their fire.” Where it is plain enough to any unprejudiced reader, that the fire of exorcism here spoken of, is of the same kind with the whips, and stripes, and rack;

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iii. c. 2. Ergo quando dedisti nomen tuum, tulit lutum et linivit super oculos tuos. Quod significat ut peccatum tuum fatereris, ut conscientiam tuam recognosceres, ut pœnitentiam ageres delictorum. hoc est, sortem humanæ generationis agnosceres. <sup>2</sup> Aug. Tract. 44. in Johan. tom. ix. p. 133. Catechumenus inunctus est, nondum lotus.

<sup>3</sup> Vicecomes, de Ritib. Bapt. lib. ii. c. 32. p. 488.

<sup>4</sup> Basnag. Critic. in Baron. <sup>5</sup> Cypr. ad Donatum, p. 4. Facultas datur, immundos et erraticos spiritus ad confessionem minis increpantibus cogere; ut recedant duris verberibus urgere; conflictantes, ejulantes, gementes, incremento pœnæ propagantis extendere; flagris cedere, igne torrere. Res illic geritur, nec videtur; occulta plaga, et pœna manifesta.

that is, the spiritual and invisible power of the Holy Ghost, as Cyprian himself immediately explains them, when he says, "all this was done, but not seen; the stroke was invisible, and the effect of it only appeared to men." So that it was not a material fire, or a lighted taper in the hands of the catechumens, that Cyprian speaks of, as Vicecomes fancies, but the invisible fire or power of the Holy Ghost. And it is the same fire that St. Austin means, whose authority only is urged by Mr. Basnage to found this custom on. He speaks of a fire indeed in the sacraments,<sup>1</sup> and in catechizing, and in exorcizing. "For whence otherwise, should it be," says he, "that the unclean spirits so often cry out, 'I burn,' if there be not a fire that burns them? From the fire of exorcism we pass to baptism, as from fire to water, and from water to a place of rest." There is nothing in all this that can signify a lighted taper in the hands of the catechumens, which certainly has no power to burn an unclean spirit: but the fire of exorcism is the invisible fire of the Holy Ghost, that is, the energy and powerful operation of God's spirit, which casts out devils with a word, and makes Satan fall like lightning from Heaven. Though I deny not but that this custom might come into the Church in after-ages: for Albinus Flaccus, a ritualist of the eighth century, speaks of a custom like to it,<sup>2</sup> as used at least the night before the catechumens were to be baptized. For describing the ceremonies of the vigil of the great Sabbath before Easter, he says, "a wax taper was used to be carried before the catechumens, which signified the illumination wherewith Christ enlightened that night, by the grace of his resurrection, and the catechumens coming to baptism." And this was it that deceived Vicecomes, who would have all modern customs appear with a face of antiquity, and therefore wrested the words of St. Cyprian and St. Austin to patronise a no-

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Enarrat. in Psal. lxxv. p. 277. In sacramentis et in catechizando et in exorcizando adhibetur prius ignis. Nam unde immandi spiritus plerumque clamant, ardeo, si ille ignis non est? Post ignem autem exorcismi venit ad baptismum, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Albin. al. Alcuin. de Divin. Ofic. c. 19. Cereus præcedit catechumenos nostros; lumen ipsius Christum significat, quo præsens nox illuminetur, gratiâ scilicet resurrectionis, et catechumeni ad baptismum venturi.

vel ceremony, which in their days was not so much as thought of.

SECT. 16.—What meant by the Sacrament of the Catechumens.

There is another mistake, which runs through the writings of many modern authors, concerning what the Ancients call the sacrament of the catechumens. They suppose, that though the catechumens were not allowed to participate of the eucharist, yet they had something like it, which they call *Eulogiæ*, or *Panis Benedictus, consecrated bread*, taken out of the same oblations, out of which anciently the eucharist itself was taken. Baronius<sup>1</sup> was the first that maintained this opinion; and after him Bellarmin<sup>2</sup> and Vicecomes,<sup>3</sup> Alaspiny,<sup>4</sup> Petavius,<sup>5</sup> Bp. Beverege,<sup>6</sup> Estius, Maldonate and many others follow him in the same assertion. But the opinion is wholly grounded on a mistaken passage in St. Austin, who speaks indeed of something that according to the language of his age was then called the sacrament of the catechumens; but he does not say, that it was consecrated bread, or part of the same *eulogiæ* out of which the eucharist was taken. His words are these,<sup>7</sup> “ that which the catechumens receive, though it be not the body of Christ, is yet an holy thing, and more holy than the common meat, which sustains us, because it is a sacrament. He gives it the name of sacrament according to the custom of that age, which was to call every thing a sacrament, that had either any thing of mystery, or of spiritual signification in it. But that this sacrament was not the consecrated bread, but only a little taste of salt, we may learn from the same St. Austin, who speaking of himself as a catechumen says, “ at that time<sup>8</sup> he was often signed with the cross of Christ,

<sup>1</sup> Baron. an. 313. n. 55.

<sup>2</sup> Bellarm. de Sacram. lib. ii. c. 25.

<sup>3</sup> Vicecom. de Ritib. Bapt. lib. ii. c. 9. p. 259.

<sup>4</sup> Alaspin. Observat.

lib. ii. c. 36. <sup>5</sup> Petav. Aníadvers. in Epiphan. Exposit. Fid. p. 366.

<sup>6</sup> Bevereg. Not. in Can. 2. Con. Antioch. Estius in Sentent. lib. iv. dist. 10. sect. 5.

<sup>7</sup> Aug. de Peccator. Meritis, lib. ii. c. 26.

Quod accipiunt catechumeni, quamvis non sit corpus Christi, sanctum est tamen, et sanctius quàm cibi quibus alimur, quoniam sacramentum est.

<sup>8</sup> Aug. Confess. lib. i. c. 11. Audieram ego adhuc puer de vitâ æternâ nobis promissa per humilitatem filii tui Domini Dei nostri, et signabar jam signo crucis, et condiebar ejus sale.

and seasoned with his salt." And that it was this and no more, appears further from a canon of the third council of Carthage, at which St. Austin was present, which orders,<sup>1</sup> "that no other sacrament should be given to the catechumens on the most solemn days of the Paschal festival, except their usual salt;" giving this reason for it, "that for as much as the faithful did not change their sacraments on those days, neither ought the catechumens to change theirs." From whence it is easy to be inferred, that the sacrament of the catechumens means no more than this ceremony of giving them a little taste of the salt, like milk and honey that was given after baptism, as Cardinal Bona,<sup>2</sup> and Mr. Aubertine,<sup>3</sup> and Basnage<sup>4</sup> have rightly concluded: the design of the thing being not to give them any thing in imitation of the eucharist, or introductory to that, which they always kept hid as a secret from them; but that by this symbol they might learn to purge and cleanse their souls from sin; salt being the emblem of purity and incorruption.

SECT. 17.—How the Catechumens were punished, if they fell into gross Sins.

I have but two things more to observe concerning the discipline used towards the catechumens. The one relates to those ecclesiastical censures and punishments, which were usually inflicted on them, in case they were found to have lapsed into any gross and scandalous offences. These being not yet admitted into full communion with the Church, could not be punished as other offenders, by being subjected to those several rules of penance as other offenders were; nor did the Church think fit to be so severe upon them, as upon other penitents that lapsed after baptism: but their punishment was commonly no more but a degradation of them from one degree of catechumenship to another, or at most a prorogation of their baptism to the

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carth. iii. can. 5. Placuit ut per solemnissimos paschales dies sacramentum catechumenis non detur, nisi solitum sal: quia si fideles per illos dies sacramenta non mutant, nec catechumenis oportet mutari.

<sup>2</sup> Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. c. 16. n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Albertinus, de Eucharist.

lib. ii. p. 650 et 711.

<sup>4</sup> Basnag. Exercit. Critic. in Baron. p. 487.



hour of death. This appears plainly from the fifth canon of the council of Neocæsarea, which speaks thus of the several degrees of catechumens and their punishment: "If any catechumen, who comes to church, and stands in any order of catechumens there, be found guilty of sin; if he be a kneeler or prostrator, let him become a hearer, if he sins no more: but if he sin while he is an hearer, let him be cast out of the Church." After the same manner it was decreed by the great council of Nice,<sup>1</sup> "that if any of the catechumens, by whom they more especially mean the kneelers, were found guilty of sin, they should be degraded to the classis of the hearers for three years, and after that be admitted to pray with the catechumens again." In the council of Eliberis there are several canons to this purpose: for whereas the ordinary time of continuing catechumens was but two years, as appointed by that council;<sup>2</sup> yet in case of lapsing, they were obliged to continue catechumens sometimes three years, sometimes five, and sometimes to the hour of death before they were baptized, according to the nature and quality of their offences. If a catechumen took upon him the office of an heathen flamen, and did not sacrifice,<sup>3</sup> but only exhibit the usual games, he was to be punished with the prorogation of his baptism for three years from the time of his lapsing. If a woman, who was a catechumen, divorced herself from her husband,<sup>4</sup> her punishment was five years prorogation: but if she committed adultery, and after conception used any arts to destroy her infant in the womb, then her baptism was to be deferred to the hour of death:<sup>5</sup> and this was the highest punishment, that ever was inflicted upon catechumens. For though in this council many times communion, even at the

<sup>1</sup> Con. Nicen. c. 14. Περὶ τῶν κατηχημένων ἐκ παραπεσόντων ἔδοξε τῇ ἁγίᾳ ἐκ μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ, ὥστε τριῶν ἐτῶν αὐτὲς ἀκρωμένους μόνον, μετὰ ταῦτα εὐχασθᾶι μετὲ τῶν κατηχημένων. <sup>2</sup> Con. Eliber. c. 42. <sup>3</sup> Con. Eliber. c. 4. Item flamines, si fuerint catechumeni, et se à sacrificiis abstinuerunt, post triennii tempora, placuit ad baptismum admitti debere.

<sup>4</sup> Con. Eliber. c. 10 et 11. Intra quinquennii autem tempora, catechumena si graviter fuerit infirmata, dandum ei baptismum placuit non denegari. Vid. can. 73. de Delatoribus. <sup>5</sup> Ibid. can. 68. Catechumena, si per adulterium conceperit, et conceptum uocaverit, placuit eam in sine baptizari. Vid. can. 73. ibid.

hour of death, be denied to believers that had lapsed after baptism; yet we meet with no instance or command, in this or any other place, prohibiting catechumens to be baptized at their last hour. The sixty-seventh canon of this council<sup>1</sup> orders them for some crimes to be cast out of communion; which is the same as the council of Neocæsarea calls casting out of the church, or reducing them back to the lowest rank of private catechumens, who were not allowed to enter the church: but when this was done, if ever after<sup>2</sup> they showed true signs of repentance, and a desire to be baptized, they were admitted to this privilege at the hour of death, if not before: and this council gives a reason for this moderation toward them in comparison of others, because their sins were committed whilst they were unregenerate in the old man, and therefore were more easily pardoned than crimes committed by believers after baptism. This was the distinction universally observed between the punishments of the catechumens, and those that had arrived to greater perfections in the Church.

SECT. 18.—How they were treated by the Church, if they died without Baptism.

But in case the catechumens died without baptism by neglect or their own default, then they were punished as other malefactors, who unqualified themselves for the solemnities of a Christian burial. They were put into the same rank as those who laid violent hands on themselves, or were publicly executed for their crimes. The first council of Bracara joins all these together,<sup>3</sup> as persons unworthy to be interred with the usual solemnities of singing of psalms, or to be commemorated amongst the faithful in the oblations and prayers of the Church: for in ancient times, prayers,

<sup>1</sup> Con. Eliber. can. 67. Prohibendum ne qua fidelis vel catechumena aut comicos aut viros cinerarios (al. scenicos) habeat; quæcunque hoc fecerit à communione arceatur.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Eliber. c. 45. Qui aliquando fuerit catechumenus, et per infinita tempora nunquam ad ecclesiam accesserit, si eum de clero quisquam cognoverit esse (al. voluisse esse) Christianum, aut testes aliqui extiterint fideles, placuit, ei baptismum non negari, eo quòd in veterem hominem deliquisse videatur.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Bracar. I. c. 35. Catechumenis sine redemptione baptismi defunctis, simili modo, non oblationis sanctæ commemoratio, neque psallendi impendatur officium.

and oblations, and thanksgivings were solemnly made in the communion-service for all that died in the faith of Christ, and in full communion with the Church: but such as neglected their baptism, were none of this number; and therefore they were buried in silence, and no mention was ever after made of them among others in the prayers of the Church. Chrysostom says expressly,<sup>1</sup> “this was the peculiar privilege of those that died in the faith, but catechumens were excluded from this benefit and all other helps, except that of alms and oblations for them.”

SECT. 19.—What Opinion the Ancients had of the Necessity of Baptism.

This discipline plainly respected those, who put a contempt upon the holy ordinance of baptism, and neglected to receive it, when the time of their catechumenship, perhaps, was expired, and they were under an obligation by the laws of the Church to have received it. But in case there was no contempt, but only an unforeseen and unavoidable necessity hindered their baptism, whilst they were diligently preparing for it; in that case, they were treated a little more favourably by the Ancients, who did not generally think the mere want of baptism, in such circumstances, to be such a piacular crime, as to exclude men absolutely from the benefit of church-communion, or the hopes of eternal salvation. Some few of them indeed are pretty severe upon infants dying without baptism, and some others seem also in general terms to deny eternal life to adult persons dying without it: but yet, when they interpret themselves, and speak more distinctly, they make some allowance, and except several cases, in which the want of baptism may be supplied by other means, when the want of it proceeded not from contempt, but from some great necessity and disability to receive it. They generally ground the necessity of baptism upon those two sayings of our Saviour, “He, that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved;” and, “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God:” but then, in their exposi-

<sup>1</sup> Chrysost. Hom. iii. in Phil. p. 1225. Οἱ δὲ κατηχούμενοι εἶδε ταύτης ἀξιοῦνται τῆς παραμυθίας, &c.

tion of these texts, they limit the sense to the ordinary method of salvation, and such cases wherein baptism may be had; and, as for extraordinary cases, wherein baptism could not be had, though men were desirous of it, they made several exceptions in behalf of other things, which, in such circumstances, were thought sufficient to supply the want of it.

SECT. 20.—The Want of Baptism supplied by Martyrdom.

The chief of these excepted cases was martyrdom, which commonly goes by the name of second baptism, or baptism in men's own blood, in the writings of the Ancients, because of the power and efficacy it was thought to have to save men by the invisible baptism of the Spirit, without the external element of water. Tertullian,<sup>1</sup> upon this account, not only dignifies it with the title of second baptism, but says, "it was that which men desired to suffer, as that which procured the grace of God, and pardon<sup>2</sup> of all sins by the compensation of their own blood: for by this act all sins were pardoned." "This was that second baptism<sup>3</sup> in men's own blood, with which our Lord himself was baptized, after he had been baptized in water." "This baptism was of force both to compensate for want of baptism, and to restore it when men had lost it." Cyprian treads in the steps of his master Tertullian: for, speaking of the catechumens who were apprehended and slain for the name of Christ, before they could be baptized in the Church, he says, "these were not deprived<sup>4</sup> of the sacrament of baptism, seeing they were baptized in the most glorious and cele-

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Patient. c. 13. Quum verò producitur ad experimentum felicitatis, ad occasionem secundæ intinctionis, &c. <sup>2</sup> Tertul. Apol. c. 50.

Quis non ubi requisivit accedit? ubi accessit, pati exoptat? ut totam Dei gratiam redimat, ut omnem veniam de eo compensatione sanguinis sui expediat? omnia enim huic operi delicta donantur. <sup>3</sup> Tertul. de Bapt.

c. 16. Est quidem nobis etiam secundum lavacrum, unum et ipsum, sanguinis scilicet: de quo Dominus, 'habeo,' inquit, 'baptismo tingui,' quum jam tinctus fuisset.—Hic est baptismus, qui lavacrum et non acceptum representat, et perditum reddit.

<sup>4</sup> Cypr. Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 208. Deinde nec privari baptismi sacramento, utpote qui baptizentur gloriosissimo et maximo sanguinis baptismo, de quo et Dominus dicebat, habere se aliud baptismæ baptizari, &c.

brated baptism of their own blood; to which our Lord had reference, when he said, ‘I have another baptism to be baptized with.’ And,” says he, “that they, who are thus baptized in blood, are also sanctified and consummated by their passion, and made partakers of the grace which God hath promised, is further declared by our Saviour in his Gospel, in that he said to the thief, who believed and confessed him upon the cross, ‘To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise!’” Cyprian has many other noble encomiums and flights upon this second baptism, and he excepts no sort of men from the benefit of it, but only one,—that is,—heretics and schismatics, because they wanted the grace of charity, and died out of the communion of the Church without repentance; in which case he thought martyrdom itself not sufficient<sup>1</sup> to expiate their crimes, though it was available to purge away any others. Origen was wont to speak of this kind of baptism, under the name of baptism by fire, as that which often translated even catechumens to heaven, though they wanted baptism by water: for so Eusebius represents both Origen’s sense and his own, when, speaking of the martyrs that suffered out of the school of Origen, he says, “two of them were only catechumens; Heraclides among the men, and Herais among the women,<sup>2</sup> were in this class only, when they died, but they received baptism by fire, as Origen was used to phrase it.” And that this baptism did purge away sins, as well as baptism by water, Origen himself declares: for he argues thus, “that martyrdom<sup>3</sup> is rightly called baptism, because it procures remission of sins, as baptism by water and the Spirit

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. de Orat. Domin. p. 150. Quale delictum est, quod nec baptismo sanguinis potest abluī? Quale crimen est, quod martyrio non potest expiari? Vid. Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. p. 113. It. Ep. 55. ad Antonian. p. 108. Ep. 57 et 60. ad Cornel. Ep. 73. ad Stephan. p. 207.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. Hist. lib. vi. c. 4. Ἡραΐς ἔτι κατηχημένη. το βάπτισμα, ὡς πρ φησὶν αὐτος, το διὰ πυρός λαβῆσα, τον βίον ἐξελίλυθεν.

<sup>3</sup> Orig. Tract. xii. in Matth. p. 85. Si baptismus indulgentiam peccatorum promittit, sicut accepimus de baptismo aquæ et spiritūs: remissionem autem accipit peccatorum et qui martyrii suscipit baptismum: sine dubio ipsum baptismum rationabiliter baptismus appellatur. Quoniam autem remissio fit peccatorum omni martyrium sustinenti, manifestum est ex eo quod ait, ‘Omnis qui confessus fuerit in me coram hominibus, et ego confitebor in illo coram Patre meo qui est cælis.’

doth; and that by virtue of Christ's promise, who ascertains pardon of sins to all that suffer martyrdom, saying, 'Who-soever shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father which is in heaven.'" And that this was then the general doctrine of the Christians in that age, appears further from this, that it was so common and well-known, that the Heathens themselves were not ignorant of it. For in the Acts of the martyrdom of St. Felicitas and Perpetua, who suffered about the time of Origen and Tertullian, one Saturus, a catechumen,<sup>1</sup> is spoken of as being thrown to a leopard, who, by the first bite of the wild beast, was so washed all over in blood, that the people, as he returned, gave him the testimony of the second baptism, crying out, *Salvum lotum! Salvum lotum!*—*baptized and saved! baptized and saved!* This they said only by way of ridicule of the Christian doctrine of martyrdom's being esteemed a second baptism, and a means of salvation: but the author of the Acts rightly observes, "that he was saved indeed, who was so baptized."

Nor was this only the doctrine of the more ancient writers, who lived in the times of persecution and martyrdom, but of those that followed after, and who are commonly imagined more rigid defenders of the necessity of baptism. For even St. Austin and all his contemporaries, who were engaged against Pelagius, made the same allowance in the case of martyrdom. St. Austin declares himself<sup>2</sup> wholly of Cyprian's opinion, that martyrdom does many times supply the room of baptism: and he thinks Cyprian argued well from the instance of the thief upon the cross, to whom it was said, though he was not baptized, "To day thou shalt be with me in Paradise!" St. Austin often argues from the same<sup>3</sup> example of the thief in other places, telling us, "that

<sup>1</sup> Acta Perpetuæ et Felicit. ad calcem Lactantii de Mort. Persecutor. p. 34. Statim in fine spectaculi leopardo ejecto, de uno morsu tanto perfusus est sanguine, ut populus revertenti illi secundi baptismatis testimonium reclamaverit; 'Salvum lotum! Salvum lotum!'—plane utique salvus erat, qui hoc modo laverat.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. iv. c. 22. Baptismi sanè vicem aliquando implere passionem, de latrone illo, cui non baptizato dictum est, hodiè mecum eris in Paradiso, non leve documentum B. Cyprianus assumit.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. Octogint. Quæst. lib. Q. 62. tom. iv. Ineffabili potestate dominantis Dei atque justitiâ deputatum est etiam baptismum credenti latroni, et pro accepto habitum in animo libero, quod in corpore crucifixo accipi non poterat.

by the ineffable power and justice of God baptism was imputed to the thief upon his faith, and it was accounted to him as if he had received it, because he had a good mind and will toward it, though he could not actually receive it in his body by reason of his crucifixion." Therefore he reckons him<sup>1</sup> among those, who are sanctified by the invisible grace without the visible sacrament, as he thinks many were both under the Old and New Testament: from whence yet it does not follow, that the visible sacrament may be contemned by any; for the contemner of it cannot by any means be sanctified by the invisible grace thereof. In his book *De Civitate Dei*, he speaks more generally of all those that suffer martyrdom,<sup>2</sup> "that though they have not been washed in the laver of regeneration, yet their dying for the confession of Christ avails as much toward the remission of sins, as if they had been washed in the holy fountain of baptism;" for which he alleges those sayings of our Saviour, "He that loses his life for my sake shall find it;" and "He that confesses me before men, him will I confess before my Father which is in heaven." This passage is repeated and approved by Prosper in his Collection of Sentences<sup>3</sup> out of St. Austin's works; to which he adds an epigram of his own, expressing his sense to this purpose,<sup>4</sup> "They are not deprived of the holy baptism of Christ, who instead of a font are washed in their own blood; for whatever benefit accrues to any by the mystical rite of the sacred laver, is all fulfilled by the glory of martyrdom." Fulgentius is as severe as any man,

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Quæst. in Levit. Q. 84. tom. iv. Hoc et de latrone illo, cui secum crucifixo Dominus ait, hodiè mecum eris in Paradiso. Neque enim sine sanctificatione invisibili tantâ felicitate donatus est. Proinde colligitur invisibilem sanctificationem quibusdam affuisse atque profuisse sine visibilibus sacramentis.—Nec tamen ideò sacramentum visibile contemnendum est; nam contemptor ejus sanctificari nullo modo potest.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. xiii. c. 7. Quicumque etiam non percepto regenerationis lavaero, pro Christi confessione moriuntur, tantum eis valet ad dimittenda peccata quantum si abluerentur sacro fonte baptismatis. It. Ep. 108. ad Seleucian. Ipsa passio pro baptismo deputata est. It. de Orig. Animæ, lib. i. c. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Prosper. Sentent. 149.

<sup>4</sup> Id. Epigram. 88.

Fraudati non sunt sacro baptismate Christi,  
Fons quibus ipsa sui sanguinis unda fuit.  
Et quicquid sacri fert mystica forma lavacri,  
Id totum implevit gloria martyrii.

yet he allows martyrdom<sup>1</sup> to compensate for the want of baptism. Though he pronounces peremptorily of all others, that die without the sacrament of faith and repentance, which is baptism, that they shall not inherit eternal life; yet he excepts those that are baptized in their own blood for the name of Christ. And Gennadius, after he has said, that none but persons baptized<sup>2</sup> are in the way of salvation; and that no catechumen, though he die in good works, can have eternal life; yet he excepts the case, of martyrdom, because in that all the mysteries of baptism are fulfilled. "A martyr," as the author of the Apostolical Constitutions expresses it,<sup>3</sup> "may rejoice in the Lord, and leave this life without sorrow, though he be but a catechumen; because his passion for Christ is a more genuine baptism: he really and experimentally dies with his Lord, whilst others only do it in figure." It were easy to add many other such testimonies out of St. Chrysostom,<sup>4</sup> and St. Jerom,<sup>5</sup> St. Basil,<sup>6</sup> Gregory Nazianzen,<sup>7</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem,<sup>8</sup> and St. Ambrose:<sup>9</sup> but enough has been already said to show this to be the general sense of the Ancients, that catechumens were not to be despaired of, though they died without baptism, if they were baptized in their own blood.

SECT. 21.—And by Faith and Repentance in such Catechumens as were piously preparing for Baptism.

Nor was it only the case of martyrs they spake so favourably of, but of all other catechumens, who, whilst they were preparing for baptism by the exercises of faith and repentance, and a pious life, were suddenly cut off, before they

<sup>1</sup> Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum, c. 30. Firmissimè tene et nullatenus dubites, exceptis illis qui pro nomine Christi suo sanguine baptizantur, nullum hominem accepturum vitam æternam, qui non hic à malis suis fuerit per penitentiam fidemque conversus, et per sacramentum fidei et pœnitentiæ, id est, per baptismum liberatus. Vid. Fulgent. de Baptismo Æthiopiæ, c. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Gennad. de Eccles. Dogmat. c. 74. Baptizatis tantum iter esse salutis credimus; nullum catechumenum, quamvis in bonis operibus defunctum, vitam æternam habere credimus, excepto martyrio, ubi tota baptismi sacramenta complentur.

<sup>3</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. v. c. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Chrys. Hom. xi. in Ephes. p. 1107.

<sup>5</sup> Hieron. Com. in Rom. vi.

tom. ix. p. 277.

<sup>6</sup> Basil. de Spir. Sanct. c. 15. tom. ii. p. 323.

<sup>7</sup> Nazianzen. Orat. 39. in S. Lumina. tom. i. p. 631.

<sup>8</sup> Cyril. Catech.

iii. n. 7.

<sup>9</sup> Ambros. de Virgin. lib. iii. p. 118.



could have opportunity to put their desires in execution. St. Ambrose joins these two cases together, and makes them in a manner parallel. For in his Funeral Oration upon the younger Valentinian, who was thus snatched away before he could attain to his desired baptism, he thus makes apology for him ;<sup>1</sup> “ If any one is concerned that the holy rites of baptism were not solemnly administered to him, he may as well say, that the martyrs are not crowned, if they happen to die whilst they are only catechumens ; but if the martyrs are washed in their own blood, then this man also was washed by his piety and desire of baptism.” St. Austin was entirely of the same opinion, that not only martyrdom,<sup>2</sup> but faith and repentance, joined with a desire of baptism, were sufficient to save a man in the article of necessity, when there was otherwise no opportunity to receive it. “ Considering,” says he, “ oyer and oyer again the case of the thief upon the cross, I find, that not only suffering for the name of Christ may supply that which was wanting of baptism, but also faith and true conversion of heart, if want of time in extreme necessity would not suffer the sacrament of baptism to be administered. For that thief was not crucified for the name of Christ, but for the merit of his own crimes ; nor did he suffer because he was a believer, but he became a believer whilst he was suffering. Therefore his case declares, how far that saying of the Apostle avails, without the visible sacrament of baptism, “ With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation ;” but then only this invisible opera-

---

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Obitu Valentin. p. 12. Si quia solemniter non sunt celebrata mysteria, hoc movet : ergo nec martyres, si catechumeni fuerint, coronantur. Quod si suo abluuntur sanguine, et hunc sua pietas abluit et voluntas.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. iv. c. 22. Etiam atque etiam considerans, invenio non tantum passionem pro nomine Christi id quod ex baptismo decrat, posse supplere, sed etiam fidem conversionemque cordis, si forte ad celebrandum mysterium baptismi in angustiis temporum succurri non potest. Neque enim latro ille pro nomine Christi crucifixus est, sed pro meritis facinorum suorum ; nec quia credidit passus est, sed dum patitur credidit. Quantum igitur valeat etiam sine visibili sacramento baptismi quod ait apostolus, ‘ corde creditur ad justitiam, ore autem confessio fit ad salutem,’ in illo latrone declaratum est : sed tunc impletur invisibiliter, cum ministerium baptismi non contemptus religionis, sed articulus necessitatis excludit.

tion is performed, when the ministry of baptism is excluded purely by the article of necessity, and not any contempt of religion. Therefore when these writers speak in general terms of the absolute necessity of baptism, they must be allowed to interpret themselves with these two limitations and restrictions. As when St. Ambrose says,<sup>1</sup> “no man ascends into the kingdom of heaven, but by the sacrament of baptism,” he must be understood to except martyrs, and such catechumens as were desirous of baptism, but could not have it by reason of some pressing necessity intervening to hinder it; such as was the case of Valentinian, who was slain suddenly before he had opportunity to receive it. The like interpretation must be put upon all such passages in St. Austin,<sup>2</sup> Chrysostom,<sup>3</sup> Cyril of Jerusalem,<sup>4</sup> or any others, who speak in general terms of the absolute necessity of baptism for catechumens or adult persons.

SECT. 22.—The Case of Heretics returning to the Unity of the Church. How far Charity in that Case was thought to supply the want of Baptism.

Cyprian also had a very charitable opinion concerning all such heretics and schismatics, as forsook their errors, and returned to the unity of the Catholic Church. For though according to his principles, who denied the validity of their baptism, none of these could be really and truly baptized, unless they were re-baptized upon their return to the Church; yet, if any such died in the unity of the Church without being re-baptized, he did not think their condition deplorable, though in his opinion they died without baptism, but charitably hoped they might find mercy and favour with the Lord. For he thus answers the objection that was made against his own opinion about re-baptization; “Some man will say,<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Abrah. Patriarch. lib. ii. c. 10. Nemo ascendit in regnum cœlorum, nisi per sacramentum baptismatis. <sup>2</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. iv. c. 21.

<sup>3</sup> Chrys. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. c. 5. It. Hom. iii. in Philip. p. 1224. Hom. iii. in 1. Cor. p. 347.

<sup>4</sup> Cyril. Catech. iii. n. 7.

<sup>5</sup> Cypr. Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 208. Sed dicet aliquis: Quid ergo fiet de his qui in præteritum de hæresi ad ecclesiam venientes, sine baptismo admissi sunt? Potens est Dominus misericordiâ suâ indulgentiam dare, et eos qui ad ecclesiam simpliciter admissi in ecclesiâ dormierunt, ab ecclesiæ suæ muneribus non separare.

what then becomes of all those, who in times past came over from heresy to the Church, and were admitted without baptism? The Lord," says he, "is able of his mercy to grant them indulgence, and not exclude them from the gifts of his Church, who are simply admitted into the Church, and die in the communion of it." Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea, delivers himself much after the same manner in answer to the same objection;<sup>1</sup> "What shall become of those, who returning from heretics, are admitted without the baptism of the Church? If they depart out of the world," says he, "in that condition, we reckon them in the number of such catechumens among us as die before they are baptized." So that in his opinion two sorts of persons might be saved without baptism, that is, catechumens in the Church, and such heretics as returned to the peace and unity of the Church, though according to his sentiments they were not baptized. St. Austin often mentions and approves this opinion of Cyprian;<sup>2</sup> nay, and urges it in favour of the Church against the Donatists; for, supposing the Catholics did err in admitting heretics without baptism, yet they were in the number of those, whom Cyprian presumed capable of pardon for the sake of unity and charity, which covers a multitude of sins. St. Basil also, as Vossius has rightly observed,<sup>3</sup> seems to have been of Cyprian's opinion,—that God in his mercy was able to save such schismatics as returned to the peace and unity of the Church, even without baptism. For though he thought their baptism null and void, as Cyprian did, yet he advises men to comply with the custom of receiving such to communion in those Churches which received their baptism,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Firmil. Ep. 75. ap. Cyprian. p. 226. Quid ergo, inquit, fiet de his qui ab hæreticis venientes, sine ecclesiæ baptismo admissi sunt? Si de sæculo excesserunt, in eorum numero, qui apud nos catechizati quidem, sed priusquam baptizarentur obierunt, habentur.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. ii. c. 13. Cùm arbitraretur eos qui extra ecclesiæ communionem baptizarentur, baptismum non habere, credidit eos tamen in ecclesiam simpliciter admissos, propter ipsius unitatis vinculum posse ad veniam pervenire. It. lib. v. c. 2. Bene quidem præsumpsit, quod charitas unitatis possit co-operire multitudinem peccatorum.—Nos autem si ad ecclesiam sine baptismo admittimus, in eo numero sumus quibus Cyprianus propter unitatis custodiam ignosci posse præsumpsit. Vid. Aug. de Bapt. lib. v. c. 28. It. cont. Crescon. lib. ii. c. 33 et 35.

<sup>3</sup> Voss. de Baptismo, Disput. xi. p. 156.

<sup>4</sup> Basil. Can.

Epist. c. 1.

rather than break the peace and unity of the Church upon it. Which advice he would hardly have given, had he not thought such men in such circumstances capable of salvation by God's mercy without baptism.

SECT. 23.—The Case of Persons communicating with the Church without Baptism. How far that was thought to supply the want of Baptism.

I find one case more in which some of the Ancients made an allowance for the want of baptism; and that was, when the Church, presuming a person to have been truly baptized, he himself, *bona fide*, presuming so too, admitted him to communicate constantly at the altar for many years: though it appeared at last, that either he had not been baptized at all, or at least with a very doubtful and suspicious baptism; yet in this case, constant communicating with the Church was thought to supply this defect or want of baptism. A single act of communicating, indeed, in a child or a catechumen, happening only by some surprise or mistake, was not deemed sufficient to compensate for baptism: for in that case the canons provided, that, whenever any such thing happened, the party should be immediately baptized. Thus, in the Canonical Determinations of Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, the question being put, what should be done in case a youth of seven years old, or a man that was only a catechumen, being present at the oblation, had communicated through ignorance or mistake?—The answer is,<sup>1</sup> “Let him be baptized.” And so the author of the Apostolical Constitutions brings in the Apostles making this decree,<sup>2</sup> “that, if any unbaptized person should through ignorance partake of the eucharist, they should immediately instruct and baptize him, that he might not go away a despiser.” But in case a man, upon presumption of his being truly baptized, when he was not so, had been allowed to communicate with the Church for many years, his communicating at the altar was thought to supersede the necessity of baptism, and such a one was allowed to continue in the Church without rebaptizing. There is a famous instance in Eusebius of such a

<sup>1</sup> Timoth. Respons. Canon. Q. 1. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. tom. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. c. 25.

case, that happened at Alexandria in the time of Dionysius, which Eusebius relates out of an Epistle of Dionysius to Xystus, bishop of Rome, where he asks the bishop of Rome's advice upon it.<sup>1</sup> "A certain person, who for many years had assembled and communicated with the Church, both in his own time, and in the time of his predecessor Heraclas, happening to be present at the baptism of some, who were lately baptized, upon hearing the interrogatories and answers, that are usually made in that solemnity, came to me weeping and lamenting himself, and falling down at my feet, confessed with a most solemn protestation, that the baptism which he received among heretics, was not like this, nor had any thing common with it; for it was full of blasphemy and impiety: and therefore he said his soul was full of trouble, and he had not confidence to lift up his eyes unto God, being initiated with such impious words and ceremonies. He prayed, therefore, that I would give him our sincere baptism, and admit him to the adoption and grace of the Church. Which thing I durst not do, but told him, his communicating for so long time at the altar, was sufficient to this purpose. For I durst not rebaptize one, who had so often heard the solemn thanksgiving, and joined with the rest in saying Amen! to it; who had stood at the Lord's table and stretched forth his hand to receive the holy food; who had taken it and been so long used to participate of the body and blood of Christ. But I bid him be of good courage, and with a firm belief and a good conscience continue to partake of the holy mysteries." This was a nice resolution of a rare and singular case, and we scarce meet with such another instance in ancient history; but I have mentioned this, and all the preceding cases, to show, that the Ancients had not generally that rigid opinion of the absolute necessity of baptism, barring the neglect and contempt of the sacred institution, which some would father upon them; since they thought the bare want of it might be dispensed with and supplied so many several ways: either, first, by martyrdom; or secondly, by faith and true conversion; or thirdly, by an immense charity and love of

---

<sup>1</sup> Dionys. Epist. ad Xystum, ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. 9.

unity and peace; or fourthly, by a constant partaking of the eucharist, in the bosom of the Church.

SECT. 24.—The Case of Infants dying unbaptized. The Opinion of the Ancients concerning it.

But it is to be observed that these allowances were chiefly made to adult persons, who could exhibit faith and repentance, the essential parts of religion, to make some compensation for the want of the external ceremony of baptism; but as to infants, the case was thought more difficult, because there was no personal faith or repentance could be pleaded in their behalf; so that they were destitute both of the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace of baptism. Upon this account, they, who spoke the most favourably of them, would only venture to assign them a middle state, neither in heaven nor hell. As Gregory Nazianzen,<sup>1</sup> who says, “that such children as die unbaptized, without their own fault, shall neither be glorified nor punished by the righteous Judge, as having done no wickedness, though they die unbaptized, and as rather suffering loss than being the authors of it.” Severus, bishop of Antioch, follows Nazianzen in this opinion; for first he says,<sup>2</sup> “that if children die unbaptized, without partaking of the laver of regeneration, they are certainly excluded from the kingdom of heaven:” but then he adds, “that, forasmuch as they have committed no sin, they shall not undergo any punishment, or torment, but be consigned to a sort of middle state,” which he describes as a state betwixt the glory of the saints and the punishment of the damned. But this opinion of a middle state never found any acceptance among the Latins. For they make but two places to receive men after the day of judgment, heaven and hell, and concluded, that since children, for want of washing away original sin, could not be admitted into heaven, they must of necessity be in hell, there being no third place between them. St. Austin frequently insists upon this against the Pelagians, who distinguish between the kingdom of God and eternal life, asserting, “that children dying unbaptized, might be ad-

<sup>1</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. tom. i. p. 653.

<sup>2</sup> Sever. Caten. in Joh. iii. p. 83.

mitted to eternal life and salvation, though not to the kingdom of God :” whom he opposes after this manner in his books about the Merits and Remission of Sin ; “ though,” he says,<sup>1</sup> “ the condemnation of those shall be greater, who to original sin add actual sins of their own ; and every man’s condemnation so much the greater, by how much greater sin he commits ; yet original sin alone does not only separate from the kingdom of God, whither children, dying without the grace of Christ, cannot enter, as the Pelagians themselves confess ; but also it excludes them from eternal life and salvation, which can be no other than the kingdom of God, into which our communion with Christ alone can introduce us.” A little after he says plainly,<sup>2</sup> “ that children dying without baptism are under condemnation, though theirs be the mildest of any other. But he is very much deceived and deceives others, who teaches that they are in no condemnation at all, whilst the Apostle declares, “ that judgment was by one offence to condemnation.” And again, “ that by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation.” He tells us,<sup>3</sup> “ upon this account the Punic Christians were used to call baptism by the name of salvation, and the sacrament of the body of Christ, life. And therefore, since no one could hope for salvation and eternal life without baptism and the body and blood of the Lord, it was in vain to promise children salvation without them.” In the same book<sup>4</sup> he declares peremptorily against

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Peccat. Meritis. lib. i. c. 12. Quamvis condemnatio gravior sit eorum, qui originali delicto etiam propria conjunxerunt, et tanto singulis gravior, quanto gravius quisque peccavit ; tamen etiam illud solum quod originaliter tractum est, non tantum à regno Dei separat, quo parvulos sine acceptâ gratiâ Christi intrare non posse, ipsi etiam confitentur ; verum et à salute ac vitâ æternâ facit alienos, quæ nulla alia esse potest præter regnum Dei, quò sola Christi societas introducit.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. c. 16. Potest proinde rectè dici, parvulos sine baptismo de corpore exeuntes in damnatione omnium mitissimâ futuros. Multum autem et fallit et fallitur, qui eos in damnatione prædicat non futuros, dicente Apostolo, ‘judicium ex uno delicto in condemnationem.’ Et paulo post, ‘per unius delictum in omnes homines ad condemnationem.’

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. lib. i. c. 24. Optimè Punicæ Christiani baptismum ipsum nihil aliud quàm vitam vocant.—Si ergo nec salus, nec vita æterna sine baptismo, et corpore et sanguine Domini cuiquam speranda est, frustra sine his promittitur parvulis.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. c. 28. Nec est ullus ulli medius locus, ut possit esse, nisi cum diabolo, qui non est cum Christo. Hinc et

the doctrine of a middle state for infants or any other. "There is no middle place for any," says he, "he must be with the devil, who is not with Christ. For our Lord himself intending, to take away this opinion of a middle state, which some erroneously endeavour to assign to children dying unbaptized, as if by virtue of their innocence they might be in eternal life, though not with Christ in his kingdom so long as they wanted baptism, pronounced this definitive sentence to stop the mouths of these men, saying, 'He that is not with me, is against me.'" He argues against this middle state in many other places,<sup>1</sup> against the Pelagians, and urges the necessity of baptism to take away original sin in children, and bring them by regeneration to eternal life: therefore, he says, men ran with their children to be baptized, because they verily believed they could not otherwise be made alive in Christ. Fulgentius<sup>2</sup> is rather more peremptory and severe than St. Austin: he says, "It is to be believed without all doubt, that not only men, who are come to the use of reason, but infants, whether they die in their mother's womb, or after they are born, without baptism, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are punished with everlasting punishment in eternal fire, because though they have no actual sin of their own, yet they carry along with them the condemnation of original sin from their first conception and birth." The author under the name of Justin Martyr,<sup>3</sup> also speaking of infants, says, "there is this difference between those that die baptized, and those that

---

*ipse Dominus volens auferre de cordibus malè credentium istam nescio quam medietatem, quam conantur quidam parvulis non baptizatis tribuere, ut quasi merito innocentiae sint in vitâ aeternâ, sed quia non sunt baptizati, non sint cum Christo in regno ejus, definitivam protulit ad hæc ora obstruenda sententiam, ubi ait, 'qui mecum non est, adversum me est.'* <sup>1</sup> Aug.

*Serm. 14. de Verb. Apost. tom. x. p. 122. Aug. de Anima. lib. i. c. 9. Lib. ii. c. 12. Lib. iii. c. 13. It. Epist. 28. ad Hieron.*

<sup>2</sup> Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum, c. 27. *Firmissimè tene et nullatenus dubites, non solùm homines jam ratione utentes, verùm etiam parvulos, qui sive in uteris matrum vivere incipiunt et ibi moriuntur, sive cùm de matribus nati, sine sacramento sancti baptismatis, quod datur in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, de hoc sæculo transeunt, ignis aeterni sempiterno supplicio puniendos: quia etsi propriæ actionis peccatum nullum habuerunt, originalis tamen peccati damnationem carnali conceptione et nativitate traxerunt. Vid. Fulgent. de Baptismo Æthiopsis, c. 8.* <sup>3</sup> Justin. Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodox. Q. 56.



die unbaptized, that the one obtain the benefits that come by baptism, which the other do not obtain." And the author of the *Hypognostics*,<sup>1</sup> under the name of St. Austin, who is supposed by learned men to be either Marius Mercator, or Sixtus, bishop of Rome, disputing against the Pelagians, treads exactly in the steps of St. Austin; for he says, "there is no middle state between heaven and hell; a third place for unbaptized infants is no where mentioned in Scripture. This was only an invention forged in the shop of the Pelagians, to find out a place where infants might have rest and glory without the grace of Christ." These are pretty severe expressions, and yet considering the state of the controversy between the Catholics and Pelagians, there seems to have been pretty good reason for them. For Pelagius said, "there was no original sin nor any need of baptism to wash away the guilt of it, but children might obtain salvation and eternal life, distinct from the kingdom of God, without it." In opposition to this, the Catholics maintained the necessity of baptism for infants, as well as adult persons, to purge away original sin, and procure eternal life for them. But they have not so plainly told us, whether there be any excepted cases as to what concerns infants, as they have concerning adult persons; whether a bare want of baptism in the child, when there was no contempt or neglect of baptism in the parent, but an unavoidable necessity and sudden death intervening, debars the child from the kingdom of heaven? Among all the Ancients, only Fulgentius has declared absolutely against the salvation of infants dying before the birth in the mother's womb. But others seem to speak more favourably, except where the parents were guilty of a contempt or neglect of baptism, in not bringing their children to be baptized when they had time and opportunity to do it, in which case the child might fail of salva-

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. *Hypognostic*. lib. v. c. 5. Primum locum fides Catholicorum divinâ autoritate regnum credidit esse cœlorum, unde, ut dixi, non baptizatus excipitur; secundum, gehennam, ubi omnis apostata, vel à Christi fide alienus, æterna supplicia experiatur. Tertium penitens ignoramus, immò nec esse in Scripturis Sanctis invenimus. Finge, Pelagiane, locum ex officinâ perversi dogmatis tui, ubi alieni à Christi gratiâ vitam requies et gloriæ possidere parvuli possint.

tion for the parents' fault, and there be no impeachment of God's justice or mercy in the punishment. This seems to have been the judgment of that excellent author, who wrote the book *De Vocatione Gentium*, which goes under the name of Prosper or St. Ambrose. For he gives this reason, why this doctrine about the necessity of baptism for the salvation of infants was so earnestly pressed upon men; that parents might not be remiss or negligent in bringing their children to baptism; which they certainly would be, if they were once possessed with an opinion that there was no necessity of baptism to salvation. "We ought not to believe," says he,<sup>1</sup> in general terms, "that they, who obtain not the sacrament of regeneration, can appertain to the society of the blessed: for every one must be sensible, how easily sloth and negligence would creep into the hearts of the faithful, if in the business of baptizing infants nothing was to be feared from the parents' carelessness, or the mortality of their children." This author presses the necessity of baptizing infants, as all good Christians do, upon supposition of some benefit which the parents' care may bring to the child; and contrariwise, an irreparable damage and loss which the child may sustain by the parents' default and negligence. And this is sufficient to quicken the care and watchfulness of parents, though it be allowed, that in cases of extreme necessity children may be saved without baptism. Nor is it improbable, that the Ancients intended any more, though their expressions run in severe and general terms without standing precisely to make exceptions. For it cannot be denied but that infants may be martyrs as well as adult persons; such were the children which Herod slew at Bethlelem: parents likewise may desire baptism for their children, vowing faith and repentance in their name, when some extreme necessity only, and not any culpable neglect hinders the obtaining of it. And in such cases, if adult persons may be saved without

---

<sup>1</sup> Prosper. de Vocat. Gentium. lib. ii. c. 8. Neque credi fas est, eos qui regenerationis non adepti sunt sacramentum, ad ullam beatorum pertinere consortium.—Non latet quantum cordibus fidelium desidiæ gigneretur, si in baptizandis parvulis nihil de cujusquam negligentia, nihil de ipsorum esset mortalitate metuendum.

baptism, as all the Ancients agree, there seems to be a parity of reason to extend the same charity and indulgence to little children. Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, a man of great reputation and learning in his time, and one well versed in the writings of the Ancients, gives this solution of the whole matter upon a remarkable case that happened in his time. A certain bishop of the same country, Hincmar, bishop of Laon, had for some unjust cause hindered the baptism of infants in his diocese, when their parents or godfathers desired they might be baptized; by which means many children died without baptism. Now the question was concerning the future state of these infants, whether the parents' desire and presenting them to baptism was sufficient for the salvation of their children?—This, without any scruple,<sup>1</sup> Hincmar resolves in the affirmative, “that as children, who are subject to original sin, which is the sin of other men, are saved by the faith of others, that is, their godfathers answering for them in baptism; so those infants, who by the command of that perverse bishop were denied baptism, might be saved by the faith and faithful desire of their parents or godfathers, who had required both in heart and words that their children might be baptized; and this by the gift of him, whose Spirit, that is the author of regeneration, bloweth where it listeth.” If we thus interpret the sense of the Ancients with Hincmar, then all those passages, which condemn infants dying without baptism, must be understood not of the bare want of baptism, when it could not be had, but of the parents' contempt or neglect in not desiring or procuring baptism for their children, when it was in their power to do it. I have been the longer in explaining and confirming the truth of these points, concerning the necessity of baptism both for infants and adult persons, because the Ancients are mistaken by some, and accused by

---

<sup>1</sup> Hincmar. Opusc. 55. Capit. c. 48. Sicut parvulis naturali, id est, alieno peccato, obnoxiiis, aliorum, id est, patronorum fides pro eis respondentium in baptismate sit ad salutem: ita parvulis, quibus baptismum denegari jussisti, parentum vel patronorum corde credentium, et pro parvulis suis fideli verbo baptismum expetentium, sed non impetantium, fides et fidelis postulatio prodesse potuerunt, dono ejus cujus Spiritus, quo regeneratio fit, ubi vult spirat.

others as too severe in urging the necessity of baptism; when yet it appears their sentiments about it were exact enough as to what concerned the case of catechumens, and also capable of a favourable interpretation in the case of infants, if we do not over rigidly force their general expressions beyond the true design and intentions of the authors.

I should here have put an end to this discourse concerning the institution and discipline of the catechumens, but only that there are two things, that may seem to require a little more distinct handling than has been allowed them above: First, concerning the original, nature, and use of the ancient creeds of the Church, which were chiefly drawn up for the institution and service of the catechumens, and therefore are most proper to be considered in this place. Secondly, concerning that part of their discipline, which consisted in concealing from them for some time the distinct and full knowledge of some of the higher doctrines and mysterious rites of the Church. The consideration of which things shall be the subject of the following Chapters.

### CHAP. III.

#### *Of the Original, Nature, and Names of the Ancient Creeds of the Church.*

##### SECT. I.—Why the Creed is called *Symbolum*.

IN speaking of the Creed, it will be proper to say something in the first place, of its several ancient names, and the reasons of them, because some of them are a little obscure, and liable to be mistaken. The most usual name of the Creed was *Symbolum*; but why it was called so, is not agreed among learned men. Baronius<sup>1</sup> assigns three reasons of the name: First, he supposes every Apostle cast in his *Symbola*, his *article* or *part*, to the composition of it; and therefore it might be called their *symbol* or *collation*: but if the foundation of this supposition be uncertain, as we shall see hereafter that it is, this could not be the reason of

---

<sup>1</sup> Baron. an. 44. n. 15.

the name. Secondly, he thinks it might be so called, because it was like the *Tessera Militaris* among the Roman soldiers, a sort of *mark* or *badge*, by which true Christians might be distinguished from infidels or heretics. Thirdly, because it was a collation or epitome of the Christian doctrine. Suicerus<sup>1</sup> adds to these a fourth reason of the name. It might be so called, he thinks, not from the military badge, but the military oath or contract, which soldiers made with the Emperor, when they entered into his service: for the Creed is a token of the contract which we make with God at our baptism. For this he alleges the testimony of St. Ambrose,<sup>2</sup> who calls the Creed “the oath or bond of our warfare:” and Petrus Chrysologus,<sup>3</sup> who says, “an agreement or covenant is called *Symbolum* both in human and divine contracts.” This last signification is not improbable; but the second is more generally received and approved by modern authors,<sup>4</sup> and has also the countenance of some ancient writers. For Maximus Taurinensis<sup>5</sup> supposes it to be called the *symbol*, because it is a *sign* or *mark* by which believers are distinguished from unbelievers and renegadoes. And Ruffinus<sup>6</sup> allows this signification, when he says, “it was therefore called the sign or mark, because at that time, when (according to his opinion) it was made by the Apostles, many of the circumcised Jews, as is re-

<sup>1</sup> Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. Voce, *Σύμβολον*. <sup>2</sup> Ambros. de Veland. Virgin. lib. iii. *Symbolum cordis signaculum, et nostræ militiæ sacramentum.*

<sup>3</sup> Chrysolog. Hom. 62. *Placitum vel pactum, quod lucri spes venientis continet, vel futuri, symbolum nuncupari, contractu etiam docemur humano, &c.*

<sup>4</sup> Forbes, Instruct. Histor. Theolog. lib. i. c. 1. n. 2. <sup>5</sup> Maxim. Taurin. Homil. in Symbol. p. 239. *Signaculum symboli inter fideles perfidosque discernit.*

<sup>6</sup> Ruffin. Expos. Symboli ad calcem Cypriani, p. 17. *Indicium autem vel signum idcirco dicitur, quia illo tempore, sicut et Paulus Apostolus dicit, et in Actis Apostolorum refertur, multi ex circumcisis Judæis simulabant se esse Apostolos Christi, et lucri alicujus vel ventris gratiâ ad prædicandum proficisciebantur; nominantes quidem Christum, sed non integris traditionum lineis nunciantes. Idcirco ergo istud indicium posuere, per quod agnosceretur is qui Christum verè secundum apostolicas regulas prædicaret. Denique et in bellis civilibus hoc observari ferunt: quoniam et armorum habitus par, et sonus vocis idem, et mos unus est, atque eadem instituta bellandi, ne qua doli subreptio fiat, symbola discreta unusquisque dux suis militibus tradit; quæ Latinè vel signa vel indicia nominantur: ut si fortè occurrerit quis de quo dubitetur, interrogatus symbolum, prodat si sit hostis, an socius.*

lated both by St. Paul, and in the Acts of the Apostles, did feign themselves to be the Apostles of Christ; and to serve their own lucre or their belly, went forth to preach; naming indeed the name of Christ, but not preaching him according to the true lines of tradition. Therefore the Apostles laid down this mark or test, whereby to discern him, who preached Christ truly, according to the apostolical rules. It is further reported to be a customary thing in civil wars, that because their arms, language, methods, and manner of fighting are the same, therefore every general, to prevent fraud, should give his soldiers a distinct symbol, which in Latin is called a sign or token; that if one met another, of whom he had reason to doubt, by asking him the symbol he might discover whether he was friend or foe." But this does not satisfy a late learned writer,<sup>1</sup> who thinks, "that this name was not derived from any military custom, but rather to be fetched from the *Sacra*, or *religious services* of the heathens, where those who were initiated in their mysteries, and admitted to the knowledge of their peculiar services, which were hidden and concealed from the greatest part of the idolatrous multitude, had certain signs or marks, called *Symbola*, delivered unto them, by which they mutually knew each other, and upon the declaring of them, were without scruple admitted in any temple to the secret worship and rites of that God, whose symbols they had received." The use of these symbols among the Heathens, is abundantly proved by that learned author, both from Heathen and Christian writers; but then he alleges no authority to prove that the Christians called their creed by the name of symbol, in imitation of that heathen practice: and it is some prejudice against it, that no such thing is said or hinted by any ancient writer. Neither is it very likely, that the Christians would have so nice a regard to the abominable and filthy mysteries of the Heathen, as to chuse that signification of the name, symbol, for their creed, when with much more decency it might be fetched from the innocent and ordinary customs used in military affairs or civil

---

<sup>1</sup> Critical History of the Creed, p. 11.

contracts, from which it is with greater probability derived, both by ancient and modern writers.

SECT. 2.—Why called *Canon*, and *Regula Fidei*.

Another usual name of the Creed was *Κανὼν*, *the rule*, so called because it was the known standard or rule of faith, by which orthodoxy and heresy were examined and judged. As when the council of Antioch,<sup>1</sup> says of Paulus Samosatenensis, “that he was an apostate from the rule,” it is plain the meaning is, he had deviated in his doctrine from the Creed, the rule of faith. Agreeably to this, it is commonly styled among the Greeks,<sup>2</sup> “Ὁρος and Ἐκδοσις Πίστεως, *the determination or exposition of the faith*; and sometimes simply Πίστις, *the faith*;<sup>3</sup> which answers to the Latin name *Regula Fidei, the rule of faith*, the common appellation of it in Irenæus,<sup>4</sup> Tertullian,<sup>5</sup> Novatian,<sup>6</sup> and St. Jerom,<sup>7</sup> where they speak of heretics, and their deviations from the common articles of the Christian faith contained in the creeds of the Church.

SECT. 3.—Why called *Mathema*.

Another ordinary appellation of the Creed in the ancient Greek writers, is *Μάθημα, the lesson*, so called from the obligation the catechumens were under to learn it. This may easily be mistaken by an unwary reader for a lesson in the Bible, unless where some note of distinction is added to it. Therefore, when we read in the council of Constantinople, under Mennas, that after the reading of the Gospel, in time of the communion-service,<sup>8</sup> “the holy lesson was read accord-

<sup>1</sup> Epist. Con. Antioch. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. 30. Ἐποστὰς τῆ κανόνος.

<sup>2</sup> Socrat. lib. ii. c. 39 et 40. lib. v. c. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Theodoret. Hist. lib. i. c. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Iren. lib. i. c. 19.

<sup>5</sup> Tertul. de Præscript. c. 13. Regula est autem

Fidei, quæ creditur unum omninò Deum esse, &c. It. de Veland. Virgin. c. 1. Regula autem Fidei una omninò est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum omnipotentem, &c.

<sup>6</sup> Novatian. de Trinit. c. 1 et 9. Regula Veritatis.

<sup>7</sup> Hieron. Ep. 54. ad Marcellam, contra Errores Montani. Primum in fidei regulâ discrepamus, &c.

<sup>8</sup> Con. C. P. sub Menna. Act. 5. tom. v. p. 151. Τῆ ἁγίῃ μαθήματος κατὰ τὸ συνήθεις λεχθέντος.

ing to custom," we are not to understand it of any other lesson out of the Bible, but of the creed, which was then made part of the communion-service. And so Socrates<sup>1</sup> sometimes uses the word; and Valesius has observed,<sup>2</sup> that in two manuscripts of that author, where the Nicene creed is recited, the title of *Mathema* is set before it. But Leontius Byzantinus<sup>3</sup> speaks more explicitly, and calls it, by way of distinction, the decree, or lesson of faith, speaking of the creed, which the fathers of the council of Chalcedon were about to make.

SECT. 4.—Why called Γράμμα and Γραφή.

Valesius<sup>4</sup> has also observed out of Socrates, that it is sometimes styled Γραφή simply and absolutely, and Γράμμα, which words, though they are usually taken to signify the Holy Scripture, yet here they must have another meaning; for the creed, properly speaking, is not an inspired writing, unless in that sense as it may be said to be collected out of the inspired writings; but here those words signify only, in a common sense, letters or learning; and so are used as the foregoing word, *Mathema*, with a peculiar reference to the learning of the catechumens. Some also allege Cyprian for another name, as if he called the creed peculiarly the sacrament of faith.<sup>5</sup> But I am not satisfied that Cyprian's meaning is so to be restrained. For he is rather speaking in general against profaning the mysteries of religion, which include the sacraments, or any other religious rites, as well as the creed; applying that text of Scripture to his purpose, "Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, lest they tread them under their feet, and turn again and rent you." Or, if it be limited to any particular mystery, it should rather signify baptism than the creed;

<sup>1</sup> Socrat. Hist. lib. iii. c. 25. Τὰ λοιπὰ τῶ μαθήματος. Usser. de Symbolis, p. 20, shows the same out of Justinian, Maxentius, and Photius.

<sup>2</sup> Vales. Not. in Socrat. lib. i. c. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Leont. de Sectis. Act. vi. p. 515.

<sup>4</sup> Εδοξεν αὐτοῖς ὥστε ὄρον πίστεως ἐκ μαθήματα ποιῆσαι.

<sup>5</sup> Vales. Not. in

Theodor. Hist. lib. i. c. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Cyp. Testim. ad Quirin. lib. iii. c. 50.

Sacramentum Fidei non esse profanandum.—Ne dederitis sanctum canibus, &c.



for baptism is sometimes called, "the sacrament of faith," by St. Austin,<sup>1</sup> and the "sacrament of faith and repentance," by Fulgentius<sup>2</sup> and others, as I shall more particularly show when I come to treat of baptism. For which reason I do not take this to be any particular name given to the creed by any ancient writer: but the creed is the faith itself, the "*credulitas*," as some middle-age writers call it,<sup>3</sup> and the sacrament of faith is baptism.

SECT. 5.—Whether that which is commonly called The Apostles' Creed, was composed by the Apostles in the present form of Words.

The next inquiry is into the original and nature of the ancient creeds; which will admit of three questions: First whether that, which is commonly called the Apostles' creed, was composed by the Apostles in the same form of words, as it is now used in the Church? Second, whether the Apostles made or used any creeds at all for the institution of catechumens, or the administration of baptism? Third, if they did; what articles were contained in them? The first question is now generally resolved in the negative, by learned men, though many both of the Ancients and Moderns have been of a different opinion. Some have thought that the twelve Apostles in a full meeting, composed the creed in the very same form of words as now it is used in the Church; and others have gone so far as to pretend to tell what article was composed by every particular Apostle. Dr. Comber is so positive in the matter, as to say, "we have no better medium to prove the books<sup>4</sup> were written by those authors whose names they bear, than the unanimous testimony of antiquity; and by that we can abundantly prove the Apostles were the authors of this creed." For this he cites Clemens Romanus, Irenæus, Origen, Tertullian, Ruffinus,

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Ep. 23. ad Bonifac. Sicut secundùm quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum Fidei Fides est.

<sup>2</sup> Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum, c. 30. Per sacramentum fidei et pœnitentiæ, id est, per baptismum liberatus.

<sup>3</sup> Vid. Herardi Turonensis Capitul. 140. ap. Wharton. Auctarium Historiæ Dogmaticæ Usserii, p. 368. Gloria Patri, ac Sanctus, atque Credulitas, et Kyrie Eleison à cunctis reverenter canatur. It. Edictum Recaredi Regis ap. calcem concilii Toletani tertii.

<sup>4</sup> Comber's Companion to the Temple, p. 132.

Ambrose, Austin, Jerom, Pope Leo, Maximus Taurinensis, Cassian, and Isidore. But none of these writers, except Ruffinus, speak home to his purpose; but only say, the creeds in general are of apostolical institution; which, for the substance, no one denies; for they speak of several forms, and yet ascribe them all to the Apostles: which is an argument, they did not mean this particular form any more than others. For the Nicene creed is often called the Apostles' creed; and yet no one believes that that creed was composed, *totidem verbis*, by the Apostles. Ruffinus indeed seems to say, "there was an ancient tradition, that the Apostles, being about to depart from Jerusalem,<sup>1</sup> first settled a rule for their future preaching; lest, after they were separated from one another, they should expound different doctrines to those, whom they invited to the Christian faith. Wherefore being all assembled together, and filled with the Holy Ghost, they composed this short rule of their preaching, each one contributing his sentence, and left it as a rule to be given to all believers." And for this reason, he thinks, it might be called the symbol, because that word in Greek signifies both a test, and a collation of opinions together. The author<sup>2</sup> under the name of St. Austin, is a little more particular in the story: for he pretends to tell us what article was put in by each particular Apostle: Peter said, "I believe in God the Father Almighty." John, "Maker of Heaven and Earth." James, "And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord." Andrew added, "Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary." Philip said, "Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried." Thomas, "He descended into Hell; the third day he rose again from the dead." Bartholomew,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ruffin. Expos. Symboli, ad calcem Cypriani. p. 17. Discessuri itaque ab invicem, normam prius futuræ sibi prædicationis in commune constituunt; ne fortè alius ab alio abducti, diversum aliquid his qui ad fidem Christi invitabantur, exponerent. Omnes ergò in uno positi, et Spiritu Sancto repleti, breve istud futuræ sibi, ut diximus, prædicationis indicium, conferendo in unum quod sentiebat unusquisque, componunt; atque hanc credentibus dandam esse Regulam statuunt. Symbolum autem hoc multis et justissimis causis appellare voluerunt. Symbolum enim Gracè et indicium dici potest, et Collatio, hoc est, quod plures in unum conferunt. <sup>2</sup> Aug. de Tempore, Ser. 115. al. 42. in Append. tom. x. p. 675.

“He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty.” Matthew, “From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.” James, the son of Alphæus, added, “I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church.” Simon Zelotes, “The Communion of Saints, the forgiveness of sins.” Jude, the brother of James, “The Resurrection of the body.” Matthias, “Life everlasting.”

But now there is an insuperable difficulty lies against this tradition, which is this, that there are two or three articles here mentioned, which are known not to have been in this creed for three or four ages at least. For Ruffinus himself tells us, the descent into Hell, was neither in the Roman creed,<sup>1</sup> which is that we call, the Apostles' Creed, nor yet in any creed of the Eastern Churches; only the sense of it might be said to be couched in that other expression, “He was buried.” Bp. Usher and Bp. Pearson have demonstrated the truth of this observation by a particular induction from all the ancient creeds, and showed this article to be wanting in them all for four hundred years, except the creed of Aquileia, which Ruffinus expounds, and the creed of the council of Ariminum, mentioned in Socrates.<sup>2</sup> Others have made the same observation upon the article concerning the communion of Saints, which is not to be found either in the creed of Aquileia, or any ancient Greek or Latin creed for above the space of four hundred years. Nor is the article of the life everlasting, expressly mentioned in many creeds, but only inclusively contained in the resurrection of the body; which is the concluding article in many ancient creeds. These are plain demonstrations, without any other argument, that the creed as it stands in the present form, could not be composed, in the manner as is pretended, by the Apostles. The silence of The Acts of the Apostles about any such composition, is a collateral evidence against it. The silence of ecclesiastical writers, for above three whole centuries, is a further confirmation. The variety of creeds

<sup>1</sup> Ruffin. Expos. Symboli. p. 22. Sciendum sanè est, quod in Ecclesie Romanæ Symbolo non habetur additum, ‘descendit ad inferna,’ sed neque in Orientis Ecclesiis habetur hic sermo. Vis tamen verbi eadem videtur esse in eo quod sepultus dicitur.

<sup>2</sup> Socrat. lib. ii. c. 37.

in so many different forms, used by the Ancients, yet extant in their writings, some with omissions, others with additions, and all in a different phrase, are no less evident proofs, that one universal form had not been pitched upon and prescribed to the whole Church by the Apostles. For then it is scarce to be imagined, that any Church should have received any other form in the least tittle varying from it. These reasons do now generally satisfy learned men, that no such precise form was composed, according to that pretended tradition, by all the Apostles. The reader may find dissertations in Vossius,<sup>1</sup> Bp. Usher,<sup>2</sup> Hammond, l'Estrange,<sup>3</sup> Basnagius,<sup>4</sup> Suicerus,<sup>5</sup> and the learned author of the late Critical History of the Creed,<sup>6</sup> to this purpose. And it is much to be wondered at, that any knowing person, against such convincing evidence, should labour to maintain the contrary, upon no better grounds than only this, that the Ancients agree in calling the creed apostolical. For they do not always intend this particular form, but call all other forms apostolical, the Nicene creed, the Constantinopolitan creed, the Eastern creeds, the Western creeds, and all others which agree with this in substance, though not in method or expression, and are all equally apostolical, as being all derived from the Apostles' preaching, and for substance composed by them, and some of them perhaps left in the Churches, where they preached, as the first rudiments of this creed seem to have been in the Roman Church. So far all the ancient catholic creeds may be said to be apostolical, as being in substance the same with the creeds used in baptism by the Apostles.

SECT. 6.—That probably the Apostles used several Creeds differing in Form, not in Substance.

By all then that has hitherto been said, I intend not to insinuate, that the Apostles used no creeds at all, but rather

<sup>1</sup> Voss. de Tribus Symbolis.

<sup>2</sup> Usser. de Symbolo Romano.

<sup>3</sup> L'Estrange Alliance of Divin. Offic. chap. iii. p. 80.

<sup>4</sup> Basnag.

Critic. in. Baron. p. 471.

<sup>5</sup> Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. Voce, Σύμβολον.

tom. ii. p. 1092.

<sup>6</sup> Critical Hist. of the Creed, chap. i. p. 27. See

also Bishop Bull's Judicium Ecclesiæ Cathol. &c. cap. v. n. 3. where he refers to Vossius as having abundantly proved this thesis.

that they used many differing in form, but not in substance from one another. All that I contend for, is only this, that none of the present forms are exactly the same in expression with those of the Apostles, which is demonstrated from the variety of creeds used in several Churches, and from the addition of some words to that creed, which pretends most to be apostolical. But though the Apostles composed no one creed to be of perpetual and universal use for the whole Church, yet it is not to be doubted, but that they used some forms in admitting catechumens to baptism. There are many expressions in Scripture that favour this, particularly Philip's questions to the Eunuch before he baptized him, and St. Peter's interrogatories or the answer of a good conscience towards God, which was used in baptism; and the constant practice of the Church, in imitation of the Apostles, admitting none to baptism but by answer to such interrogatories, is a sufficient demonstration of the apostolical practice. But then as the Church used a liberty of expression in her several creeds, so it is not improbable the Apostles did the same, without tying themselves to any one form, who had less need to do it, being all guided by inspiration. And hence it came to pass, that there being no one certain form of a creed prescribed universally to all Churches, every Church had liberty to frame their own creeds, as they did their own liturgies, without being tied precisely to any one form of words, so long as they kept to the analogy of faith and doctrine at first delivered by the Apostles; which seems to be the true reason of so many ancient forms, differing in words, not in substance.

SECT. 7.—What Articles were contained in the Apostolical Creeds.

But now the grand question still remains, concerning the nature, substance, and extent of the apostolical creeds; that is, what articles were contained in them?—Some there are, who would confine these to very narrow bounds, making them at first to be no more than what is contained expressly in the form of baptism, "I believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." So Episcopius<sup>1</sup> and his followers, who

---

<sup>1</sup> Episcop. Institut. lib. iv. sect. 2. cap. 34.

would persuade the world, that, for the three first ages, the doctrine of our Saviour's divinity was no necessary article of the Christian faith. But the learned Bp. Bull,<sup>1</sup> and Dr. Grabe,<sup>2</sup> have judiciously refuted these pretences, the one by showing from all the ancient creeds, that this doctrine was a necessary article before the Nicene council; and the other by evincing from Scripture, that the lineaments of the Apostles' creed, used in the administration of baptism, were at the first much larger than what Episcopius pretended; and that in the Apostles' age, either by their authority or permission, the creed consisted of all the present articles, except only those two, of the descent into hell, and the communion of saints, which are owned to be of later admission. Mr. Basnage indeed has a peculiar opinion,<sup>3</sup> that the creed was composed and the chief articles inserted only in the second century, in opposition to several heresies, which then began to infest the Church. The Gnostics brought in the doctrine of a two-fold Deity, the one good, the other evil: against this pestilent heresy, the Church put that article into her creed, "I believe in God, or in one God." Menander, the disciple of Simon Magus, asserted "that the world was not created by God, but by angels;" this occasioned the Church to insert those words, "Maker of Heaven and Earth." Carpocrates taught, "that Jesus was a mere man, and begotten of both sexes, as other men;" in opposition to whom it was inserted, "that Christ was conceived by the Holy Ghost." The Basilidians did not believe Jesus was crucified by the Jews, but only Simon of Cyrene; to confute whom they put in those words, "He was dead and buried." Carpocrates rejected the resurrection of the flesh; and upon that, "I believe the resurrection of the flesh," was added to the creed. Thus, if we will hearken to this learned person, there was no creed at all made by the Apostles, but it was composed entirely by the Church, and gradually augmented, only as the rise of sects and heresies required some opposition to be made to them. The learned author of the late Critical History of the Creed

<sup>1</sup> Bull. Judic. Eccles. Cathol. &c. cap. 6.

<sup>2</sup> Grabe Annotata ad cap.

5, 6, et 7. ejusd. p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> Basnag. Exercit. in Baron. p. 476.

goes the same way, only with this difference, that he supposes, what Mr. Basnage does not, that some articles were inserted by the Apostles themselves, and others superadded by the Church, as the occasion of heresies required. But when he speaks of the particular articles, he falls in with Mr. Basnage's notion about the chiefest: for he supposes the first article, "I believe in one God," not to be made against the polytheism of the Gentiles by the Apostles, but only by the Church, upon the rise of the heresies of the Valentinians, Cerdonians, Marcionites, and others in after ages. Which in effect is to say, the creed was made, and not made by the Apostles; for if the principal articles were not composed by them, I see not what else can entitle them to have been the authors of it. And therefore I much more readily subscribe to the opinion of the learned Dr. Grabe, which he maintains against this learned person, that the article of, "One God the Father, Maker of Heaven and Earth," was originally inserted into the creed, by the Apostles, against the capital error of the Gentiles, who made one God to have power over heaven, another over the earth, another over the sea, &c. and divided the divine honour among them. For so the vulgar among the Heathen practised their idolatry, however the philosophers among them might be a little more refined in their theology, and have more agreeable notions of the unity of the Supreme God. Therefore it is reasonable to believe this first article was inserted to make men renounce in their baptism this erroneous opinion of the Gentiles.

The opinion of Episcopus, that nothing more was originally in the creed about our Saviour, but only the bare title of the Son, is solidly refuted by Dr. Grabe, who proves from Scripture, that he had always this title with the addition of his being the Son of God; and that those other articles, "He was crucified, dead, and buried; that he rose again, and ascended into Heaven, and sat at the right hand of God, and from thence should come to judge the quick and dead," were all original articles of the creed; being such doctrines as the Apostles chiefly taught their catechumens, and such as the Jews and Gentiles either denied or ridiculed; and therefore it was proper to make all

new converts, at their entrance on Christianity, make a particular profession of such articles, in opposition to their former errors, whether they came over from the Jews or Gentiles. Upon this account he also rejects the opinion of the author of the Critical History, who supposes the article of the ascension of Christ into heaven, to have been added to the creed only in the second century, and that in opposition to Apelles, one of Marcion's disciples, who denied the ascension of Christ's flesh into heaven. But if it had been designed against him, it would no doubt have been more particularly expressed, "that his flesh ascended into heaven;" as Dr. Grabe observes it is in Irenæus; and not barely, "that Christ ascended into heaven." For the same reason he concludes, that the following articles, of his session at God's right hand, and his coming to judge the quick and the dead, could not be inserted into the creed in opposition to the Marcionites, and Gnostics, as the fore-mentioned author supposes; for then they would have been more precisely worded against their reigning tenets, which were, "that Christ's flesh was void of sense in heaven, and that Christ was not the son of that God, who is the Judge of the world." Wherefore it is more reasonable to suppose those articles were originally inserted by the Apostles, to correct the ignorance and errors of the Jews and Gentiles.

As to those two articles, "He was conceived by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary," Dr. Grabe makes some question, whether they were as ancient as the former, because they do not appear in the common catechetical discourses of the Apostles, but he thinks, before St. John's death, they were inserted against the heresies of Carpocrates, Ebion, and Cerinthus, who denied both articles, and asserted, "that Christ was born of Joseph and Mary, after the common way of mankind."

The article of the Holy Ghost was always a part of the Apostles' creed, by the confession of Episcopius himself. And therefore the opinion of those, who maintain, that nothing more was required of catechumens before baptism, but only the profession of their faith in Jesus Christ, as the son of God, is wholly to be rejected.



The article of remission of sins was also originally in the apostolical creed, because it always appears to have been one principal point of their catechetical institutions. And therefore the opinion of the learned author of the Critical History, that it was only in some creeds, but not in all, till the rise of the Novatian heresy, is also to be rejected; because it appears from Cyprian, that it was in the creed, which the Novatians themselves made use of in baptism.

The articles of the resurrection of the dead, and life everlasting, are also concluded to have been in the Apostles' creed, if not from the very first, yet at least when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to the Hebrews, because he there mentions the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment, among the fundamental doctrines of the Christian faith. Heb. vi. 2.

The article of the Church, Dr. Grabe thinks, was not originally in the creed, but added in the latter end of the first century, or beginning of the second, upon occasion of heretics and schismatics separating from the Church. At least it appears from Tertullian's book, *De Baptismo*, that the profession of it was required in his time, of catechumens at their baptism. For he says,<sup>1</sup> "after they had testified their faith in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, they also added the Church, because where those three were, there was the Church, and it was the body of the three.

The article of the communion of saints, he readily acknowledges, was never in any creed before the fourth century. And that, concerning the descent into hell, was not originally in the creed, but added upon occasion of heretics in after ages. But the precise time of its addition is not exactly agreed upon, between the author of the Critical History and Dr. Grabe. The former, who is allowed to have explained the genuine sense of this article with as great exactness as the most consummate divine, supposes it to have been added against the Arians and Apollinarians, who denied the soul or spirit of Christ, because the Fathers argued

---

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Bap. cap. 6. Cùm sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignorentur, necessariò adjicitur ecclesiæ mentio; quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi ecclesia, quæ trium corpus est.

thus against them: Christ descended into hell either in his divinity or his soul, or his body; but it is absurd to ascribe the descent into hell either to his divinity or his body, and therefore it must be his soul that descended; which proves the reality of his soul. But Dr. Grabe thinks this article was of earlier date, because it is to be found in some of the Arian creeds themselves, and others, more ancient than the Apollinarians: and that, if it had been inserted against the Apollinarian doctrine, it would not have been barely said, "He descended into hell," but rather, "he descended by his soul into hell," which had been directly against that heresy. Therefore he rather supposes it to have been added to the creed in opposition to the Valentinians and Marcionites, who according to the account given by Irenæus<sup>1</sup> and Tertullian pretended,<sup>2</sup> that the souls of all that died of their sects went immediately to heaven; when yet Christ himself went into the state and place of separate souls for three days before his resurrection and ascension.

Upon the whole matter, Dr. Grabe concludes, that all the articles of the creed, except these three, the communion of saints, the Church, and the descent of Christ into hell, were solemnly professed by the first Christians in their confessions of faith in the Apostles' days, by their authority, or at least their approbation: for which reason the creed, as to those parts of it, may properly be called apostolical. And it could hardly be, that all Churches in the world should so unanimously agree in the common confession of so many articles of it, unless it had proceeded from some such authority as they all acknowledged. But the reason, why the confessions of particular Churches differed in words and phrases, he thinks was from hence, that the creed, which the Apostles delivered, was not written with paper and ink, but "in the fleshly tables of the heart," as St. Jerom words it.<sup>3</sup> Whence every Church was at liberty to express their sense in their own terms. But he will not undertake to vindicate the common tradition of Ruffinus, that it was made by joint consent of all the Apostles, when they were about to sepa-

<sup>1</sup> Iren. lib. v. c. 31.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Animâ. c. 55.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron.

Ep. 61. ad Pammach. c. 9.

rate from one another; and much less, that every one of the twelve Apostles cast in his symbol to complete the number of twelve articles, as the other story is told by the author under the name of St. Austin, which he thinks is not in the least to be regarded. I have been a little more particular in representing the sense of this great man upon this point, both because his account of the original of the several articles of the Creed seems to be most exact, and because the discourse, where he delivers his opinion, may not yet be fallen into the hands of every ordinary reader.

## CHAP. IV.

### *A Collection of several ancient Forms of the Creed out of the primitive Records of the Church.*

#### SECT. I.—The Fragments of the Creed in Irenæus.

I SHALL now in the next place present the reader with several of the ancient forms of the Creed, as we find them preserved in the most ancient writers and the most authentic primitive records of the Church. The use of these will be, not only to illustrate and confirm what has been said in the last Chapter, but also to declare what was the ancient faith of the Church, and show the vanity of modern hereties, especially the Arians, who pretend that the doctrine of our Saviour's divinity was no necessary article of faith before the council of Nice. Bp. Usher, in his curious tract *De Symbolo Romano*, has already collected a great many of these ancient forms, but because that piece is written in Latin, and become very scarce, and some things more may be added to it, I will here oblige the English reader with a new account of them, beginning with the fragments of the Creed, which we have in Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Tertullian, and other private writers, which Bp. Usher gives no account of. Some fancy the Creed may be found in the writings of Ignatius, Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, and Justin Martyr; but Bp. Pearson<sup>1</sup> has rightly observed, that these writers, however they may incidentally

---

<sup>1</sup> Pearson's Exposition of the Creed, Article 5. in Initio.

mention some articles of faith, do not formally deliver any rule of faith used in their own times. The first, that speaks of this, is Irenæus, who calls it the “unalterable canon<sup>1</sup> or rule of truth, which every man received at his baptism;” and he immediately declares what it was in these words:<sup>2</sup> “The Church, though it be dispersed over all the world from one end of the earth to the other, received from the Apostles and their disciples, the belief in one God the Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven, and earth, and sea, and all things in them: and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was incarnate for our salvation: and in the Holy Ghost, who preached by the prophets the dispensations of God, and the advent, and nativity of a virgin, and passion, and resurrection from the dead, and bodily ascension of the flesh of his beloved Son, Christ Jesus, our Lord, into heaven, and his coming again from heaven in the glory of the Father, to recapitulate all things, and raise the flesh of all mankind; that according to the will of the invisible Father every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in the earth; and things under the earth, to Jesus Christ, our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King; and that every tongue should confess to him and that He may exercise just judgment upon all, and send spiritual wickednesses, and the transgressing and apostate angels, with all ungodly, unrighteous, lawless and blaspheming men into everlasting fire; but grant life to all righteous and holy men, that keep his commandments and persevere in his love, some from the beginning, others after repentance, on whom he confers immortality, and invests them with eternal glory.” This faith, he says, was the same in all the world; men professed it with one heart and one soul: for though there were different dialects in the world, yet the power of the faith was one and the same.<sup>3</sup> The Churches in Germany had no other faith or tradition than those in Iberia or Spain, or those among the Celtæ, that is, France, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Libya, or in the middle parts of the world, by which he means Jerusalem and the adjacent Churches, which were reckoned to be in the midst of the earth. But as one and the same Sun enlightened all the world; so the preaching of this truth shined all over,

<sup>1</sup> Iren. lib. i. c. 1. p. 41.<sup>2</sup> Ibid. c. 2. p. 45.<sup>3</sup> Ibid. lib. i. c. 3.

and enlightened all men that were willing to come to the knowledge of truth. Nor did the most eloquent ruler of the Church say any more than this; (for no one was above his master) nor the weakest diminish any thing of this tradition: for the faith being one and the same, he that said most of it could not enlarge it, nor he that said least take any thing from it.

The reader will easily perceive, that Irenæus by this one faith did not mean the express form of words now used in the Apostles' Creed; for his words differ much in expression from that, though in sense and substance it be the same faith, and that which was then preached and taught over all the Churches.

SECT. 2.—The Creed of Origen.

There is another such form of apostolical doctrine collected by Origen in his books of Christian Principles,<sup>1</sup> where he thus delivers the rule of faith: “The things which are manifestly handed down by the apostolical preaching, are these; First, that there is one God, who created and made all things, and caused the whole universe to exist out of nothing; the God of all the just that ever were from the first creation and foundation of all; the God of Adam,

---

<sup>1</sup> Origen. *Περί Ἀρχῶν*, in Præfat. tom. i. p. 665. Species verò eorum, quæ per prædicationem apostolicam manifestè traduntur, istæ sunt. Primo, quod unus Deus est, qui omnia creavit atque composuit, quique ex nullis fecit esse universa; Deus à primâ creaturâ et conditione mundi omnium Justorum, Deus Adam, Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noe, Sem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, duodecim Patriarcharum, Moysi, et Prophetarum. Et quod hic Deus in novissimis diebus, sicut per prophetas suos ante promiserat, misit Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, primo quidem vocaturum Israel, secundo etiam Gentes post perfidiam populi Israel. Hic Deus justus et bonus, Pater Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Legem et Prophetas et Evangelia dedit, qui et Apostolorum Deus est, et Veteris et Novi Testamenti. Tum deinde quia Jesus Christus ipse qui venit, ante omnem creaturam natus ex Patre est: qui cùm in omnium conditione Patri ministrâset (per ipsum enim omnia facta sunt) novissimis temporibus seipsum exinaniens homo factus est: incarnatus est cùm Deus esset, et homo mansit quod Deus erat. Corpus assumpsit nostro corpori simile, eo solo differens quod natum ex virgine de Spiritu Sancto est. Et quoniam hic Jesus Christus natus, et passus est in veritate et non per imaginem communem hanc mortem, verè mortuus est; verè enim à mortuis resurrexit, et post resurrectionem conversatus cum discipulis suis, assumptus est. Tum deinde honore ac dignitate Patri et Filio sociatum tradiderunt Spiritum Sanctum, &c.

Abel, Seth, Enos, Enoch, Noe, Sem, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, the twelve Patriarchs, Moses, and the Prophets : and that this God in the last days, as he had promised before by his prophets, sent our Lord Jesus Christ, first to call Israel and then the Gentiles, after the infidelity of his people Israel. This just and good God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, gave both the Law and the Prophets, and the Gospels, being the God of the Apostles, and of the Old and New Testament." The next article is, "that Jesus Christ, who came into the world, was begotten of the Father before every creature, who ministering to his Father in the creation of all things, (for by him all things were made,) in the last times made himself of no reputation and became man : he who was God, was made flesh, and when he was man, he continued the same God that he was before. He assumed a body in all things like ours, save only that it was born of a virgin by the Holy Ghost. And because this Jesus Christ was born and suffered death common to all, in truth, and not only in appearance, he was truly dead ; for he rose again truly from the dead, and after his resurrection conversed with his disciples, and was taken up into heaven. They also delivered unto us, that the Holy Ghost was joined in the same honour and dignity with the Father and the Son."

Thus far Origen speaks of the principal articles of the Christian faith, as handed down by the Church from the preaching of the Apostles. And there goes another book under his name, written by way of dialogue against the Marcionites, where he more succinctly delivers the Catholic faith in opposition to the false principles of those Heretics ; "I believe there is one God,<sup>1</sup> the Creator and Maker of all things ; and one that is from him, God the Word, who is consubstantial with him and co-eternal, who in the last times took human nature upon him of the Virgin Mary, and was crucified, and raised again from the dead. I believe also the Holy Ghost, who exists to all eternity." It is true, learned men are not certainly agreed, who was the true author of those Dialogues ; Westenius, who first pub-

---

<sup>1</sup> Origen. Cont. Marc. Dial. i. p. 815. tom. ii. Edit. Latin. Basil. 1571.

lished them in Greek, ascribes them to Origen: but Huetius makes one Maximus the author, who lived, as he conjectures, in the time of Constantine. But whoever was the author, they contain a form of a very orthodox creed, for which reason I have given it a place in this collection.

SECT. 3.—The Fragments of the Creed in Tertullian.

Next after Origen we find some parts of the ancient Creed in Tertullian, who speaks of it as the rule of faith common to all Christians. “There is” says he, “one rule of faith only,<sup>1</sup> which admits of no change or alteration, that, which teaches us to believe in one God Almighty, the Maker of the world; and in Jesus Christ his Son, who was born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, the third day arose again from the dead, received into heaven, and sitteth now at the right hand of God, who shall come again to judge both the quick and the dead, by the resurrection of the flesh.”

In his book of Prescriptions against Heretics,<sup>2</sup> he has another form not much unlike this. “The rule of faith is that, whereby we believe one God only, and no other beside, the Maker of the world, who produced all things out of nothing, by his Word, which He sent forth before all things. This Word was called his Son, who at sundry times appeared to the Patriarchs, and always spake by the

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Veland. Virgin cap. i. Regula quidem Fidei una omninò est, sola immobilis et irreformabilis, credendi scilicet in unicum Deum Omnipotentem, Mandi Conditorem, et Filium ejus Jesum Christum, natum ex Virgine Mariâ, crucifixum sub Pontio Pilato, tertiâ die resuscitatum à mortuis, receptum in cœlis, sedentem nunc ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos per carnis etiam resurrectionem.

<sup>2</sup> Id. de Præscript. advers. Hæreticos. cap. 13. Regula est autem Fidei, illa scilicet quâ creditur, unum omninò Deum esse, nec alium præter mundi conditorem, qui universa de nihilo produxerit, per Verbum suum primo omnium emissum. Id Verbum Filium ejus appellatum, in nomine Dei variè visum Patriarchis, in Prophetis semper auditum, postremo delatum ex Spiritu Dei Patris et virtute in Virginem Mariam, carnem factum in utero ejus, et ex eâ natum hominem et esse Jesum Christum: exinde prædicâsse novam legem, et novam promissionem regni cœlorum; virtutes fecisse; fixum cruci; tertiâ die resurrexisse; in cœlos creptum sedere ad dexteram Patris; nâssisse vicariam vim Spiritûs Sancti, qui credentes agat; venturum cum claritate ad sumendos sanctos in vitæ æternæ et promissorum cœlestium fructum, et ad profanos judicandos igni perpetuo, utriusque partis resuscitatione cum carnis resurrectione.

Prophets, and at last descended into the Virgin Mary by the Power and Spirit of God the Father, and was made flesh in her womb, and born of her, a man, Jesus Christ; who preached a new law, and a new promise of the kingdom of heaven; who wrought miracles, and was crucified, and the third day arose again, and was taken into Heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father; whence he sent the power of the Holy Ghost in his stead, to guide them that believe: who shall come again with glory, to take the saints into the possession and fruition of eternal life and the heavenly promises, and to condemn the profane to everlasting fire, having first raised both the one and the other by the resurrection of the flesh." This rule, he says, was instituted by Christ himself, and there were no disputes in the Church about it,<sup>1</sup> but such as heresies brought in, or such as made heretics. To know nothing beyond this, was to know all things.

In his Book against Praxeas he repeats the same creed with a little variation of expression: "We believe in one God,<sup>2</sup> yet under this dispensation, which we call the economy, that that one God hath a Son, which is his Word, who proceeded from Him, by whom all things were made, and without whom nothing was made. We believe, that he was sent by the Father to be born of a Virgin, both man and God, the Son of man and the Son of God, and that he was called Jesus Christ. That he suffered, and was dead and buried according to the Scriptures; that he was raised again by the Father, and taken up again into heaven,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. cap. 14. Hæc Regula à Christo instituta, nullas habet apud nos quæstiones, nisi quas hæreses inferunt et quæ hæreticos faciunt.—Nihil ultra scire, omnia scire est.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. advers. Prax. cap. 2. Unicum quidem Deum credimus, sub hæc tamen dispensatione, quam *οικονομίαν* dicimus, ut unicus Dei sit et Filius Sermo ipsius, qui ex ipso processerit, per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine quo factum est nihil. Hunc missum à Patre in Virginem, et ex eâ natum Hominem et Deum, filium hominis et filium Dei, et cognominatum Jesum Christum. Hunc passum, hunc mortuum, et sepultum secundùm Scripturas, resuscitatum à Patre, et in cælos resumptum, sedere ad dexteram Patris, venturum judicare vivos et mortuos. Qui exinde miserit secundùm promissionem suam à Patre Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum, sanctificationem fidei eorum qui credunt in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum Sanctum. Hanc regulam ab initio Evangelii decucurrisse, &c. Confer. Tertul. de Bapt. cap. 6 et 11.



where he sits at the right hand of the Father, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead; from whence also he sent from his Father, according to his promise, the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, who sanctifies the faith of those that believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." This faith, he says, was the rule of believing from the beginning of the Gospel, and the antiquity of it was sufficiently demonstrated from the novelty of heresies, which were but of yesterday's standing in comparison of it.

Now it is easy to observe, that Tertullian here speaks not of any certain form of words, but of the substance of the faith; for some articles, as the descent into hell, and the communion of saints, are not here expressly mentioned, though they may be implied; but the articles of the Trinity, the incarnation, &c. are both expressed, and carefully explained in such a manner, as shows the necessity of an explicit faith in those points, and how the doctrine of our Saviour's divinity was a prime article of the Creed from the very foundation of the Church.

#### SECT. 4.—The Fragments of the Creed in Cyprian.

Next after Tertullian, we have some remains of the use of the Creed in Cyprian: he says, "both the Catholics and Novatians agreed in the same form of interrogatories, which they always proposed to catechumens at their baptism; some of which were these questions in particular, whether they believed in God the Father,<sup>1</sup> and in Christ his Son, and in the Holy Ghost? and whether they believed the remission of sins and life eternal was to be obtained by the holy Church?" For though, as he observes, the Novatians did but falsify and prevaricate as it were in these questions;

---

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. Ep. 69. al. 76. ad Magnum, p. 183. Quod si aliquis illud opponat, ut dicat, eandem Novatianum legem tenere, quam Catholica Ecclesia tenet, eodem symbolo quo et nos baptizare, eundem nôsse Deum Patrem, eundem Filium Christum, eundem Spiritum Sanctum, ac propter hoc usurpare cum potestatem baptizandi posse, quòd videatur in interrogatione baptismi à nobis non discrepare: sciat, quisquis hoc opponendum putat, primùm non esse unam nobis et schismaticis symboli legem, neque eandem interrogationem: nam cum dicunt, Credis remissionem peccatorum et vitam aeternam per sanctam Ecclesiam? mentiuntur in interrogatione, quando non habeant ecclesiam.

there being no true Church among them to grant remission of sins; yet however they observed the same form of words, as the Church did in her creed, and put the same questions to all that came to them for baptism. Cyprian repeats this in another Epistle, which is written in the name of the council of Carthage,<sup>1</sup> to the bishops of Numidia, where mention is made of the same interrogatories, as generally used in the administration of baptism. From whence it appears, that not only the articles of the Trinity, but those other, which relate to the Church, and remission of sins, and eternal life, were parts of the Creed used in Cyprian's time in all the African Churches. And except the descent into hell, and the communion of saints, which are of later date in the Creed than the times of Cyprian or Tertullian, all the other articles are taken notice of by these two primitive writers.

SECT. 5.—The Creeds of Gregory Thaumaturgus.

Not long after Cyprian lived Gregory, bishop of Neocæsarea, commonly called Thaumaturgus. Among his works published by Gerhard Vossius of Tongres we have a creed, which he composed for the use of his own Church, or rather, as Gregory Nyssen reports in his Life, a creed which he received in the entrance on his ministry by a vision from heaven. The form is in these words;<sup>2</sup> “There is one God, the Father of the living Word, the subsisting wisdom and power, the eternal express image of God, who is a perfect begetter of a perfect, a Father of an only begotten Son. And one Lord, one of one, God of God, the character and image of the Godhead, the word of power, the wisdom that comprehends the whole system of the world, the power that made every creature. The true Son of the true Father, invisible of invisible, incorruptible of incorruptible, immortal of im-

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. Ep. 70. ad Episc. Numid. p. 190. Sed et ipsa interrogatio, quæ sit in baptismo, testis et veritatis. Nan cùm dicimus, ‘Credis in vitam æternam et remissionem peccatorum per sanctam Ecclesiam?’—intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesiâ dari, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Gregor. Neocæsar. Oper. p. 1. et ap. Greg. Nyss. tom. iii. p. 546. Εἷς Θεός, πατήρ λόγῳ ζωῶντος, σοφίας ὑφεπέσσης, ἢ ἐνέργειᾳ ἢ χαρακτῆρος ἀϊδίῳ, τέλειῳ τελείῳ γεννήτωρ, πατήρ ὑἱῷ μονογενῆς. εἷς κέριος, μόνος ἐκ μόνου, Θεὸς ἐκ Θεοῦ, &c.

mortal, eternal of eternal. And one Holy Ghost, who has his existence from God, who was manifested to men by the Son, the perfect image of the perfect Son, the living cause of all living, the fountain of holiness, essential sanctity, who is the author of holiness in all others. In whom God the Father is manifested, who is above all and in all, and God the Son, whose power runs through all things. A perfect Trinity, whose glory, eternity and dominion is no way divided or separated from each other. In this Trinity, therefore, there is nothing created or servile, nothing adventitious or extraneous, that did not exist before, but afterward came into it. The Father was never without the Son, nor the Son without the Spirit, but the Trinity abides the same, unchangeable and invariable for ever."

This creed is not a complete summary of the faith, but only so far as relates to the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, of which it is one of the most convincing testimonies that is to be met with in any of the Anti-Nicene Fathers; it being particularly designed against the two opposite heresies of the Samosatensians and Sabellians, the one of which denied the divinity of our Saviour, and the other his personal subsistence. Some modern Arians, following Sandius, have objected against it, as not genuine; but the learned Bp. Bull has abundantly vindicated the credit of it<sup>1</sup> from the undeniable evidences of Gregory Nyssen and St. Basil, to whose excellent dissertation I refer the reader.

SECT. 6.—The Creed of Lucian the Martyr.

In the same age with Gregory Thaumaturgus lived Lucian the martyr, who suffered in the last persecution under Diocletian. He was presbyter of the Church of Antioch, where he wrote a confession of faith in opposition to the Sabellians. The form is recorded both by Athanasius,<sup>2</sup> and Socrates,<sup>3</sup> and Hilary, who comments upon it, and vindicates it from the objections, which some made against it, because it was produced by the Arians in the council of Antioch under Constantius, Anno 341: as if it had favoured

<sup>1</sup> Bull. Defens. Fid. Nic. sect. 2. cap. 12. n. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Athan. de Synod.

Arimin. et Seleuc. tom. i. p. 892.

<sup>3</sup> Socrat. lib. ii. c. 10.

their opinion ; which Hilary shows it did not, though there were some expressions in it against the Sabellians, that might be wrested to an heretical sense, as any Catholic words may be, contrary to the mind of the author. The form, as delivered by St. Hilary, runs thus : “ We believe,<sup>1</sup> according to the tradition of the Gospels, and Apostles, in one God, the Father, Almighty, Creator, and Maker, and Governor of all things, of whom are all things : and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, who is God, by whom are all things, who was begotten of the Father, God of God, Whole of Whole, One of One, Perfect of Perfect, King of King, Lord of Lord, the Word, the Wisdom, the Life, the true Light, the true Way, the Resurrection, the Shepherd, the Gate, the incommutable and unchangeable image of the divine essence, power, and glory, the first-born of every creature, who was always from the beginning God the Word with God, according to what is said in the Gospel ; ‘ and the Word was God,’ by whom all things were made, and in whom

---

<sup>1</sup> Hilar. de Synodis, p. 107. Consequenter evangelicæ et apostolicæ traditioni credimus in unum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, cunctorum quæ sunt Edificatorem et Factorem et Provisorem, ex quo omnia : et in unum Dominum Jesum Christum, Filium ipsius unigenitum, Deum per quem omnia, qui generatus est ex Patre, Deum ex Deo, Totum ex Toto, Unum ex Uno, Perfectum de Perfecto, Regem de Rege, Dominum de Domino, Verbum, Sapientiam, Vitam, Lumen verum, Viam veram, Resurrectionem, Pastorem, Januam, inconvertibilem et incommutabilem, divinitatis essentiæque et virtutis et gloriæ incommutabilem Imaginem, primum editum totius creaturæ, qui semper fuit in principio apud Deum Verbum Deus, juxta quod dictum est in Evangelio ; ‘ et Deus erat Verbum,’ per quem omnia facta sunt, et in quo omnia constant, qui in novissimis diebus descendit de summis, et natus est ex Virgine secundum Scripturas, et agnus factus est, Mediator Dei et hominum, prædestinatus fidei nostræ et dux vitæ ; dixit quippe, ‘ Non enim descendi de cælo, ut facerem voluntatem meam, sed voluntatem ejus qui me misit.’ Qui passus est, et resurrexit pro nobis tertiâ die, et ascendit in cælos, et sedet in dexterâ Patris, et iterum venturus cum gloriâ judicare vivos et mortuos.

Et in Sanctum Spiritum, qui in paraclisin et sanctificationem et consummationem credentibus datus est, juxta quod et Dominus Jesus Christus ordinavit discipulis, dicens, ‘ Pergite et docete universas gentes, baptizantes eas in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti.’ Manifesta utique Patris, verè Patris, certaque Filii, verè Filii, notaque Spiritûs Sancti, verè Spiritûs Sancti ; hisque nominibus non simpliciter, neque otiosis propositis, sed significantibus diligenter propriam uniuscujusque nominatorum substantiam et ordinem et gloriam, ut sint quidem per substantiam tria, per consonantiam verò unum.—Τῆ ὑποστάσει τρία, τῇ δὲ συμφωνίᾳ ἓν.—So the Greek in Socrates and Athanasius.

all things subsist, who in the last days descended from on high, and was born of a virgin according to the Scriptures, and being the Lamb of God, he was made the Mediator between God and men, being fore-ordained to be the author of our faith and life: for he said, ‘ I came not from Heaven to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me.’ Who suffered and rose again for us the third day, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again with glory to judge the quick and the dead. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, which is given to believers for their consolation, and sanctification, and consummation, according to what our Lord Jesus Christ appointed his disciples, saying, ‘ Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’ Whence the properties of the Father are manifest, denoting him to be truly a father, and the properties of the Son, denoting him to be truly a son, and the properties of the Holy Spirit, denoting him to be truly the Holy Ghost: these names not being simply put and to no purpose, but to express the particular subsistence, or hypostatic substance, as the Greeks term it, of each person named, so as to denote them to be three in hypostasis, and one by consent.”

This creed was anciently suspected by some as an Arian creed, because of the term three hypostases, or three substances, in Hilary’s translation: but Hilary abundantly clears it from this suspicion, by showing, that these terms were only used to oppose the Sabellians, who made the three persons no more than three names; and that all other expressions in it are very full and significant against the Arian heresy; and therefore neither does he censure the council of Antioch as Arians, who only repeated and adopted this creed from Lucian, but he calls them a synod of ninety-five holy bishops, who intended thereby to establish the Catholic faith against the Sabellians chiefly, though not without a sufficient guard against the Anomœans or Arians. His words are these:<sup>1</sup> “ The holy synod intending to de-

---

<sup>1</sup> Hilar. de Synodis, p. 108. Volens igitur congregata sanctorum synodus impietatem eam perimere, quæ veritatem Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti

stroy the impiety of those heretics, who eluded the true faith of a Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, by the equivocation of three names only, that by a triple appellation, without any real subsistence belonging to each name, they might, under the false shadow of three names, introduce such an unity, as that the Father alone, though but one and the same, should have the name of the Holy Spirit and of the Son also: therefore the synod used the term, three substances or hypostases, meaning by substances, subsisting persons, and not intending to introduce such a division of substance in the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as implies a dissimilitude and diversity of essence." Which was the heresy of the Arians, who made the Father only God, and the other two persons only creatures, so dividing the substance by a diversity of nature or essence; which this Council did not: and therefore Hilary says, "they were not to be blamed, though they spake of the divine persons as of three substances or hypostases, and one by consent, because they meant no more than real subsisting persons, in opposition to the Sabellians." Yet notwithstanding this just defence and apology made by St. Hilary for this Council, it is condemned by Baronius, Binnius, Hermantius, and many other modern writers, as an Arian council. But the learned Schelstrate has written an accurate dissertation in favour of this Council, wherein he answers<sup>1</sup> all the objections made by Baronius and his followers, either against this Council or the creed of Lucian the martyr; which is also done by our learned Bp. Bull,<sup>2</sup> to whose dissertations I refer the curious reader.

SECT. 7.—The Creed of the Apostolical Constitutions.

About the time of Lucian the martyr, in the latter end of

---

nominum numero eluderet, ut non subsistente causâ uniuscujusque nominis triplex nuncupatio obtineret sub falsitate nominum unionem; ut Pater solus atque unus idem atque ipse haberet et Spiritûs Sancti nomen et Filii. Ideirco tres substantias esse dixerunt, subsistentium personas per substantias edocentes, non substantiam Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti diversitate dissimilis essentiæ separantes. Quod autem dictum est ut sint quidem per substantiam tria, per consonantiam verò unum, non habet calumniam, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Schelstrat. Sacrum Concilium Antiochenum Restitutum, Dissert. iii. c. 2. p. 109.

<sup>2</sup> Bull. Defens. Fid.

Nic. sect. 2. c. 13. n. 6.

the third century, Cotelierus supposes the author or compiler of the book, called the Apostolical Constitutions, to have lived; which I think more probable than either the opinion of those, who thrust him down to the fifth century, or the opinion of Mr. Whiston, who will needs have this book not only to be the genuine work of Clemens Romanus, but the work of a divine and inspired writer. For this reason I speak of him in this place next after Lucian, as one that has left us the form of an ancient creed, then most probably used in some of the Eastern or Greek Churches. For he brings in the catechumen making his profession in these words: "I believe,<sup>1</sup> and am baptized in one unbegotten, the only true God Almighty, the Father of Christ, the Creator and Maker of all things, of whom are all things: and in one Lord Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, the first-born of every creature, who before all ages was begotten, not made, by the good will of the Father, by whom all things were made in Heaven and in Earth, visible and invisible; who in the last times came down from Heaven, and taking flesh upon him, was born of the Holy Virgin Mary, and lived a holy life according to the laws of God his Father, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and died for us, and the third day, after he had suffered, rose again from the dead and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and shall come again with glory in the end of the world to judge both the quick and dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And I am baptized into the Holy Ghost, that is to say, the Comforter, which wrought effectually in all the Saints from the beginning of the world and was afterward sent to the Apostles by the Father, according to the promise of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, and after the Apostles to all others, who in the Holy Catholic Church believe the resurrection of the flesh, the remission of sins, the kingdom of heaven, and the life of the world to come."

---

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. c. 41. Πιστεύω ἕ βαπτίζομαι εἰς ἓνα ἀγέννητον μόνον ἀληθινόν Θεόν παντοκράτορα, τὸν πατέρα τῷ Χριστῷ, κτιστὴν ἕ δημοσργὸν τῶν ἀπάντων, ἐξ ἕ τὰ πάντα. ἕ εἰς τὸν Κέριον Ἰησοῦν τὸν Χριστὸν, τὸν μονογενῆ αὐτῷ υἱόν, τὸν πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως, τὸν πρό αἰῶνων εὐδοκίᾳ τῷ Πατρὸς γεννηθέντα, ἕ κτισθέντα, &c.

Some have suspected this author of Arianism, but there is nothing of it appears in this creed: for though he gives the title of ἀγέννητον only to the Father, yet that is no more than what Alexander, and Athanasius, and all the opposers of Arius always did, who never asserted δύο ἀγέννητα, as those words signify, *two absolute, co-ordinate, unbegotten principles*, which is the proper notion of two Gods; but always reserved the title of ἀγέννητον, *unbegotten*, to the Father only, as the eternal principle and fountain of the Deity, and styled the Son μονογενῆ Θεόν, *the only-begotten God*, which is the proper notion of the Son of God, who is neither created, nor unbegotten, but eternally begotten of the substance of the Father; and this title of μονογενῆς Θεός, *the only-begotten God*, is the same, as this very author of the Constitutions elsewhere ascribes to the Son,<sup>1</sup> whom he makes to be no creature, but God, in this only differing from the Father, that he is not unbegotten; which is necessary to the notion of a Son; for it were a contradiction to say, He is the Son of God, and yet unbegotten also. I observe this to show, how little advantage the modern Arians have from this author, if we allow him but that favourable interpretation, which in justice ought to be allowed to all ancient Catholic writers.

We may further observe, that though this creed be the same in substance with the Roman Creed, which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, yet it differs from it very much in phrase and expression, and comes nearer the creeds of the Eastern Church; and though it be as perfect as any of that age, yet it has neither the article of the descent into hell, nor the communion of saints expressly mentioned in it; which shows, that these articles were not *totidem verbis* inserted into the first creeds of the Church.

#### SECT. 8.—The Creed of Jerusalem.

Thus far I have collected the scattered remains of the ancient creeds, which were composed, before the Nicene Creed, for the use of several Churches; as they are still

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. Lib. vii. cap. 43. lib. viii. c. 7, 11, 12, 17.



upon record in private writers. But we have some more perfect forms also remaining, as those of Jerusalem, Cæsarea, Antioch, Alexandria, and Rome, by comparing which together the reader may easily perceive, how the unity of faith was exactly agreed upon, and preserved with some variety of expression. The Creed of the Church of Jerusalem we have imperfectly in St. James's Liturgy, and more perfectly in the Catechetical Discourses of Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, which are an exposition upon it. In St. James's Liturgy we have only the beginning of the Creed; "I believe in one God the Father Almighty,<sup>1</sup> Maker of heaven and earth, and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God." But the remaining articles are not inserted, as being vulgarly known without reciting. However, in Cyril's Catechisms the articles are rehearsed at full length, and when collected together they run in this form:

"I believe in one God,<sup>2</sup> the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God begotten of the Father before all ages, the true God, by whom all things were made, who was incarnate and made man, who was crucified and buried, and the third day he rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, and shall come to judge the quick and dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Comforter, who spake by the prophets. In one baptism of repentance, in the remission of sins, in one Catholic Church, in the resurrection of the flesh, and in life everlasting."

That this creed was neither the Nicene Creed nor the Constantinopolitan, is evident, because it wants the word, consubstantial, and other titles, which are given to the Son in the Nicene Creed; nor has it the full explication of the character of the Holy Ghost, which was afterward made in the Constantinopolitan Creed; which is not to be wondered at, because Cyril's Catechisms were written some years before the council of Constantinople was held. There-

---

<sup>1</sup> Jacobi Liturg. in Bbl. Patr. Gr. Lat. tom. ii. p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril. Cateches. 6. &c.

fore it must be the ancient Creed of Jerusalem,<sup>1</sup> as learned men have rightly concluded, and hence also observed, that the oriental creeds had originally the articles that follow the Holy Ghost, viz., the Catholic Church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, and eternal life. Only the communion of saints, and descent into hell, are wanting in it.

SECT. 9.—The Creed of Cæsarea in Palestine.

And so we find in the Creed of Cæsarea in Palestine, in the profession of which Eusebius says he was baptized and catechized; the descent into hell is not mentioned in it. But it differs in expression from the Jerusalem Creed, and comes up the nearest to the Nicene Creed of any other. The form, as it was proposed by Eusebius himself to the council of Nice, is in these words; “We believe in one God, the Father Almighty,<sup>2</sup> Maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Word of God, God of God, Light of Light, Life of Life, his only begotten Son, the first born of every creature, begotten of the Father before all ages, by whom all things were made; who for our salvation was incarnate, and conversed among men, and suffered, and rose again the third day, and ascended unto the Father, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. We believe also in one Holy Spirit. Every one of these we believe to be and exist; we confess the Father to be truly a Father, the Son truly a Son, the Holy Ghost truly a Holy Ghost, according to what our Lord, when he sent his disciples to preach, said, ‘Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.’”

The articles, that follow the Holy Ghost, are here omitted only for the same reason, as, I shall show hereafter, they were omitted in the Nicene Creed, because then no dispute was made about them, and only so much of the creed was now produced, as was necessary to be mentioned in opposition to the Arian heresy.

<sup>1</sup> Bull. Judic. Eccles. Cathol. &c. cap. 6. n. 5.  
Ecclesiam Cæsar. ap. Socrat. lib. i. cap. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. Epist. ad

## SECT. 10.—The Creed of Alexandria.

The Creed of Alexandria was somewhat shorter than this, and is supposed by learned men to be that, which Arius and Euzoios delivered in to Constantine, when they made a sort of feigned recantation before him. The form is recorded in Socrates in these words ;<sup>1</sup> “ We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, his Son, our Lord, God the Word, begotten of Him before all ages ; by whom all things were made, that are in heaven and in earth ; who came down from heaven, and was incarnate, and suffered, and rose again, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, and in the resurrection of the flesh, and in the life of the world to come, and in the kingdom of heaven, and in one Catholic Church of God extended from one end of the earth to the other.”

## SECT. 11.—The Creed of Antioch.

The Creed of the Church of Antioch seems to be that which is recorded in Cassian, who delivers it as it was probably received in that Church from the time of the Apostles, only with the addition of the word, consubstantial, inserted from the time of the council of Nice. “ The text and faith of the Creed of Antioch,” says he, “ is this :<sup>2</sup> I believe in one only true God, the Father, Almighty, Maker of all creatures visible and invisible : and in Jesus Christ our Lord, his only begotten Son, the first-born of every creature, born of Him before all ages, and not made, very God of very God, consubstantial with the Father ; by whom the world was framed and all things made : who for our sakes came, and

---

<sup>1</sup> Socrat. lib. i. c. 26.      <sup>2</sup> Cassian. de Incarnat. lib. vi. p. 1272. *Textus ergo et fides Antiocheni Symboli hæc est. Credo in unum et solum verum Deum Patrem Omnipotentem, Creatorem omnium visibilium et invisibilium creaturarum. Et Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, Filium ejus unigenitum, et primogenitum totius creaturæ, ex eo natum ante omnia sæcula, et non factum, Deum verum ex Deo vero, Homousion Patri, per quem et sæcula compaginata sunt et omnia facta. Qui propter nos venit et natus est ex Mariâ Virgine, et crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus, et tertiâ die resurrexit secundum Scripturas, et in cœlos ascendit, et iterum veniet judicare vivos et mortuos. Et reliqua.*

was born of the Virgin Mary, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried, and the third day rose according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead."

Cassian here repeats not the whole creed, but only those articles that were proper to be urged against Nestorius, who had been baptized into this faith, and by this creed, at Antioch; from which he shows his prevarications, and how he had started from the profession which he himself had made in the words of this creed, both at his baptism and ordination, leaving the remaining articles unrecited.

SECT. 12.—The Roman Creed, commonly called the Apostles' Creed.

The reader may easily perceive by comparing the fore-mentioned creeds, that the articles of the communion of saints, and the descent into hell, are not expressly mentioned in any of them. Nor were they originally in the Roman Creed, which is commonly called the Apostles' Creed, as appears not only from the testimony of Ruffin, but from some ancient copies of this creed still remaining. Bp. Usher<sup>1</sup> met with two copies here in England, which wanted these additions, and also that of life everlasting. The one was in Greek, though written in Saxon characters, at the end of King Athelstan's Psalter, about the year 703; and the other in Latin, but both exactly in the same form of words, "I believe in God, the Father, Almighty; and in Jesus Christ, his only begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried, and the third day rose again from the dead, ascended into heaven, sitteth on the right hand of the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Church, the remission of sins, and the resurrection of the flesh. Amen."

The variations of these ancient forms from the present form of the Apostles' Creed in the want of several words that have been since added, are noted by Bp. Usher, who also observes that this creed is delivered by several ancient

<sup>1</sup> Usher. de Symbolis, p. 6.

authors, with some variety of expression. For in some authors, which use this creed, life everlasting is added after the resurrection of the flesh. As in the Homilies of Petrus Chrysologus,<sup>1</sup> bishop of Ravenna, where he expounds this creed. And in the author of the book, *De Symbolo ad Catechumenos*, in the ninth tome of St. Austin's works. And in the creed which Marcellus, bishop of Ancyra, presented to Pope Julius, which is recorded in Epiphanius.<sup>2</sup> But others conclude this creed with the resurrection of the flesh, and make no express mention of life everlasting: not that they supposed it to be no article of faith, but because it was included in the other article of the resurrection, as they rightly expound it. St. Jerom says plainly,<sup>3</sup> "that ther Ceed was concluded with the resurrection of the flesh." And Maximus Tauriensis,<sup>4</sup> who expounds every article of it distinctly, says the same. And St. Austin also concludes the Creed with the resurrection of the flesh,<sup>5</sup> but then he includes eternal life in the exposition of it. "For," says he, "when the resurrection of the body is effected, we shall be freed from the conditions of time, and enjoy eternal life, with ineffable charity and stability without corruption." And so the author of the Sermons, *De Tempore*, under his name:<sup>6</sup> "The resurrection of the flesh is the end of all, but it is an end without end, for there is no death after that." Therefore they made it the conclusion of the Creed, because it was the conclusion of all things in this world.

SECT. 13.—The Creed of Aquileia.

And thus it was in the Creed of the Church of Aquileia, which differed in other points both from the Roman and Oriental Creeds. For Ruffinus, who wrote an exposition upon it, concludes it with the article of the resurrection,

<sup>1</sup> Petrus. Chrysol. Homil. 57, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Epiph. Hær. 72. Marcel. n. 3.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron. Ep. 61. ad Paminach. In Symbolo Fidei—post confessionem Trinitatis et unitatem Ecclesie, omne Christiani dogmatis sacramentum carnis resurrectione concluditur.

<sup>4</sup> Maxim. Taurin. Hom. i. de Diversis, p. 239.

Hic religionis nostræ finis, hæc summa credendi est. <sup>5</sup> Aug. de Fide et Symbolo. tom. iii. p. 66. Quâ corporis resurrectione factâ à temporis conditione liberati, æternâ vitâ ineffabili charitate et stabilitate sine corruptione perfruemur.

<sup>6</sup> Aug. Serm. 119. de Tempore, tom. x. p. 306. Iste jam finis est. Sed finis crit sine fine resurrectio carnis: &c.

and neither mentions nor expounds the article of eternal life, but only tacitly, as it is implied in the resurrection. In other articles some additions were made to this creed, which were not in the Roman: for here the descent into hell is particularly mentioned; and not only the resurrection of the flesh in general, but the resurrection of this flesh in particular: and in the first article, after the word Almighty, were added impassible and invisible, as peculiar appellations of God the Father. For it was thus conceived: "I believe in God, the Father, Almighty, invisible and impassible:<sup>1</sup> and in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who was born by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried; he descended into hell, and the third day rose again from the dead, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father, whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the Holy Catholic Church, the remission of sins, and the resurrection of this flesh."

The reason of adding the words, invisible and impassible, to this creed, which were not in the Roman, was to obviate the Sabellian or Patripassian heresy, which asserted that God the Father, was born of the Virgin, and so made visible and passible in the flesh. In opposition to which impiety, Rufinus says,<sup>2</sup> "their fore-fathers seem to have added those words, professing the Father to be invisible and impassible," that is, that He never was incarnate, as the Son only was and not the Father. The descent into hell, is also almost peculiar to this creed; for excepting this and the creed of the council of Sirmium or Ariminum, mentioned by Socrates,<sup>3</sup> this article was not expressly men-

<sup>1</sup> Rufin. Expos. Symboli ad calcem Cypriani, p. 19. Credo in Deum Patrem, Omnipotentem, Invisibilem et Impassibilem. Et in Christum Jesum, unicum Filium ejus, Dominum nostrum, qui natus est de Spiritu Sancto ex Mariâ Virgine, crucifixus sub Pontio Pilato, et sepultus, descendit ad inferna. Tertiâ die resurrexit à mortuis, ascendit in cœlos, sedet ad dexteram Patris, inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Et in Spiritum Sanctum, Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, remissionem peccatorum hujus carnis resurrectionem.

<sup>2</sup> Rufin. *ibid.* p. 19. Sciendum quod duo isti Sermones in Ecclesiâ Romanâ Symbolo non habentur; Constat autem apud nos additos hæreseos causâ Sabellii, illius profectò quæ à nostris Patripassiana appellatur; id est quæ Patrem ipsum vel ex Virgine natum dicit, et visibilem factum, vel passum affirmat in carne.

<sup>3</sup> Soerat. lib. ii. cap. 37.

tioned in any other creed of this age; though Rufinus thinks it was always implied in the word, buried, which he reckons of the same importance. When it first came into the Roman Creed, the reader may find a particular account in Bp. Pearson, who speaks of it as done about the year 600.

SECT. II.—The Nicene Creed, as first published by the Council of Nice.

I have hitherto given an account of all such creeds as might be reckoned of use in the Church before the time of the Nicene council. I shall now give the like account of the first forming of the Nicene Creed, and how it was afterward completed and put into a new form by the council of Constantinople. The creed as first published by the council of Nice, was in these words; “We believe in one God Almighty,<sup>1</sup> Maker of all things, visible and invisible; and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only-begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father; by whom all things both in heaven and earth were made: who for us men and our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate and made man, and suffered, and the third day rose again, and ascended into heaven, and shall come again to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost. And those who say, there was a time when the Son of God was not, or that he did not exist before he was made, because he was made out of nothing, or of another substance or essence, or that he was created or mutable, the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes them.”

This creed often occurs in the writings of the ancient Fathers and Councils in this very form. As in Athanasius Epist. ad Jovian. tom. i. p. 247. Hilar. de Synodis, p. 114. Leo, Ep. 95. ad Leonem Imperat. The Council of Rome under Julius, Anno 337. The Council of Ephesus, Epist. ad Nestor. The Council of Chalcedon, Act. 2. The Council of Hippo. The sixth Council of Carthage. The Preface to the African Code. The third Council of Bracara. The third

---

<sup>1</sup> Ap. Socrat. lib. i. c. 8.

and thirteenth of Toledo. The fifth General-Council of Constantinople, Act. 17. and many others.

Now some learned persons have been of opinion, that the ancient creeds before the council of Nice, had none of the articles which follow after the Holy Ghost, but all ended as that does, with those words, "And in the Holy Ghost." This was the opinion of Vossius and Erasmus; and Bp. Usher says, he was once inclined to think so himself, but upon better consideration, he professes he found it necessary to alter his judgment.<sup>1</sup> For it plainly appears, from most of the forms before recited, that several of the articles which follow after the Holy Ghost, were always a part of the Creed; and the reason why the council of Nice repeated them not, was only because there was then no dispute about them, and they only rehearsed so much of the former creeds as there was then occasion for, to oppose the heresy of the Arians, leaving the rest to be supplied from the former creeds, then generally received in the Church. This is evident both from the creeds used by the Arians, and those that were used by the Church, before the council of Constantinople had settled and new modelled the form of the Nicene Creed that was afterward generally received in the Church. Thus in the creed of the separating bishops, in the council of Sardica, related by St. Hilary and others,<sup>2</sup> after the article of the Holy Ghost, there follows, "We believe in the Holy Church, and in the remission of sins, and eternal life." Or, as it is more perfectly in his Fragments,<sup>3</sup> "The Holy Church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the flesh, and eternal life." So again, the Eusebians in their first creed, which they published in the council of Antioch, mentioned both by Athanasius and Soerates,<sup>4</sup> after the article of the Holy Ghost, add, "We believe the resurrection of the flesh, and eternal life." Now it were absurd to think the Arians should retain these articles in their creeds, and in the mean time the Church reject or neglect them. Therefore it is plain the Nicene Creed was only one

<sup>1</sup> Usser. de Symbolis, p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Hilar. de Synodis, p. 108.

<sup>3</sup> Pilar. Fragmenta. p. 140.

<sup>4</sup> Soerat. lib. ii. c. 10. Athanas. De

Synod. Arm. et Seleuc. tom. i. p. 892.



part of the ancient Creed, that was used at full length in baptism, though not here so recited. And what has been observed before out of Cyril's Catechisms, is a manifest proof of it.

SECT. 15.—The Creeds of Epiphanius.

This is further evident from the two creeds, a shorter and a longer, recited in Epiphanius, who wrote his *Anechorate* some years before the council of Constantinople. The shorter creed, which he says every catechumen repeated at his baptism, from the time of the council of Nice to the tenth year of Valentinian and Valens, Anno 373, was in these words:<sup>1</sup> “We believe in one God, the Father, Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible. And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of the Father before all ages, that is, of the substance of his Father, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made which are in heaven and in earth: who for us men and our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered and was buried, and the third day rose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right-hand of the Father: and shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead, of whose kingdom there shall be no end. And in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. And in one Catholic and Apostolic Church. We confess one baptism for the remission of sins, and we look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. But they who say, there was a time when the Son of God was not, or that he was not before he was begotten, or that he was made out of nothing, or of any other substance or essence, or that he is mutable or changeable, those the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes.”

---

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius, *Anechorat.* n. 120. tom. ii. p. 122.

“ This,” says Epiphanius, “ is the faith which was delivered by the holy Apostles, and received by the Church in the council of Nice, where three hundred and eighteen fathers were present.” By which he does not mean that these articles were delivered in this very form, either by the Apostles or the council of Nice, but that the Church agreed upon this form to be used at baptism, in pursuance of the doctrine delivered by the Apostles and the Nicene Fathers. And afterwards, upon occasion of the Apollinarian and other hereties, which infested the Church about the tenth year of Valentinian and Valens, and the sixth of Gratian, and the ninetieth year of the Diocletian account, that is, Anno 373, she enlarged her Creed with a more particular explication of some certain articles in opposition to those heresies; and then the form appointed to be used in baptism was in these terms, as he informs us in the same place:

“ We believe in one God, the Father, Almighty, Maker of all things, visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of God the Father, the only-begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made, as well in heaven as in earth, visible and invisible: who for us men and our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate, that is, was born in perfect manner of the holy Virgin Mary, by the Holy Ghost; and was made man, that is, took upon him perfect man, soul and body and mind, and whatsoever is in man, sin only excepted; not by the seed of man, nor merely by existing in man, but by framing flesh to himself into one holy unity; not after the manner as he inspired the prophets, and spake and wrought in them, but by being perfectly made man: for the word was made flesh, not by undergoing any change, or transforming the godhead into manhood, but by making one perfect and divine union: for there is but one Lord Jesus Christ, not two, the same God, the same Lord, the same King; who suffered in the flesh and rose again, and ascended with his body into heaven, and sitteth in glory at the right-hand of the Father; whence he shall come with glory in the same body to judge the quick and dead, of

whose kingdom there shall be no end. We believe in the Holy Ghost, who spake in the law, and preached by the prophets, and descended at Jordan; who spake by the Apostles, and dwells in the Saints: and thus we believe of him, that he is the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of God, the perfect Spirit, the Comforter, uncreated, proceeding from the Father, receiving from the Son, in whom we believe. We believe in one Catholic and Apostolic Church, in one baptism of repentance, in the resurrection of the dead, in the just judgment of body and soul, in the kingdom of heaven, and life everlasting. And those that say, there was a time when the Son or the Holy Ghost was not, or that they were made out of nothing, or of another substance or essence; that say, the Son of God, or the Holy Ghost are mutable or changeable; those the Catholic and Apostolic Church, the mother of us and you, anathematizes. And again, we anathematize those that confess not the resurrection of the dead, and all heresies which accord not to this holy faith."

Now if these creeds were in use in the Church at the time which Epiphanius mentions, then it is certain the Nicene Creed was completed by the Church for the use of her catechumens long before the general-council of Constantinople: and what was done by that council, was rather to contract the form, than to augment or lengthen it, as any one may easily perceive, that will compare the Constantinopolitan Creed with either of those that have now been recited out of Epiphanius.

SECT. 16.--The Nicene Creed, as completed by the Council of Constantinople, Anno 381.

For the Creed that was drawn up in the second general-council of Constantinople, is no other but the Nicene Creed, with the addition of such articles as were always used by the Church in the interrogatories of baptism, though not inserted in the particular form used by the Nicene council. I need not here repeat the form, because it is the same with that which is commonly called the Nicene Creed in our Liturgy: only the word, *Filioque*, expressing the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and Son together, was added afterward by the Latin Church.

For the first copies of this creed in the council of Constantinople<sup>1</sup> and the councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon<sup>2</sup> have it only, “proceeding from the Father, ἐκ τῆ Πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον,” without any mention of the Son: but in the Latin councils the word, *Filioque*, is commonly added, as in the first council of Bracara, Anno 411, and the third council of Toledo,<sup>3</sup> Anno 589, where the Constantinopolitan Creed is recited.

SECT. 17.—Of the Use of the Nicene Creed in the ancient Service of the Church. And when first it was taken in to be a part of the Liturgy in the Communion-Office.

As to the use of the Nicene Creed, it is certain, it was used in the Greek Church much after the same manner as the Apostolical and other Creeds were used in the Latin Church: first in the office of baptism; afterward it was taken in to be a part of the liturgy in the communion-service. Some learned persons, I know, are of opinion, that the Nicene Creed was never used in the administration of baptism, but only the Apostolical Creed, still throughout the whole Church. But this is a very plain mistake. First, because it does not appear, that the Apostolical Creed, which is the Roman Creed, was ever used in the Greek Church, even before the Nicene Creed was made: for they had several creeds of their own, agreeing indeed with the Roman Creed in substance, but differing from it in words and expression; and those creeds were used by the Greek or Eastern Church, in the administration of baptism. Secondly, when the Nicene Creed was formed, it is very evident, that very form was used by many Churches in the East as the creed of baptism: for the fathers of the council of Constantinople, under Mennas, Anno 536, do frequently call it the creed, in which both they themselves were baptized,<sup>4</sup> and also baptized others. And so it is said in the Synodical Epistles of the councils of Tyre and Jerusalem, which are related in the Acts of the same council.<sup>5</sup> As also in the Acts of the general-councils of Ephesus<sup>6</sup> and Chalcedon;<sup>7</sup> in the former

<sup>1</sup> Con. Constantin. Con. tom. ii. p. 953.

tom. iv. p. 341. <sup>3</sup> Con. tom. v. p. 100.

Menna. Act. 5. Con. tom. v. p. 166, 171, 179.

et 199.

<sup>6</sup> Con. Ephes. Act. 6. tom. iii. p. 690.

Act. 2. tom. iv. p. 341.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Chalcedon. Act. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Vid. Con. CP. sub

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 190

<sup>7</sup> Con. Chalcedon.

of which an order was made, that catechumens should be taught the Nicene Creed, and no other. The like may be observed in the Edict of the Emperor Basiliscus mentioned by Evagrius,<sup>1</sup> who, speaking of the Nicene Creed, calls it "the creed in which both he and all his ancestors were baptized." And it is remarked by Epiphanius,<sup>2</sup> of the two creeds which he recites, "that they were the creeds which every catechumen repeated at his baptism;" which were nothing but the Nicene Creed, with the addition of such articles as the Church supplied to make it a complete summary of the Faith. So that nothing can be more evident, than that the Nicene Creed was the creed then generally made use of in all the Eastern Churches for the instruction of catechumens at their baptism.

But as yet it was not made a part of the common liturgy of the Church, to be repeated daily in divine service. St. Ambrose<sup>3</sup> indeed speaks of it as used in private devotion, and gives directions to the holy virgins so to use it in their morning retirements, and upon other proper occasions. And Habertus<sup>4</sup> thinks it was also required of bishops at their ordination; which is not improbable, because they were obliged to make a profession of their faith. But all this did not yet make it a part of the daily liturgy of the Church. For it is agreed among learned men, both of the Romish and Protestant Communion, that the Creed was not used to be repeated in the daily service till about the middle of the fifth century in the Greek Church, and not till some time after in the Latin Church. So Valesius,<sup>5</sup> Cardinal Bona,<sup>6</sup> Schelstrate,<sup>7</sup> Pagi,<sup>8</sup> Christianus Lupus,<sup>9</sup> Hamond L'Estrange,<sup>10</sup> and Vossius.<sup>11</sup> Theodorus Lector<sup>12</sup> observes, that Peter Fullo, who was bishop of Antioch about the year

<sup>1</sup> Evagr. lib. iii. c. 4 et 7.  
p. 120.

<sup>2</sup> Epiphan. Anchorat. n. 120. tom. ii.

<sup>3</sup> Ambros. de Virgin. lib. iii. p. 115. *Symbolum quoque specialiter debemus, tanquam nostri signaculum cordis, antelucanis horis quotidie recensere. Quod etiam, cum horremus aliquid, animo recurrendum est.*

<sup>4</sup> Habert. *Archieratic*, p. 499.

<sup>5</sup> Vales. *Not. in Theodor.*

*Lector*, lib. ii. p. 566.

<sup>6</sup> Bona, *Rer. Liturg.* lib. ii. c. 8. n. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Schelstrat. *Con. Antiochen.* c. 6. p. 210.

<sup>8</sup> Pagi, *Critic. in Baron.*

*Anno 325.* n. 18.

<sup>9</sup> Lupus, *Scholia in Con.* tom. i. c. 4. p. 13.

<sup>10</sup> *Alliance of Divine Offices*, chap. iii. p. 79; chap. vi. p. 170.

<sup>11</sup> Vossius, de *Symbolis*,

<sup>12</sup> Theodor. *Lector. Hist.* lib. ii. p. 566.

471, was the first that ordered the Creed to be repeated in that Church,—“*εν πάση συνάξει, in every Church-assembly.*” And the same author reports,<sup>1</sup> that Timotheus, bishop of Constantinople, Anno 511, was the first that brought in this custom into that Church, which he did in hatred to his predecessor, Macedonius, and with an intent to represent him as disaffected to the Nicene Creed, which before that time was used to be rehearsed in the Church only once a year, on the *Parasceue*, or great day of preparation before the Passover, now called Maunday-Thursday, when the bishop was wont to catechize such as were to be baptized at Easter. From the Oriental Churches the custom was brought into the West, first in Spain and Gallicia, at the petition of King Reccardus, by the order of the third council of Toledo,<sup>2</sup> about the year 589, when those Churches were newly recovered from the inundation of the Arian heresy, this practice was then thought a proper antidote to preserve them from relapsing into their ancient error. Lupus and Pagi say it it was not brought into the French Churches till the time of Charles the Great, and then Pope Leo the Third advised them to lay it aside again, because it was not yet the custom of the Roman Church. They concluded yet further, that in the time of Pope John the Eighth, Anno 870, it was not yet the practice of the Roman Church. But at last in the days of Benedict the Eighth, Anno 1014, as is collected from Berno Augiensis, the custom was admitted into the Roman Church; for this reason, to give it in the words of Lupus, since the Roman Church could not bring over the French and Spanish Churches to her own way, she resolved at last to comply with their custom, that there might be no disagreement among them: and so the Nicene Creed came to be universally read throughout the whole Church.

SECT. 18.—Of the Athanasian Creed.

There is but one creed more, which I need to stand to

<sup>1</sup> Theodor. Lector. Hist. lib. ii. p. 563.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Tolet. iii. c. 2.

Petitione Reccardi Regis constituit synodus, ut per omnes Ecclesias Hispaniæ et Gallicie, secundum formam Orientalium Ecclesiarum, Concilii Constantinopolitani Symbolum Fidei recitetur: et priusquam Dominica dicatur Gratia, voce clara populo predicetur, &c.

give any account of, and that is the creed which is commonly received under the name of the Athanasian Creed. Baronius is of opinion,<sup>1</sup> that it was composed by Athanasius, when he was at Rome, and offered to Pope Julius as a confession of his faith; which circumstance is not at all likely, for Julius never questioned the faith of Athanasius. However, a great many learned men have so far embraced the opinion of Baronius, as to believe this creed to be of Athanasius's composing; as Cardinal Bona,<sup>2</sup> and Petavius,<sup>3</sup> and Bellarmin,<sup>4</sup> and Rivet,<sup>5</sup> with many others of both communions. Scultetus leaves the matter in doubt. But the best and latest critics, who have examined the thing most exactly, make no question but that it is to be ascribed to a Latin author, Vigilius Tapsensis, an African bishop, who lived in the latter end of the fifth century, in the time of the Vandalic Arian persecution. The learned Vossius,<sup>6</sup> and Quesnel,<sup>7</sup> have written particular dissertations upon this subject. Their arguments are; First, because this creed is wanting in almost all the manuscripts of Athanasius's Works. Secondly, because the style and contexture of it does not bespeak a Greek, but a Latin author. Thirdly, because neither Cyril of Alexandria, nor the council of Ephesus, nor Pope Leo, nor the council of Chalcedon, have ever so much as mentioned it in all that they say against the Nestorian or Eutychian heresies. Fourthly, because this Vigilius Tapsensis is known to have published several others of his writings under the borrowed name of Athanasius, with which this creed is commonly joined. These reasons have persuaded such men as Bp. Pearson,<sup>8</sup> Archbishop Usher,<sup>9</sup> Hamond L'Estrange,<sup>10</sup> Dr. Cave,<sup>11</sup> Schelstrate,<sup>12</sup> Pagi,<sup>13</sup> and Du Pin, critics of the

<sup>1</sup> Baron. An. 340. n. 11.<sup>2</sup> Bona, de Psalmodiâ.<sup>3</sup> Pelav.

Not. in Epiphan. Hær. 72.

<sup>4</sup> Bellarmin. de Scriptor. Eccles. p. 81.<sup>5</sup> Rivet. Critic. Sacr. lib. iii. c. 4. p. 240.<sup>6</sup> Voss. de Symbolis,

Dissert. 2.

<sup>7</sup> Quesnel. Dissert. De variis Fidei Symbolis in antiquo

Codice Romano.

<sup>8</sup> Pearson, in Symbol. Artic. 8. p. 570. Edit. Lat.<sup>9</sup> Usser. de Symbol. Rom. p. 1.<sup>10</sup> L'Estrange's Alliance of Divine

Offices, chap. iv. p. 99.

<sup>11</sup> Cave, Hist. Literar. vol. i. p. 146.<sup>12</sup> Schelstrat. Con. Antioch. Dissert. iii. c. 2. p. 109.<sup>13</sup> Pagi, Critic.

in Baron. An. 340. n. 6. Du Pin. vol. ii. p. 35. Stillingfleet, Orig. Brit. c. 4. p. 227, says the first author that mentions it, is Abbo Floriacensis, An. 970. But in this he is a little mistaken.

best rank, to come into this opinion, that this creed was not composed by Athanasius, but by a later and a Latin writer. Dr. Cave thinks, the first that mentions it under the name of Athanasius is Theodulphus Aurelianensis, who lived about the year 794, in the reign of Charles the Great. But in this he is a little mistaken; for the council of Autum, which was held above an hundred years before, Anno 670, not only mentioned it under that name, but ordered every presbyter, deacon, subdeacon, &c. to read it together with the Apostles' Creed,<sup>1</sup> or be liable to the bishop's censure for his omission: which implies, that it was then esteemed the genuine work of Athanasius, and as such had for some time been received in the Church. But whoever was the author of it, there never was any question made of its orthodoxy, except by the Samosatensians and Arians in these later ages of the Church. Only as Bp. Usher and others have observed, the modern Greeks now use it with some additions and alterations. For whereas it is said in the Latin copies, that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father and the Son, the Greeks now read it, from the Father, or the Father only; as Paræus<sup>2</sup> has remarked in his exposition of this creed. And in the Greek copy lately brought out of the East, and published by Bp. Usher there is a long interpolation by way of addition, and explication of those words, "He was man of the substance of his mother, perfect God and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting;" with some other additions of lesser note, which the curious reader may find marked out in the forementioned tract of that learned author.<sup>3</sup>

To all the Creeds that have been related in this Chapter, I think it not improper to add the short account which Eusebius gives of the first preaching of St. Thaddeus to King Agbarus and the people of Edessa, which I had from the information of my learned and judicious friend Mr. Lowth,

<sup>1</sup> Con. Augustodun. Can. ult. Con. tom. vi. p. 536. Si quis presbyter, diaconus, subdiaconus, vel clericus, Symbolum, quod inspirante Sancto Spiritu Apostoli tradiderunt, vel Fidem sancti Athanasii præsulis irreprehensibiliter non recensuerit, ab episcopo condemnatur.

<sup>2</sup> Paræus, Not. in

Symbol. Athanas. ad calcem Ursin. Catech. p. 124.

<sup>3</sup> Usser. De

Symbolis, p. 29.



to whose useful conversation I owe many other curious remarks and observations, that lie scattered throughout the Antiquities of the Church. This is not indeed properly a creed, but a summary of his first sermon, or the heads of his first catechetical institution to the people;—Concerning the coming of Jesus into the world, after what manner it was; and concerning his mission, for what reason he was sent by the Father; concerning his power, and the mysteries which he spake in the world, and by what power he did these; then of his new way of preaching; of his meanness and abject estate, and the humility of his outward appearance as a man; after what manner he humbled himself, and submitted to death, and made a diminutive<sup>1</sup> appearance in his divine nature; what things he suffered of the Jews, and how he was crucified, and descended into hell, and brake down the partition that had been kept up in former ages; how he arose from the dead, and raised with himself those that slept in preceding generations; how he descended from heaven alone, but ascended with a mighty company to his Father; how he sits at the right of God the Father, and shall come again with glory and power to judge both the quick and the dead.—Here are two things very remarkable in this ancient account of the first principles of Christian doctrine, viz., the divinity of our Saviour, and the descent into hell, both which are here expressed in terms, for which reason I thought it might deserve a place among the creeds of the Church. Eusebius says, “he had the account in the Syriac tongue, as it was preserved in the archives of the Church of Edessa, signed in the year 340, which, according to the computation of time then used by the Syrians of Edessa, reckoning from the first year that Seleucus began to reign in Asia, falls in with the same year that Christ

---

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. lib. i. c. 13. Ἐσμίκρυνεν αὐτῶ τὴν θεότητα.—κατέβη εἰς τὸν ᾄδην, ἔ διεσχίσε φραγμαον, &c. It is worth our observation to compare the Apostle's expression, Phil. ii. 7. “Ἐαυτον ἐκένωσε,—He made himself of no reputation, or he emptied himself,” with this expression of Thaddæus,—“ἐσμίκρυνεν αὐτῶ τὴν θεότητα, He lessened, or made a diminutive show and appearance of his godhead.” For these places mutually explain one another, and are a solid proof that the divinity of Christ in the apostolical age was one of the principal articles of the Christian Faith.

suffered and arose from the dead, as Valesius and Pagi<sup>1</sup> after him have rightly computed in their observations upon this passage of Eusebius.

## CHAP. V.

*Of the Original, Nature, and Reasons of the ancient Discipline, in concealing the Sacred Mysteries of the Church from the Catechumens.*

SECT. I.—The Errors and Pretences of the Romanists upon this Point.

THAT which makes this inquiry a little more necessary, is the several vain pretences of the Romanists concerning the original and reasons of this discipline. Bellarmin and others urge it as a mighty argument for transubstantiation in particular, as if the concealing the mystery of the eucharist from the catechumens, was an indication of the belief of the Church concerning the real presence of Christ's body and blood, which they were so studiously careful to hide from the knowledge of the catechumens. But this is abundantly refuted by a more accurate observation of Albaspinæus, a learned bishop of the same communion, who in his book of the Ancient Polity of the Church relating to the Eucharist,<sup>2</sup> as I find him cited by others,<sup>3</sup> rejects this as an incompetent proof of the Romish doctrine of the real presence. For he rightly observes, "that the Ancients concealed not only the mystery of the eucharist, but also the sacrament of baptism, from the catechumens; yea, and almost all other their sacred rites and ceremonies, which in a large sense are called sacraments, as the oil of chrism or confirmation, and the ordination of priests, which were as studiously concealed from the knowledge or inspection of the uninitiated, as the elements of the holy eucharist were." So that the bare concealing that mystery from the catechumens, could no more be an argument of transubstantiation

<sup>1</sup> Pagi, Critic. in Baron. An. 41. n. 3.  
l'Ancienne Eglise, &c. lib. i. c. 2. p. 17.  
lib. ii. p. 703.

<sup>2</sup> Albaspin. Police de  
<sup>3</sup> Albertin. de Eucharist.

in the bread and wine in the eucharist, than it was in the waters of baptism, or any other ceremony where the same silence and caution was used.

The learned Schelstrate with a subtle invention has made a more general use of this ancient practice, to palliate and excuse all the novel doctrines and practices of his own Church. He wrote a book, which he intituled *Disciplina Arcani*, a book highly magnified by Pagi and others of his own communion,<sup>1</sup> as stopping the mouths of the Protestants, when they ask the Romanists,—“ why no footsteps of their modern doctrines and practices appear in the earliest writers of the Church ?”—The answer is ready upon all occasions, from this *Disciplina Arcani*, “ that it was because these doctrines and practices were kept secret, and only handed down by tradition, not committed to writing, lest they should come to the knowledge of the uninitiated Jews and Gentiles, and the catechumens of the Church.” This is the reason, he tells us, why there is no account of the seven sacraments, nor of the worship of saints or images, in the first writers of the Church. The things were really believed and practised from the days of the Apostles, as he will have it, but kept secret as the hidden mysteries of religion, which were not to be divulged to any but such as were initiated and prepared to know them.

This is an artifice that would justify as many errors and vanities as any Church could be guilty of: it is but working a little with this admirable instrument and tool, called *Disciplina Arcani*, and then all the seeming contradictions between the ancient doctrines and practices of the Church universal, and the novel corruptions of the modern Church of Rome, will presently vanish and disappear. So that we need not wonder why men, whose interest it serves so much, should magnify this as a noble invention: when yet in truth it is only a veil and a mist cast before the reader's eyes, which may easily be dispelled by giving a true account of that ancient piece of discipline and practice, first in its original, and then in the nature, use, and reasons of it.

---

<sup>1</sup> Pagi, Critic. in Baron. An. 118. n. 9.

SECT. 2.—This Discipline not strictly observed in the very first Ages of the Church.

As to its original, the learned Albaspinæus has rightly observed, that in the apostolical age, and some time after, they were not so very strict in this discipline of concealing their sacred mysteries from the knowledge of the catechumens. For he thus argues against the antiquity of the book called the Apostolical Constitutions: “The last words,” says he,<sup>1</sup> “which forbid the publication of those eight books, do plainly show, that they were not written in the first age; for the Christians of the first age did never make any scruple of publishing their mysteries, as appears from the writings of Justin Martyr.” Mr. Aubertine<sup>2</sup> observes the same out of Athenagoras and Tatian; and Daille<sup>3</sup> joins in opinion with Albaspinæus, and cites his authority with approbation: and Basnage<sup>4</sup> is so far from thinking, that the Apostles concealed their mysteries from the catechumens, that he rather supposes they administered the sacraments in their presence. Upon which supposition, the whole fabric, which Schelstrate builds upon the *Disciplina Arcani*, is ruined at once: for then it is certain, the Apostles had no such fear or caution upon them, lest the catechumens should come to the knowledge of the Christian rites or doctrines, as is pretended. And indeed any one that looks into the writings of the Apostles, may perceive with half an eye, that they were far enough from concealing their opinion about the worship of angels, saints, and images: for they expressly write against it. And when they speak of the mysteries of baptism and the eucharist, they do it with the greatest freedom, without any fear or apprehension of giving offence to the catechumens.

---

<sup>1</sup> Albaspin. Observat. lib. i. c. 13. p. 38. Postrema verba, quibus cavetur, Ne octo libri Constitutionum Apostolicarum publicentur, apertè indicant, eas primis sæculis factas non esse, cùm primi sæculi Christiani sua lubentes mysteria, ut vel ex Justino constat, enuntiarent.

lib. ii. p. 709.

<sup>2</sup> Albertin. de Eucharist. p. 142.

<sup>3</sup> Dallæus, de Scriptis Ignatii, lib. i. c. 22. p. 142.

<sup>4</sup> Basnag. Exercitat. in Baron. p. 489. Alta de mysteriis silentia non agebant Apostoli, nec catechumenos arcebant sacramentorum conspectu.

SECT. 3.—But introduced about the Time of Tertullian, for other Reasons than what the Romanists pretend.

Nay, and when this discipline was first introduced into the Christian Church, it is very evident, it was done for different reasons than those which the Romanists pretend. The first beginning of it seems to have been about the time of Tertullian; for he is the first writer that makes any mention of it. He says,<sup>1</sup> “there was a secrecy and silence observed in all mysteries;” and he blames the heretics of his own times for not regarding something of this discipline. “They made no distinction,” he says,<sup>2</sup> “between believers and catechumens, they all met together, they all heard together, they all prayed together; and if heathens chanced to come in upon them, they gave that which was holy to dogs, and cast their pearls, such as they were, before swine.” Here it is plain, the Church now made several distinctions between catechumens and believers, which heretics did not. The place of the catechumens was now in a separate part of the Church; they heard sermons, but not all that believers were allowed to hear; they had prayers for themselves, but were not admitted to hear the prayers of the faithful, which were peculiar to the celebration of the eucharist, from which catechumens were excluded. But all this was, and might be done, without favouring in the least the vain pretences of the modern Arcanists: for in all this there was no design to conceal such mysteries as the worship of saints, and angels, and images, from the knowledge of the catechumens; but, on the contrary, Tertullian speaks openly of these kinds of worship, and with indignation condemns them as superstitious practices, belonging only to heathens or heretics, and not to the mysteries of the Church.

---

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. Apol. c. 7. Ex formâ omnibus mysteriis silentii fides adhibetur.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Præscript. advers. Hæretic. c. 41. In primis quis catechumenus, quis fidelis, incertum est: pariter adeunt, pariter audiunt, pariter orant: etiam ethnici si supervenerint, sanctum canibus, et porcis margaritas, licet non veras, jactabunt.

SECT. 4.—This proved from a particular Account of the Things which they concealed from the Catechumens. Which were, first, the Manner of administering Baptism.

And in the following ages, no writer that mentions this discipline, among all those that give us a more particular account of what things were concealed from the knowledge or inspection of the catechumens, ever so much as intimates, that the worship of saints and images was in the number of the mysteries of the Church which they concealed from them. But the mysteries which they were so careful in some measure to hide from them were, First, the manner of administering baptism. Second, the unction of chrism, or confirmation. Third, the ordination of priests. Fourth, the manner of celebrating the eucharist. Fifth, the liturgy or divine service of the Church. Sixth, and for some time the mystery of the Trinity, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, till they became greater proficients, and were ready for baptism.

In the first place that they were careful to conceal from them the manner of administering baptism, appears from this, that catechumens were never so much as suffered to enter,<sup>1</sup> or look into the baptistery, or place where baptism was administered, according to the order of the first council of Orange. St. Basil therefore says,<sup>2</sup> “baptism, the eucharist, and the oil of chrism, were things that the uninitiated were not allowed to look upon.” And St. Austin,<sup>3</sup> putting the question,—“what things were kept secret, and not made public in the Church?” answers, “the sacrament of baptism, and the sacrament of the eucharist; for even Pagans may see our good works, but the sacraments are kept hidden from them.” And as they did not admit catechumens to see baptism administered, so neither did they ordinarily discourse of it before them in plain terms, but in a mystical way, or else wholly excluded them from such discourses as incompetent hearers. “We do not speak openly,”

<sup>1</sup> Con. Arausican. can. 19. Ad baptisterium catechumeni nunquam admittendi.

<sup>2</sup> Basil. de Spiritu Sancto, c. 27. “Α ἀδὲ ἐποπτεύειν ἕξει τοῖς ἀμύητοις, tom. ii. p. 352.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. Com. in Psal. ciii. Concio. I. tom. viii. p. 484. Quid est quod occultum est, et non publicum in ecclesiâ? Sacramentum baptismi, sacramentum eucharistiæ. Opera nostra bona vident et pagani, sacramenta verò occultantur illis.

says St. Cyril,<sup>1</sup> “ of the sacraments before the catechumens, but deliver many things covertly, that the faithful who know them, may understand us, and they who know them not, may receive no harm.” So Theodoret,<sup>2</sup> “ we discourse of mysteries obscurely because of the unbaptized; but when they are gone we speak plainly before the initiated.” In like manner Nazianzen<sup>3</sup> speaking of baptism, “ You have heard,” says he, “ so much of the mystery as we are allowed to speak publicly in the ears of all, and the rest You shall hear privately, which you must retain secret within yourself, and keep under the seal of baptism.” A great many other passages may be read in Chrysostom,<sup>4</sup> Theodoret,<sup>5</sup> Cyril of Alexandria,<sup>6</sup> the author under the name of Dionysius the Areopagite,<sup>7</sup> and the Apostolical Canons,<sup>8</sup> with many others to the same purpose. From all which we learn, that though the Ancients acquainted the catechumens with the doctrine of baptism so far as to make them understand the spiritual nature and design of it, yet they never admitted them to the sight of the outward ceremony, nor so much as to hear any plain discourse about the manner of its administration, till they were fitted and prepared for the actual reception of it.

SECT. 5.—Secondly, the Manner of Administering the Holy Unction or Confirmation.

And they observed the same discipline in reference to the holy unction or chrism, which the Latins call imposition of hands or confirmation. St. Basil,<sup>9</sup> speaking of the oil which was used to be consecrated and used in this ceremony, says, “ it was one of those things which the uninitiated were not allowed to look upon:” and Pope Innocent the First, writing to another bishop about confirmation, and the form of words used in the administration of it, says, “ he

<sup>1</sup> Cyril. Catech. vi. n. 16.      <sup>2</sup> Theodor. Quæst. 15. in Numer. tom. i. p. 149.      <sup>3</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. tom. i. p. 672.      <sup>4</sup> Chrys. Hom. 40. in I Cor. p. 688. Hom. 46. in Act. p. 868. tom. iv. Ed. Savil.  
<sup>5</sup> Theodor. Hæret. Fabul. lib. v. c. 18.      <sup>6</sup> Cyril. adv. Julian. lib. vii. tom. vi. p. 247.      <sup>7</sup> Dionys. Eccles. Hierar. c. 2. p. 251.      <sup>8</sup> Can. Apost. c. 85.      <sup>9</sup> Basil. de Spiritu Sancto, c. 27.

could<sup>1</sup> not repeat the words, lest he should seem to disclose the mystery, rather than answer the question proposed.”

SECT. 6.—Thirdly, the Ordination of Priests.

A third thing which they concealed from the catechumens was the ordination of priests. The council of Laodicea has a canon to this purpose,<sup>2</sup> that “ordinations shall not be performed in the presence of the hearers,” that is, the catechumens. And Chrysostom, speaking of this office and the solemn prayers used at the consecration, delivers himself in an obscure and covert way, because of the catechumens. “He that ordains,” says he, “requires the prayers of the Church,<sup>3</sup> and they then join their suffrage, and echo forth those words which the initiated know. For we may not speak them openly before the uninitiated catechumens.”

SECT. 7.—Fourthly, the Liturgy or public Prayers of the Church, such as the Prayers for the Energumens, Penitents, and the Faithful.

A fourth thing, which they concealed from the catechumens, was the public liturgy or solemn prayers of the Church. For one rank of the catechumens, the *Audientes*, or *hearers*, were only permitted to stay and hear the sermon, but not any prayers of the Church. Another sort, called kneelers, or prostrators, had the prayers of the Church particularly for themselves, but no others. And the *Competentes* staid only to hear the prayers offered up for themselves and the energumens, and then were dismissed. They might not stay to hear so much as the prayers for the penitents, much less the prayers for the Church Militant, or any others preceding the communion. But before all these the usual word of command was given by the deacons, or sacred heralds of the Church, “*Ne quis Audientium*,” or “*Ite, Missa est, catechumens depart.*” From

<sup>1</sup> Innocent. Epist. 1. ad Decentium Eugubin. c. 3. Verba verò dicere non possum, ne magis prodero videar, quàm ad consultationem respondere.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Laodic. can. 5. Μη δεῖν τὰς χειροτονίας ἐπὶ παρουσίᾳ ἀκροωμένων γίνεσθαι.

<sup>3</sup> Chrysost. Hom. 18. in 2 Cor. p. 872. Ὁ μέλλων χειροτονεῖν τὰς ἐκείνων εὐχὰς καλεῖ τότε, ἐξ αὐτοῖ ἐπιψηφίζονται, ἐξ ἐπιβοῶσιν, ἅπερ ἴσασι οἱ μεμνημενοὶ ἔ γὰρ δὴ θείμεις ἐπὶ τῶν ἀμύητων ἐκκαλύπτειν ἅπαντα.



whence it is easy to collect further, that the solemn office of the absolution of penitents was never performed in the presence of the catechumens. For the time of absolution was not till all others were dismissed, except the penitents themselves who were to be absolved, which was, immediately before their going to the altar to begin the communion-service. As seems to be clear from those words of Optatus, where he speaks of it as the common custom both in the Church and among the Donatists,<sup>1</sup> “to give imposition of hands for absolution immediately before their going to say the Lord’s Prayer at the altar.” All these things therefore were kept secret from the catechumens: for they were never suffered to be hearers or spectators of any part of them.

SECT. 8.—Fifthly, the Manner of celebrating the Eucharist.

But as the eucharist was the highest mystery in the Christian service, so they were most careful to conceal the manner of its celebration from the catechumens. And in this they made a difference between one sort of penitents and the catechumens. For the highest class of penitents, called *Consistentes*, or *co-standers*, were allowed to be present at the communion-prayers, and see the oblation offered and received by the faithful, though they might not partake with them. But catechumens of all ranks were wholly excluded from all this: they were always dismissed before these prayers began, and the doors of the church were locked and guarded by proper officers, to the intent that no uninitiated person should indiscreetly rush in upon them. “We shut the doors,” says Chrysostom,<sup>2</sup> “when we celebrate the holy mysteries, and drive away all uninitiated persons.” This was one of the secrets of the Church, as we heard St. Austin<sup>3</sup> before speak of it. One of the things which a catechumen might not look upon, according to St. Basil.<sup>4</sup> Therefore the author of the Apostolical Constitu-

<sup>1</sup> Optat. cont. Parmen. lib. ii. p. 57. Inter vicina momenta, dum manus imponitis et delicta donatis, mox ad altare conversi, Dominicam Orationem prætermittere non potestis. Vid. Constitut. Apost. lib. viii. c. 6, 7, 8, 9.

<sup>2</sup> Chrys. Hom. 23. in Mat. p. 236.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. in Psal. ciii.

<sup>4</sup> Basil.

de Spir. Sto. c. 27.

tions<sup>1</sup> makes it part of the deacon's office not only to command their absence, but also to keep the doors, that none might come in, during the time of the oblation. Epiphanius<sup>2</sup> and St. Jerom<sup>3</sup> bring it as a charge against the Marcionites, "that they despised this discipline, and admitted catechumens indiscriminately with the faithful to all their mysteries." And Palladius<sup>4</sup> forms a like charge against the enemies of Chrysostom, "that in the tumult they raised against him, they gave occasion to the uninitiated to break into the church, and see those things which it was not lawful for them to set their eyes upon." Nay, so strict was the Church then in the observation of this discipline that Athanasius convicted the Meletians of false witness against him, when they pretended to prove, by the testimony of some catechumens, that Macarius, one of his presbyters, had overturned the communion-table in the time of the oblation: he argued, that this could not be so, because<sup>5</sup> "if the catechumens were present, there could then be no oblation."

Nor did they only exclude catechumens from the sight of these mysteries, but also from all discourses which treated plainly about them. They made a distinction between moral and mysterious subjects, and admitted the catechumens to the one, but not to the other, as I have had occasion formerly to show<sup>6</sup> from the testimonies of Theodoret,<sup>7</sup> St. Austin,<sup>8</sup> and St. Ambrose.<sup>9</sup> To which we may here add that of St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "You were once," says he,<sup>10</sup> "a catechumen, and then we did not discourse of mysteries to you: and now that you have attained by experience to the height of those things which we teach, you will easily perceive that catechumens are not worthy to be hearers of such things." And that of Gaudentius, bishop

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 57. Lib. viii. c. 11.      <sup>2</sup> Epiphanius, Hæres. 42. n. 3.      <sup>3</sup> Hieron. Com. in Galat. vi. tom. ix. p. 199.      <sup>4</sup> Palladius, Vit. Chrys. c. 9. The same complaint is made by Chrysostom himself in his first Epistle to Pope Innocent, tom. iv. p. 681. Edit. Front. Ducæi.  
<sup>5</sup> Athan. Apol. 2. tom. i. p. 747.      <sup>6</sup> Book i. chap. iv. s. 8.  
<sup>7</sup> Theodor. Quæst. 15. in Numer.      <sup>8</sup> Aug. Sermon. 1. ad Neophytos, in Append. tom. x. p. 845.      <sup>9</sup> Ambros. de Initiatis, c. 1.      <sup>10</sup> Cyril. Catech. Præf. n. 7.

of Brixia, who, in his Sermon <sup>1</sup> to the Neophytes, or persons newly baptized, tells them, “ he would now open to them those mysteries, which could not be explained in the presence of the catechumens.” Sometimes indeed they spoke of the eucharist before the catechumens in their popular discourses; but then they did it in such obscure and figurative terms as were understood only by communicants, and not by the catechumens: according to that of St. Chrysostom, <sup>2</sup> “ I would speak plainly, but I dare not because of the unbaptized. For they make our expositions to be more difficult, they compel us to speak obscurely, or else we must reveal what is not to be revealed unto them.” Upon this account Epiphanius, speaking of the words of institution before the catechumens, would not say, “ This bread is my body, this wine is my blood,” but “ *Hoc meum est hoc et hoc, this is my that and that,*” <sup>3</sup> to let the initiated know his meaning, and not the catechumens. And hence it was they so often used that phrase, “ *ἴσασι οἱ μεμῆμενοι,*” and “ *normul fideles, the initiated know what we say;*” which phrase Casaubon <sup>4</sup> has observed to occur no less than fifty times in the writings of St. Chrysostom. Casaubon makes another good observation upon this matter, which the learned Albertinus <sup>5</sup> takes from him, and strenuously defends, “ that whereas there are three things in the eucharist; 1. the symbols or sacred elements of bread and wine; 2. the things signified by them; and, 3. the rites of celebration; that which the Ancients laboured chiefly to conceal from the catechumens, was not the things signified, but only the symbols or outward signs, and the rites and manner of celebration.” For they made no scruple to call the eucharist by the name of Christ’s body and blood before the catechumens, at the same time that they would not call it bread and wine, or speak particularly of the form and manner of administering it, as Albertinus proves out of Theodoret and many others. Which shows, that the reason of concealing the mystery from

<sup>1</sup> Gaudent. Sermon. 2. ad Neophytos, Bibl. Patr. tom. ii. p. 14. Ea solùm aperienda neophytis, quæ præsentibus catechumenis explanari non possunt.

<sup>2</sup> Chrys. Hom. 40. in 1 Cor. p. 688.

<sup>3</sup> Epiphanius, Anchorat. n. 57.

<sup>4</sup> Casaubon. Exercit. 16. in Baron. p. 490.

<sup>5</sup> Albertinus. de Euchar. lib. ii. p. 708.

the catechumens was not the belief of transubstantiation, as the Romanists pretend; for then they would have chosen rather to conceal the names of Christ's body and blood, than the names of the outward symbols, and the mystical rites of celebration, the latter of which they studiously concealed, but not the former. He that would see more of this may consult the elaborate discourse of that most acute and learned writer, where he answers all the objections of Cof-fetellus against the present assertion.

SECT. 9.—Sixthly, the Mystery of the Trinity, the Creed, and the Lord's-Prayer, from the first Sort of Catechumens.

The last sort of things which they for some time concealed from the more imperfect catechumens, were the sublimer doctrines of Christianity, such as the mystery of the Trinity, and hypostatic union, together with the Creed itself and the Lord's Prayer, which the catechumens did not learn till immediately before their baptism. For so Theodoret tells us,<sup>1</sup> “that they did not teach this prayer to the uninitiated, but to the baptized, or immediate candidates of baptism. For no one that was not baptized, could presume to say, “Our Father, which art in heaven;” not having yet received the gift of adoption. But he that was made partaker of baptism, might call God his Father, as being adopted among the sons of grace.” St. Chrysostom speaks after the same manner:<sup>2</sup> this prayer belongs only to the faithful, as both the rule of the Church and the beginning of the prayer itself teach: for an unbaptized person cannot yet call God his Father. This prayer was then peculiar to the communion-service, and never used in church, but only at the altar, where none of the catechumens could be present, but only the faithful. Whence it was called *Εὐχησιῶν*, *the prayer of the faithful*. And one petition in it was thought to refer more particularly to the eucharist, “Give us this day our daily bread,—*ἄρτον ἐπίσειον*, *our super-substantial*, or *super-celestial bread*,”—as many of the Ancients render it. For these reasons they never taught the Lord's Prayer to any

<sup>1</sup> Theod. Epitom. Divin. Decret. lib. v. Hæret. Fabul. c. 28. *Ταύτην τήν προσευχὴν ἢ τὰς ἀμύητας, ἀλλὰ τὰς μυσταγωγισμένους διδάσκομεν.*  
<sup>2</sup> Chrys. Hom. 20. al. 19. in Matth. p. 200. Hom. 2. in Cor. p. 740.

of the catechumens but the highest rank of them, the *Competentes*, a few days before their baptism. As we learn from those words of St. Austin,<sup>1</sup> "Now learn the Lord's Prayer, which ye must repeat eight days hence, when ye are to be baptized." So they received it only on Saturday before Palm Sunday, in order to repeat it on Saturday before Easter, which was the day of their baptism.

They observed the same discipline in reference to the Creed, which they taught to the catechumens at the same time only as they did the Lord's Prayer, a little before their baptism. This they did not always commit to writing, but kept it, as St. Jerom words it,<sup>2</sup> "in tables of the heart, and delivered it by word of mouth, that it might not come to the knowledge of the uninitiated and unbelievers." Which is the reason that Sozomen gives,<sup>3</sup> why he did not insert the words of the Nicene Creed into his History, because probably many uninitiated persons might read his book, who ought not to read or hear the Creed. They were as careful not to communicate to new beginners the profound mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, till they had first prepared them by proper preceding instructions for the reception of them. Therefore, as St. Jerom observes,<sup>4</sup> it was the custom of the Church to put off this part of the instruction of catechumens to the last, and not acquaint them with these doctrines till about forty days before they were to be baptized, though the catechetical instruction had continued perhaps for two or three years before.

This was the whole of that discipline, we read so much of among the Ancients, of concealing the sacred mysteries from the catechumens. Among all which we have never the least intimation given that the practice of image-worship, or the adoration of saints and angels, or the doctrine of seven sacraments, were the mysteries they intended to con-

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Hom. 42. Ex 50. tom. 10. p. 105. Tenete ergò hanc orationem, quam reddituri estis ad octo dies.—Ad octo dies ab hodierno die reddituri estis hanc orationem, quam hodiè acceptis.

<sup>2</sup> Hieron. Ep. ad Pammach. c. 9. p. 173. Symbolum fidei et spei nostræ, quod ab Apostolis traditum, non scribitur in chartâ et atramento, sed in tabulis cordis carnalibus.

<sup>3</sup> Sozomen. lib. i. c. 20.

<sup>4</sup> Hieron. Epist. 61. ad Pammach. c. 4. p. 167. Consuetudo apud nos istiusmodi est, ut his qui baptizandi sunt, per quadraginta dies publicè tradamus sanctam et adorandam Trinitatem.

ceal from them. For in those days there were no such mysteries in the Christian Church, and therefore the late invention of Schelstrate is a mere fiction and sophism to cover the nakedness of the present Roman Church. And the pretence of Bona,<sup>1</sup> concerning the prohibition of images in churches, made by the council of Eliberis, that it was only to conceal the secrets of religion from the knowledge of the heathen, is an absurd supposition, which neither Albaspinæus nor Petavius could digest, as I have showed more fully in another place,<sup>2</sup> where I speak of the ornaments of the ancient churches.

SECT. 10.—Reasons for concealing these Things from the Catechumens. First, that the Plainness and Simplicity of them might not be contemned.

As to those things which they really concealed from the catechumens, the true reasons were, first that the plainness and simplicity of the Christian rites might not be contemned by them, or give any occasion of scandal or offence to them, before they were thoroughly instructed about the nature of the mysteries. For both Jews and Gentiles, out of whom Christian converts were made catechumens, were apt to deride the nakedness and simplicity of the Christian religion, as void of those pompous ceremonies and sacrifices, with which those other religions abounded. The Christian religion prescribed but one washing in water, and one oblation of bread and wine, instead of that multitude of bloody sacrifices, which the other religions commanded. Therefore, lest the plainness of these few ceremonies should offend the prejudiced minds of catechumens, before they were well instructed about them, the Christian teachers usually adorned these mysteries with great and magnificent titles, such as would convey noble ideas to the minds of men concerning their spiritual effects, but concealing their other names lest the simplicity of the things should offend them. When they speak of the eucharist, they never mentioned bread and wine, but the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ; and styled baptism, illumination, and life, the sacrament of faith and remission of sins, saying little in

<sup>1</sup> Bona, Rer. Liturg. lib. i. cap. 16. n. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Book viii. chap. viii. s. 6.

the mean time of the outward element of water. This was one plain reason, why they denied catechumens the sight of their sacraments and always spake in mystical terms before them. "We shut the doors," says Chrysostom,<sup>1</sup> "when we celebrate our mysteries, and keep off all uninitiated persons from them, not because we acknowledge any imperfection in the things themselves, but because many are weakly affected toward them." And so St. Cyril,<sup>2</sup> in the place mentioned above, "We speak not openly of our mysteries before the catechumens, but say many things mystically and obscurely, that they who know them may understand us, and they who know them not, may receive no harm." In like maner the synod of Alexandria,<sup>3</sup> charging the Meletians for publishing the mystery of the eucharist before the catechumens, and what was worse, before the heathens, contrary to those rules of Scripture, "It is good to conceal the secrets of a king;" and "Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine;" they add, "that it is not lawful to bring mysteries upon the open stage before the uninitiated, lest the heathen through their ignorance should deride them, or the catechumens by their curiosity should be offended." Therefore there was an ancient rule in the Church, that if any uninitiated person had by any mistake been admitted to partake of the eucharist, he should be immediately instructed and baptized, that he might not go forth a contemner or despiser, as the author of the Apostolical Constitutions words it.<sup>4</sup> And the fourth council of Toledo gives a like reason<sup>5</sup> why such Jews, as had been baptized by force, should continue in the Christian profession, "lest the name of God should be blasphemed, and the faith which they had received, should be reputed vile and contemptible." Though they made a severe decree against obliging any Jews to be baptized by force or compulsion for the future.

<sup>1</sup> Chrys. Hom. 23. in Mat. p. 236.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril. Catech. 6. n. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Apud Athanas. Apol. 2. tom. i. p. 731.

<sup>4</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii.

c. 25. <sup>5</sup> Con. Tolet. 4. can. 56. Oportet ut fidem etiam, quam vi vel necessitate susceperunt, tenere cogantur, ne nomen Domini blasphemetur, et fides, quam susceperunt, vilis ac contemptibilis habeatur.

SECT. 11.—Secondly, to conciliate a Reverence for them.

Another reason assigned for this discipline of silence was to conciliate a reverence in the minds of men for the mysteries which they kept so concealed from them. For as St. Basil observes,<sup>1</sup> “the veneration of mysteries is preserved by silence;” and as things that are trite and obvious, are easily contemned; so those that are uncommon and reserved, are naturally adapted to beget in men an esteem and veneration, and therefore, he thinks, the Apostles and fathers of the Church, who made laws about these matters, prescribed secrecy and silence, to preserve the dignity of the mysteries. St. Austin gives the same reason for this practice,<sup>2</sup> when he says, “it was the honour that was due to the mysteries, which made him pass them over in silence, and not explain them.”

SECT. 12.—Thirdly, to make the Catechumens more desirous to know them.

St. Austin adds to this a third reason, which is, “that the mysteries of baptism and the eucharist, were therefore chiefly concealed from the catechumens, to excite their curiosity, and inflame their zeal and make them more earnest and solicitous in hastening to partake of them, that they might come to an experimental knowledge of them. “Though the sacraments,” says he, “are not disclosed to the catechumens,<sup>3</sup> it is not always because they cannot bear them, but that they may so much the more ardently desire them, by how much they are the more honourably hidden from them.” And again, “The Jews acknowledge not the priesthood according to the order of Melchisedek.<sup>4</sup> I speak to the faithful: if the catechumens understand it not, let them cast away their slowness and hasten to the knowledge

<sup>1</sup> Basil. de Spir. Sancto, c. 27.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. Serm. i. inter 40. Edit. à Sirmondo, tom. x. Non mirari debetis, fratres charissimi, quod inter ipsa mysteria de mysteriis nihil diximus, quod non statim ea quæ tradidimus interpretati sumus. Adhibuimus enim tam sanctis rebus atque divinis honorem silentii.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. Hom. 96. in Joh. Et si catechumenis sacramenta fidelium non produntur, non ideo fit quod ea ferre non possint, sed ut tanto ardentius ab eis concupiscantur, quanto eis honorabilius occultantur.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. Hom. in Psal. 109. Judæi non agnoscunt sacerdotium secundum ordinem Melchisedek. Fidelibus loquor, si quid non intelligunt catechumeni, auferant pigritiam, festinent ad nolitiam.



of it. They that do not yet eat of this banquet,<sup>1</sup> let them hasten upon invitation. The feast of Easter is at hand. Give in your name to baptism. If the festival does not excite you, let curiosity draw you, that you may know that which is said, ‘He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.’”

These were the reasons which engaged the Ancients to conceal their mysteries from the catechumens; which, we plainly see, have no relation to such doctrines as that of transubstantiation, or the number of seven sacraments, or such superstitious practices as the worship of images, or saints, and angels, which are mere novelties, and the modern inventions of the Romish Church.

I have now gone through all things relating to the discipline of the catechumens in their preparation for baptism. We are next to take a view of baptism itself, and inquire into the manner how the Church administered it, and what rites and customs were observed in the celebration of it.

---

## BOOK XI.

### OF THE RITES AND CUSTOMS OBSERVED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM IN THE PRI- MITIVE CHURCH.

#### CHAP. I.

##### *Of the several Names and Apellations of Baptism in the Primitive Church.*

SECT. I.—The Names of Baptism most commonly taken from the Spiritual Effects of it.

THERE are a great many questions relating to the doctrine of baptism, which I intend not to make any part of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Id. de Verbis Domini. Hom. 46. Qui nondum manducant, ad tales epulas invitati festinent.—Ecce Pascha est, da nomen ad baptismum. Si non te excitat festivitas, ducat ipsa curiositas, ut scias quid dictum sit, “Qui manducat carnem meam et bibit sanguinem meum, manet in me, et ego in eo.”

subject of this Book, because they may be found in any didactical and polemical writers upon this head, and especially in Vossius's elaborate discourse *De Baptismo*, where he accurately canvasses all questions of this nature, and learnedly determines them from the doctrine of the Ancients. Here the reader may find a satisfactory account of all questions relating to the mystical signification and spiritual effects of baptism; such as are, First, regeneration. Secondly, adoption. Thirdly, reception into the covenant of grace. In which also is contained remission of sins, renovation of the Spirit, and eternal life, which are the noble effects, conferred on all those who rightly receive it. Here also he determines the questions,—How it comes to pass, that though sins are forgiven in baptism, yet concupiscence, the fuel or incentive of sin, remains still in the regenerate? And whence it is, that after baptism, we are still afflicted with diseases, and that as well infants as adult persons? How it comes to pass, that the magistrate has power to punish those sins which are committed before baptism, even after they are purged away and forgiven in baptism? With many other questions of the like nature, which are not necessary to come into this discourse. I shall also omit the question about the indelible character of baptism, which is pretended to be impressed upon the soul; and the questions about the administrator of baptism, and lay-baptism, and heretical baptism, because I have lately considered these distinctly and fully, in a first and second part of the Scholastical History of Lay-baptism. What remains therefore to be considered in this place, is only such other matters in the practice of the ancient Church relating to the administration of baptism, as have not yet been spoken of. And here, first of all, it will be proper to say something of the ancient names of baptism; some of which were taken from the internal and spiritual effects of it; others from the nature and substance of the action; others from the conditions required in the receivers; others from the external circumstances and rites observed in the administration.

SECT. 2.—Hence Baptism called *Indulgentia*, *Indulgence*, or *Absolution*.

From one of its noblest effects, it was sometimes styled

*Indulgentia, indulgence, or absolution and remission of sins.* Thus, in the African council under Cyprian,<sup>1</sup> Privatianus à Suffetula terms it, “the divine indulgence.” And in the Roman council, mentioned by Cotelarius,<sup>2</sup> it is said, “that at the Easter festival, remission of sins, meaning baptism, may be administered by either presbyter or deacon, in the presence of the bishop, in the parish-churches.” But forasmuch as absolution or remission of sins may not always necessarily accompany baptism, through some default in the administrator or the receiver, though the baptism be otherwise a true baptism; therefore St. Austin, in disputing with the Donatists, chuses rather to call it the sacrament of grace,<sup>3</sup> and the sacrament of absolution, rather than grace or absolution itself: because wicked men may receive the sacrament of baptism, but they cannot receive the grace of baptism, which is absolution or remission of sins; for God grants that to none but those that turn to him with a sincere faith and true repentance. Whenever therefore the Ancients call baptism by the name of absolution or indulgence, they are to be understood with this limitation, that it is so only to those who are worthy receivers of it. And hence we may observe, that the true ancient proper notion of an absolution or indulgence, is God’s pardoning sin by the ministerial application of his sacraments, which are the seals of his covenant, granting remission of sins: whence baptism, entering men into that covenant of grace, was dignified with the name of the sacrament of absolution and indulgence.

SECT. 3.—And Παλιγγενεσία, *Regeneration*, and Χρίσμα, *the Unction*.

Another noble effect of baptism was regeneration, or a new birth from the death of sin to the life of righteousness. For every Christian was supposed to be born again by the

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carth. ap. Cypr. n. 19. p. 234. Si hæresis à Deo est, habere et indulgentiam divinam potest.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Rom. Can. 7. ap. Cotelar. Not. in Const. Apost. lib. iii. c. 9. Paschæ tempore presbyter et diaconus per parochias dare remissionem peccatorum et ministerium implere consueverunt, etiam præsentem episcopo.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. v. c. 21. Sacramentum gratiæ dat Deus etiam per malos: ipsam verò gratiam non nisi per seipsam vel per sanctos suos:—Baptismum verò, quod est sacramentum remissionis peccatorum, nulli dubium est habere etiam homicidas posse, &c.

waters of baptism, according to that of Tertullian,<sup>1</sup> “*Nos pisciculi secundum ἰχθύν nostrum, Jesum Christum, in aquâ nascimur, We fishes are born in water, conformable to the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, ΙΧΘΥΣ;*” which, as I have observed in another place,<sup>2</sup> was an acrostic or technical name, made of the initial letters of our Saviour’s several titles in Greek, Ἰησούς, Χριστός, Θεῶ Υἱός, Σωτήρ, which put together, make up the name ΙΧΘΥΣ, which signifies a fish, and is alluded to not only by Tertullian, but by Prosper<sup>3</sup> and Optatus.<sup>4</sup> Hence baptism had the name of Παλιγγενεσία Ψυχῆς<sup>5</sup> in Cyril’s Catechism, *the regeneration of the soul*; and Ὑδωρ Ζωῆς, *the water of life*, in Justin Martyr;<sup>6</sup> and *Fons Divinus*, in Cassiodore,<sup>7</sup> *the divine fountain*, whence comes our English name, font; with many other titles of the same importance. And because this new birth was wrought by the power and influence of the Spirit, therefore it was called the spiritual birth, whereby those who were born carnally to the world before, were now born spiritually to God. And so as Optatus words it,<sup>8</sup> God was hereby made Father of men, and the holy Church their mother. For till men were baptized, they were not perfect members of Christ’s body, the Church, nor properly adopted into God’s family, and consequently had as yet no right to call God their father, or the Church their mother. And because the divine operations of the Holy Spirit, in sanctifying grace, are sometimes in Scripture called the unction or anointing of the Spirit, therefore baptism had also the name of chrism or unction, from this noble effect attending it. Gregory Nazianzen takes notice of this among many other titles of honour: “We call it” says he,<sup>9</sup> “the gift, and grace, and baptism, and unction, and illumination, and garment of immortality, and laver of regeneration, and seal or character, and whatever else is precious or honourable.”

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. cap. i.      <sup>2</sup> Book i. Chap. i. n. 2.      <sup>3</sup> Prosper. de Prædict. et Promissis. Par. ii. cap. 39.      <sup>4</sup> Optat. lib. iii. p. 62.

<sup>5</sup> Cyril. Catech. Præfat. n. 10.      <sup>6</sup> Justin. Dial. p. 231.      <sup>7</sup> Cassiodor. in Cantic. cap. 7.

<sup>8</sup> Optat. lib. ii. p. 52. Dum Trinitas cum fide concordat, qui natus fuerat sæculo, renascitur spiritaliter Deo. Sic fit hominum pater Deus, sancta sic fit mater Ecclesia.

<sup>9</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. de Barl. p. 638. Δῶρον καλεῖμεν, χάρισμα, βάπτισμα, χρίσμα, φῶτισμα, ἀφθαρσία, ἐνδύμα, λειτρον παλιγγενεσίας, σφραγίδα, πᾶν ὅτι τίμιον.

And in explaining these terms, he particularly notes that it had the name of unction, because it was a sacred and a royal thing, as those things usually were that were anointed. Whence every man was in some sense made a king and a priest to God by Christ in his baptism, upon which account St. Jerom<sup>1</sup> styles baptism, *Sacerdotium Laici, the layman's priesthood*, in contradistinction to the clerical priesthood, which was only conferred by ordination.

SECT. 4.—Φωτισμός, *Illumination.*

Another effect of baptism was the enlightening men's understandings with divine knowledge. Hence baptism had the name of Φωτισμός, *Illumination*, as it frequently occurs in Chrysostom,<sup>2</sup> Nazianzen,<sup>3</sup> Dionysius<sup>4</sup> the Arcopagite, the council of Laodicea,<sup>5</sup> and many others. The reason of which name seems to be partly from the preceding instruction of the catechumens in their preparation for baptism, according to that of Justin Martyr,<sup>6</sup> "this laver is called illumination, because the minds of those, who learn these things, are enlightened." Then again, because it was the entrance on an enlightened state, and the introduction to divine knowledge, which grew by degrees to greater perfection: for Justin's words may be understood of the knowledge consequent to baptism. And so the reason is given by Clemens Alexandrinus,<sup>7</sup> and the author under the name of Dionysius,<sup>8</sup> because it confers the first light, and is the introduction to all other divine illuminating mysteries, therefore from the effect, it was dignified with the name of illumination. Perhaps it might be so called in regard also that the baptized were now admitted to all the mysterious parts and recondite knowledge of religion, which by the discipline of the Church, were kept secret from them whilst they were

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. Dialog. advers. Lucifer. cap. 2. Sacerdotium Laici, id est, baptismisma. Scriptum est enim, 'regnum quippe nos et sacerdotes Deo et patri suo fecit.' Et iterum, 'gentem sanctam, regale sacerdotium, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Chrysost. Hom. 13. in Heb. p. 1848.

<sup>3</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. p. 638.

<sup>4</sup> Dionys. Hierar. Eccl. cap. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Con. Laod. can. 47.

<sup>6</sup> Justin.

Apol. 2. p. 94. Καλεῖται δὲ τῆτο τὸ λειτρὸν φωτισμός, ὡς φωτιζομένων τὴν διάνοιαν τῶν ταῦτα μαρζανόντων.

<sup>7</sup> Clem. Alex. Pædagog. lib. i. c. 6.

p. 93.

<sup>8</sup> Dionys. Eccl. Hier. cap. 3. p. 283. Ἐπειδὴν πρῶτς φωτὸς μεταδίδωσι, ἢ πασῶν ἐστιν ἀρχὴ τῶν θείων φωταγωγίων, ἐκ τῆ τελειμένη τὴν ἀληθῆ τῆ φωτισματος ἐπωνυμίαν ἡμῶμεν.

catechumens. And perhaps some regard might be had to the plentiful effusion of the Spirit in the gift of tongues, knowledge, and prophecy, which in the apostolical age was immediately conferred at baptism, by the imposition of the hands of the Apostles.<sup>1</sup>

SECT. 5.—And *Salus, Salvation.*

Another effect of baptism, was eternal salvation, as it was the ordinary means, not only of obtaining remission of sins, but of bringing men by the grace and blood of Christ to the glory of the kingdom of Heaven. Whence, as St. Austin observes,<sup>2</sup> it was very common among the Punic, or African Christians, to call baptism by the name of *Salus, salvation*; as they did the sacrament of the body of Christ, by the name of life, because these two sacraments were reputed necessary to the obtaining of salvation or eternal life. And upon this account Gregory Nazianzen, introducing a person pleading for liberty to delay his baptism, makes him speak after this manner; “I stay only for my father, or mother, or brother, or wife, or children, or friends, or some near relations, and then I will be saved,—*τηνικαὐτα σωθήσομαι*;<sup>3</sup>” the meaning of which must needs be, that then he would be baptized, in order to obtain salvation. Such honourable titles and appellations did the Ancients give to this sacrament of baptism, taken from the noble effects which it was supposed to confer on all those who were worthy partakers of it.

SECT. 6.—From the Nature and Substance of it, it was called *Mysterium, Sacramentum*, and *Σφραγίς*.

Next, from the nature and substance of it, it had the names of *Mysterium, Sacramentum*, and *Σφραγίς*. The two first of which are so common, and so well known to every reader, that I need not here spend time to explain them. Only I shall note, that the terms, mystery and sacrament, are sometimes taken in a larger sense, to signify any sacred ceremony,

<sup>1</sup> Chrys. Hom. 54. de Util. Sect. Script. tom. v. p. 680. <sup>2</sup> Aug. de Pec. Merit. lib. i. c. 24. tom. vii. p. 294. Optimè Punicæ Christiani baptismum ipsum nihil aliud quàm salutem et sacramentum corporis Christi, nihil aliud quam vitam vocant, &c. <sup>3</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. p. 655.

or any part of religion that had any thing of spiritual or mystical signification in it: of which there will be a more proper place to discourse, when we come to treat of confirmation. The name *Σφραγίς*, and *Signaculum*, *the seal of the Lord*, is a little more uncommon, as applied to baptism, and therefore has occasioned some errors among learned men, who often mistake it, either for the sign of the cross, or the consignation and unction that was used in confirmation. Thus in that famous discourse of Clemens Alexandrinus, intituled *Quis Dives Salvetur?* part of which is recorded in Eusebius,<sup>1</sup> and the whole published by Combefis,<sup>2</sup> it is said that the bishop, to whose care St. John had committed a certain young convert, first instructed or catechized him, and then gave him the perfect phylactery or preservative against sin, namely, *the seal of the Lord*,—*τὴν σφραγιδα τῆς Κυρίας*. Now by the seal of the Lord, Christopherson, and Bellarmin, and others from him, understand confirmation. Mr. Seller,<sup>3</sup> and some others, will have it to be the sign of the cross; but Valesius,<sup>4</sup> and Daille,<sup>5</sup> more truly expound it of baptism, which was called, the seal of the Lord, because in the very nature of it there is contained a covenant made between God and man; and baptism being the seal of this covenant, it was with the greatest propriety of speech styled, the seal of the Lord. In this sense the ancient author of the Acts of Paul and Thecla uses the name *Σφραγίς*, for *baptism*. “Give me,” says Thecla to St. Paul, “the seal of Christ,<sup>6</sup> and no temptation shall touch me.” And Hermes Pastor, in like manner, speaking of some that were baptized and gone to heaven, uses the same dialect: “They that are now dead, were sealed with the seal of the Son of God,<sup>7</sup> and are entered into the kingdom

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. lib. iii. c. 23,<sup>2</sup> Combefis, *Auctarium Novissimum*, p. 185.<sup>3</sup> Seller, *Life of Just. Martyr*. p. 102.<sup>4</sup> Vales. *Not. in. Euseb. lib. iii.*

c. 17.

<sup>5</sup> Dallæus de *Confirmat. lib. ii. c. i. p. 110.*<sup>6</sup> *Acta*Theclæ, ap. Grabe *Spicileg. tom 1. p. 106.**Δός μοι τὴν ἐν Χριστῷ σφραγιδα,**ἧ ἐχ ἄψεται μὲ πειρασμός.*<sup>7</sup> Hermes Past. lib. iii. *Simil. 9. n. 16.*

*Illi igitur defuncti sigillo Filii Dei signati sunt, et intraverunt in regnum Dei. Antequam enim accipiat homo nomen Filii Dei, mortis destinatus est; at ubi accipit illud sigillum, liberatur à morte, et traditur vitæ. Illud autem sigillum aqua est, in quam descendunt homines mortis obligati, ascendunt verò vitæ assignati. Et illis igitur prædicatum est illud sigillum, et usi sunt eo ut intrarent in regnum Dei.*

of God. For before a man receives the name of the Son of God, he is consigned over to death; but when he receives that seal, he is freed from death, and consigned over to life. Now that seal is water, into which men descend bound over to death, but rise out of it, marked out or sealed unto life. This seal therefore was preached unto them, and they made use of it, that they might enter into the kingdom of God." In all this passage, there is no express mention made of baptism, but it is called the seal and name of Christ, because it sets the mark and name of Christians on us, and distinguishes us from Jews and Gentiles, and shows that we belong to the dominion and possession of Christ. Hence Tertullian frequently calls it, *Signaculum fidei*,<sup>1</sup> *the signature of our faith*: and says we are distinguished from Jews by this signature in our bodies,<sup>2</sup> "because their signature was circumcision, but ours baptism." In like manner, Gregory Nazianzen, accounting for the reason of this name, says it was called the seal of the Lord, "because it was an indication to whose dominion we belong,<sup>3</sup> and because it was the consignment of us to eternal life." In which respect, Constantine at the hour of death, desiring the benefit of baptism from the bishops that were about him, is said by Eusebius<sup>4</sup> to ask it in these words; "Now is the time for me to enjoy the seal of immortality; now is the time for me to obtain the seal of salvation." Whence it was also called the seal of the Spirit, because every worthy receiver was supposed, together with the outer element, to receive the earnest of the Spirit in baptism: according to that of Chrysostom, as a mark is set upon soldiers,<sup>5</sup> so the Spirit is put upon true believers. And as the Jews had circumcision for their character, so we have the earnest of the Spirit. And this distinction between the internal and

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Spectat. c. 4. Ad principalem auctoritatem convertar, ipsius signaculi nomen. It. c. 24. Hoc erit pompa diaboli, adversus quam in signaculo fidei ejeramus.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. Apol. c. 21. Neque de ipso signaculo corporis, neque de consortio nominis cum Judæis agimus.

<sup>3</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. p. 639.

<sup>4</sup> Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. iv. c. 62. "Ὁρα δὲ ἡμᾶς ἀπολαύσαι τῆς ἀθανάτοιοῦ σφραγίδος, ὥρα τῆ σωτηρίας σφραγίσματος μετασχεῖν.

<sup>5</sup> Chrysost. Hom. iii. in 2. Cor. in fine. Κάθεπερ στρατιώταις σφραγίς, ἔτω δὲ τοῖς πιτοῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐπιτίθεται, &c.



external seal of baptism necessary was to be made, because many men received the external seal of baptism, or the outward form of it, who by their own default could not receive the internal seal of the Spirit. Thus the author of the Apostolical Constitutions observes,<sup>1</sup> “that even Simon Magus himself received the seal of the Lord,” meaning the outward form of baptism; but neither he nor any other author ever said, that he received the internal seal or grace of the Holy Spirit. In like manner Optatus tells the Donatists,<sup>2</sup> “that both they and the Catholics, were sealed with one and the same seal,” which he explains to be the outward form of baptism, in which they both agreed and were both alike baptized. But both Optatus and St. Austin, and all other ancient writers are agreed, that heretical and schismatical baptism, such as was that of the Donatists, could not confer the internal seal, or sanctifying graces of the Holy Spirit, because these were only conferred by the ministry of the holy Catholic Church, of which I have given a more ample account in another place.<sup>3</sup> So that in this respect it was always thought necessary to distinguish between the internal and external seal of baptism, because though they are commonly joined together, as in all true believers, yet they are sometimes separated, as in such hypocritical or unworthy receivers, as Simon Magus, and others of the like complexion.

SECT. 7.—And *Character Dominicus, the Mark or Character of the Lord.*

St. Austin commonly uses the name, *Character Regius*, and, *Character Dominicus, the royal mark, or character*, and *the character of the Lord*. By which he does not mean any internal quality, or spiritual power, distinct from baptism, imprinted on the soul, as the modern schoolmen now love to word it; but only the external form of baptism, which is common to all receivers both good and bad, who are duly baptized in the name of the Holy Trinity: they are so far signed by the mark or character of the Lord, as thereby to be distinguished from unbaptized Jews and

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. ii. c. 14. Σίμων ὁ μάγος τῆν ἐν Κυρίῳ σφραγίδα ἔλαβε. Vid. Aug. de Bapt. lib. vi. c. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Optat. lib. iii. p. 72. Pares

credimus, et uno sigillo signati sumus: nec aliter baptizati quam vos.

<sup>3</sup> Scholast. Hist. of Lay-Baptism, Part i. chap. i. s. 21.

Gentiles, who never made any formal profession of Christianity, nor ever received so much as the external character or indication of it. And this character is allowed by St. Austin to be so far indelible also, as that an apostatizing Christian, though he turn Jew or Pagan in profession, can never need a second baptism, but only repentance and absolution, to reinstate him in all the privileges of the Christian Church. Of which, because I have spoken largely in a former Book, I need say no more in this place.<sup>1</sup>

SECT. 8.—Why called the Sacrament of Faith and Repentance.

Another sort of names given to baptism, were taken from the conditions required of all those that received it, which were the profession of a true faith and a sincere repentance. Upon which account baptism is sometimes called the sacrament of faith, and the sacrament of repentance. St. Austin uses this name to explain how<sup>2</sup> children may be said to have faith, though they are not capable of making any formal profession by themselves. As the sacrament of the body of Christ is in some sort the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the blood of Christ is the blood of Christ, so the sacrament of faith is faith. And upon this account, when the answer is made, that an infant believes, who has not yet the habit of faith, the meaning is, that he has faith because of the sacrament of faith, and that he turns to God because of the sacrament of conversion. Fulgentius uses the same terms in speaking of the necessity of baptism: “Firmly believe and doubt not,<sup>3</sup> that excepting such as are baptized in their own blood for the name of Christ, no man shall have eternal life, who is not here first turned from his sins by repen-

<sup>1</sup> See Scholast. Hist. of Lay-Baptism, Part. ii. chap. vi. <sup>2</sup> Aug. Ep. 23. ad Bonifac. Sicut secundum quandam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, et sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum Fidei Fides est.—Ac per hoc cum respondetur parvulus credere, qui nondum fidei habet affectum, respondetur fidem habere propter fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum propter conversionis sacramentum, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Fulgent. de Fide ad Petrum, c. 30. Firmissimè tene et nullatenus dubites, exceptis illis, qui pro nomine Christi suo sanguine baptizantur, nullum hominem accepturum vitam æternam, qui non hic à malis suis fuerit per pœnitentiam fidemque conversus, et per sacramentum fidei et pœnitentiæ, id est, per baptismum, liberatus, &c.

tance and faith, and set at liberty by the sacrament of faith and repentance, that is, by baptism." Whence we may observe, what the Ancients mean, when they speak of penance and absolution, or remission of sins, as a sacrament: for they themselves explain their own meaning to be baptism, which is a sacrament requiring repentance as a condition, and granting absolution as an effect and privilege to all worthy receivers.

SECT. 9.—The Notation of the Names, Baptism, Tinction, Laver, &c. that they do not universally denote Immersion.

Lastly, from the ceremonies used in the act of administration it took the peculiar names of baptism, tinction, and laver of regeneration, which properly denote either an immersion in water, or such a washing or sprinkling as was used among the Jews in some cases, and among Christians when they had occasion to baptize sick persons upon a death-bed. For then baptism was administered by sprinkling only, and not by dipping or immersion, as we shall see when we come to speak more particularly of clinic baptism. So that it must be noted, that baptism in the ancient style of the Church, does not absolutely and necessarily import dipping or immersion, though that was the more usual ceremony practised heretofore as well upon infants as adult persons, but an exception was made for the time of sickness, and such other cases of necessity, as could not admit of a total immersion. In which cases, the substance of baptism was still supposed to be preserved, though some minuter circumstances were less regarded.

SECT. 10.—Of some other Names given to Baptism.

Besides these names, which were taken from things that more immediately related to the administration of baptism, there were some others alluding to circumcision, and others respecting the great author and institutor of it, our Saviour Christ, and others taken from the more remote and distant effects of it; which because we shall have no further occasion to speak of them, it will not be improper just to mention in this place. Because baptism succeeds in the room of circumcision, and is the seal of the Christian covenant, as that was the seal of

the covenant made with Abraham, therefore it is by way of analogy sometimes styled the great circumcision. As when Epiphanius, comparing them both together, says,<sup>1</sup> “the carnal circumcision served for a time, till the great circumcision came, that is, baptism; which circumcises us from our sins, and seals us in the Name of God.” So in regard that baptism had Christ for its author and not man, it was anciently known by the name of Δῶρον, and Χάρισμα Κυρίου, *the gift of the Lord*. As in the ancient Acts of Paul and Thecla; when Thecla desired the seal of the Lord, Paul bids her wait with patience, and she should receive “δωρεάν τῆς Χριστοῦ, *the gift of Christ*,” which, as the learned editor observes,<sup>3</sup> is but another way of denoting baptism. Sometimes it was simply called Δῶρον, without any other addition, by way of eminence, because it was both a gratuitous and a singular *gift* of Christ. “We call it the gift,” says Gregory Nazianzen,<sup>3</sup> “because it is given to those who offer nothing for it.” And St. Basil, “Δέον ἐπιτρέχειν τῷ δώρῳ, *we ought to run to the gift*,”<sup>4</sup> meaning baptism. And Casaubon has also further observed,<sup>5</sup> that because the Spirit was likewise given in baptism, therefore the Holy Ghost had sometimes the name of *Munus, the gift*. And the eucharist also, or the sacramental oblation of the body and blood of Christ, both before and after consecration, commonly went by this name, Δῶρα and Μύτικα Δῶρα, of which there are various instances collected out of the ancient Rituals by that learned writer, which are not proper to be inserted in this place. Baptism had also the name of Ἐφοδίου, or *Viaticum*, as well as the eucharist, which denotes properly the preparation of all things necessary for a journey: in which respect both the sacraments were called *Viatica*, because they were equally esteemed men’s necessary provision and proper armour both to sustain and conduct them safe on their way in their passage through this world to eternal life. St. Basil, exhorting men of all ages and conditions to receive baptism,

<sup>1</sup> Epiphani. Hær. 8. al. 28. Cerinth. n. 4. Vid. Just. Mart. Dial. c. Tryph. p. 261.<sup>2</sup> Grabe, Spicileg. Patrum. tom. i. p. 106. <sup>3</sup> Naz.

Orat. 40. de Bapt. p. 638.

<sup>4</sup> Basil. Homil. 13. de Bapt. p. 411.

<sup>5</sup> Casaubon. Exercit. 16. in Baron. n. 51.

makes his address to them in these words:<sup>1</sup> “ Art thou a young man? then secure thy youth by the bridle of baptism. Art thou past the flower of thy age? then beware thou lose not thy *Viaticum*, thy phylactery, which should keep and preserve thee in thy way to eternal life.” In allusion to which name, Gregory Nazianzen,<sup>2</sup> speaking of the minister’s act in baptizing, terms it *ἰφοδιάζειν*, *giving to men their Viaticum*, or *provision for their journey to another world*. In reference to its making men complete members of Christ’s body, the Church, it had the name of *Τελείωσις* and *Τελετή*, *the consecration* and *consummation*; because it gave men the perfection of Christians, and a right to partake of the *Τὸ Τέλειον*, which was the eucharist, or the Lord’s-supper. It had the name of *Μύησις*, and *Μυστηγωγία*, *the initiation*, because it was the admittance of men to all the sacred rites and mysteries of the Christian religion. And as the eucharist, from its representing the death of Christ by the outward elements of bread and wine, was called the sacred symbols, so baptism sometimes had the same name, as we find in Isidore of Pelusium, and the author of the dispute with Arius in the council of Nice, under the name of Athanasius. “ Though the priest be an ill liver,”<sup>3</sup> says Isidore “ the person initiated, receives no harm by the symbols of salvation, but only the priest himself.” And the other<sup>4</sup> thus argues for the divinity of the Holy Ghost: “ If the Holy Spirit be not of the substance of the Father and the Son, why then did the Son of God join him together with them in the symbol of sanctification, when he said to his disciples, “ Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” In both which places, it is plain, the symbols of sanctification and salvation, can mean no other than baptism. And hence it appears, that the same honourable titles were given to the waters of baptism, as to the elements of bread and wine in

<sup>1</sup> Basil. de Bapt. p. 413. Μὴ ζημιωθῆς τὰ ἰφόδια, μὴ ἀπολέσῃς τὸ φυλακτήριον.

<sup>2</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. p. 644.

<sup>3</sup> Isidor.

lib. ii. Ep. 37. Ὁ τελέμενος ἐδὲν παραβλάπτεται εἰς τὰ σωτηριώδη σύμβολα, εἰ ὁ ἱερεὺς μὴ εὔβητος εἴη, ἀλλ’ αὐτὸς μὲν πάντως.

<sup>4</sup> Athanas.

Disp. contra Arium, in Con. Nic. tom. i. p. 111. Τίνος ἕνεκεν συνηϊόθησεν αὐτὸ ὁ ὕδωρ τῷ Θεῷ ἐν τῷ συμβόλῳ τῷ ἁγιασμῷ, &c.

the Lord's-supper; and whatever change was supposed to be wrought in the one by the invocation of the Holy Spirit, was equally ascribed to the other also; and as noble effects derived from the font as the Lord's-table, whilst the death of Christ was equally represented, and the benefits of it alike communicated to all worthy receivers in baptism and the Lord's-supper. For which reason I have been a little the more curious in examining and explaining the several titles of honour which the Ancients gave to baptism, that under these eminent characters we might see what apprehensions and ideas the Church of Christ always had of this venerable mystery, which some now by way of contempt call water-baptism, as if the Spirit had no concern in it; whose doctrines may easily be perceived not to proceed from the general sense of the ancient Catholic Church, but from particular sects and heresies broken off from it, of which it will not be amiss to give a short account in the following Chapter.

## CHAP. II.

### *Of the Matter of Baptism, with an Account of such Heretics, as rejected or corrupted Baptism by Water.*

SECT. 1.—Baptism wholly rejected by the Heretics called Ascodrutæ, and Marcosians, and Valentinians, and Quintillians.

THOUGH the Church always maintained an honourable opinion of baptism, as a divine and heavenly institution, yet there wanted not sects and heresies, who in the earliest ages spake very diminutively and contemptibly of it; and either in whole or in part upon various reasons rejected or corrupted it. The Ascodrutæ, who were a sort of Gnostics, placed all religion in knowledge, and under pretence of spiritual worship, would admit of no external or corporeal symbols whatsoever. They asserted, as Theodoret describes them,<sup>1</sup> "that divine mysteries, being the images of invisible things, were not to be performed by visible things;

---

<sup>1</sup> Theodor. Hæret. Fabul. lib. i. c. 10.

nor incorporeal things by sensible and corporeal things." Therefore they never baptized any that were of their sect, nor celebrated any part of the mystery of baptism among them: for they said, the knowledge of all things was their redemption. Irenæus<sup>1</sup> and Epiphanius observe the same thing to be practised, upon the same principle of spiritual redemption by knowledge alone, among some of those who were called Marcosian heretics, whilst others of them, who retained a sort of baptism, invented strange forms of their own to corrupt it, of which I shall give an account in the following Chapter, s. 8. Irenæus<sup>2</sup> gives a like account of the Valentinians, some of whom wholly rejected baptism, and others corrupted it with strange forms of their own inventing, as the Marcosians did, who seem to have been branches of the same heresy under different leaders. Tertullian<sup>3</sup> brings a like charge against one Quintilla, a woman-preacher at Carthage, a little before his time, who set up to decry water-baptism as useless; pleading, that faith alone was sufficient to save men, as it did Abraham, who pleased God without any other sacrament, but the sacrament of faith. Against this heresy Tertullian wrote his Book of Baptism, to establish the necessity of it from our Saviour's institution, and to answer the little sophisms, whereby the libertines of this new sect pretended to destroy it.

SECT. 2.—And by the Archontici.

The Archontici rejected baptism for another reason, as Epiphanius<sup>4</sup> and Theodoret<sup>5</sup> inform us. They had entertained a very monstrous and blasphemous opinion, that the world was not created by the Supreme God of all things, but by certain powers, whom they called "Ἀρχοντες, rulers, whence they themselves had the denomination of *Archontici*: these rulers, seven or eight in number, they imagined to be in so many several orbs of the heavens, one above

<sup>1</sup> Iren. lib. i. c. 18.      <sup>2</sup> Iren. lib. iii. c. 2.      <sup>3</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. c. 1. Nuper conversata istic quædam de Caianâ hæresi vipera venenatissima, doctrinâ suâ plerosque rapuit imprimis baptismum destruens, &c. II. cap. 13. Adeò dicunt, baptismus non est necessarius, quibus fides satis est, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Epiphanius. Har. 40. de Archonticis, n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> Theodor. Har. Fab. lib. i.

c. 11.

another, with orders of angels and ministries under them; and to the chief of these they gave the name of Sabaoth. Now they also pretended that baptism was only administered in the name of Sabaoth, and not in the name of the Supreme God, and therefore they rejected both it and the eucharist as foreign institutions, given by Sabaoth, the god of the Jews and the giver of the Law, whom they blasphemously distinguished from the Supreme God.

SECT. 3.—And by the Seleucians and Hermians.

The Seleucians and Hermians refused the use of baptism by water, as St. Austin describes them.<sup>1</sup> And the ground of their refusal, was a pretence, that baptism by water was not the baptism instituted by Christ, because St. John Baptist, comparing his own baptism, with the baptism of Christ, says, “I baptize you with water, but he that cometh after me, shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire:”<sup>2</sup> they thought the souls of men consisted of fire and spirit, and therefore a baptism by fire was more suitable to their nature. But what kind of baptism that was, none of the Ancients have told us: unless perhaps we may conjecture from what Clemens Alexandrinus<sup>3</sup> tells us out of Heraeleon, of some, who when they had baptized men in water, also made a mark upon their ears with fire; so joining water-baptism, and, as they imagined, baptism by fire, together. Though this was far enough from the fiery baptism St. John speaks of, which some of the Ancients understand of the ordinary operations of the Spirit, which consumes our sins; and others, of that extraordinary effusion of the Spirit in the form of fiery tongues upon the Apostles at the day of Pentecost: and others of the fire of the last judgment. A particular account of which interpretation the

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Hæres. c. 59. Seleuciani et Hermiani baptismum in aquâ non accipiunt.

<sup>2</sup> Philastr. de Hæres. n. 8. Seleucus et Hermius hæretici animas hominum de igne et spiritu esse existimantes, isto baptismo non utuntur propter verbum hoc quod dixit Johannes Baptista; ‘Ipse vos baptizabit in spiritu et igne.’

<sup>3</sup> Clem. Alex. Electa ex Scriptura, ap. Combefis Auctarium, tom. i. p. 202. “Ἐμοί δὲ, ὡς φησιν Ἡρακλέων, πρὸς τὰ ὅσα τῶν σφραγιζομένων κατεσημῆσαντο. Irenæus, lib. i. c. 24. has something like this, of the Carpocratians.



reader that is curious, may find in Suicerus upon this subject.<sup>1</sup> I only note further out of the anonymous writer about heretical baptism, published by Rigaltius and Bp. Fell at the end of St. Cyprian, that there were a sort of heretics, who pretended, that baptism by water alone was of itself imperfect, because St. John had said, we were to be baptized with the Holy Ghost and with fire. Therefore they boasted,<sup>2</sup> that theirs was the only complete and perfect baptism, and all others curtailed, and given only by halves, because when they went down into the water to baptize, either by some curious art in philosophy, like that of Anaxilaus, or by some magical art, they made fire to appear upon the surface of the water, and this they called baptism by fire. Which they confirmed from an apocryphal writing of their own inventing, called the preaching of Peter or Paul, wherein it was said, that when Christ was baptized, fire so appeared upon the water. The censure which this author passes upon this kind of baptism, is that it is adulterate, pernicious, and wholly evacuating the true baptism of Christ.

SECT. 4.—And by the Manichees and Paulicians.

Another sect which rejected water-baptism, were the Manichees, who among many other prodigious errors, maintained, that baptizing in water was of no efficacy to salvation, and therefore they despised it, and never baptized<sup>3</sup> any that entered into their society, as St. Austin and the author of the *Prædestinatus*,<sup>4</sup> published by Sirmondus, inform us. But whether they admitted any other kind of baptism, or upon what ground they rejected this, we are not told: only we may probably conjecture, that it was upon that general vile principle of theirs, that material things were the work of an evil god, and therefore to be abhorred as polluted and

---

<sup>1</sup> Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. tom. i. p. 630.      <sup>2</sup> Anonym. de Baptismo Hæreticorum, ad calcem Cypriani, p. 30. Tentant nonnulli iterum tractare se solos integrum atque perfectum, non sicuti nos, mutilatum et decurtatum baptismum tradere. Quod taliter dicantur adsignare, ut quam mox in aquam descenderunt statim super aquam ignis appareat, &c.      <sup>3</sup> Aug. de Hæres. cap. 46. Baptismum in aqua nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis adferre: nec quenquam eorum, quos decipiunt, baptizandum putant.      <sup>4</sup> Prædestinatorum Hæresis, c. 46.

profane. One branch of this heresy was afterwards called Paulicians, from one Paulus and Johannes, the first founders of it. Euthymius, out of Photius, gives a large account of them, where he tells us,<sup>1</sup> “that though they really rejected and despised baptism, yet they pretended to receive it: but that was only with a deceitful equivocation; for they maintained, that the word of the Gospel was baptism, because our Lord said, “I am the living water.” The learned Vossius<sup>2</sup> is of opinion, that those words, “*Ego sum aqua viva, I am the living water,*” was the form which these Paulicians used in baptism instead of the form of the Church: but he plainly mistakes Euthymius, who does not say, that they used this as a form of words in their baptism; for they had no baptism at all, nor consequently any form of words for baptizing: but their opinion was, that believing in Christ, or the word or the truth of the Gospel, was all the baptism that was required of men, and that because Christ had said, “I am the living water.” Yet, sometimes, as Euthymius relates in the same place,<sup>3</sup> they would bring their children to the presbyters of the Church to be baptized after the catholic way, because they had an opinion that both baptism and the cross were of some advantage to the body for the cure of diseases, but of no other efficacy, benefit, or virtue to purge the soul. And such an opinion possessed the minds of many others, who had no further regard for baptism, but only as it was of use to free the body of some distemper or uncleanness. St. Austin<sup>4</sup> puts the question once or twice concerning some such persons who desired to be baptized with no other view but this. And Matthew Blastares<sup>5</sup> mentions a famous case of the Agarenes, who

<sup>1</sup> Euthym. Panoplia. par. 2. tit. 21. p. 48. Quinetiã cum baptismum aspernentur, illud tamen se fingunt suscipere: nam evangelii verba baptismum existimant, quoniam Dominus, ‘Ego sum,’ inquit, ‘aqua viva.’

<sup>2</sup> Voss. de Baptismo, disp. 1. Thes. 2. p. 28. <sup>3</sup> Euthym. ibid. Liberos etiam suos ab ecclesiã presbyteris salutari baptismo volunt aliquando lustrari; existimant enim crucem et baptismum corpori prodesse. Horum tamen vim ad animæ purgationem pervenire non putant, nec ullam aliam afferre utilitatem.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. Ep. 23. ad Bonifacium. <sup>5</sup> Blastar. Syntagm. Can. Litera B. cap. 3. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. tom. 2. p. 42. Vid. Balsamon in Photii Nomocanon, tit. 13. de Laicis, cap. 2. et Baron. an. 1145. p. 358. tom. xii. lt. an. 1145. p. 311.

compelled the Christian clergy, that were under their dominion, to baptize their children before they would circumcise them; because they conceived this would contribute toward the prevention of those distempers and noisomenesses, which are occasioned by circumcision. Upon this case a question was made in the council of Constantinople under Lucas Chrysoberges, whether such persons, when they came over to the Christian faith, were to be rebaptized, or only anointed with chrism? and it was resolved, that they ought, without controversy, to be rebaptized, since the baptism with which they were washed, was not received with any pious intent, but only as an amulet or charm. These instances make the account, which Euthymius gives of the Paulicians, seem very probable, that though they had no regard for baptism as a Christian sacrament, yet they might sometimes make use of it, as the Saracens did, as an enchantment or a sort of magical spell; which appears to be the only use they ever made of it, and that not in their own assemblies, where they had no sacraments at all, neither baptism nor the eucharist, but fraudulently receiving it in the Church at the hands of the Christian Catholic priests. The reader may observe by the way, that these Paulicians were not the followers of Paulus Samosatensis, bishop of Antioch, who are commonly called Paulianists and Samosatensians, though Balsamon confounds them together; but they had their denomination from another Paulus Samosatensis and one Johannes, who revived and enlarged the heresy of the Manichees, as appears plainly from Euthymius. And Justellus<sup>1</sup> and Vossius<sup>2</sup> have observed the same out of Cedrenus, Theophanes, Matthew Blastares, Nicephorus, and other modern Greeks, with which it would be needless in this place to trouble the reader.

SECT. 5.—What Opinion the Messalians or Euchites had of Baptism.

Some add to the forementioned sects, who rejected baptism, the heresy of the Messalians, or Euchites, who were so called from the Greek word, *Ἐυχὴ*, *prayer*, and Messalians from

<sup>1</sup> Justel. Not. in Can. 19. Codicis Eccl. Universæ.  
Baptismo, Disp. 20. p. 241.

<sup>2</sup> Voss. de

the Syriac word, *Metsalah*, which is much of the same signification, because they resolved all religion into prayer. But it does not appear, that they wholly rejected the sacrament of baptism: for then the Church would have ordered them upon their return to have been baptized as Jews or Pagans; which she never did, but only obliged them to anathematize their errors, in order to be admitted to communion; as may be collected from the decree of the general-council of Ephesus,<sup>1</sup> made with relation to such of the clergy or laity as returned from them. But their error was in denying the principal part of the spiritual efficacy of baptism: they said indeed it granted remission of sins that were past, but added no strength or ability from the Spirit to withstand sin for the future. This we learn from Theodoret, who, comparing the doctrine of the Catholic Church and that of the Messalians upon this point together, delivers himself to this purpose: <sup>2</sup> “Baptism,” says he, “is not like a razor only, as the Messalian enthusiasts call it, which takes away sins that are past, though it has this effect among many others; for if this were the only work of baptism, for what reason should we baptize infants, who have never yet tasted of sin? for the sacrament does not only promise this effect, but greater and more perfect things than that. It is the earnest of future good, the type of the resurrection to come hereafter, the communication of our Lord’s passion, the participation of our Lord’s resurrection, the garment of salvation, the clothing of joy, and the robe of light, or rather light itself.” So that we must allow Theodoret to be his own interpreter, when he seems to give a more harsh account of these Messalians in another place, describing them as men who taught, “that no manner<sup>3</sup> of advantage accrued from divine baptism, to those who received it, but that it was only fervent prayer that expelled the indwelling devil out of men’s minds.” For this is to be understood with the forementioned exception, that they

<sup>1</sup> Con. Ephes. tom. iii. p. 869.

sive de Fabul. Hæret. lib. v. cap. 18.

<sup>2</sup> Theod. Epitom. Divin. Decret.

<sup>3</sup> Theod. Hæret. Fab. lib. iv. c. 10

Μηδεμίαν ἐκ τῆς βαπτίσματος ὀφέλειαν τοῖς ἀδικημένοις γίνεσθαι μόνην δὲ τὴν σπαδαίαν εὐχὴν τὸν δαίμονα τὸν ἔνοικον ἕξειλαίνειν

allowed baptism so far to be useful, as to wash away all former sins, but not to grant any further perfection. And so Harmenopulus<sup>1</sup> represents their doctrine, as teaching, that neither baptism nor participation of the eucharist could give a man the perfection of a Christian, but only such prayer as they pretended to. In like manner Euthymius<sup>2</sup> describes them as maintaining, that baptism did not eradicate sin. They did not deny that it purged away former sins, but they would not allow any efficacy of the Spirit to be joined with it to resist or overcome sin for the future. Against which doctrine Euthymius thus argues: “ Our Lord Jesus Christ said, ‘ Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.’ Now the Holy Ghost is a divine fire; for he descended in the form of fiery tongues upon the disciples, and the forerunner of Christ spake of this to the multitude, when he testified of the excellency of Christ, ‘ He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.’ As therefore material fire, when it catches a wood, burns all things upon the surface of the earth, dries up the roots, and purges the place from filth: so the Holy Spirit does, and much more; for it is a fire consuming the iniquity of those who are baptized: and it not only purges and obliterates the spots, and scars, and filth of the soul, but also illuminates and endows it with many gifts, as the Apostles, and especially St. Paul, teach us, where they speak of the distribution of the graces of the Holy Spirit, which are conferred on those who are baptized.” From this account of the Messalians it appears, that they were neither Anabaptists, nor Quakers; they neither rejected the baptism of adult persons nor infants. For the true state of the controversy between them and the Church, was not about the use of the outward element of water in baptism, but about the internal and spiritual effects of it, which the Messalians confined to remission of sins, but the Church extended to many other

<sup>1</sup> Harmenop. de Sectis, c. 18. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. tom. i. p. 536. Τὸ βάπτισμα μὴ τελεῖν τὸν ἀνθρώπου, μηδὲ τὴν μετὰ λήψιν, ἀλλὰ μόνον τὴν παρ’ αὐτοῖς εὐχὴν.

<sup>2</sup> Euthym. Panopl. partii. tit. 22. p. 55. Negant divinum baptismum posse radices evellere peccatorum, &c.

noble benefits, which were the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit. Upon which account, the Church never rebaptized the Messalians, that we read of, as she did the Manichees and such other heretics, who rejected the use of water, which was the outward element which Christ had appointed. If this was either neglected, or any other element used instead of it, the baptism was esteemed not only irregular, but null, as wanting one necessary and essential part, which could not be supplied but by a new baptism. And therefore when a certain Jew had been baptized in sand, for want of water in the wilderness, Dionysius, bishop of Ascalon, ordered him to be rebaptized, as Johannes Moschus<sup>1</sup> tells the story: and this was done, not because he was baptized by a layman in extreme necessity, but as Archbishop Whitgift<sup>2</sup> after the Centuriators<sup>3</sup> has observed, "because the baptism wanted water." Such was the Church's opinion of the necessity of water-baptism, that where it might be had, she never thought fit to dispense with the neglect or contempt of it; and therefore she urged the necessity of it against those ancient heretics who despised it, even whilst she judged favourably of such catechumens as died without baptism, not through contempt, but unavoidable necessity: of which I have given a particular account in the last Book, chap. ii. sect. 20, &c.

Indeed there is one exception against this in some collections of the canon law. For there we have a decree under the name of Pope Siricius<sup>4</sup> which says, that if an infant is baptized in wine instead of water, in case of necessity, it is no crime, and the baptism shall stand good. But as Antonius Augustinus, and Baluzius have observed, this was no decree of Siricius, but of Stephen II. about the eighth century. So that it cannot be pleaded as a competent

<sup>1</sup> Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale*, c. 176.  
tract. ix. p. 519.

<sup>2</sup> Whitgift's Defence,  
<sup>3</sup> Centur. Magdeburg. cent. ii. c. 6. p. 82.

<sup>4</sup> Antonius Augustinus cites it out of a Spanish Collection of Canons, and Baluzius from one in France, under the name of Siricius. *Presbyter qui in vino baptizatus proximâ necessitate, ut æger non periclitetur, pro tali re nulla ei culpa adscribitur. Si verò aqua aderat, et necessitas talis non urgebat, hic communione privetur. Infaus verò ille, si in Sanctâ Trinitate baptizatus est, in eo baptismo permaueat. Vid. Anton. August. de Emendat. Gratiani, p. 200. et Baluz. Not. in Anton. p. 431.*

authority to show what was the ancient practice of the Church. Antonius Augustinus is very positive, that the primitive Church had never any such custom : and it seems pretty evident from that saying of St. Ambrose,<sup>1</sup> that if we take away water, the sacrament of baptism cannot stand. But among the Moderns, Beza<sup>2</sup> and some of the Schoolmen, Tolet and Valentia, determine otherwise ; against whose resolution I am not concerned to dispute, but only to declare what I take to have been the more current and received opinion of the primitive writers of the Church.

### CHAP. III.

#### *Of the Ancient Form of Baptism, and of such Heretics, as altered or corrupted it.*

SECT. I.—The usual Form of Baptizing in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

NEXT to the matter of baptism, it will be proper to consider the form of words in which it was anciently administered. And this was generally such a form of words as made express mention of every person of the blessed Trinity, according as our Saviour did at the first institution, when he commanded his disciples to baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. This the ancient author of the Recognitions<sup>3</sup> means, when he says, “men were baptized under the appellation of the triple mystery.” And again,<sup>4</sup> “by invoking the name of the blessed Trinity.” Tertullian<sup>5</sup> refers this to the institution of Christ: “The law of baptizing was imposed, and the form prescribed, ‘Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. De iis qui initiantur, c. 4. Nec iterum sine aquâ regenerationis mysterium est.

<sup>2</sup> Beza, Ep. 2. ad Tillium.

<sup>3</sup> Clem. Rom.

Recognit. lib. vi. c. 9. Baptizantur sub appellatione triplicis sacramenti.

<sup>4</sup> Id. lib. iii. c. 67. Baptizabitur unusquisque vestrum in aquis perennibus, nomine Trinæ Beatitudinis invocato super se.

<sup>5</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. c. 13.

Lex tinguendi imposita est, et forma præscripta, ‘Ite,’ inquit, ‘docete nationes, tinguentes eas in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti.’

the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In another place,<sup>1</sup> he says, "Christ appointed baptism to be administered not in the name of one, but three, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Therefore we are dipped not once, but thrice, unto every person at the mention of each name." Cyprian derives this practice<sup>2</sup> likewise from the institution, saying, "the Lord after his resurrection taught his disciples after what manner they should baptize, when he said, 'Go teach all nations,&c.' where he delivered the doctrine of the Trinity, unto which mystery, or sacrament, the nations were to be baptized." And he argues<sup>3</sup> further, against such heretics as baptized only in the name of Jesus Christ, from the same principle, that Christ commanded the nations to be baptized, not into one person, but a complete and united Trinity. Hence Optatus<sup>4</sup> calls baptism the laver which Christ commanded to be celebrated in the name of the Trinity, and that holy water which flowed from the fountain of those three names. And to mention no more authorities, which are innumerable, St. Austin<sup>5</sup> observes, that this was not only the general practice of the Catholic Church, but of most heresies also: "for one might more easily find heretics that did not baptize at all, than such as retained baptism without using those evangelical words, of which the Creed consists, and without which baptism cannot be consecrated."

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. cont. Praxeam, c. 26. Novissimè mandans, ut tinguent in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum. Nam nec semel, sed ter, ad singula nomina in singulas personas tinguimur. <sup>2</sup> Cyprian. Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 200.

Dominus post resurrectionem discipulos suos mittens, quemadmodum baptizare deberent instituit et docuit, dicens.—'Ite et docete gentes omnes, baptizantes eas in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti.' Insinuat Trinitatem, cujus sacramento baptizarentur.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 206. Quomodo quidam dicunt, foris extra ecclesiam, immò et contra ecclesiam, modo in nomine Jesu Christi ubicunque et quomodocunque Gentilem baptizatum, remissionem peccatorum consequi posse; quando ipse Christus gentes baptizari jubeat in plenâ et adumatâ Trinitate?

<sup>4</sup> Optat. lib. v. p. 85. Lavacrum quod de Trinitate celebrandum esse mandaverat—aquâ sanctâ quæ de trium nominum fontibus inundat.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. vi. c. 25. Quis nesciat, non esse baptismum Christi, si verba evangelica quibus symbolum constat, illic defuerint? Sed facilius inveniuntur hæretici, qui omninò non baptizent, quàm qui non illis verbis baptizent.



SECT. 2.—This Form of Words generally thought necessary to be used in Baptism.

And hence it appears, that St. Austin, and these other writers thought this precise form of words necessary to be used in the administration of baptism, by virtue of the original appointment and institution. And this may be further evidenced to have been the general sense of the Ancients, some one or two only excepted. The Apostolical Canons<sup>1</sup> order every bishop and presbyter, that shall presume to baptize any other way, than according to the command of the Lord, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to be deposed. And Athanasius<sup>2</sup> speaks of such baptism as null, that is any otherwise delivered: “He that takes away any one person from the Trinity, and is baptized only in the name of the Father, or only in the name of the Son, or only in the Father and the Son, without the Spirit, receives nothing, but remains void and uninitiated; for in the Trinity alone initiation is given.” He says in another place,<sup>3</sup> “that baptism, which is as it were the compendium of our whole faith, is not given in the name of the Word, but of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” Didymus of Alexandria<sup>4</sup> treads in the steps of Athanasius: “I cannot suppose any one,” says he, “so mad and void of understanding, as to think that to be perfect baptism, which is given in the name of the Father and Son, without the assumption of the Holy Spirit; or in the name of the Father and Holy Ghost, omitting the name of the Son; or

<sup>1</sup> Canon. Apost. c. 49.

<sup>2</sup> Athan. Epist. ad Serapion. tom. i. p. 204.

‘Ο ὑψαιζόμενος τι τῆς Τριάδος, ἢ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ τῷ Πατρὸς ὀνόματι βαπτιζόμενος, ἢ ἐν μόνῳ τῷ ὀνόματι Υἱοῦ, ἢ χωρὶς τῷ Πνεύματος ἐν Πατρὶ ἢ Υἱῷ, ἔδειν λαμβάνει, ἀλλὰ κενὸς ἢ ἀτελής διαμένει, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Id. Orat. 5. cont.

Arian. p. 535. ‘Οὐκ εἰς Λόγον, ἀλλ’ εἰς Πατέρα ἢ Υἱόν ἢ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα δίδονται.

<sup>4</sup> Didymus, de Spir. Sancto. lib. ii. Bibl. Patr. tom. ix.

p. 37. Non arbitrator quemquam tam vecordem atque insanum futurum, ut perfectum baptisma putet, quod datur in nomine Patris et Filii, sine assumptione Spiritus Sancti: aut rursus in nomine Patris, et Spiritus Sancti, Filii vocabulo prætermisso; aut certè in nomine Filii et Spiritus Sancti, non præposito vocabulo Patris. Licet enim quis posset esse saxei, ut ita dicam, cordis, et penitus mentis alienæ, qui ita baptizare conetur, ut unum de præceptis nominibus prætermittat, videlicet contrarius legislator Christi; tamen sine perfectione baptizabit; immò penitus à peccatis liberare non poterit quos à se baptizatos existimaverit.

in the name of the Son and Holy Ghost, without first mentioning the name of the Father. For though any man should be of such a stony heart, as I may say, or so much beside himself, as to leave out one of the appointed names in baptism, setting up himself a lawgiver in opposition to Christ, his baptism will be imperfect, and altogether insufficient to grant remission of sins to those whom he esteems baptized by him." Idacius Clarus<sup>1</sup> asserts the same, arguing thus against Varimundus, the Arian, for the divinity of the Holy Ghost: "If the Holy Ghost be not equal to the Father and Son in the substance of the Deity, why then is that sacrament of baptism imperfect, which is given without him?" St. Basil<sup>2</sup> has a whole chapter to the same purpose. The very title of it is against those, who asserted that it was sufficient to give baptism only in the name of the Lord: and whereas they urged, that in several passages of Scripture baptism was said to be given only in the name of Christ, he answers, "that in all those places though the name of Christ was only mentioned, yet the whole Trinity was understood." Which he confirms from the like expressions concerning the Holy Ghost, 1 Cor. xii. 13. "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." And, Acts, i. 5. "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." Where the Apostles seem only to make mention of the Holy Ghost in baptism. "But," says he, "no one may from hence conclude, that that baptism is perfect, wherein the Holy Ghost alone is named. For the tradition ought to remain inviolable, which was given by the quickening grace." He means the form of baptizing, given by the command of Christ, Matth. xxviii. Upon which he concludes, that as we believe in the Father, and in the Son, and in the Holy Ghost, so we are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Therefore both Vossius<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Idacius, lib. iii. contra Varimundum, Bibl. Patr. tom. iv. p. 300. Si Spiritus Sanctus Deitatis substantia Patri et Filio non coæquatur, cur in sacramento sacri baptismatis nihil absque illo completur?

<sup>2</sup> Basil. de Spir. Sancto. c. 12. Οὐ τέλειον ἂν τις εἶπη τὸ βάπτισμα, ἢ μόνον τῷ Πνεύματος ὄνομα ἐπεκλήθη· χρὴ γὰρ ἀπαράβατον μενεῖν τὴν ἐν τῷ ζωοποιῷ χάριτι δεδομένην παράβασιν, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Voss. de Bapt. Disp. 2. Thes. v. p. 51.

and Petavius<sup>1</sup> are greatly mistaken to allege St. Basil as one of those who asserted, that baptism in the name of Christ alone was allowable, when he so plainly and directly writes against it. Many other testimonies might here be inserted out of Theodoret,<sup>2</sup> Gregory Nazianzen<sup>3</sup> and Nys- sen,<sup>4</sup> Theophylact<sup>5</sup> and others, but I shall only add further the decree of Pope Vigilius, which shows both the practice of the Church and the severity of her censures against any one that should pretend to transgress this settled rule of baptizing. “If any bishop or presbyter,” says he,<sup>6</sup> “baptize not according to the command of the Lord, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, but in one person of the Trinity, or in two, or in three Fathers, or in three Sons, or in three Comforters, let him be cast out of the Church of God.”

SECT. 3.—Whether Baptism in the Name of Christ alone was ever allowed in the Church?

Indeed among all the writings of the Ancients, I have never yet met with any but two, that plainly and directly allow or approve of any other form of baptism, save that which was appointed by Christ at the institution. Gennadius mentions one Ursinus, an African monk, who, he says, wrote a book, which is now lost, wherein he asserted, against such as were for rebaptizing all heretics, “that it was not lawful to rebaptize those, who were baptized either simply,<sup>7</sup> in the name of Christ, or in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but it was sufficient for both sorts of them,

<sup>1</sup> Petav. de Trin. lib. ii. c. 14. n. 6.      <sup>2</sup> Theodor. Ep. 146. ad Johan. Oeconom. tom. iii. p. 1038.

<sup>3</sup> Naz. Orat. 24. p. 431.

<sup>4</sup> Nys- sen. de Bapt. Christi, tom. iii. p. 372.

<sup>5</sup> Theophylact. in Luc. 24. Fulgent. de Incarnat. c. 11. Cyril. Dial. 7. de Trin. tom. v. p. 633.

<sup>6</sup> Vigil. Ep. 2. ad Eutherum, c. 6. Si quis episcopus aut presbyter juxta præceptum Domini non baptizaverit in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti, sed in unâ personâ Trinitatis, aut in duabus, aut in tribus Patribus, aut in tribus Filiis, aut in tribus Paracletis, projiciatur de ecclesiâ Dei.

<sup>7</sup> Gennad. de Scriptor. Eccles. c. 27. Ursinus monachus scripsit adversus eos, qui rebaptizandos hæreticos decernunt, docens, nec legitimum, nec Deo dignum rebaptizari illos, qui in nomine vel simpliciter Christi, vel in nomine Patris, Filii et Spiritûs Sancti, quamvis pravo sensu, baptizantur: iis autem, post Sanctæ Trinitatis et Christi simplicem confessionem, sufficere ad salutem manûs impositionem catholici sacerdotis.

upon confession of the Trinity, to receive the bishop's confirmation, in order to obtain eternal life." This author plainly distinguishes between the two forms of baptizing, one with explicit mention of the three persons of the Trinity, and the other in the name of Christ alone; both which he makes to be lawful, and equivalent in sense, though differing in words from one another. And St. Ambrose, I confess, seems to have been of the same opinion: for he takes all those expressions of Scripture, which speak of being baptized in the name of Christ, to mean, the using such a form as this; 'I baptize thee in the name of Christ,' without any express mention of the three persons, though the whole Trinity was implied in it. "He that is blessed in Christ," says he,<sup>1</sup> "is blessed in the name of the Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost; because the name is one, and the power one. The Ethiopian eunuch, who was baptized in Christ, had the sacrament complete. If a man names only a single person expressly in words, either Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, so long as he does not deny in his faith either Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, the sacrament of faith is complete: as on the other hand, if a man in words express all the three persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but in his faith diminishes the power either of the Father, or Son, or Holy Ghost, the sacrament of faith is void." He says further, "he that names but one person, designs thereby the whole Trinity; he that names Christ only, intends both the Father by whom the Son is anointed, and the Son himself who is anointed, and the Spirit with which he is anointed. And he that names only the Father, does in like manner

---

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Spir. Sancto, lib. i. cap. 3. Qui benedicitur in Christo, benedicitur in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti, quia unum nomen, potestas una.—Denique et Æthiops Eunuchus Candaces Reginæ, baptizatus in Christo plenum mysterium consecutus est.—Quemadmodum si unum in sermone comprehendas, aut Patrem, aut Filium, aut Spiritum Sanctum, fide autem nec Patrem, nec Filium, nec Spiritum abneges, plenum est fide sacramentum; ita etiam quamvis, et Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum dicas, et aut Patris, aut Filii, aut Spiritûs Sancti minuas potestatem, vacuum est omne sacramentum.—Qui unum dixerit, Trinitatem signavit. Si Christum dicas, et Deum Patrem, à quo unctus est Filius, et ipsum qui unctus est Filius, et Spiritum quo unctus est, designasti. Et si Patrem dicas, et Filium ejus, et Spiritum oris ejus pariter indicasti, si tamen id etiam corde comprehendas.

intend both his Son and the Spirit of his mouth, if he truly believe them in his heart." So that according to St. Ambrose, it was a sufficient baptism, though only one person, Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, was expressly mentioned; because in one name by an orthodox believer all the rest were implied. But this appears to have been a singular opinion in St. Ambrose, contrary to the general stream and current of the ancient writers. For though Petavius joins St. Basil with him; and Vossius after Soto makes Cyprian, and Athanasius, and the author of the *Opus Imperfectum*, under the name of St. Chrysostom, to be abettors of the same assertion; yet it is clear from what has been alleged before, out of Cyprian, Athanasius, and Basil, that they were of the contrary opinion, and esteemed it an error and transgression against the first institution, to give baptism only in the name of Christ. Whence it is also further evident, that they did not understand those passages of Scripture, which speak of baptizing in the name of Jesus, or the Lord, or Christ, as new forms of baptizing, different from the original form delivered by Christ; but, as Eulogius in Photius has explained them,<sup>1</sup> "to be baptized into Christ Jesus, signifies to be baptized according to the command and tradition of Jesus Christ; that is in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." According to which sense, it follows, that the form of baptizing delivered by Christ was not changed, as some imagine, but precisely observed even by the Apostles, and after them by the general consent and practice of the Catholic Church.

SECT. 4.—Of Alterations made in the Form of Baptism. Ist, By the Tritheists and Priscillianists.

It is true, indeed, as sects grew up and increased in the Church, some innovations were made in this matter among them. For though, as St. Austin observes, the greatest part of heretics who retained any baptism at all, retained also the old form of the Church; yet some there were who

---

<sup>1</sup> Eulog. ap. Phot. Cod. 280. p. 1608. Τὸ εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν βαπτισθῆναι σημαίνει ἂν τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐντολὴν ἐκ παραδοσίου τῷ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθῆναι, τρεῖσι, εἰς Πατέρα, ἔκ Υἱόν, ἔκ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Vid. Aug. Con. Maximin. lib. iii. cap. 17.

varied from it, and brought in new forms of their own, according as their fancies or the genius of their heresies led them. There were some very early that turned the doctrine of the Trinity into Tritheism, and instead of three divine persons under the economy of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, brought in three collateral, co-ordinate, and self-originated beings, making them three absolute and independent principles, without any relation of Father or Son, which is the most proper notion of three Gods. And having made this change in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, they made another change answerable to it in the form of baptism. For instead of baptizing in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, they brought in an unheard-of form of baptizing in the name of three unoriginated principles, as we learn from one of those called the Apostolical Canons, which is directly levelled against them in these words: "If any bishop or presbyter<sup>1</sup> baptize not according to the command of Christ, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but in three unoriginated principles, or in three Sons, or in three Paracletes, or Holy Ghosts, let him be deposed." This canon does not describe these heretics by any name, but we may conjecture from another canon of the first council of Bracara, that they were the Gnostics, who first introduced this kind of Tritheism, or doctrine of three gods, into the world, which was afterwards taken up by the Priscillianists, and both of them condemned together in that council. For so the canon words it; "If any one shall introduce any strange names of the Divinity,<sup>2</sup> beside the holy Trinity, saying, that in the Godhead there is a Trinity of Trinities, as the Gnostics and Priscillianists maintain, let him be *Anathema*." This was the consequence of asserting three unbegotten principles; for hereby they made three Fathers, and three Sons, and three Holy Ghosts, which was a Trinity of Trinities, as the council

<sup>1</sup> Canon. Apost. c. 49. "Εἰ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος κατὰ τὴν τῷ Κυρίου δίαταξιν μὴ βαπτίσῃ εἰς Πατέρα, ἢ Υἱόν, ἢ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, ἀλλ' εἰς τρεῖς ἀνάρχους, ἢ εἰς τρεῖς υἱούς, ἢ εἰς τρεῖς παρακλήτους, καθαιρείσθω.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Bracar. i. Can. 2. Si quis extra Sanctam Trinitatem alia nescio que divinitatis nomina introducit, dicens, quod in ipsâ divinitate sit Trinitas Trinitatis, sicut Gnostici et Priscilliani dixerunt, anathema sit.

charges them. And in compliance with this grand error they sometimes baptized in the name of three Fathers, or three Sons, or three Holy Ghosts. As seems pretty evident from that decree of Pope Vigilius, made against all such heterodox innovations; if any bishop or presbyter<sup>1</sup> baptize not according to the command of the Lord, “in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but in one person of the Trinity, or in two, or in three Fathers, or in three Sons, or in three Paracletes, or Holy Ghosts, let him be cast out of the Church.”

SECT. 5.—Secondly, by Menander and his Followers.

Another corruption of the form of baptism, was introduced by Menander, who was a disciple of Simon Magus, and to all his master’s heresies added this of his own, “that no one could be saved, except he was baptized in his name,” as Tertullian informs us.<sup>2</sup> The reason of this innovation is assigned by Irenæus<sup>3</sup> and Epiphanius,<sup>4</sup> who tell us that he took upon him to be the Messiah: for he taught, that he was the person sent for the salvation of men; and to gather a Church by mysteries of his own appointing, to deliver men from the dominion of the angels, and principalities, and powers that made the world. And Theodoret<sup>5</sup> gives the same account of him. For he says, “he called himself the saviour of the world, and taught that men were saved by being baptized in his name, by which means also they got power over the powers that made the world.” But this was so absurd an heresy, that as Epiphanius observes, it never prevailed much in the Church. Menander had promised his proselytes, as Tertullian says,<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Vigil. Ep. 2. ad Eutherum. cap. 6. cited before, sect. 2.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul.

de Præscript. c. 46. Quicquid se Simon dixerat, hoc se Menander esse dicebat, negans habere posse quenquam salutem, nisi in nomine suo baptizatus fuisset.

<sup>3</sup> Iren. lib. i. c. 21.

<sup>4</sup> Epiphani. Hær. 22. Ἐλεγεν

ἑαυτὸν πεπεμφθαι εἰς σωτηρίαν δῆθεν, ἢ εἰς τὸ συνάγειν τινὰς εἰς τὸ ἑαυτῶ μυστήριον, &c.

<sup>5</sup> Theod. Hæret. Fab. lib. i. c. 2. Σωτήρα ἑαυτὸν

προσηγόρευσε.—σώζεσθαι δὲ τὰς εἰς αὐτὸν βαπτιζομένους.

<sup>6</sup> Tertul. de

Anima, c. 50. In hoc scilicet se à supernâ et arcanâ potestate legatum, ut immortales et incorruptibiles et statim resurrectionis compotes fiant, qui baptisma ejus induerint.—At ubi sunt illi quos Menander ipse perfudit, quos in Stygem suam mersit? Apostoli perennes veniant, assistant: videant illos meus Thomas, audiat, contrectet, et credat.

“that all who would be baptized in his name, should be immortal and incorruptible, and have the benefit of an immediate resurrection:” but experience in a little time confuted this foolery; for in an hundred years time none of his immortal Apostles appeared, to convince any doubting Thomas of the truth of such a pretended resurrection. And so this vain attempt upon the baptism of Christ quickly sunk by its own absurdity.

SECT. 6.—Thirdly, by the Elcesians.

A no less absurd innovation was made by the Elcesians, so called from their founder, one Eleesai, who taught them enchantments and invocation of demons, and to use baptisms in the name or confession of the elements,<sup>1</sup> or letters, as Theodoret represents them. Though what sort of baptism this was, is not very easy to conjecture, there being scarce any one besides Theodoret that gives any account of this heresy. But they were great admirers of astrology and magic and upon that account perhaps might bring the elements into their baptism, by composition of certain letters and numbers used by them in their magical operations.

SECT. 7.—Fourthly, by the Montanists and Sabellians.

The Montanists also, or Cataphrygians, introduced a new form of baptism. For Montanus their founder took upon him to be the Holy Ghost, and made himself two prophetesses, Priscilla and Maximilla, who pretended to write books by inspiration. Therefore their followers having them in great esteem corrupted the old form of baptism, and administered it in the name of Father, Son, and Montanus, or Priscilla, as St. Basil acquaints us, who therefore judges their baptism to be null, and necessary to be repeated when they came over to the Catholic Church.<sup>2</sup> Theophylact gives the same account of them,<sup>3</sup> telling us, “that their foul and stinking tongues baptized in the name of Montanus and Priscilla and Maximilla.” By which he does

<sup>1</sup> Theod. Hæret. Fab. lib. ii. c. 7. *Κέχρηται βαπτίσμασιν ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν στοιχείων ὁμολογίᾳ.* <sup>2</sup> Basil. Epist. Can. i. cap. 1. <sup>3</sup> Theoph. in Luc. xxiv. p. 546.



not mean, that they used those three names instead of the Trinity, but that they added the name of Montanus, or Priscilla, or Maximilla, to the Father and Son, instead of the Holy Ghost. For which reason, most probably, the council of Laodicea,<sup>1</sup> orders them to be rebaptized, notwithstanding that some of them had received a pretended ordination, and were advanced not only to the dignity of bishops, but to the title of patriarchs and *Maximi* among them, as the council of Laodicea words it. And the same decree was made against them in the first general-council of Constantinople,<sup>2</sup> and some others also. St. Jerom seems further to intimate, that these Montanists were, as to the doctrine of the Trinity, really Sabellians; for though they pretended to believe a Trinity of divine persons, yet it was but equivocally, in the same way as Sabellius had done before, whose three persons were no more but three names, or different appearances of one and the same person. Therefore St. Jerom says,<sup>3</sup> “the Montanists differed from the Catholics in the very rule of faith: for we assert Father, and Son, and Holy Ghost, every one distinct in his own person, though united in substance; but they, following the opinion of Sabellius, bring the Trinity to the narrow restraints of one person;” that is, as he explains it a little after, they said, “that God at first intended to save the world by Moses and the Prophets; but because he could not effect his design that way, he assumed a body of the Virgin, and preached in Christ, under the species of a Son, and suffered death for our sakes. And because by these two degrees he could not save the world, at last he de-

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Laodic. Can. 8.      <sup>2</sup> Con. 1. Constant. Can. 7.      <sup>3</sup> Hieron. Ep. 54. ad Marcellam adv. Montanum. Primum in Fidei Regulâ discrepamus. Nos Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum in suâ-unumquemque personâ ponimus, licet substantiâ copulemus: illi Sabellii dogma sectantes, Trinitatem in unius personæ angustias cogunt.—Aperta est convincenda blasphemia dicentium. Deum primum voluisse in Veteri Testamento per Moysen et Prophetas salvare mundum: sed quia non potuerit explere, corpus sumpsisse de Virgine, et in Christo sub specie Filii prædicantem, mortem obiisse pro nobis. Et quia per duos gradus mundum salvare nequiverit, ad extremum per Spiritum Sanctum in Montanum, Priscillam, et Maximillam insanas feminas descendisse: et plenitudinem quam Paulus non habuerit—abscisum et semivirum habuisse Montanum.

scended by the Holy Ghost into Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla; and made Montanus, who was an eunuch, and but half a man, have that plenitude of prophecy, which Paul himself could not pretend to have." From this account of St. Jerom, it is evident the Montanists in point of doctrine were really Sabellians, and believed but one person in the Godhead under different appearances, or manifestations of himself, which they called *πρόσωπα*, *persons*, in an equivocal sense; whereby they imposed upon many Catholics, and among the rest upon Theodoret,<sup>1</sup> to make them believe them sound and orthodox men, when yet they asserted three persons in no other sense, than Simon Magus, and Praxeas, and Noetus, and Sabellius, and all the Patripassians had done before them. Now it is very probable the Sabellians had introduced a new form of baptism, correspondent to their principles, for which reason all the councils that mention them order them to be rebaptized:<sup>2</sup> and the Montanists, following the doctrine of Sabellius, were liable to the same censure: so that upon all accounts it must be concluded, they had made innovations upon the form of baptism received in the Catholic Church.

SECT. 8.—Fifthly, by the Marcossians.

Another very strange form was conceived by the Marcossians, or Marcites, so called from one Marcus, a sorcerer, who taught his disciples to baptize in the name of the unknown Father<sup>3</sup> of all things, in the name of Truth, the mother of all things, and in Jesus, who descended (or as Eusebius<sup>4</sup> reads it, in him who descended into Jesus) for the union, and redemption, and communion of the principalities or powers; or in the union and redemption and communion of these powers: for it may be so understood, as if the names of these powers were taken into their form of baptism. But Irenæus, and Epiphanius from him, tell

<sup>1</sup> Theod. Hæret. Fab. lib. iii. c. 2.  
can. 7. Con. Trull. can. 95.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Con. Constant. 1.

<sup>3</sup> Theodor. Hæret. Fab. lib. i. c. 9.  
Εἰς ὄνομα ἀγνώστου πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων, εἰς ἀλήθειαν μητέρα πάντων, εἰς τὸν κατελθόντα, Ἰησοῦν, εἰς ἔνωσιν ἢ ἀπολύτρωσιν ἢ κοινωνίαν τῶν δυνάμεων. So also in Irenæus, lib. i. c. 18; and in Epiphanius Hæres. 34. <sup>4</sup> Euseb. lib. iv. c. 11. has it, εἰς τὸν κατελθόντα εἰς τὸν Ἰησοῦν.

us, they had several forms of baptism, and some of them added certain hard Hebrew names to astonish their catechumens and converts, which the inquisitive reader may find in those writers. And some of them wholly rejected baptism as useless, because the mysteries of the ineffable and invisible power were not to be performed by visible and corruptible creatures, nor intellectual and incorporeal things by those that are sensible and corporeal; but the knowledge of the ineffable greatness was a perfect redemption: and in this they agreed with the Ascodrutæ, of whom we have spoken in the last Chapter.

SECT. 9.—Sixthly, by the Paulianists.

The Paulianists, or followers of Paulus Samosatensis, bishop of Antioch, who denied the divinity of Christ, seem also to have been guilty of introducing a new form of baptism, though I do not remember any ancient writer, that tells us particularly what it was. But St. Austin concludes it must be so, because the council of Nice<sup>1</sup> made an order to receive them only by a new baptism into the Church: which he takes to be an argument, that the Paulianists had not kept to the form or rule of baptism, which many other heretics when they left the Church took along with them, and continued still to observe. Pope Innocent<sup>2</sup> likewise assigns this for the reason, why the council of Nice allowed the baptism of the Novatians, but not the Paulianists; because the Paulianists did not baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but the Novatians in their baptism always made use of those venerable names, as being in point of the divine power of the Holy Trinity, always asserters of the Catholic faith.

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Hæres. c. 44. Istos sanè Paulianos baptizandos esse in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ Nicæno Concilio constitutum est. Unde credendum est, eos regulam baptismatis non tenere, quam secum multi hæretici, cùm de Catholicâ discederent, abstulerunt, eamque custodiunt.

<sup>2</sup> Innocent. Ep. 22. ad Episcopos Macedon. cap. 5. Idcirco distinctum esse ipsis duabus hæresibus ratio manifesta declarat: Quia Paulianistæ in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti, minimè baptizant: et Novatiani iisdem tremendis venerandisque nominibus baptizant, &c.

SECT. 10.—Seventhly, by the Eunomians and others, who baptized into the Death of Christ.

Another sort of heretics there were, who instead of “Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,” used this form, “I baptize thee into the death of Christ.” Among the Apostolical Canons, there is one that particularly reflects upon this as an unlawful practice:<sup>1</sup> “If any bishop or presbyter use not three immersions in the celebration of baptism, but one only given in the death of Christ, let him be deposed; for our Lord did not say, ‘Baptize into my death:’ but, ‘Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.’” St. Paul indeed sometimes speaks of being baptized into the death of Christ; but then, as Origen has rightly observed, this does not denote any new form of baptism; for no other form of baptism was ever thought lawful,<sup>2</sup> beside that which was given in the name of the Trinity, according to the command of Christ: and the Apostle is not speaking of the manner of baptizing, but of Christ’s death, and our conforming to it, as signified in baptism; where it would not have been convenient to have said, “as many of us as have been baptized in the name of the Father, or of the Holy Ghost, have been baptized into his death:” and therefore the Apostle in prudence omitted them in that place, because it was not proper to mention either Father or Holy Ghost, where he was speaking of death, which did not belong to them, but only to Christ incarnate. Notwithstanding this just observation of Origen’s, Eunomius, the Arian, revived this irregular practice of those ancient heretics, and cast off the old form of baptism, to make way for others more agreeable to his damnable errors and opinions. For, because he denied the divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost, he would no longer use the trine immersion, nor baptize in the name of the Trinity, but only into the death of Christ, as Socrates<sup>3</sup> gives an account of his practice. Epiphanius<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Canon. Apost. c. 50. *Εἴ τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μᾶς μυσέως ἐπιτελέσῃ, ἀλλὰ ἓν βάπτισμα, τὸ εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου διδόμενον, καθαιρέσθω, &c.*

<sup>2</sup> Orig. Com. in Rom. vi. p. 540. *Cum utique non habeatur legitimum baptismum nisi sub nomine Trinitatis, &c.*

Socrat. lib. v. c. 24.

<sup>4</sup> Epiph. Hær. 76. Anomœan. p. 992.

observes of the Anomœans, who were the peculiar followers of Eunomius, that they baptized also in another form, in the name of the uncreated God, and the name of the created God, and the name of the sanctifying Spirit, created by the created Son. And so stiff were they to this form of their own inventing, that they baptized not only the Catholics, but all other sects, and even the Arians themselves, who had been otherwise baptized before them. And Gregory Nyssen tells us from Eunomius's own books, that he perverted the law of Christ, the law or tradition of the divine institution, and taught, that baptism was not to be given in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as Christ commanded his disciples when he first delivered the mystery, but<sup>1</sup> "in the name of the Creator and Maker, and not Father only, but God of the Only-begotten." Upon which he charges him with adding to the word of God, and corrupting it, because no such words as Creator or Maker of the Only-begotten, or the Son's being a creature, or the servant of God, were to be found in the words of the first institution.

SECT. II.—Whether all the Arians were guilty of the same Innovation.

But now this innovation was peculiar to the disciples of Eunomius, though Baronius<sup>2</sup> and some other learned men, bring the charge against the Arians in general, upon the mistaken authority of Athanasius and St. Jerom. Athanasius says they baptized<sup>3</sup> "in a Creator and a creature;" and St. Jerom,<sup>4</sup> "that they believed in the Father, the only true God, in Jesus Christ the Saviour and a creature, and in the Holy Ghost, the servant of them both." But they do not say, that the Arians used this form of baptism; but only that their baptism, though it was given in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was in effect, no more than if

<sup>1</sup> Nyssen. cont. Eunom. lib. xi. tom. ii. p. 706. *Μὴ εἰς Πατέρα τε καὶ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα καθὼς ἐνετείλατο τοῖς μαθηταῖς παραδίδως τὸ μυστήριον, ἀλλ' εἰς δημιουργὸν καὶ κτιστὴν, καὶ ἄ μόνον πατέρα τῷ μονογενῆς, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεον.*

<sup>2</sup> Baron. an. 325. n. 88.

<sup>3</sup> Athanas. Orat. 3. cont. Arian. tom. i.

p. 413. *Εἰς κτιστὴν καὶ κτίσμα, καὶ εἰς ποίημα καὶ ποιητὴν.*

<sup>4</sup> Hieron.

Dial. adv. Lucifer. c. 4. Arrianus cum nihil aliud crediderit—nisi in Patre solo, vero Deo, et in Jesu Christo, salvatore, creatura, et in Spiritu Sancto, utriusque servo: quomodo Spiritum Sanctum ab Ecclesiâ recipiet, qui necdum peccatorum remissionem consecutus est?

it had been given in the name of a creature, because they believed the Son and Holy Ghost to be no more than creatures. The Arians corrupted the faith, but they still retained the Catholic form of baptism, till Eunomius brought in another form among them. And that is the true reason, why both the first general-council of Constantinople,<sup>1</sup> and the council of Trullo<sup>2</sup> ordered the Eunomians to be rebaptized, at the same time that they appointed the other Arians to be received by imposition of hands only, without a new baptism. And the second council of Arles made a like decree concerning the Bonosiaci, or followers of Bonosus, bishop of Sardica, who were a branch of the Arians, "that because they retained baptism in the Catholic form, as they there<sup>3</sup> say the other Arians did, therefore it should be sufficient, after the confession of a true faith, to receive them with chrism and imposition of hands without a new baptism." Which is demonstration, that neither the ancient Arians before Eunomius, nor the Bonosians after him, had made any alteration in this matter; but though they had corrupted the faith, yet they retained the ancient form of baptizing used in the Catholic Church. For had it been otherwise, there is no question to be made, but that, as Suicerus<sup>4</sup> out of Vossius<sup>5</sup> has rightly observed, the ancient councils would have rejected their baptism, as they did the Eunomians, and ordered them to have been rebaptized upon their return to the Catholic Church. For the observation of the form of baptism was always esteemed so necessary a part of the institution, and so essential to the sacrament, that where it was wanting, the baptism was reputed an imperfect and void baptism, and to be repeated by all the rules made against heretics in the Catholic Church.

SECT. 12.—Whether any Additions were made to the Form of Baptism in the Catholic Church.

There is one question more relating to the form of bap-

<sup>1</sup> Con. Const. 1. can. 7.      <sup>2</sup> Con. Trull. can. 95.      <sup>3</sup> Con. Arelat. 2. can. 17. Bonosiacos autem ex eodem errore venientes (quos, sicut Arianos, baptazari in Trinitate manifestum est) dum interrogati fidem nostram ex toto corde confessi fuerint, Chrismate et manûs impositione in Ecclesiâ recipi sufficit.      <sup>4</sup> Suicer. Thesau. Eccles. tom. i. p. 638.      <sup>5</sup> Voss. de. Bapt. Disp. 2. p. 54.

tism, which it may not be improper to resolve in this place; that is, whether any additions were ever allowed to be made to the form of baptism in the Catholic Church? Some learned persons are of opinion, that such additions, when they were only by way of explication, and greater illustration, to confirm the truth against heretics, were used in the form of baptism, as well as in the Creed. But I think Vossius, upon better grounds of reason and authority, more judiciously determines the contrary. Two authors are commonly alleged in favour of their assertion, viz. Justin Martyr and the author of the Constitutions, but neither of them comes fully up to the thing intended. For Justin Martyr, as Vossius observes,<sup>1</sup> is only giving a paraphrastic explication of the words used in baptism for the instruction of the heathens, to whom he is writing, when he tells them how the Christians baptized in the name of the Father of all things, who was Lord and God, and in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, and of the Holy Ghost. And the Author of the Constitutions is yet more plain: for first of all, he tells every bishop and presbyter, that they ought to baptize<sup>2</sup> precisely in that form of words which our Lord enjoined us, when he said, “Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you.” And then he goes on to explain the several names of the three persons concerned, viz. “that the Father is the person who sent, Christ the person who came, and the Paraclete or Comforter the person who bears witness.” So that this was plainly an explication or paraphrase of the form of baptism only, and not the very form that was then in use. Nor can it be made appear, that ever the Catholic Church varied from the form delivered by our Saviour, though Vossius thinks a form

<sup>1</sup> Justin. Apol. 2. n. 80. p. 107. Ἐν ὀνόματι τῶν Πατρῶν τῶν ὅλων ἐξουσιάζει θεῶν, ἐξουσιάζει σωτήρος ἡμῶν Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ, ἐξουσιάζει Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, τοῦ ἐν ὑδασι τότε λυτρῶν ποιῶνται.

<sup>2</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. c. 22. Οὕτως βαπτίσεις, ὡς ὁ Κύριος διετάξατο ἡμῖν, λέγων, Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἐξουσιάζει τοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἐξουσιάζει τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος—τοῦ ἀποστείλαντος Πατρὸς, τοῦ ἐλθόντος Χριστοῦ, τοῦ μερτηρήσαντος Παρακλήτου.

with such an orthodox addition would not destroy the essence of baptism, as those heretical forms certainly do, which corrupt the truth of the Catholic faith.

#### CHAP. IV.

*Of the Subjects of Baptism, or an Account of what Persons were anciently allowed to be baptized. Where particularly of Infant-Baptism.*

SECT. 1.—Why the Question about the Administrators of Baptism is here omitted.

HAVING spoken of the matter and form of baptism, I should now have considered the persons by whom this sacrament was anciently administered; but because I have lately had occasion to handle this subject fully in a scholastical way in two distinct discourses,<sup>1</sup> it will be sufficient in this place to give this summary account of the matter. There I have showed, that bishops, as the Apostles' successors, were the persons chiefly entrusted with this power; that they granted power to presbyters to baptize in ordinary cases; to deacons sometimes in ordinary, and sometimes only in extraordinary cases; to laymen only in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity; that the usurped baptism of laymen was allowed to be valid, so far as not to need repeating, though given irregularly; that the baptism of women was wholly prohibited; that the baptism of Jews and Infidels was never allowed, though now accepted in the Church of Rome; that the baptism of heretics and schismatics was disannulled by the Cyprianists, and some few others, who required a true faith, as well as a true form, to make a complete baptism; but that this opinion was rejected by the great body of the Catholic Church, who thought the defects of heretical baptism might be supplied by imposition of hands without rebaptizing; that yet it was agreed, both by the Cyprianists and all others whatsoever, that heretics and schismatics had

---

<sup>1</sup> Scholastical History of Lay-Baptism, 1st and 2d Part, 1712 and 1714. To be republished at the end of this work.



not the power of priests, because some of them, as the Novatians, never had a just and legal call to the priesthood; and others were deprived of their power by the lawful authority of the Church, which first committed that power to them; that thenceforward they were reputed, not true Christian priests, but wolves and Anti-christs, instead of true shepherds and governors of the flock of Christ; that the Church had power, not only to suspend the execution of their office, but to cancel their commission, and wholly take away the power and authority of the priesthood from them; and then they were reduced to the state and condition of laymen; and sometimes they were not only degraded from the priesthood, but thrust down one degree below laymen, by being anathematized and cast out of the communion of the Church: and yet, notwithstanding all this, the Church did not think fit to cancel or wholly disannul the baptisms given by such men, though given by usurpation and without any authority of the priesthood, so long as it appeared, they were given in due form, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. All which things being abundantly proved in the two foresaid discourses, I think it not proper to repeat or insist any longer upon them; but shall now proceed, as the order of the discourse requires, to consider the persons on whom baptism was anciently conferred.

SECT. 2.—Who were anciently reckoned the proper Subjects of Baptism.

Where of the corrupt Custom of baptizing inanimate Things, as Bells in the Roman Church.

And here first of all, it is certain, that none but living persons, whether adult or infants, and that in their own personal capacity, were ever reckoned subjects capable of baptism in the primitive Church. The Ancients knew nothing of that profane custom of giving baptism to inanimate things, as bells and the like, by a superstitious consecration of them. The first notice we have of this is in the Capitulars of Charles the Great,<sup>1</sup> where it is only mentioned to be censured: but afterward it crept into the

---

<sup>1</sup> Capitular. Caroli Magni, cited by Durantus de Ritib. Eccl. lib. i. c. 22. n. 2. Ut Cloacas non baptizent.

Roman offices by degrees, (as I have noted in another place<sup>1</sup> out of Baronius, Cardinal Bona, and Menardus,) till at last it grew to that superstitious height, as to be thought proper to be complained of in the *Centum Gravamina* of the German nation, drawn up in the public diet of the empire held at Norimberg, Anno 1518; where, after having described the ceremony of baptizing a bell with godfathers, who make responses, as in baptism, and give it a name, and clothe it with a new garment, as Christians were used to be clothed, and all this to make it capable of driving away tempests and devils they conclude<sup>2</sup> against it, as not only a superstitious practice, but contrary to the Christian religion, and a mere seduction of the simple people, and an exaction upon them: for which reason, they declare, so wicked and unlawful a custom ought to be abolished. He that would see more of this, may consult Hospinian,<sup>3</sup> or Wolfius,<sup>4</sup> or Sleidan,<sup>5</sup> who describe the ceremony at large out of the old Romish Pontifical; for I must return to the primitive Church.

SECT. 3.—Baptism not to be given to the Dead.

And here we meet with a practice a little more ancient, but not less superstitious than the former: which was a custom, that began to prevail among some weak people in Afric, of giving baptism to the dead. The third council of Carthage<sup>6</sup> speaks of it, as a thing that ignorant Christians were a little fond of, and therefore gives a seasonable caution against it, to discourage the practice: and this is again repeated in the African Code.<sup>7</sup> Gregory Nazianzen<sup>8</sup> also takes notice of the same superstitious opinion

<sup>1</sup> See Origin. vol. iii. book viii. chap. vii. p. 240. <sup>2</sup> Centum Gravam. n. 51. in Fasciculo Rer. Expetend. tom. i. p. 366. Quæ res non solum superstitiosa, sed etiam Christianæ religioni contraria, ac simpliciorum seductio, et mera est exactio.—Res igitur tam nefanda et illicita meritò aboleri debet.

<sup>3</sup> Hospin. de Templis. lib. iv. c. 9. p. 113. <sup>5</sup> Sleidan, Commentar. lib. xxi. p. 388.

<sup>4</sup> Wolfius, Lection. Memorabil. Centur. 16. an. 1550. <sup>6</sup> Con. Carth. iii. can. 6. Cavendum, ne mortuos baptizari posse fratrum infirmitas credat.

<sup>7</sup> Cod. Eccles. Afr. can. 18. Μὴ τὰς ἡδὴ τελευτώντας βαπτισθῆναι ποιήσῃ ἡ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἄγνοια. <sup>8</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. p. 64S. "Ἢ εἰ σὸ μὲνεις νεκρὸς λαθῆναι; εἰ μᾶλλον ἠλεόμενος ἢ μισόμενος.

prevailing among some who delayed to be baptized. In his address to this kind of men, he asks them whether they stayed to be baptized after death? and doubts upon this account whether to esteem them greater objects of pity or contempt. Philastrius also<sup>1</sup> notes it as the general error of the Montanists or Cataphrygians, “that they baptized men after death.” The practice seems to be grounded upon a vain opinion, that when men had neglected to receive baptism in their life time, some compensation might be made for this default by receiving it after death. And for the same reason they gave the eucharist also to the dead in the like circumstances, which is equally condemned in the forementioned African Canons, as proceeding from gross ignorance in some presbyters, and want of a due understanding of the true intent and meaning of those holy institutions; for whose information they order provincial councils to be held twice a year, that they might be better instructed.

SECT. 4.—Nor to the Living for the Dead. Where of the Apostles meaning of being baptized for the Dead, 1 Cor. xv. 29.

Another absurd practice, prevailing among some of the ancient heretics, was a sort of vicarious baptism, which was, that when any one died without baptism, another was baptized in his stead. St. Chrysostom tells us<sup>2</sup> this was practised among the Marcionites with a great deal of ridiculous ceremony, which he thus describes: “After any catechumen was dead, they hid a living man under the bed of the deceased, then coming to the dead man, they spake to him, and asked him whether he would receive baptism? and he making no answer, the other answered for him, and said, he would be baptized in his stead, and so they baptized the living for the dead, as if they were acting a comedy upon the stage, so great was the power of Satan in the minds of these vain men.” Afterward when any one challenged them upon this practice, they had the confidence to plead the Apostle’s authority for it, ‘Why are they then

---

<sup>1</sup> Philastr. de Hæres. c. 2. de Cataphry. *Hi mortuos baptizant, &c.*

<sup>2</sup> Chrys. Hom. 40. in 1 Cor. p. 688.

baptized for the dead?' Against which St. Chrysostom urges very well, "that if this were allowed, in vain had God threatened those that died unbaptized: for by this means any Jew or Gentile might easily be made a Christian, by having another after his death baptized for him." Tertullian brings the same charge against the Marcionites,<sup>1</sup> comparing their practice to the heathen lustrations for the dead upon the Kalends of February; but he tells them, "they did but in vain allege the Apostle's authority for this practice, as if he had argued from it for the truth and confirmation of the resurrection: for the Apostle speaks of but one baptism, and that was of the living for themselves." He reflects upon the same practice in another place,<sup>2</sup> where he calls it "the vicarious baptism, which some used in hopes of the resurrection." Suicerus thinks the Cerinthians were the first authors of this kind of baptism, and that indeed would carry it up to the Apostles' time. But Epiphanius, on whose authority he depends, says no such thing, as from any certain proof, or his own judgment, but only "that there was an uncertain tradition handed down to them, concerning some heretics in Asia in the Apostles' days,<sup>3</sup> who, when any one died without baptism, substituted another in his room, to be baptized for him, lest in the resurrection he should be punished for want of baptism, and be subjected to the powers which made the world." And the same tradition asserted, that the Apostle hence took occasion to say, "if the dead rise not, why are they then baptized for the dead?" But Epiphanius wholly rejects this opinion, nor do we find any of the Ancients so interpreting this passage of the Apostle, except only the author under the name of St. Ambrose, who is clearly of opinion, that

---

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. cont. Marcion. lib. v. c. 10. Viderit institutio ista, Kalendæ si forte Februariæ respondebunt illi pro mortuis petere. Noli ergò apostolum novum statim auctorem aut confirmatorem eum denotare, ut tanto magis sisteret carnis resurrectionem, quanto illi qui vanè pro mortuis baptizarentur, fide resurrectionis hoc faerent. Habemus illum alicubi unius baptismi definitorem.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Resur. Carnis. e. 48. Si autem et baptizantur quidam pro mortuis, videbimus an ratione. Certè illâ præsumptione hoc eos instituisse contendit, quâ alii etiam carni vicarium baptismum profuturum existimarent ad spem resurrectionis.

<sup>3</sup> Epiphian. Hærcs. 28.

Cerinthian. n. 6.

the Apostle had respect to such a custom then in being, and thence drew an argument from the example<sup>1</sup> of those, who were so firmly persuaded of the truth of the future resurrection, that when any one among them was prevented by sudden death, they had another to be baptized in his name, fearing lest he should either not rise at all, or rise to condemnation. But St. Chrysostom gives a much more rational account of the Apostle's argument; for he supposes him to refer to the Catholic custom of making every catechumen at his baptism with his own mouth declare his belief of the resurrection of the dead, by repeating the Creed, of which that was a part, and so being baptized into that faith, or hope of the resurrection of the dead. And therefore he puts them in mind of this, saying,<sup>3</sup> "If there be no resurrection of the dead, why art thou then baptized for the dead, that is, the body? for therefore thou art baptized for the dead, believing the resurrection of the dead, that the body may not remain dead, but revive again." So that baptizing for the dead is an elliptical expression, for being baptized into the faith or belief of the resurrection of the dead. And so I think Tertullian<sup>3</sup> is to be understood, when he says, in opposition to the error of the Marcionites, "that to be baptized for the dead, is to be baptized for the body which is declared to be dead by baptism:" that is, we are baptized into the belief of the resurrection of the body, both whose death and resurrection are represented in baptism. And the interpretation of Epiphanius comes pretty near these, when he says,<sup>4</sup> "it refers to those who were baptized upon the approach of death in hopes of the resurrection from the dead; for they showed thereby that the dead should rise again, and that therefore they had need of the remission of sins, which is obtained in baptism." The

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. Com. in 1 Cor. xv. Exemplum eorum subjicit, qui tam securi erant de futurâ resurrectione, ut etiam pro mortuis baptizarentur. Si quem forte mors prævenisset, timentes, ne aut malè, aut non resurgeret, qui baptizatus non fuerat, vivus nomine mortui tingebatur.

<sup>2</sup> Chrys. Hom. 40. in 1 Cor. p. 689. *Εἰ μὴ ἔσω ἀνάστασις, τί δὲ βαπτίζω ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν, ἡτέστι, τῶν σωμάτων; δὲ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ βαπτίζῳ, τῷ νεκρῷ σώματος ἀνάστασιν πιστεύων, ὅτι ἐκέτι μένει νεκρόν.*

<sup>3</sup> Tertul. cont. Marcion. lib. v. c. 10. Igitur et pro mortuis tingui, est pro corporibus tingui; mortuum enim corpus ostendimus.

<sup>4</sup> Epiphian. Hæc. 28. n. 6.

same sense is given by Theodoret<sup>1</sup> and Theophylact,<sup>2</sup> and Balsamon and Zonaras,<sup>3</sup> and Matthew Blastares<sup>4</sup> among the Greeks; and it is embraced by Bp. Patrick,<sup>5</sup> and Dr. Hammond,<sup>6</sup> as the most natural and genuine exposition of this difficult passage of the Apostle. Some indeed think it may refer to another custom of baptizing over the monuments of the martyrs, who died for the faith in hopes of a future resurrection. But that custom was hardly ancient enough to be alluded to in the time of the Apostles, though Vossius,<sup>7</sup> and some other learned men incline to this opinion. However it be, it is not likely the Apostle would draw an argument from the absurd practice of the worst of heretics: therefore whatever interpretation be thought most proper and worthy to be received, that is certainly to be rejected, together with the error of the Marcionites, who founded their vicarious baptism upon the authority of this apostolical passage, contrary to the sense and practice of the whole Catholic Church, which never allowed of baptism given to the living for the dead, or of any baptism but such as was given to men in their own persons.

SECT. 5.—Proofs of Infant-Baptism from the Ancient Records of the Church.

Now of persons, who were reckoned capable of receiving baptism, there were two sorts, infants and adult persons. And infants were of two sorts, either such as were born of Christian parents, or such as were born of Heathens, but by some providential means became the possession and property, as I may call it, of the Christian Church; neither of which sort were excluded from baptism, when sufficient sponsors could be provided for them. This is so evident from the ancient records of the Church, that it is to be wondered, how some learned persons could run into the contrary opinion, and offer reasons from antiquity, in prejudice of the Church's constant practice. Mr. Wall,

<sup>1</sup> Theodor. Com. in 1 Cor. xv. 29.

<sup>2</sup> Theophyl. in eundem Loc.

<sup>3</sup> Balsamon. in Can. 18. Con. Carthag. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. tom. i. p. 541.

<sup>4</sup> Blastar. Syntag. Canon. ibid. tom. ii. p. 41.

<sup>5</sup> Patrick. Aqua Genitalis, p. 453.

<sup>6</sup> Hammond in 1 Cor. xv. 29.

<sup>7</sup> Voss. Thes.

Theol. Disp. 15. p. 225.

in his elaborate discourse of Infant-Baptism,<sup>1</sup> has justly reflected upon abundance of these men, who, by their unwary concessions, have given too great advantage to the Anabaptists of this age. There are some others also, which he had not seen, who advance as unworthy notions of the ancient practice; for Salmasius, and Suicerus<sup>2</sup> out of him, deliver it as authentic history, that for the two first ages no one received baptism, who was not first instructed in the faith and doctrine of Christ, so as to be able to answer for himself, that he believed, because of those words, "He that believeth and is baptized:" which in effect is to say, that no infant for the two first ages, was ever admitted to Christian baptism. But afterwards they own pædo-baptism came in, upon the opinion that baptism was necessary to salvation. Now I shall not think myself obliged to be very prolix in refuting this opinion, together with the false supposition which is made the foundation of it, since that has so often, and so substantially been done by Vossius,<sup>3</sup> Dr. Forbes,<sup>4</sup> Dr. Hammond,<sup>5</sup> Mr. Walker,<sup>6</sup> and especially Mr. Wall,<sup>7</sup> who has exactly considered the testimony and authority of almost every ancient writer that has said any thing upon this subject. But that no one who reads these collections, may be wholly at a loss for want of other authors, I shall here subjoin a brief account of the most pertinent authorities that occur in the three first ages.

SECT. 6.—From Clemens Romanus and Hermes Pastor.

The most ancient writer we have is Clemens Romanus, who lived in the time of the Apostles. And he, though he does not directly mention infant-baptism, yet says a thing that by consequence proves it. For he makes infants liable

---

<sup>1</sup> Wall, Hist. of Infant-Baptism, par. ii. Chap. ii. <sup>2</sup> Suicer.  
 Thesaur. Eccles. tom. ii. p. 1136. *Primis duobus sæculis nemo baptismum accipiebat, nisi qui in fide instructus, et doctrinâ Christi imbutus, testari posset, se credere, propter illa verba, ' Qui crediderit, et baptizatus fuerit.'—Posteâ opinio invaluit, ' Neminem salvari posse, nisi qui baptizatus fuisset.'*  
<sup>3</sup> Voss. de Bapt. Disp. 14. <sup>4</sup> Forbes, Instruct. Hist. Theol. lib. x. c. 5.  
<sup>5</sup> Hammond, Def. of Infant-Bapt. c. 4.  
<sup>6</sup> Walker, Plea for Infant-Baptism, c. 27, &c. <sup>7</sup> Wall, Hist. of Infant-Baptism, par. i. c. 1, &c.

to original sin, which in effect is to say, that they have need of baptism to purge them from it; for speaking of Job, he says, “though he was a just man, yet he<sup>1</sup> condemns himself, saying, ‘there is none free from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one day.’” Now if children be born in sin, they have need of a regeneration to make them capable of the kingdom of heaven. Hermes Pastor, lived about the same time with Clemens, and has several passages to show the general necessity of water, that is, baptism, to save men. In one place he represents the Church as a tower built on the waters, and says,<sup>2</sup> “hear therefore why the tower is built on waters; because your life is saved, and shall be saved by water.” In another place he makes water-baptism so necessary to all, that in a vision he represents the Apostles as going after death<sup>3</sup> to baptize the holy spirits who lived under the Old Testament, that they might be translated into the kingdom of God. “It was necessary,” says he, “for them to ascend by water that they might be at rest; for they could not otherwise enter into the kingdom of God, than by putting off the mortality of their former life. They therefore, after they were dead, were sealed with the seal of the Son of God, and so entered into the kingdom of God: for before any one receives the name of the Son of God, he is liable to death; but when he receives that seal, he is delivered from death, and is assigned to life: now that seal is water, into which men descend bound over unto death, but ascend out of it assigned unto life. For this reason the seal was also preached unto them, and they made use of it, that they might enter into

<sup>1</sup> Clem. Rom. Ep. I. ad Corinth. n. 17. *Αὐτος ἑαυτῆ κατηγορῶν λέγει, εἰς εἰς καθαρὸς ἀπο ῥύπτου, εἰς εἰ μίαις ἡμέρας ἢ ζωὴ αὐτῆ.* <sup>2</sup> Hermes

Pastor, lib. i. Vision iii. c. 3. Quare igitur super aquas ædificatur turris, audi. Quoniam vita vestra per aquam salva facta est et fiet. <sup>3</sup> Id.

lib. iii. Simil. 9. n. 16. Necessè est ut per aquam habeant ascendere, ut requiescant: non poterant enim aliter in regnum Dei intrare, quàm ut deponerent mortalitatem prioris vitæ. Illi igitur defuncti sigillo Filii Dei signati sunt, et intraverunt in regnum Dei. Antequam enim accipiat homo nomen Filii Dei, mortì destinatus est: at ubi accipit illud sigillum, liberatur à morte, et traditur vitæ. Illud autem sigillum aqua est, in quam descendunt homines mortì obligati, ascendunt vero vitæ assignati. Et illis igitur prædicatum est illud sigillum, et usi sunt eo, ut intrarent in regnum Dei.



the kingdom of God." The plain design of this place, is to represent the necessity of baptism, without which, none can ordinarily enter into the kingdom of God. And it cannot be doubted, that he who thought it so necessary, even for the Patriarchs, who died before the coming of Christ, must think it equally necessary to all those who lived under the dispensation of the Gospel. Though, whether the baptism here mentioned, be to be understood in a literal and corporeal sense, or only in a metaphorical or mystical way, as a vision or a parable may require, is what may admit of some dispute. And therefore Cotelerius<sup>1</sup> gives his opinion for the latter sense, concluding, that forasmuch as washing in water properly belongs to bodies and not to spirits, our author is necessarily to be understood of a metaphorical and mystical baptism, that is, the spiritual effects of it, the good things which are conferred by God in baptism, the chief of which is a title to eternal life, which the patriarchs after death are supposed to be made partakers of by believing the word of the Gospel then preached to them. This was that spiritual water, in which departed souls were baptized, as the bodies of the living are baptized in common water; from the analogy of which we must needs conclude the necessity of water-baptism for all those who are in a capacity to receive it, that is, for all those who are yet in the body, in order to be made partakers of eternal life. God indeed may, if he pleases, give the baptism of the Spirit, and the baptism of faith, which is the baptism of the Word, without it: and so some of the Ancients suppose the Apostles to be baptized without water, from that saying of our Saviour, "Now ye are clean, through the word which I have spoken unto you." So Tertullian<sup>2</sup> and others: though the more general opinion is,<sup>3</sup> that they were baptized by Christ himself. In like manner God might dispense with the want of water-baptism in cases extraordi-

---

<sup>1</sup> Coteler. in Loc. p. 117. Quandoquidem lavatio corporibus competit, non animis, noster necessariò intelligit baptismum metaphoricum et mysticum, bona videlicet quæ in baptisinate à Deo conceduntur. <sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. c. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Vid. Augustin. Ep. 108. Anonymus auctor de non iterando baptismo ad calcem Cypriani, p. 23. Edit. Oxon. It. Clem. Alex. Hypotypos. lib. v. ap. Johan. Moschum Prat. Spiritual. c. 176.

nary, and supply this want either by martyrdom, or faith and repentance, in such cases where it could not be had; as I have showed, in the last Book, the general consent of the Ancients<sup>1</sup> upon this matter to be. But yet in all ordinary cases, where water-baptism might be had, they concluded as generally for the necessity of it, from that assertion of our Saviour, “Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” This was not only a doctrine of the third or fourth ages, as Salmasius and Suicerus represent, but the doctrine of the very first ages immediately succeeding the Apostles: for we see Hermes Pastor, who lived in the apostolical age, founds the general necessity of baptism upon that very saying of our Saviour. And therefore they who represent this doctrine of the necessity of baptism, as a novelty or an error, first introduced into the Church in the age of St. Austin against the Pelagian heretics, do manifest wrong both to the doctrine itself, and to St. Austin, and to the Ancients, who embraced and delivered the same before him. And it gives an unnecessary advantage to the anti-pædobaptists, which a right understanding of this matter absolutely takes from them. I thought it therefore of some use to observe this against Salmasius and Suicerus, and to add it to the observations which Mr. Wall has made upon Hermes Pastor.

SECT. 7.—From Justin Martyr.

Another ancient writer, who lived within the compass of the second century, was Justin Martyr, who very plainly speaks of infant-baptism as used from the time of the Apostles. For in one of his Apologies he takes occasion to say,<sup>2</sup> “there were among Christians in his time many persons of both sexes, some sixty, and some seventy years old, who had been made disciples to Christ from their infancy, and continued virgins or uncorrupted all their lives.” Now Justin wrote this Apology about the year 148, in the middle of the second century, and therefore those

<sup>1</sup> See Book x. chap. ii. sect. 20.

<sup>2</sup> Justin. Apol. ii. p. 62. *Kai πολλοί τινες ἢ πολλὰ ἐξηκουῦνται ἢ ἑβδομηκοντῆται, οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἑμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ, ἄφθοροι διαμένεσι.*

whom he speaks of as baptized sixty or seventy years before in their infancy, must be persons baptized in the first age, while some of the Apostles were living. In another place of the same Apology<sup>1</sup> he urges these words of our Saviour, Joh. iii. 35. "Except ye be regenerated, or born again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven," to prove the necessity of baptism. And in his Dialogue with Trypho, the Jew, he speaks of the whole progeny of Adam as liable to death<sup>2</sup> and the deception of the Serpent, by reason of Adam's sin, beside the particular guilt which each man contracts by actual sin in his own person. Now if all mankind be born with original sin, this extends to infants, who have need of regeneration, or baptism, to free them from it. And this assertion in Justin by consequence proves the necessity of baptism for infants, as well as others, that they may have redemption from original sin. In another place of the same Dialogue<sup>3</sup> he makes baptism parallel to circumcision, saying, "We have not received that carnal circumcision, but the spiritual circumcision, which Enoch and those like him observed. And we have received it by baptism, through the mercy of God, because we were sinners; and it is incumbent on all persons to receive it in the same way." Now if baptism be answerable to circumcision, and succeed in its room, and be necessary to be received as the means to obtain the true circumcision of the Spirit; then as infants were admitted to circumcision, so they were to be admitted to baptism, that being the ordinary means of applying the mercy of the Gospel to them, and cleansing them from the guilt of original sin.

SECT. 8.—And the Author of the Recognitions, contemporary with Justin Martyr.

Next after Justin Martyr, I subjoin the ancient author of

<sup>1</sup> Justin. Apol. ii. p. 94.    <sup>2</sup> Justin. Dial. c. Tryph. p. 315. Τὸ γένος τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπο τῆ Ἀδάμ ὑπὸ θάνατον ἐκ πλάνην τῆ Ὁφείως ἐπεπτώκει, παρὰ τὸν ἴδιαν αἰτίαν ἐκάστῃ αὐτῶν πονηρευσαμένῃς.

<sup>3</sup> Justin. Dial. p. 261. Οὐ ταύτην τὴν κατὰ σάρκα περιλάβομεν περιτομὴν, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴν, ἣν ἐνώχ ἐκ οἰ ὅμοιοι ἐφύλαξαν. ἡμεῖς δὲ διὰ τῆ βαπτίσματος αὐτῆν, ἐπειδὴ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἐγεγόναμεν, διὰ τὸ ἔλεος τὸ παρὰ τῆ Θεῶ ἐλάβομεν, ἐκ πᾶσιν ἐφετὸν ὁμοίως λαμβάνειν.

the book called, *The Recognitions, or Travels of St. Peter*; because, though it be not the genuine work of Clemens Romanus, whose name it borrowed, yet it is an ancient writing of the same age with Justin Martyr, mentioned by Origen in his *Philocalia*, and by some ascribed to Bardesanes Syrus, who lived about the middle of the second century. This author speaks of the necessity of baptism in the very same style as Justin Martyr did, making it universally necessary to purge away original sin, and to qualify men for the kingdom of Heaven. For, putting an objection by way of question, “what does baptism by water<sup>1</sup> contribute toward the worship of God?” he answers, “First, that it is fulfilling that which is the will and pleasure of God. Then, secondly, the man that is regenerated by water, and born again to God, is thereby freed from the weakness of his first nativity, which comes to him by man: and so he is made capable of salvation, which he could not otherwise obtain. For so the true prophet, (meaning Christ,) has testified with an oath, saying ‘Verily, I say unto you, except one be born again of water, he shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven.’” This author indeed does not speak particularly of the baptism of infants, but his reasons are such, as show his discourse to extend to them. For if baptism be necessary upon these two accounts, first, to cut off concupiscence, or original sin, which is the infirmity of our first birth; and then to qualify us to enter into the kingdom of God; these are general reasons for baptism, which make it necessary for infants as well as any other, since according to this author, they are born in original sin, and cannot enter into the kingdom of God, till that sin be purged away by the waters of baptism. Here then we have another author within the compass of the two first ages, directly confronting that assertion of Salmasius and Suicerus, “that the doctrine of

---

<sup>1</sup> Recognition. lib. vi. n. 9. p. 551. ap. Coteler. tom. i. Quid confert aquæ baptismus ad Dei cultum? Primò quidem, quia quod Deo placuit impletur; secundò, quia regenerato ex aquis, et Deo renato, fragilitas prioris nativitatæ, quæ tibi per hominem facta est, amputatur; et ita demum pervenire poteris ad salutem: aliter verò impossibile est. Sic enim nobis cum sacramento verus propheta testatus est, dicens; ‘Amen dico vobis, nisi quis denuò renatus fuerit ex aquâ, non intrabit in regnum cœlorum.’ This is repeated in the *Græek Clementines*. Hom. 11. n. 26. p. 698.

the necessity of baptism to salvation, was not the doctrine of the two first ages, but only an opinion taken up afterwards, upon which foundation the practice of infant-baptism was introduced into the Church." For no one can, or ever did, declare himself plainer for the necessity of baptism to salvation, than this author does, from the words of our Saviour Christ, which he interprets, as all the Ancients both before and after him did, of the ordinary necessity of water-baptism to salvation. So that if infant-baptism was founded, as Salmasius pleads, upon the opinion of the necessity of baptism to salvation; this author must be an asserter of infant-baptism, because he was undeniably an asserter of the general necessity of baptism to salvation. I have the rather insisted a little upon this author's meaning, because I know not whether his testimony has been produced before in this cause by any other.

SECT. 9.—And Irenæus.

Not long after the time of Justin Martyr and the author last mentioned, lived Irenæus, bishop of Lyons, who, as Mr. Dodwel evidently shows,<sup>1</sup> and Dr. Cave from him,<sup>2</sup> was born in the latter end of the first century, about the year 97, and was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of St. John. About the year 176, he wrote his book against heresies, being then near eighty years old, and died not many years after. So that he must needs be a competent witness of the Church's sense and practice upon this point during the second century. Now there are three things relating to this matter, which appear very evident from him. First, that the Church then believed the doctrine of original sin. Secondly, that the ordinary means of purging away this sin was baptism. Thirdly, that children, as well as others, were then actually baptized to obtain remission of sins, and apply the redemption of Christ to them. For the doctrine of original sin, he sometimes calls it the sin<sup>3</sup> of our first

<sup>1</sup> Dodwel. Dissert. in Iren.

<sup>2</sup> Cave, Hist. Liter. vol. i. p. 41.

<sup>3</sup> Irenæ. lib. v. c. 19. *Protoplasti peccatum per corruptionem Primogeniti emendationem accipiens.*—*Vinculis illis resolutis, per quæ alligati eramus morti.*

parents, which was done away in Christ, by his loosing the bonds wherein we were held and bound over unto death: the sin whereby we offended God<sup>1</sup> in the first Adam, by disobeying his command, but were reconciled to God in the second Adam by obedience unto death. So that infants, as well as others, were under the guilt of this sin, and had need of a redeemer with the rest of mankind, to deliver them from it. Now the ordinary way of being freed from this original guilt, he says, is baptism, which is our regeneration,<sup>2</sup> or new birth unto God. And this he expressly affirms to be administered to children as well as adult persons. "For," says he, "Christ<sup>3</sup> came to save all persons by himself; all, I say, who by him are regenerated unto God,—infants, and little ones, and children, and youths, and elder persons. Therefore he went through the several ages, being made an infant for infants, that he might sanctify infants; and for little ones, he was made a little one, to sanctify them of that age also." No art can elude this passage, so long as it is owned, that regeneration means baptism. And for this we have the explication of Irenæus himself, who calls baptism by the name of regeneration; and so all the Ancients commonly do, as Suicerus, against whom I am now disputing, scruples not to own, alleging Justin Martyr,<sup>4</sup> Chrysostom, and Gregory Nyssen to this purpose. Which fully evinces infant-baptism in the age of Irenæus, that is, in the second century, to have been the common practice of the Church.

SECT. 10.—And Tertullian.

In the latter end of the second century and beginning of the third lived Tertullian, presbyter of the Church of Carthage, who though he had some singular notions about

<sup>1</sup> Irenæ. lib. v. c. 16. Deum in primo quidem Adam offendimus, non facientes ejus præceptum, in secundo autem Adam reconciliati sumus, obedi-  
entes usque ad mortem facti.

<sup>2</sup> Id. lib. i. c. 18. Τὸ βάπτισμα τῆς

εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, &c

<sup>3</sup> Id. lib. ii. c. 39. Omnes venit per

semetipsum salvare: omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum; infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores. Ideò per omnem venit ætatem, et infantibus infans factus; sanctificans infantes: in parvulis parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes ætatem, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Suicer.

Thesaur. Eccles. Voce, Ἀναγέννησις, tom. i. p. 243.

this matter, yet he sufficiently testifies the Church's practice. In his own private opinion he was for deferring the baptism of infants, especially where there was no danger of death, till they came to years of discretion. But he so argues for this, as to show us that the practice of the Church was otherwise: "For," says he,<sup>1</sup> "according to every one's condition and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of baptism is more advantageous, especially in the case of little children. For what need is there that the godfathers should be brought into danger? because they may either fail of their promises by death, or they may be deceived by a child's proving of wicked disposition. Our Lord says indeed, 'Do not forbid them to come unto me.' Let them come therefore when they are grown up: let them come when they can learn; when they can be taught whither it is they come: let them be made Christians, when they can know Christ. What need their innocent age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins? men proceed more cautiously in worldly things: and he that is not trusted with earthly goods, shall he be trusted with divine? Let them know how to ask salvation, that you may appear to give it to one that asketh. For no less reason unmarried persons ought to be delayed, because they are exposed to temptations, as well virgins that are come to maturity, as those that are in widowhood by the loss of a consort, until they either marry or be confirmed in continence." The way of Tertullian's arguing upon this point shows plainly that he was for introducing a new practice; that, therefore, it was the custom of the Church in his time to give baptism to infants, as well as adult persons: and his arguments tend

---

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Baptismo, c. 18. Pro cujusque personæ conditione ad dispositione, etiam ætate, cunctatio baptismi utilior est, præcipuè tamen circa parvulos. Quid enim necesse est sponsos etiam periculo ingeri? Quia et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possint, et proventu malæ indolis falli. Ait quidem Dominus, 'Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire.' Veniant ergo dum adolescent, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniunt docentur: fiant Christiani, dum Christum nôsse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum? Cautiùs agetur in sæcularibus; ut cui substantia terrena non creditur, divina credatur! Nôrint petere salutem, ut petenti dedisse videaris. Non minori de causâ innupti quoque procastinandi, in quibus tentatio præparata est; tam virginibus per maturitatem, quàm viduis per vacationem, donec aut nubant, aut continentiam corroborentur.

not only to exclude infants, but all persons that are unmarried or in widowhood, for fear of temptation. Which are rules that no one beside himself ever thought of, much less were they confirmed by any Church's practice. But even this advice of Tertullian, as singular as it was, seems only calculated for cases where there was no danger or apprehensions of death: for otherwise he pleads as much for the necessity of baptism as any other, both from those words of our Saviour,<sup>1</sup> "Except one be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven;" as also from the general corruption of original sin, which renders every son of Adam unclean till he be made a Christian: which is only done in baptism; for men are not born Christians, but made so. And therefore in case of necessity, he thought every Christian had power to give baptism, rather than any person should die without it. Which seems to imply, that his opinion for delaying baptism, whether of infants or others, respected only such cases, where there was no danger of death; but even in those cases the practice of the Church was otherwise, for she baptized infants as soon as they were born, though without any imminent danger of death, as appears from Tertullian's discourse itself who laboured to make an innovation, but without any success; for the same practice continued in the Church in the following ages.

SECT. 11.—And Origen.

Origen lived in the beginning of the third century, and nothing can be plainer than the testimonies alleged from him. In one place he says, "every one is born in original sin;" which he thus proves from the words of David, saying, "I was conceived in iniquity, and in sin did my mother bear me;"<sup>2</sup> showing, that every soul that is born

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Anima, c. 40. De Bapt. c. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Orig. Hom. 8. in Levit. tom. i. p. 145. Audi David dicentem, 'in iniquitatibus,' inquit, 'conceptus sum, et in peccatis peperit me mater mea,' ostendens, quod quæcunque anima in carne nascatur, iniquitatis et peccati sorde polluitur: et propterea dictum esse illud, quod jam superius memoravimus; 'quia nemo mundus à sorde, nec si unius dici fuerit vita ejus.' Adde his etiam illud potest, ut requiratur quid causæ sit, cum baptisma Ecclesiæ in remissionem peccatorum detur,



in the flesh is polluted with the filth of sin and iniquity; and that therefore it was said, as we mentioned before, “that none is clean from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one day.” Besides all this, it may be inquired, what is the reason, why the baptism of the Church, which is given for remission of sins, is by the custom of the Church given to infants also? whereas if there were nothing in infants that wanted remission and indulgence, the grace of baptism might seem needless to them. In another place he says,<sup>1</sup> “infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins.” Of what sins? or when did they commit them? or how can any reason be given for baptizing them, but only according to that sense which we mentioned a little before;—“none is free from pollution, though his life be but the length of one day upon the earth.” And for that reason infants are baptized, because by the sacrament of baptism, the pollution of our birth is taken away: and, “Except one be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of Heaven.” Where he not only makes infant-baptism the practice of the Church, but derives it from divine institution. As he does in another place from apostolical tradition:<sup>2</sup> for he affirms, that the Church received the order of baptizing infants from the Apostles. For they to whom the divine mysteries were committed, knew that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be washed away by water and the Spirit; by reason of which the body itself is also called the body of sin.

---

secundum Ecclesiæ observantiam etiam parvulis baptismum dari? Cùm utique si nihil esset in parvulis quod ad remissionem deberet et indulgentiam pertinere, gratia baptismi superflua videretur.

<sup>1</sup> Orig. in Luc. Hom 14. tom. ii. p. 223. Parvuli baptizantur in remissionem peccatorum. Quorum peccatorum? vel quo tempore peccaverunt? aut quomodo potest ulla lavacri in parvulis ratio subsistere, nisi, juxta illum sensum de quo paulo ante diximus, ‘Nullus mundus à sorde, nec si unius diei quidem fuerit vita ejus super terram.’ Et quia per baptismi sacramentum natiuitatis sordes deponuntur, propterea baptizantur et parvuli. Nisi enim quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ et Spiritu, non potest intrare in regnum cœlorum.

<sup>2</sup> Id. in Rom. lib. v. cap. 6. p. 543. Ecclesia ab Apostolis traditionem suscepit etiam parvulis baptismum dare. Sciebant enim illi quibus mysteriorum secreta commissa sunt divinorum, quia essent in omnibus genuinæ sordes peccati, quæ per aquam et Spiritum ablui deberent; propter quas etiam corpus ipsum corpus peccati nominatur

SECT. 12.—And Cyprian with the Council of Carthage under him.

In the middle of this age lived St. Cyprian, in whose time there was a question moved concerning the day on which infants ought to be baptized. For one Fidus, an African bishop, had sent a query to him on this case,—whether infants were to be baptized, if need required, as soon as they were born, or not till the eighth day, according to the rule given in the case of circumcision? To this question St. Cyprian and a council of sixty-six bishops returned this synodical answer: “As to the case of infants, whereas you judge,<sup>1</sup> that they ought not to be baptized within two or three days after they are born; and that the rule of circumcision should be observed, so that none should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born;—we were all in our council of the contrary opinion. It was our unanimous resolution and judgment, that the mercy and grace of God is to be denied to none as soon as he is born. For if the greatest offenders, and they that have sinned most grievously against God before, have afterward, when they come to believe, forgiveness of their sins; and no person is kept off from baptism and grace; how much less reason is there to prohibit an infant, who being newly born has no other sin, save that being descended from Adam according to the flesh, he has from his birth contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened? who comes for that reason more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, because they are not his own, but other men’s sins, that are forgiven him.” Here we have

---

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. Ep. 59. al. 64. ad Fidum, p. 158. Quantum verò ad causam infantium pertinet, quos dixisti intra secundum vel tertium diem, quo nati sunt, constitutos, baptizari non oportere, et considerandam esse legem circumcisionis antiquæ, ut intra octavum diem cum qui natus est baptizandum et sanctificandum non putares; longe aliud in concilio nostro omnibus visum est.—Universi potius judicavimus, nulli hominum nato misericordiam Dei et gratiam denegandam.—Porrò autem si etiam gravissimis delictoribus et in Deum multum ante peccantibus, cum postea crediderint, remissa peccatorum datur; et à baptismo atque à gratiâ nemo prohibetur; quanto magis prohiberi non debet infaus, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus, contagium mortis antiquæ primâ nativitate contraxit? Qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendum hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria, sed aliena peccata.

both the practice of the Church, and the reason of it together: infants were baptized, because they were born in original sin, and needed baptism to cleanse them from the guilt and pollution of it. To this we may add another place of Cyprian, where, describing the great wickedness of those that lapsed in time of persecution, he thus aggravates their crime: "That nothing might be wanting to fill up the measure of their wickedness,<sup>1</sup> their little infants were either led or carried in their parents arms, and lost that which they had obtained at their first coming into the world,"—meaning the benefits of their baptism: and therefore he brings them in thus pleading against their parents in an elegant strain at the day of Judgment; "This was no fault of ours, we did not of our own accord forsake the meat and cup of the Lord, to run and partake of those profane pollutions; 'twas the unfaithfulness of others that ruined us; we had our parents for our murderers; they denied us God for our father, and the Church for our mother: for whilst we were little, and unable to take care of ourselves, and ignorant of so great a wickedness, we were ensnared by the treachery of others, and by them drawn into a partnership of their impieties." Here we may observe, that children were made partakers of the eucharist, which Cyprian calls, "the meat and drink of the Lord." And this is evident from other passages in the same author: which is a further evidence for the practice of infant-baptism; for it is certain, that none but baptized persons were ordinarily allowed to partake of the eucharist at the Lord's table. I think it needless to clog this discourse with any more authorities from the council of Eliberis, Optatus, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Paulinus, the councils of Carthage, St. Austin, or St. Jerom, or other writers of the fourth age, which the reader may find collected together by Mr. Wall, with suitable observations on them. It is sufficient to my design, against Salmasius and Suicerus, to have proved that infant-baptism was not

---

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. de Lapsis, p. 125. Ac nequid deesset ad criminis cumulum, infantes quoque parentum manibus vel impositi vel attracti, amiserunt parvuli, quod in primo statim nativitatis exordio fuerant consecuti, &c.

owing to any new doctrine begun in the third century, but was derived from more ancient principles, and handed down through the two first ages from apostolical practice.

**SECT. 13.**—**Infant-Baptism** not to be delayed to the Eighth Day after the Example of Circumcision. Nor till Three Years, as Gregory Nazianzen would have had it.

I shall now proceed to remark a few other things relating to the baptism of infants, among those who allowed them to be capable of it from their birth. Some there were in the African Church, as we have heard out of the last-mentioned citations from Cyprian, who were strictly for confining baptism to the eighth day, because such was the rule in the case of circumcision: but Cyprian and the council of Carthage answer all the arguments that were brought in favour of this novelty, which seems only to have been a question in theory, and scarce ever reduced to practice. The abettors of it pleaded, that an infant in the first days after its birth is unclean, so that any one of us abhors to kiss it. To which Cyprian answers, “we judge not<sup>1</sup> this to be any reason to hinder the giving to it the heavenly grace: for it is written, ‘To the clean all things are clean:’ nor ought any of us to abhor that which God has vouchsafed to make.” To the other pretence, that the eighth day was observed in the Jewish circumcision, he answers, “that this was only a type going before a shadow and resemblance, but upon Christ’s coming it was fulfilled in the substance; for because the eighth day, that is, the next to the Sabbath-day, was to be the day on which the Lord was to rise from the dead, and quicken us, and give us the spiritual circumcision; this eighth day, that is, the next day to the Sabbath, or Lord’s day, was signified in the type before, which type ceased, when the substance came, and the spiritual circumcision was given to us. So that we judge that no person is to be hindered from obtaining the grace, by the law that is now appointed: and that the spiritual circumcision ought not to be restrained by the circumcision that was according to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. Ep. 59. al. 64. ad Fidum, p. 160.

flesh ; but that all are to be admitted to the grace of Christ ; forasmuch as Peter says, in the Acts of the Apostles, ‘ the Lord hath showed me, that no person is to be called common or unclean.’” This is the only place wherever we read that this question was made, and after the resolution here given, we never find that it was proposed again : so that this circumstance of time seems never to have prevailed in the practice of the Church. Gregory Nazianzen had also a singular opinion in relation to the time of baptizing children when there was no danger of death : for in that case he thought it better to defer it till they were about three years old, but in case of danger to give it immediately after they were born, for fear they should die unbaptized. His words are these : “ What say you<sup>1</sup> to those that are as yet infants, and are not in a capacity to be sensible either of the grace, or of the loss of it ? shall we baptize them too ? yes, by all means, if any danger so require it : for it is better that they should be sanctified without their own sense of it, than that they should die unsealed and uninitiated. And the ground of this is circumcision, which was given on the eighth day, and was a typical seal, and was given to those who had not the use of reason : as also the anointing of the door-posts, which preserved the first-born by things that have no sense. As for others, I give my opinion that they should stay three years or thereabouts, till they can hear the mystical words, and make answers to them ; and though they do not perfectly understand them, yet they can then frame to speak them : and then you may sanctify them in soul and body with the great sacrament of initiation.” But this was a singular opinion of Nazianzen, taken up upon some particular reasons, which the Church never assented to : and therefore I join this with that other of Fidus, the African, as peculiar fancies of private men, which never gained any esteem or credit in the public or avowed practice of the Church.

SECT. 14.—Yet in some Churches it was deferred to the Time of an approaching Festival.

Yet in some Churches a custom had prevailed to defer

---

<sup>1</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. de Baptismo, tom. ii. p. 658.

the baptism of infants, as well as adult persons, where there was no apparent danger of death, to the time of some of the more eminent and noted festivals, which were more peculiarly designed and set apart for the solemn administration of baptism. Socrates says,<sup>1</sup> in Thessaly they only baptized at Easter: upon which account a great many in those parts died without baptism. He does not say expressly, that this was the case of children: but there are some reasons to incline one to believe, that it related to them as well as others; for both in the French and Spanish councils there are canons which order the baptism of children to be administered only at Easter, except in case of necessity and imminent danger of death. In the council of Auxerre<sup>2</sup> it was decreed for the French Churches, “that no children should be baptized at any other time, save on the solemn festival of Easter, except such as were near death,” whom they called *Grabatarii*, because they were baptized on a *sick-bed*: and “if any one contumaciously in contempt of this decree offered their children to baptism in any of their churches, they should not be received:” and “if any presbyter presumed to receive them against this order, he should be suspended three months from the communion of the Church.” The second council of Bracara<sup>3</sup> also speaks of the like practice in the Spanish Churches, ordering “that in the middle of Lent, such infants as were to be baptized at Easter, should be presented twenty days before to undergo the purgation, or preparation of exorcism.” St. Austin also speaks of children, infants,<sup>4</sup> little ones, suck-

<sup>1</sup> Socrat. lib. v. c. 22. Ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῆ Πάσχα μόνον βαπτίζεσθαι. διὰ σφόδρα πλὴν ὀλίγων οἱ λοιποὶ μὴ βαπτισθέντες ἀποθνήσκουσι. <sup>2</sup> Con.

Autissiodor. can. 18. Non licet absque Paschæ solennitate ullo tempore baptizare, nisi illos quibus mors vicina est, quos Grabatarios dicunt. Quod si quis in alio pago, contumaciâ faciente, post interdictum hoc infantes suos ad baptismum detulerit in ecclesias nostras, non recipiantur. Et quicunque presbyter ipsos extra nostrum præceptum recipere præsumperit, tribus mensibus à communione ecclesiæ sequestratus sit. <sup>3</sup> Con. Bracar. 2.

can. 9. Mediante Quadragesimâ, ex viginti diebus baptizandos infantes, ad exorcismi purgationem offerre præcipiant. Vid. Con. Matiscon. 2. can. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. Serm. 160. de Tempore. tom. x. p. 331. Hodiè Octavæ dicuntur Infantium.—Illi pueri, infantes, parvuli, lactentes, maternis uberibus inherentes, et quantum in eos gratiæ referatur nescientes, ut ipsi videtis, quia infantes vocantur, et ipsi habent Octavas hodiè. Et isti senes, juvenes, adolescentuli, omnes infantes, &c.

lings hanging on their mothers' breasts, coming at Easter to be baptized among adult persons: whence Palm-Sunday, or the Sunday before Easter had the name of *Octavæ Infantium, the octave of infants*, upon their account. St. Ambrose also<sup>1</sup> speaks of great numbers of infants coming at Easter to be baptized: "This," says he, "is the Paschal gift: pious fathers and holy mothers bring their new-born progeny in great multitudes by faith to the holy font, from whose womb being regenerated under the tree of faith, they shine with the innocent ornament of lights and tapers." These are abundant proofs, that though in cases of extremity children might receive baptism at any time, yet in other cases, where there was no visible appearance or danger of death, their baptism in many places was deferred till the Easter festival, as well as that of adult persons.

SECT. 15.—A Resolution of some Questions. Whether Children might be baptized, when only one Parent was Christian?

Whilst I am upon the subject of infant-baptism, it will not be improper to resolve certain cases and questions, that may be put concerning it, so far as they are capable of being resolved from the practice of the Church, or judgment of the ancient writers. One is concerning such children, as had only one parent Christian, and the other a Jew or a Heathen. These were reckoned capable of baptism upon the right of one parent being Christian: for so it was resolved in the fourth council of Toledo,<sup>2</sup> in the case of such women as had Jews for their husbands, that the children that were born of them should follow the faith and condition of the mother: and so on the other hand, they who had unbelieving mothers, and believing fathers, should follow the Christian religion, and not the Jewish superstition.

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Mysterio Paschæ, c. 5. Hoc Paschæ donum.—Hinc casti patres, pudicæ etiam matres, novellam per fidem stirpem prosequuntur innumeram. Hinc sub fidei arbore ab utero fontis innocui cœcorum splendet ornatus, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Tolet. 4. can. 62. Filii autem qui ex talibus (Judæis) nati existunt, fidem atque conditionem matris sequantur. Similiter et hi qui procreati sunt de infidelibus mulieribus, et fidelibus viris, Christianam religionem sequantur, non Judaicam superstitionem.

SECT. 16.—Whether the Children of excommunicated Parents might be baptized.

Another case was concerning the children, whose parents were under excommunication and the Church's censures. St. Austin had occasion to consider this case upon the account of one Auxilius, a young bishop, who in a fit of ungoverned zeal, had rashly excommunicated one Classicianus, and together with him, laid his whole family under an anathema and interdict: which was a practice, that however some later Popes have dealt much in, the Ancients were not acquainted with. He also seems to have forbidden any children to be baptized, who were born in the family during this interdict. Upon which St. Austin took occasion to write to him, and expostulate with him upon the reasons of these proceedings, desiring to be informed<sup>1</sup> upon what grounds and authority of reason, or testimony of Scripture, he could confirm his opinion; by what right a son was to be anathematized for the father's crime, or a wife for her husband's, or a servant for his master's; or a child not yet born, if he happened to be born in the house whilst it lay under such an interdict, why it should not have the benefit of the laver of regeneration in danger of death. In corporal punishments, he owns, sometimes it was otherwise: for God thought fit to punish some despisers; with their whole families, though they were not accessory to the contemner's crimes, that by the death of mortal bodies, which must otherwise have shortly died, he might strike terror into the living: but he never dealt thus in spiritual punishments, which affect the soul; but 'the soul that sinneth, it shall die.' And therefore St. Austin for his own part declares, he never durst use excommunication to this purpose, though he was

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Ep. 75. ad Auxilium. Apud charitatem tuam tacere non potui, ut si habes de hac re sententiam, certis rationibus vel Scripturarum testimoniis exploratam, nos quoque docere digneris: quomodo rectè anathematizetur pro patris peccato filius, aut pro mariti uxor, aut pro domini servus, aut quisquam etiam in domo nondum natus, si eodem tempore quo universa domus est anathemate obligata, nascatur, nec ei possit per lavacrum regenerationis in mortis periculo subveniri.—Ego autem, si quis ex me quærat, utrum rectè fiat, quid ei respondeam non invenio. Nunquam hoc facere ausus sum, cum de quorundam facinoribus immaniter adversus Ecclesiam perpetratis gravissimè permoverer.



never so highly provoked by the most villainous actions of any men against the Church; because if any one should ask him a reason of such his practice, and oblige him to show the justice of his proceeding, he freely owns, he could find nothing to answer him." Whence I think we may fairly conclude, that the excommunication of a parent did not deprive the child of his right to baptism: and though there were some who made a stretch upon Church power in this case, yet their actions were so far from being generally approved, or authorised by any rule, that they were rather thought to deserve a censure. The reader that would know how the Reformed Churches have resolved this same case, about the admission of the children of excommunicated persons to baptism, may consult another Discourse,<sup>1</sup> which I have formerly had occasion to write in defence of the Church, where this case is more particularly considered and resolved upon the principles and practice of some of the most eminent Churches of the Reformation.

SECT. 17.—Whether exposed Children, whose Parents were unknown, might be baptized.

Another question sometimes agitated in the primitive Church, as concerning such children as were either exposed, or redeemed from the barbarians, whose parents were unknown, and consequently it was utterly uncertain whether they were ever baptized or not. This was a case that often happened in Afric, where the Christians bordered upon several barbarous nations: and it was thus resolved upon a consultation in one of the councils of Carthage; "that all such infants<sup>2</sup> as had no certain witnesses to testify that they were baptized, neither could they testify for themselves, by reason of their age, that the sacrament had been given them; that such should without any scruple be baptized,

<sup>1</sup> French Church's Apology for the Church of England, book iii. chap. xix.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Carth. v. can. 6. Placuit, de infantibus, quoties non inveniuntur certissimi testes, qui eos baptizatos esse sine dubitatione testentur, neque ipsi sunt per ætatem idonei de traditis sibi sacramentis respondere, absque ullo scrupulo eos esse baptizandos, ne ista trepidatio eos faciat sacramentorum purgatione privari. Hinc enim legati Maurorum fratres nostri consuluerunt, quia multos tales à Barbaris redimunt. Vid. Cod. Can. African. c. 72.

lest an hesitation in that case should deprive them of the purgation of the sacrament." And this resolution was made at the instance of the legates of the Churches of Mauritania, who informed the council that many such children were redeemed by them from the barbarians. In which case it was uncertain whether their parents were Heathens or Christians.

SECT. 18.—Whether the Children of Jews or Heathens might be baptized in any Case whatsoever.

But, as in some cases, if it plainly appeared, that the parents of infants, who by some providential means fell into the hands of Christians, were mere Jews or Pagans; yet in such cases, baptism was not denied to the infants, because they were now become the possession of Christians, who undertook to be their sponsors, and answer for their education. This is evident from St. Austin,<sup>1</sup> who says it in express terms: "This grace is sometimes vouchsafed to the children of infidels, that they are baptized, when by some means through the secret Providence of God they happen to come into the hands of pious Christians." Sometimes they were bought or redeemed with money, sometimes made lawful captives in war, and sometimes taken up by any charitable person<sup>2</sup> when they were exposed by their parents. In all which cases, either the faith and promises of the sponsors, or the faith of the Church in general, who was their common mother, and whose children they were now supposed to be, was sufficient to give them a title to Christian baptism. The holy virgins of the Church did many times in such exigencies become their sureties, and take care of their religious education. And so it happened, as is observed by St. Ambrose, or whoever was the author of

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Gratia et Libero Arbitrio. c. 22. tom.vii. p. 527. Aliquando filiis infidelium præstatur hæc gratia ut baptizantur, cum occultâ Dei providentiâ in manus piorum quomodocunque perveniunt.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. Ep. 23. ad Bonifac. Videas multos non offerri à parentibus, sed etiam à quibuslibet extraneis, sicut à dominis servuli aliquando offeruntur. Et nonnunquam mortuis parentibus suis, parvuli baptizantur ab eis oblati, qui illis hujusmodi misericordiam præbere potuerunt. Aliquando etiam quos crudeliter parentes exposuerunt, nutriendos à quibuslibet, nonnunquam à sacris virginibus colliguntur, et ab eis offeruntur ad baptismum.

the excellent book,<sup>1</sup> *De Vocatione Gentium*, that many who were deserted by the impiety of their kindred, were taken care of by the good offices of others, and brought to be baptized by strangers, when they were neglected by their nearest relations. Which was so general and charitable a practice among the Ancients, that some learned modern<sup>2</sup> writers speak of it with great commendation upon that account, and tell us such children have a right to baptism, after the same manner that Abraham's servants, bought with his money, had to circumcision, as well as those that were born in his house. And they concur so far in asserting it to be the common practice beyond all controversy in the primitive Church, as to say, that St. Austin made use of it as an uncontested argument to prove free grace and election against the Pelagians. Which I note only here by the way, for the sake of some mistaken persons, who impute the encouragement of the same practice in the English Church, not to her charity, but rather to a fault and error in her constitution.

SECT. 19.—Whether Children, born while their Parents were Heathens, might be baptized.

There is one question more concerning such infants as were born while their parents were heathens: but of these there was no doubt ever made; for as soon as the parents were baptized themselves, they were obliged to take care that their wives and children and whole families should be baptized likewise. To which purpose there is a law in the Justinian Code<sup>3</sup> inflicting a severe penalty upon them in

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Vocat. Gent. lib. ii. c. 8. Multis sæpe, quos suorum impietas deseruit, alienorum cura servierit, et ad regenerationem venerint per extraneos, quæ eis non erat providenda per proximos. <sup>2</sup> Vid. Rivet. et Walæum in Synopsi Purioris Theologiæ. Disput. 44. n. 49.

<sup>3</sup> Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 11. de Paganis. leg 10. Qui nondun sunt baptizati, ipsi cum liberis et conjugibus et omnibus suis perducant se ad sanctas ecclesias: et suos parvulos liberos sine more baptizari current: majores verò prius Scripturas secundùm canones doceantur. Si verò propter militiam, vel dignitatem, vel facultates habendas fingant baptizari; et liberos aut conjuges eorum, aut domesticos suos in errore reliquerint, et eos qui sibi attinent et necessitudine juncti sunt; publicantur et competenter plectuntur, et rempublicam non attingunt. This law is repeated by Balsamon. Constitut. Eccles.

case of neglect or prevarication in this matter. For it is there enacted, that such pagans as were yet unbaptized, should present themselves, with their wives and children, and all that appertained to them, in the church, and there they should cause their little ones immediately to be baptized, and the rest as soon as they were taught the Scriptures according to the canons. But if any persons for the sake of a public office or dignity, or to get an estate, received a fallacious baptism themselves, but in the mean time left their wives, or children, or servants, or any that were retainers or near relations to them, in their ancient error, their goods in that case are ordered to be confiscated, and their persons punished by a competent judge, and excluded from bearing any office in the commonwealth. Photius repeats this law in his *Nomocanon*, and adds to it another of the same nature, concerning the Samaritans,—that though they themselves were not to be baptized till they had been two years catechumens, yet their little ones, who were not capable of instruction, might be admitted to baptism without any such delay or prorogation. Which law is now extant among Justinian's *Novels*:<sup>1</sup> from all which it appears, that as soon as any Jews or Heathens were either baptized themselves, or had only taken upon them the state of catechumens, their children were made capable of baptism, and accordingly by law required to be baptized. Thus much of infants, and the several cases I have met with in the writings of the Ancients, relating to their baptism.

---

ap. Justell. *Bibliothec. Juris Canon.* tom. ii. p. 1298; and in Photius, *Nomocanon.* tit. 4. c. iv. p. 907. *ibid.* <sup>1</sup> Phot. *Nomocan.* tit. 4. c. iv. p. 907.

*Justin. Novel.* 144. c. 2. *Per duos primùm annos in fide instituantur, et pro viribus Scripturas ediscant: tuncque demùm sacro redemptionis offerantur baptismati, tam longi temporis pœnitentiâ prorsùs redemptionis fructum assecuti. Pueros autem admodùm, qui per ætatem doctrinas intelligere nequeunt, etiam adsque hâc observatione sacro dignari baptismate admittimus.*

## CHAP. V.

*Of the Baptism of Adult Persons.*

SECT. 1.—No adult Persons to be baptized without previous Instruction to qualify them to answer for themselves.

THE other sort of persons on whom baptism was conferred, were adult persons, who were grown up to years of understanding, and who in those days made up the main body of the baptized. These were usually converts from Judaism or Gentilism, who before they could be admitted to baptism were obliged to spend some time in the state of catechumens, to qualify them to make their professions of faith and a Christian life in their own persons. For without such personal professions, there was ordinarily no admission of them to the privilege of baptism. The time of their instruction, and the substance and manner of it has already been considered particularly in the last Book. All therefore I have further to observe concerning them here, is in relation to some special cases, which we find determined in the canons of the ancient councils, when, because great multitudes were baptized at riper years, the Church had occasion to consider many cases, which are scarce to be met with in the rules of later ages.

SECT. 2.—Yet dumb Persons allowed to be baptized in some certain Cases.

One of these doubtful cases, was in reference to dumb persons, who were incapacitated at the time of baptism from answering for themselves. In this case, if persons had desired to be baptized before this infirmity came upon them, or if they could by sufficient signs signify their present desire, the Church favourably accepted their request, and admitted them to the privilege of baptism. The first council of Orange<sup>1</sup> has a canon in favour of such persons, both with respect to baptism and penance; for it decrees,

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Arausican. i. can. 12. Subitò obmutescens, prout statutum est, baptizari aut pœnitentiam accipere potest, si voluntatis præteritæ testimonium aliorum verbis habet, aut præsentis in suo nutu.

“ that a person who is suddenly struck speechless, may either be baptized, or admitted to penance, if it appears by the testimony of others, that he had any such will or desire before he became dumb ; or if in the time of this misfortune he could make signs to express his present desire and intention.” In the African Code there is a canon to the same purpose,<sup>1</sup> “ that men so sick that they cannot answer for themselves, may be baptized, if their friends who attended them in danger do testify their desire of baptism.” And among the Canonical Answers of Timotheus of Alexandria, there is one of the like nature : for the question is put,<sup>2</sup> “ whether if a catechumen be so disordered in his mind, that he cannot make profession of his faith, he may be baptized notwithstanding this infirmity ?” and the answer is, “ he may if he be not possessed.” We have an instance of this case actually verified in the baptism of an African Negro-slave at Carthage, whom his master had caused to be instructed among the catechumens, and prepared him among the *Competentes* for baptism. He had made his profession of faith and the usual renunciations publicly in the church, as was customary for the candidates of baptism to do before they came to the baptistery to consummate the mystery : but just before the time of baptism he fell sick of a fever, which made him speechless. However he was baptized, others answering in his name, as if it had been for an infant. Ferrandus, who tells the story, had some doubts concerning this baptism, which he communicated to Fulgentius, bishop of Ruspa, who gave him a consoliatory answer to this effect :<sup>3</sup> “ That this man had all the conditions required by our Saviour for adult persons, which were, ‘ that they should believe and be baptized.’ Faith and the profession of it is the act of the man ; the baptizing him

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carthag. iii. can. 34. Ut ægrotantes, si pro se respondere non possunt cum voluntatis eorum testimonium sui dixerint, baptizentur. Similiter et de pœnitentibus agendum est. This canon is repeated in the Codex Canon. Eccles. Afric. can. 48. and in the later editions of the Councils it is read with a little variation, thus—Cum Voluntatis eorum testimonium hi, qui suis periculo proprio affuere, dixerint, baptizentur, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Timoth. Respons. Canon.

cap. 4. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. tom. ii. p. 166.

<sup>3</sup> Fulgent. de Baptismo Æthiopiæ, c. 8. See a like case in St. Austin’s Confessions, lib. iv. c. 4.

is only the act of the minister. And though this man had not his senses when the minister performed his act, yet he had when he himself performed his own. We believe, indeed, that none but infants are saved by the faith of those that bring them, and that at the age of reason a man's own confession is required: but this man made his profession whilst he had his senses, and was baptized whilst he was yet alive." From whence he concludes, "that there was no reason to doubt of his salvation, because he had done all that was necessary on his part, and was baptized in the manner that in this case the canons had appointed." Let me add to all this, how it is that Albaspinæus, and many others understand that canon of the council of Eliberis,<sup>1</sup> which speaks of catechumens deserting their station, and forsaking the Church for a long time, yet at last desiring to be baptized. In this case, though they were speechless, they might be baptized, if either any of the clergy, or other faithful witnesses could testify that they desired to be made Christians, because their crimes were committed whilst they were in the old man: or, as other copies read it, "because they seemed to have relinquished and bid adieu to the old man;" that is, in their former state of sin and natural corruption. And this was but the very same privilege as was allowed men in the business of penance, mentioned in the forecited council of Orange, and also the fourth council of Carthage, where it is said,<sup>2</sup> "that if a lapses desires to be admitted to penance in time of sickness, and unfortunately becomes speechless, or falls into a phrenzy, while the priest who is sent for is coming to him, they who heard his

<sup>1</sup> Con. Eliber. can. 45. Qui aliquando fuerit catechumenus, et per infinita tempora nunquam ad ecclesiam accesserit, si eum de clero quisquam agnoverit voluisse esse Christianum, aut testes aliqui fideles extiterint, placuit ei baptismum non negari, eò quòd in veterem hominem deliquisse videatur. ul. eò quòd veterem hominem dereliquisse videatur.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Carthag. iv. can. 76. Qui pœnitentiam in infirmitate petit, si casu, dum ad eum sacerdos invitatus venit, oppressus infirmitate obmutuerit, vel in frenesin versus fuerit, dent testimonium qui eum audierunt, et accipiat pœnitentiam; et si continuò ereditur moriturus, reconcilietur per manûs impositionem, et infundatur ori ejus eucharistia. Si supervixerit, admoneatur à supradictis testibus petitioni suæ satisfactum, et subdatur statutis pœnitentiæ legibus quamdiu sacerdos qui pœnitentiam dedit, probaverit. Vid. Leo. 89. ad Theodor. Forojuliensom. al. 91.

desire shall testify for him and he shall be admitted to penance: and if he seems to be at the point of death, he shall be reconciled by the imposition of hands, and have the eucharist poured into his mouth. But if he recovers, the witnesses shall acquaint him, that his petition was granted, and then he shall submit himself to the ordinary rules of penance, so long as the priest who admitted him to penance, shall think fit in his discretion." Now it is probable that after the same manner, persons who were baptized in such a condition, when they recovered, were obliged to make their professions, as was usual in baptism, when afterwards they received the imposition of hands in confirmation. But as I cannot affirm this upon the certain evidence of any rule or canon, as in the other case of penance, but only judge by parity of reason, I will not be positive, but leave every one to enjoy his own opinion.

SECT. 3.—And Energumens in Cases of Extremity.

Another question was sometimes raised about the energumens, or persons possessed by evil spirits,—whether during the time of their possession it was proper to give them baptism? The council of Eliberis orders them to be deferred, till they were set free and cured; but yet in case of extremity, and visible appearance of death,<sup>1</sup> appoints them to be baptized. The first council of Orange<sup>2</sup> seems to have allowed it not only in absolute necessity, but in the remissions and intervals of their distemper; for it orders, “that such catechumens as were possessed, should be baptized, according as their necessity required, or opportunity permitted. In the Canons of Timothy, bishop of Alexandria, the same question is put, but resolved a little differently:—“If baptism be desired for a catechumen that is possessed, what shall be done?” to which the answer is, “Let him be baptized at the hour of death, and not otherwise.”<sup>3</sup> So

<sup>1</sup> Con. Eliber. can. 37. Eos, qui ab immundis spiritibus vexantur, si in fine mortis fuerint constituti, baptizari placet.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Arausican. can. 15. Energumenis catechumenis, in quantum vel necessitas exegerit, vel opportunitas permiserit, de baptismate consulendum.

<sup>3</sup> Timoth. Respon. Canon. c. 2. Ἐὰν δαιμονιζόμενος μὴ καθαρισθῆ, ἔδύναται λαβεῖν τὸ ἕγιον βαπτισμα. περι δὲ τὴν ἕξοδον βαπτίζεται.



likewise in the Constitutions<sup>1</sup> under the name of the Apostles: "If any one is possessed with a devil, let him be taught the principles of piety, but not be received to communion till he is cleansed: yet if he be under the pressure of imminent death, let him be received." Some understand this of being received to the communion of the eucharist, but it is plain the author means it of being received to the communion of the Church by baptism: for he is there giving rules concerning persons to be baptized, and describing their necessary qualifications; among which this is one, "that energumens shall be cleansed before they be admitted to communion, except at the hour of death, where necessity gave them a dispensation." And this was the ancient rule in the time of Cyprian, who says, "that they who were possessed with unclean spirits, were baptized in time of sickness." And many times this benefit followed from it, that though some of those for want of faith were still vexed<sup>2</sup> with unclean spirits; the true energy of baptism, which was to deliver men from the power of the devil, failing in some by their own default and weakness of faith; yet in others it was found true by experience, that they who were baptized in time of sickness and urgent necessity, were thereby delivered from the unclean spirit, with which they were before possessed, and thenceforward lived a very laudable and reputable life in the Church, and made a daily proficiency and increase in heavenly grace by the augmentation of their faith. And on the contrary

---

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 32. Ἐὰν δὲ τις δαίμονα ἔχει, διδασκίεσθω μὲν τὴν εὐσέβειαν, μὴ προσδεχίεσθω δὲ εἰς κοινωνίαν, πρὶν ἂν καθαρῶσθῃ. εἰ δὲ θάνατος κατεπέγγοι, προσδεχίεσθω. <sup>2</sup> Cypr. Ep. 76. al. 69. ad Magnum. p. 187. Si aliquis in illo movetur, quod quidam de iis qui ægri baptizantur, spiritibus adhuc immundis tentantur; sciat Diaboli nequitiam pertinacem usque ad aquam salutarem valere, in baptismo verò omne nequitie suæ virus amittere.—Ibid. p. 188. Hoc denique et rebus ipsis experimur, ut necessitate urgente in ægritudine baptizati et gratiam consecuti, careant immundo spiritu, quo antea movebantur; et laudabiles ac probabiles in ecclesiâ vivant, plusque per dies singulos in augmentum cælestis gratiæ per fidei incrementa proficiant. Et contra nonnulli sæpe de illis qui sani baptizantur, si postmodum peccare cœperint, spiritu immundo redeunte quatiuntur; ut manifestum sit, diabolum in baptismo fide credentis excludi; si fides postmodum defecerit, regredi. See also Clemen. Recognit. lib. iv. c. 32. to the same purpose.

it oftentimes happened, that some of those who were baptized in health, when they afterward fell into sin, were tormented with the unclean spirit returning upon them: whence it was apparent, that the devil was excluded in baptism by the faith of the believer, but if afterward his faith failed, the devil returned to his old possession. From this discourse of Cyprian we learn, not only that enervumens in time of extremity were admitted to baptism, but that baptism in such cases was many times a peculiar benefit to them, whilst it delivered them from the possession of unclean spirits, which could not before be cast out by any power of the exorcists, though in those days the power of exorcism was a miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost.

SECT. 4.—No Slave to be baptized without the Testimony of his Master.

Another observation to be made upon the baptism of adult persons, is in relation to such as were slaves to Christian masters. For we find by the author of the Constitutions under the name of the Apostles, that in the examination of the several qualifications of those that offered themselves to baptism, one part of the inquiry was, whether they were slaves or freemen? if they were slaves to an heathen, they were only taught their obligations to please their master, that the word of God might not be blasphemed; and the master had no further concern in their baptism, as being himself an infidel: but if the master were a Christian, then the testimony of them aster was first to be required<sup>1</sup> concerning the life and conversation of his slave, before he could be admitted to the privilege of baptism. If he gave a laudable account of him, he was received: if otherwise, he was rejected, till he approved himself to his master. So far in those days it was thought necessary and serviceable to religion to grant Christian masters a power over their slaves, that without their testimony and approbation they could not be accepted as fit candidates of baptism. Not that this was intended to countenance any tyrannical power in Christian

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 32. Ἐὰν πιτῆ δέσλος ᾗ, ἐρωτάσθω ὁ κύριος αὐτῆ, εἰ μαρτυρεῖ αὐτῷ. ἐὰν δὲ μὴ, ἀποβαλλέσθω, ἕως ἂν αὐτὸν ἄξιον ἐπιειξῆ τῷ δεσπότῃ. εἰ δὲ μαρτυρεῖ αὐτῷ, προσδέχέσθω.

masters, to debar their slaves of baptism, and deny them the privilege and benefits of the Christian religion, which is a piece of barbarous cruelty, and spiritual tyranny over men's souls, unknown to former ages, but the design was to preserve the purity of religion, and keep back hypocritical and profane pretenders from the holy mysteries: the over-hasty admission of whom might prove a scandal and disgrace to the profession, if persons of a doubtful life were indiscriminately and indifferently admitted to the sacred rites of it. This caution wisely lodged an useful power in the hands of Christian masters, which prudence and charity directed them to use soberly to edification and not to destruction. And experience proved it to be an useful rule; for it both made the masters zealous for the salvation of their slaves, as we have seen in the instance of the African Negro mentioned in Fulgentius; and also made the slaves sincere in their professions and pretences to religion, when they knew they could not be accepted as real converts, worthy of baptism, without the corroborating testimony of their masters. There were also laws of state obliging all masters to take care of their families, so far as to see that every individual person, slaves as well as children, were made Christians, and in default of this, some penalties were annexed, depriving the masters of certain privileges in the commonwealth, if they were found either remiss, or acting by collusion in this part of their duty.<sup>1</sup> So that all imaginable obligation was laid upon masters, both in point of interest, duty, and charity, to take care of the instruction of their slaves, and bring them with their own testimonials to Christian baptism.

SECT. 5.—Yet Baptism to be a voluntary Act, and no one to be compelled by Force to receive it.

Yet because baptism was to be a voluntary act in adult persons, some laws were made against compelling any one by force to receive it. In the fourth council of Toledo, a canon was made to this purpose concerning the Jews, who had sometimes been drawn by force to be baptized against

---

<sup>1</sup> See chap. iv. s. 17.

their will, and it was ordered by the synod, “that thenceforth no one should be compelled by force to profess the Christian faith:’<sup>1</sup> ‘for God hath mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth;’ for such are not to be saved against their will, but of their own free consent, that the form or method of their justification may be perfect. For as man perished by his own free will, obeying the serpent, so every man is saved, when he is called by the grace of God, by his own voluntary act of faith, and conversion of his own mind: therefore they are not to be compelled by force, but to be persuaded by their own free will to be converted. But as to those who have heretofore been forced to embrace Christianity, as was done in the time of the religious prince Sisebutus, (or Sisenandus,) for as much as they have been partakers of the sacraments, and have received the grace of baptism, and the unction of chrism, and the communion of the body and blood of the Lord, therefore they ought to be obliged to hold the faith, which they were compelled by force or necessity to receive, lest the name of the Lord should be blasphemed, and the faith which they have received be vilified and exposed to contempt.” By this we learn, that baptism was always to be a voluntary act in adult persons, and none were to be compelled against their own wills to receive it: and though the Church did not rescind such actions as were done against this rule, yet she did not approve them, but thought them worthy of her censure, and unfit to be made a precedent for the future. That which looks most like force in this case allowed by law was the orders of Justinian mentioned

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Tolet. 4. can. 56. De Judæis autem præcepit sancta synodus, nemini deinceps ad credendum vim inferre. Cui enim vult Deus miseretur, et quem vult indurat. Non enim tales inviti salvandi sunt, sed volentes, ut integra sit forma justitiæ: sicut enim homo propria arbitrii voluntate Serpenti obediens periit, sic vocante se gratiâ Dei, propriæ mentis conversione homo quisque credendo salvatur. Ergo non vi, sed liberâ arbitrii voluntate, ut convertantur suadendi sunt, non potius impellendi. Qui autem jam pridem ad Christianitatem venire coacti sunt, sicut factum est temporibus religiosissimi Principis Sisebuti, al. Sisenandi, quia jam constat eos sacramentis divinis sociatos, et baptismi gratiam suscepisse, et chrismate unctos esse. Et corporis Domini et sanguinis extitisse participes, oportet etiam ut fidem, quam vi vel necessitate susceperunt, tenere cogantur, ne nomen Domini blasphemetur, et fides, quam susceperunt, vilis ac contemptibilis habeatur.

before,<sup>1</sup> one of which appoints Heathens and the other Samaritans to be baptized, with their wives and children and servants, under pain of confiscation. But even these laws did not compel them to be baptized against their wills, but allowed them two years time to be catechumens, and admitted none but such as made a voluntary profession of their faith and repentance. For the penalties were only designed to prevent fraud and prevarications, in such as pretended to receive baptism themselves, but in the mean time took no care to have their families made Christian: against whom the wisdom of the State then thought no laws severe enough could be enacted. So that these laws were tempered with the greatest prudence, between the extremes of rigour and remissness, that men might be made sensible on the one hand of their obligations to become Christians, and yet none have reason to complain on the other hand, that they were forced by violence to embrace a religion against their wills, which they could not approve and assent to. For the penalties, as I said, were only designed to chastise the hypocritical practices and fraudulent remissness of manifest prevaricators. And it were to be wished, that all civil governments and states in all ages would enact such laws, and put them duly in execution, against such sort of Christians, who instead of encouraging their slaves to be baptized, are the only obstacles to hinder and deprive them of the benefit of Christian baptism.

SECT. 6.—What Persons were rejected from baptism: With a particular Account of some certain Trades and Vocations, which kept Men from it: Such were Image-makers and Stage-players.

I have one thing more to note concerning adult persons, who might or might not be admitted to baptism: and that is, that all such heathens as made their livelihood out of any scandalous trades or professions, which could not be allowed by the rules of Christianity, were rejected from baptism, till they solemnly promised to bid adieu to, and actually forsook such vocations. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions specifies several of this nature: such as the *Πορνοβοσκοί*,

---

<sup>1</sup> See chap. iv. sect. 17.

*panders, or procurers; Πόρνοι, whores; Εἰδωλοποιοὶ, makers of images, or idols;*<sup>1</sup> against whom Tertullian has also a particular dissertation, where he censures this trade as inconsistent with the profession of Christianity, telling men, “that by this art they made the devils their *Alumni*, their *pupils*, to whom they were a sort of foster-fathers, whilst they furnished out materials to carry on their service.” “And with what confidence,”<sup>2</sup> says he, “can any man exorcize his own *Alumni*, those devils, whose service he makes his own house a shop or armoury to maintain?” reflecting on this unlawful trade of making images for the idol-temples. Next to these in the Constitutions follow Οἱ ἐπὶ σκηνῆς, *actors and stage-players*, who could not stick to that profession, and be admitted to Christian baptism, because a great deal both of lewdness and idolatry was actually committed or encouraged by such as made a livelihood of that profession. The Canons therefore forbad all such to be baptized, and excommunicated those that fell to the trade again after baptism. “If a soothsayer or a stageplayer,” says the council of Eliberis,<sup>3</sup> “have a mind to become believers, that is, to be baptized, let them be received, on condition they first bid adieu to their arts, and return not to them again: which if they attempt to do against this prohibition, they shall be cast out of the Church.” In like manner the third council of Carthage appoints all such<sup>4</sup> to be excommunicated, and not to be reconciled or received again to favour but upon their conversion. And in the time of Cyprian, not only public actors, but private teachers and masters of this scandalous art were debarred the communion of the Church: as appears from Cyprian’s answer to Eueratius, who put this question to him,<sup>5</sup>—whether a stage-

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 32.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Idololat. c. 11. Quâ

constantiâ exorcizabit alumnos suos, quibus domum suam cellariam præstat?

<sup>3</sup> Con. Eliber. can. 62. Si augur aut pantomimi credere voluerint, placuit, ut prius artibus suis renuncient, et tunc demum suscipiantur, ita ut ulterius non revertantur. Quod si facere contra interdictum tentaverint, projiciantur ab ecclesiâ.

<sup>4</sup> Con. Carth. iii. can. 35. Ut scenicis atque histrionibus, cæterisque hujusmodi personis, vel apostaticis, conversis vel reversis ad Dominum, gratia vel reconciliatio non negetur.

<sup>5</sup> Cypr. Ep. 61. al. 2. ad Eueratium, p. 3. Consulendum me existimasti, quid mihi videatur de histrione quodam, qui apud vos constitutus, in ejusdem adhuc artis sue dede-

player might communicate, who continued to follow that dishonourable trade, by teaching children that pernicious art, which he was master of? To which Cyprian replies, “that it was neither agreeable to the majesty of God, nor the discipline of the Gospel, that the modesty and honour of the Church should be defiled with so base and infamous a contagion. For if the law prohibited men to wear women’s apparel, and laid a curse upon all that did it; how much greater was the crime, not only to wear their clothes, but to express their loose, and wanton, and effeminate gestures, by teaching this immodest art to others?” Indeed, this kind of life was scandalous even among the wise and sober part of the very heathens. Tertullian observes,<sup>1</sup> that they who professed these arts were noted with infamy, degraded and denied many privileges, driven from court, from pleading, from the senate, from the order of knighthood, and all other honours in the Roman city and commonwealth. Which is also confirmed by St. Austin,<sup>2</sup> who says, “no actor was ever allowed to enjoy the freedom, or any other honourable privilege of a citizen of Rome.” Therefore since this was so infamous and scandalous a trade even among the Heathens, it is no wonder the Church would admit none of this calling to baptism, without obliging them first to bid adieu to so ignominious a profession. To have done otherwise, had been to expose herself to reproach, and to have given occasion to the adversary to blaspheme; if men of such lewd and profligate practices had been admitted to the privileges of the Church, who were excluded from the liberties of the city, and honours of the commonwealth.

SECT. 7.—And Gladiators, Charioteers, and other Gamesters.

The next that are prohibited in the Constitutions, are

---

core perseverat, et magister et doctor non erudiendorum, sed perdendorum puerorum, id quod malè didicit, cæteris quoque insinuat; an talis debeat communicare nobiscum? puto nec majestati divinæ, nec evangelicæ disciplinæ congruere, ut pudor et honor ecclesiæ tam turpi et infami contagione fædetur, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Spectac. c. 22. Damnant ignominiam et capitis minutione, arcentes curiam, senatu, equite, cæterisque honoribus omnibus simul ac ornamentis.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de Civ. Dei, lib. ii. c. 14. Actores poeticarum fabularum remouent à societate civitatis—ab honoribus omnibus repellunt homines scenicos.

charioteers and gladiators,<sup>1</sup> and racers, and curators of the common games, practicers in the Olympic games, minstrels, harpers, dancers, vintners, and such like, who were commanded either to quit these callings, or to be rejected from baptism. It may seem a little strange, that some of these callings, which seem indifferent in their own nature, and are now commonly allowed, should then be thought just reasons to debar men from baptism. But it is to be supposed, that these arts in the time of Heathenism were instrumental in carrying on idolatry, lewdness, and profaneness, and therefore by the Ancients, whose discipline was exact, were thought improper to be allowed in the practice of a Christian. The Circensian games were in honour of the gods, and therefore to be concerned in them as a charioteer, was still to partake in idolatry: upon which account the first council of Arles<sup>2</sup> orders all such to be excommunicated as continued after baptism in this service. And there is a remarkable story told by St. Jerom<sup>3</sup> in the Life of Hilarion, concerning one of these charioteers, an heathen of the city of Gaza, who being struck by the Devil with a dead palsy, as he was driving his chariot, so that he could not move his hand, nor neck, but only his tongue to prayer; in this condition he was brought in a bed to Hilarion, who told him, that he could not be healed, unless he believed in Jesus, and promise to bid adieu to his former trade. The man immediately upon this believed, renounced, and was healed, rejoicing more for the salvation of his soul than his body. This calling ministered to idolatry, and upon that score a renunciation of it was so precisely exacted of men at their baptism. The gladiator's art, was infamous for its barbarity and cruelty, involving men in murder and blood-

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 32. Ἡνίοχος, ἢ μονομάχος, ἢ σαιδιδρόμος, ἢ λουδεμπιστής, ἢ Ὀλυμπικός, ἢ χοραύλης, ἢ κιθαριστής, ἢ λυριστής, ἢ ὁ τὴν ὄρχησιν ἐπιδικνύμενος, ἢ κάπηλος, ἢ παυσάσθωσαν, ἢ ἀποβαλλέσθωσαν.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Arelat. i. can. 4. De Agitatoribus, qui fideles sunt, placuit eos, quamdiu agitant, à communione separati. <sup>3</sup> Hieron. Vit. Hilarion. c. 13. Auriga Gazensis, in curru percussus à dæmone, totus obriguit, ita ut nec manus agitare, nec cervicem posset reflectere. Delatus ergò in lecto, cùm solam linguam moveret ad preces, audit non prius posse sanari, quàm crederet in Jesum, et se sponderet arti pristinae renunciaturum. Credidit, spondidit, sanatus est, magisque de animæ quàm de corporis salute exultavit.



shed, and therefore utterly inconsistent with the rules of Christianity. The racers, and curators of the public games, and Olympic combatants, were all concerned in idolatrous practices; for these games also were held in the name and to the honour of some idol-god; which calling was therefore to be renounced, as an appendage to idolatry, before men came to baptism. For the other trades, of minstrels, harpers, dancers, &c. besides their ministering to levity, vanity, and luxury, they were also employed in idol-worship and other profaneness, which seems to have been the principal reason of making such a strict prohibition of them in the subsequent life of every Christian.

SECT. 8.—Astrologers and Practicers of other curious Arts.

The next sort of persons mentioned in the Constitutions, as unworthy of baptism, are lascivious persons, with all practicers of curious arts,<sup>1</sup> as magicians, enchanters, astrologers, diviners, magical charmers, idle and wandering beggars, makers of amulets and phylacteries, and such as dealt in heathenish lustrations, soothsayers, and observers of signs and omens, interpreters of palpitations, observers of accidents in meeting others, making divination thereupon, as upon a blemish in the eye, or in the feet, observers of the motion of birds or weasels, observers of voices and symbolical sounds. All these are appointed to be examined and tried a considerable time, whether they would relinquish their arts or not; if they did, they might be received; if not, they were to be rejected from baptism. The names of these curious arts which I have expressed in the margin, are some of them difficult to be understood. The *Λώταγες* are explained by Chrysostom,<sup>2</sup> to be *idle wandering beggars*, given to spend what they got in gaming and luxury: but others make them a sort of *diviners*, or *fortune-tellers*, like our gipsies, which is most agreeable to this place. The

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 32. Μάγος, έπασιδός, άστρολόγος, μάντης, θηρεπιδός, λώταξ, όχλαγωγός, περιάμματα ποιών, περικαθαίρων, οίωσιτης συμβολοδεικτης, παλμών έρμενεύς, φυλαττόμενος εν συναντήσει λώβας ύψεως, ή ποδών, ή όρνίθων, ή γαλών, ή έπιφωνήσεων, ή παρακροσμάτων συμβολικών, χρόνη δοκιμαζέσθωσαν, &c. <sup>2</sup> Chrysost. Hom. 13. in Ephes.

Περιάμματα were the same with the *Phylacteria*, which were amulets made of ribands, with a text of Scripture, or some other charm of words written in them, and hanged about the neck to cure diseases, and preserve men from danger, whence they had the name of *phylacteries* or *preservatives*. Now this was a piece of heathenish superstition, and idolatry, which stuck closest to new converts, and was most difficult to be cured. Therefore we find the ancient canons and fathers, very severe in their censures and invectives against it. The council of Laodicea condemns clergymen that pretended to make such phylacteries, which were truly the bonds and fetters of their own souls, and orders all such as wore them, to be cast out of the Church.<sup>1</sup> The council of Trullo<sup>2</sup> decrees six years penance for such offenders. St. Chrysostom<sup>3</sup> declaims against it as gross idolatry, whatever little pleas were brought in favour of it. “The use of amulets to hang about the neck,” says he, “is idolatry, though they that gain by it offer a thousand philosophical arguments to defend it, saying, ‘we only pray to God, and do nothing more; and, the old woman that made them was a Christian and a believer;’ with other such like excuses:” notwithstanding all which he threatens to excommunicate all such as were found to practise it. So that as this was a crime deserving excommunication in all that were already baptized, it was thought also a just reason to prohibit any from coming to baptism, who would not first promise to renounce it.

SECT. 9.—Frequenters of the public Games and Theatre.

Another sort of persons whom the author of the Constitutions excludes from the privilege of baptism, are frequenters of the public games and theatres. “If any man’s mind<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Con. Laodic. can. 36. Οὐ δεῖ ἱερατικῶς ἢ κληρικῶς ποιῆν τὰ λεγόμενα φυλακτήρια, ἅτινα ἐστὶ δεσμοτήρια τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν, τὲς δὲ φορῶντας ῥίπτεισθαι ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκελεύσαμεν. <sup>2</sup> Con. Trull. can. 61.

<sup>3</sup> Chrys. Hom. viii. in Colos. p. 1374. Τὰ περιαιπτα, κὰν μύρια φιλοσοφῶσιν οἱ ἐκ τέτων χρηματιζόμενοι, &c. εἰδωλολατρεία τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐστίν. Vid. Chrys. in Psalm ix. et Hom. 6. adversus Judæos. II. Basil. in Psal. 46. Chrys. Hom. 21. ad Pop. Antiochi. <sup>4</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 32.

Θεατρομανία εἴτις πρόσκειται, ἢ κυνηγίους, ἢ ἵπποδρομίους, ἢ ἀγῶσιν, ἢ παυσάσθω, ἢ ἀποβαλλέσθω.

be addicted to the madness of the theatre, or huntings, or horse-racings, or other gymnastical sports and exercises, let him either leave them off or be rejected from baptism. The learned Hieronymus Mercurialis<sup>1</sup> has an observation, that will explain the reason of this prohibition. For, in his curious discourse, *de Arte Gymnastica*, he observes, “these several sorts of heathen games and plays were instituted upon a religious account, in honour of the Gods, and men thought they were doing a grateful thing to them, whilst they were engaged in such exercises.” Therefore a Christian could not be present at them as a spectator, without partaking in some measure in the idolatry of them. Besides, there was a great deal of barbarity and cruelty, as well as lewdness and prophaneness, committed in many of them, which it did not become a Christian eye to behold with pleasure and approbation. The theatre was looked upon as the devil’s propriety, and so he himself termed it, as we learn from that famous story in Tertullian,<sup>2</sup> where, speaking of a Christian woman, who went to the theatre, and returned possessed with a devil, he says, “the unclean spirit being asked by the exorcist, how he durst presume to make such an attempt upon a believer, replied confidently, that he had a right to her, because he found her upon his own ground.” For these reasons the ancient canons and fathers are so severe in their invectives against all theatrical exercises, not only in the actors, but also in the spectators, declaring them to be incompatible with the piety and purity of a Christian life. And upon this account men were obliged to renounce them before they could be admitted to baptism. But of this something more when we come to the form of renunciation.

SECT. 10.—In what Cases the Military Life might unqualify Men for Baptism.

The several sorts of persons hitherto mentioned were

---

<sup>1</sup> Mercurial. *de Arte Gymnast.* lib. i. cap. iii. p. 12. *Ludorum finis erat religio quædam, qua antiqui opinabantur sese Diis rem gratam illis ludis tanquam promissam facturos.*

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. *de Spectac.* cap. xxvi. *Theatrum adiit, et inde cum Dæmonio rediit. Itaque in Exorcismo cum oneraretur immundus spiritus, quod ausus esset fidelem aggredi; constænat, et justissimè, inquit, feci, in meo enim inveni.*

excluded from baptism without exception: but there are two other kinds or states of life, that must be considered with some distinction, that is, the military life, and the state of concubinage, as it is called sometimes in the civil law and ancient canons. Some learned persons<sup>1</sup> are of opinion, that the ancients had so much dislike to the military life, as to excommunicate such as bore arms after baptism: which they affirm upon the authority of the Nicene fathers, to whom they impute it as an error, that they condemned absolutely the military life as unlawful, which St. John Baptist had approved. But this charge is grounded merely upon a mistake and misunderstanding of the meaning of these fathers, who had no intent to condemn the military life in general, but only as it might happen to be unlawful in some particular circumstances and cases. The words of the canon referred to are these: "If any, who at first by the grace of God made confession of the faith, and cast away the military girdle, afterward return to their vomit again, so as to give money and buy a place in the army, let them be ten years among the prostrators, after they have been three years among the hearers."<sup>2</sup> The generality of interpreters take this to refer to the times of Licinius the persecutor, who by an edict had ordered all such Christian soldiers to be cashiered, as would not sacrifice to the gods; upon which many Christians in the army threw away their girdles, and quitted the military life. But afterward some of them returned to it upon the conditions proposed, doing sacrifice and committing idolatry, and giving money to regain their places; against whose prevarication and revolt the discipline of this canon was intended. So Balsamon and Zonaras among the old expositors; and so Grotius<sup>3</sup> and Ziegler,<sup>4</sup> Sylvius and Coriolanus, Binnius, and Bishop Beverege, with many other modern writers. Alaspinaeus thinks it peculiarly respected such penitents only, as vowed to renounce all secular business and employments, and to

<sup>1</sup> Senti. Discus. Quest. de Concilio Nicæno, in Medulla Patr. Par. i. p. 477.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Nic. can. xii. Ὅτι προσκληθέντες μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος, ἐκ τῆν πρώτην ὁμῆν ἐκτείνανται ἐκ ἀποδίμενοι τὰς ζώνας, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα ἐπὶ τὸ δικεῖον ἔμενον ἀναδραμόντες, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Grot. de Jure Belli, lib. i. c. ii. p. 36.

<sup>4</sup> Ziegler, Animadvers. in Grotium, lib. i. c. ii. p. 105.

live in a state of perpetual penance, but afterward<sup>1</sup> returned to a secular life, and took upon them civil offices again, which in the imperial law and canons of the church are sometimes called by the name of *Militia Palatina*. And Salmasius advances<sup>2</sup> an opinion not much different from this. However it is agreed on all hands, that the council of Nice made no general prohibition of the military life, but only in some such special cases. There is therefore no reason to conclude from hence, that they esteemed the vocation of a soldier simply unlawful. Especially considering, that Constantine himself allowed the soldiers, who were cashiered by Licinius, to return to their ancient employment again, as is rightly observed by Ziegler out of Theodoret and Eusebius.<sup>3</sup> Nay, the first council of Arles excommunicated all such as threw away their arms in time of peace,<sup>4</sup> on pretence that they were Christians. All which abundantly proves, that the ancient canons did not condemn the military life as a vocation simply unlawful or anti-christian, nor consequently such as men were obliged to renounce at their baptism: but all that was required of them, was only what St. John Baptist had exacted before, when they came to his baptism, as appears from the rule in the Constitutions<sup>5</sup> providing in this case, “that a soldier, when he desired baptism, should be taught to do violence to no man, to accuse no one falsely, and to be content with his wages; if he consented to these things, he was to be received; if otherwise, to be rejected.” This was the standing rule of the church, and I believe there is no instance of any man being refused baptism merely because he was a soldier, unless some unlawful circumstance, as that of idolatry, or the like, made the vocation sinful.

SECT. II.—Whether Persons might be baptized, who lived in the state of Concubinage.

The other case, which has been matter of doubt, is con-

<sup>1</sup> Albaspin. Not. in Can. xii. Conc. Nic.      <sup>2</sup> Salmas. de Fœnore Trapezitico, p. 782, cited by Ziegler.      <sup>3</sup> Euseb. de Vit. Constant. lib. ii. c. 33.

<sup>4</sup> Conc. Arelat. i. can. iii. de his qui arma projiciunt in pace, placuit abstinere eos a communione.      <sup>5</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 32. *Στρατιώτης προσιών διδασκεσθω μή ἀδικεῖν, μή συκοφαντεῖν, ἀρκεῖσθαι δε δειδομένοις ὀψωνίοις. πειθόμενος προσδέχεσθω. ἃ τιλέγων ἀποβαλλέσθω.*

cerning the state of concubinage, which in the common acception is a matter of such ill fame, that it seems a wonder to many to hear of any allowance made to it in the civil law and ancient canons. But they made a distinction anciently in this matter, as the Jews and patriarchs of old did, among whom there was one sort of concubines which was permitted, as differing nothing from a wife, save only that she was not married with all the solemnities and usual forms that the other was. And this sort of concubines the ancient canons received both to baptism and the communion. The rule in the Constitutions<sup>1</sup> about this matter is given thus: a concubine, that is a slave to an infidel, if she keep herself only to him, may be received to baptism; but, if she commit fornication with others, she shall be rejected. A like decree was made in the Council of Toledo<sup>2</sup> concerning the admission of persons to the communion: if any Christian, who has a wife, have also a concubine, let him not communicate. But if he have no wife, but only a concubine instead of a wife, he may not be repelled from the communion, provided he be content to be joined to one woman only, whether wife or concubine, as he pleases. Now the difference betwixt such a concubine and a wife, as learned men have observed,<sup>3</sup> was not, that the one was truly married, and the other not; but in the different way of their being married. For she, that was called a wife, was married publicly, and with great solemnity, and instruments of dowry, and other ceremonies, which the civil and canon law required; but she, who was called a concubine, was one married in a private way without the solemnity, which the law required. But they both agreed in these three things; 1. That they were unmarried persons before. 2. That they obliged themselves to their husbands to live in conjugal

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. viii. c. 32. Παλλακή τινος ἀπίστα δέλη, ἐκείνη μόνη σχολάζουσα, προσδεχέσθω· εἰ δὲ ἢ πρὸς ἄλλας ἀσελγαίνει, ἀποβαλλέσθω.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. Tolet. i. can. 17. Si quis habens uxorem fidelis, concubinam habeat, non communicet. Ceterum is qui non habet uxorem, et pro uxore concubinam habeat, à communione non repellatur, tantum ut unius mulieris, aut uxoris, aut concubinae, ut ei placuerit, sit conjunctione contentus.

<sup>3</sup> Vide Anton. Augustinum de Emendatione Gratiani, lib. i. Dial. 15. p. 170. Pet. Martyr. Loc. Cor. lib. ii. cap. 20. n. 3. p. 273.

chastity, and in procreation of children, and be joined to no other. 3. And that they would continue faithful in this state all their lives. Now this sort of concubines, being in the nature of wives married without the formalities required in the civil law, were not reputed guilty of fornication, though they wanted the privileges, rights, and honours, that the law allowed to those, who were called legal wives: and therefore they were admitted to baptism without any further obligation, in case the husband was an heathen. But, if the husband was a Christian, the rule in the Constitution made a little difference. For if he had a concubine, he was obliged to dismiss her, and marry a lawful<sup>1</sup> wife, if his concubine was a slave; and if she was a free-woman, he must make her a lawful wife: otherwise he was to be cast out of the church. And so in the decrees of Pope Leo,<sup>2</sup> Christians, who had only concubines, were obliged to dismiss them, if they were slaves, unless they would free them, and lawfully endow them, and give them a public marriage as the laws required. And in these decrees seem to differ from that of the council of Toledo, which allows a concubine to cohabit in private wedlock without any ecclesiastical censure. St. Austin<sup>3</sup> reckons this case one of those dubious and difficult points, which cannot easily be determined. But he inclines to think a concubine of this kind might be admitted to baptism, because her case differs much from that of a professed adulteress, who could never be admitted to baptism, whilst she lived in the practice of so flagrant a crime; but the other case, he thinks, is a matter which the Scripture has no where so positively condemned, but rather left in doubt, as many other such points and

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. Lib. viii. c. 32. Πιστός εάν ἔχη παλλακὴν. εἰ μὲν δέλην, πανσάσω, ἢ νόμῳ γαμήτω. εἰ δὲ ἑλευθέραν, ἐγαμήτω ἀπὸ τῆν νόμῳ. εἰ δὲ μή, ἀποβαλλέσθω.

<sup>2</sup> Leo Ep. 92. ad Rusticum, c. 4. Clericus, si filiam viro habenti concubinam in matrimonium dederit, non ita accipiendum est, quasi conjugato ei dederit, nisi forte illa mulier et ingenua facta, et dotata legitimè, et publicis nuptiis honestata videatur.—Ibid. c. 5. Ancillam à toro abjicere, et uxorem eertæ ingenuitatis accipere, non duplicatio conjugii, sed profectus est honestatis.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. de Fide et Operibus, cap 19. tom. iv. p. 33. De concubina quoque, si professa fuerit nullum se alium cognituram, etiamsi ab illo, cui subdita est, dimittatur: merito dubitatur, utrum ad percipiendum baptismum non debeat admitti.

questions, which the church in her prudence must decide by the best skill she has to determine such difficult questions. I have represented the sense of the ancients upon this point as clearly as I could, because it has occasioned some ill-grounded censures of the ancients, and of Gratian's canon-law, which is only copied from them, in some modern authors; as if they had allowed such concubines, as we commonly call harlots, to be baptised without giving signs of repentance: whereas, we see, this matter was not so crudely delivered by them, but considered and determined with several necessary cautions and distinctions. And I have been the more particular in making inquiries concerning these several kinds of adult persons, who might, or might not, be admitted to baptism, because these are questions, which the reader will not readily find so distinctly examined in modern writers, who have professedly treated of the subject of baptism.

SECT. 12.—A peculiar error of the Marcionites in rejecting all married Persons from Baptism.

I only note one thing more concerning a pretended rule of purity among the Marcionites, which was, that they would admit no married persons to their baptism; but they must be either virgins, or widows, or bachelors, or divorced persons: which, as Tertullian observes, came doubtless from their abhorrence and condemnation<sup>1</sup> of the married life; which error was common to them with many other ancient heretics: though I do not find this peculiarity, of denying baptism to such persons, ascribed to any others. However it was, we are sure, there was no such rule ever made to discourage marriage in the catholic church. Her rule was always that of St. Paul, "Marriage is honourable in all, and the bed undefiled; but whoremongers and adulterers God will judge." The church took upon her to judge adulterers, and by the power of the keys to exclude them from baptism: but beyond this she pretended to no power,

---

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. Cont. Marcion. lib. i. cap. 29. Non tingitur apud illum caro nisi virgo, nisi vidua, nisi cœlebs, nisi divorlio baptisma mercata—Sine dubio ex damnatione conjugii institutio ista constabit.



or commission from God, to be exercised over any others, whom God had left at liberty to be married or unmarried, as they saw occasion.

## CHAP. VI.

### *Of the Time and Place of Baptism.*

SECT. I.—Why adult Persons sometimes delayed Baptism by order of the Church.

NEXT to the persons who were the subjects of baptism, it will be proper to consider the circumstances of time and place in the administration of it. As to infants, I have already shewed, that no time was limited for their baptism; but they were to be regenerated as soon as they could with convenience after the time of their natural birth; being confined to no day, as circumcision was, by any rule of Scripture: though the church in some places deferred them, when there was no danger of death, to the solemnity of some greater festival. But for adult persons, the case was otherwise. For their baptism was generally deferred for two or three years, or a longer, or shorter time, by order of the church, till they could be sufficiently instructed, and disciplined to the practice of a Christian life; of which I have given a full account in the last book. Others had their baptism put off a longer time by way of punishment, when they fell into gross and scandalous crimes, which were to be expiated by a longer course of discipline and repentance. This was sometimes five, or ten, or twenty years, or more, even all their lives to the hour of death, when their crimes were very flagrant and provoking. If a catechumen turned informer against his brethren in time of persecution, and any one was proscribed or slain by his means, then by a canon<sup>1</sup> of the Council of Eliberis, his baptism was to be deferred for five years. And so in case a woman-catechumen divorced herself from her husband, her punishment was five years prorogation.<sup>2</sup> But if she committed adultery, and after conception used any arts to destroy

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Eliber. Can. 73. Si quis catechumenus delator fuerit, et per delationem ejus aliquis fuerit proscripius, vel interfectus, post quinquennii tempora admittatur ad baptismum.

<sup>2</sup> Conc. Elib. Can. 11.

her infant in the womb, then she was to remain unbaptised all her life, and only to be admitted<sup>1</sup> to baptism at the hour of death. From whence it is plain, that the baptism of adult persons was sometimes deferred a considerable time by order of the church: but then this was always either by way of preparation or punishment, whilst catechumens were first learning the principles of religion, or were kept in a state of penance to make satisfaction to the church for some scandalous transgression.

SECT. 2.—Private Reasons for deferring Baptism against the Rules of the Church. I. Supinity and Negligence of Salvation.

But others deferred their baptism of their own accord against the rules of the church: Of which practice there are frequent complaints in the writings of the ancients, and severe invectives against it, answering the common pleas which men usually urged in their own behalf. Some did it out of a supine laziness and careless negligence of their salvation, which was a very common reason,<sup>2</sup> but such an one as men were ashamed to own, because its own reproach was a sufficient answer to it.

SECT. 3.—2. An Unwillingness to renounce the World, and submit to the severities of Religion.

Others deferred it out of an heathenish principle still remaining in them, because they were in love with the world and its pleasures, which they were unwilling to renounce to take upon them the yoke of Christ, which they thought would lay greater restraints upon them, and deny them those liberties, which they could now more freely indulge themselves in, and securely enjoy. They could spend their lives in pleasure, and be baptised at last, and then they should gain as much as those that were baptised before; for the labourers, who came into the vineyard at the last hour, had the same reward as those that had borne the burden and heat of the day. Thus Gregory Nazianzen<sup>3</sup> brings them in, ar-

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Eliber. Can. lxxviii. Catechumena si per adulterium conceperit, et conceptum necaverit, placuit eam in fine baptizari. <sup>2</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 654. Constit. Apost. lib. vi. cap. xv. <sup>3</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 650 and 652.

guing for delaying repentance. This reason was so very absurd and foolish, that many, who were governed by it, were ashamed to own it. But yet, as St. Basil<sup>1</sup> observes, though they did not speak a word, their actions sufficiently proclaimed it. For it was the same as if they had said; let me alone, I will abuse the flesh to the enjoyment of all that is filthy; I will wallow in the mire of pleasures; I will embroe my hands in blood; I will take away other men's goods; live by deceit; forswear and lie; and then I will be baptised when I shall leave off sinning. Such men had the idol of infidelity still in their hearts, as the author<sup>2</sup> of the Recognitions, under the name of Clemens Romanns, charges them; and that was the true reason why they put off their baptism: for had they believed baptism to be necessary to all, whether just or unjust, they would have made haste to receive it, because the end of every man's life is utterly uncertain.

SECT. 4.—3. A Fear of Falling after Baptism.

Another sort of men put off their baptism to the end of their lives upon a sort of Novatian principle, because they pretended to be afraid of falling into sin after baptism; and there was no second baptism allowed to regenerate men again to the kingdom of heaven; whereas, if they were baptised at the hour of death, heaven would be immediately open to them, and they might go pure and undefiled into it. In the mean time, if they died before baptism, they hoped God would accept the will for the deed, and the desire of baptism for baptism itself. Now, as this pretence was founded on abundance of errors, so the ancients are copious in refuting them. St. Basil<sup>3</sup> argues against their practice from the uncertainty of life. For who, says he, has fixed for thee the term of life? Who is it, that can promise thee the enjoyment of old age? Who can undertake to be a sufficient sponsor of futurity? Do you not see both young and old suddenly snatched away? And why do you stay to

<sup>1</sup> Basil. Exhort. ad Bapt. Hom. xiii. tom. i. p. 414.

<sup>2</sup> Clem. Recognit. lib. vi. n. ix. ap. Cotelerium. tom. i. Qui moratur accedere ad aquas, constat in eo infidelitatis adhuc idolum permanere: et ab ipso prohiberi ad aquas, quæ salutem conferunt, properare. Sive enim justus, baptismus tibi per omnia necessarius est, &c. vid. Chrys. Hom. xiii in Heb. p. 1848.

<sup>3</sup> Basil. Exhort. ad Bapt. tom. i. p. 415.

make baptism only the gift of a fever? Gregory Nazianzen<sup>1</sup> calls it a riddle, for an unbaptised man to think he is baptised in the sight of God, whilst he depends upon his mercy in the neglect of baptism; or to imagine himself in the kingdom of heaven, without doing the things, that belong to the kingdom of heaven. This is but a vain hope, says Gregory Nyssen,<sup>2</sup> bewitching the soul with false appearances and pretensions. And as they thus exposed the groundless hopes of these men, so they as zealously demonstrated to them the vanity of their pretended fears. For though there was no second baptism for them, that fell into sin after the first, yet it was not impossible for men to avoid falling into damnable sins after their first purgation; or, if they did so fall, yet if they were not sins unto death, they might obtain a second cleansing by pardon upon repentance. So that it was plain madness and folly to neglect baptism upon such uncertain fears, because that was to run a much more dangerous risk, whilst they sought to avoid a lesser inconvenience, which was attended with much more safety, and had no such apprehended danger in it.<sup>3</sup>

SECT. 5.—4. Superstitious Fancies in reference to the Time and Ministers of Baptism.

Some again there were, who deferred their baptism upon a principle of mere fancy and superstition, in reference to the time, or place, or ministers of baptism. Gregory Nazianzen<sup>4</sup> brings in some, making this excuse: “I stay till Epiphany, the time when Christ was baptised, that I may be baptised with Christ; I rather chuse Easter, that I may rise with Christ; I wait for Whitsuntide, that I may honour the descent of the Holy Ghost. And what then? In the mean time comes death suddenly, in a day thou didst not expect, and in an hour thou art not aware of.” Others had a superstitious fancy to be baptised in some certain place, as at Jerusalem, or in the river Jordan, and therefore they deferred their baptism, till they could have a convenience to come to the

<sup>1</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 617.  
ii. p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> Nyssen. de Bapt. tom.

<sup>3</sup> Vid. Chrys. Hom. xx. in Heb. p. 1884.

<sup>4</sup> Naz.

Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 654.

place intended. This seems tacitly to be reflected on by Tertullian<sup>1</sup>, when he says; “there is no difference between those whom John baptised in Jordan, and those whom Peter baptised in the Tiber,” and by St. Ambrose in his Discourse to the catechumens<sup>2</sup> where exhorting them to come with all possible speed to be baptised, he invites them to draw the blessing of consecration from the font of Jordan, and to drown their sins in that stream, where Christ’s sacred person was baptised: but then, that they might not mistake his meaning, he adds, “that in order to their being baptised in the font of Jordan, it was not necessary they should go to the eastern country, or to the river in the land of Judæa: for wherever Christ was, there was Jordan: and the same consecration, which blessed the rivers of the east, sanctified also the rivers of the west.” Eusebius tells us<sup>3</sup>, that Constantine had a design for many years to have been baptised in the river Jordan, after the example of Christ; and that perhaps might be the reason, why he so long deferred his baptism: but God, who knew best what was fit for him, disappointed him in this design, and he was at last baptised at Nicomedia a little before his death. For as to that story, which is so pompously set forth by Baronius<sup>4</sup>, concerning his being baptised by Pope Silvester at Rome, and cured of his leprosy, it is a mere fable, refuted by the testimony of all the ancients, Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Athanasius, St. Ambrose, St. Jerom, and the Council of Ariminum, who all speak of his baptism immediately before his death: and the best critics since Baronius, Valesius<sup>5</sup>, and Schelstrate<sup>6</sup>, Lambecius<sup>7</sup>, Papebrochius<sup>8</sup> and

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. Cap. 4. Nec quicquam refert inter eos quos Joannes in Jordane, et quos Petrus in Tiberi tinxit.

<sup>2</sup> Ambros. Ser. xli. tom. iii. p. 268. Debemus, fratres dilectissimi, vobis catechumenis loquer, gratiam baptismatis ejus omni festinatione suscipere, et de fonte Jordanis quem ille benedixit, benedictionem consecrationis haurire; ut in eum gurgitem in quem se illius sanctitas mersit, nostra peccata mergantur.—Sed ut eodem fonte mergamur, non nobis orientalis petenda est regio, non fluvius terræ Judæicæ. Ubi enim nunc Christus, ibi quoque Jordanes est. Eadem consecratio, quæ orientis flumina benedixit, occidentis fluentia sanctificat.

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. de Vita Constant. lib. iv. c. lxii.

<sup>4</sup> Baron. an. cccxxiv. n. xvii.

<sup>5</sup> Vales. Not. in Socrat. lib. i.

c. xxxix.

<sup>6</sup> Schelstrat. Concil. Antiochen. Dissert. ii. c. i. p. 43.

<sup>7</sup> Lambec. Commentar. de Bibliotheca Vindobonensi. tom. v. ap. Pagi.

<sup>8</sup> Papebroch. Acta Sanctor. Maii. tom. v. Vit. Constant. Maii xxi. p. 15.

Pagi,<sup>1</sup> agree in their verdict with the ancients against the modern fiction. So that now it is agreed on all hands, that Constantine was one of those, who deferred his baptism to the time of his death: and the most probable account, that can be given of this, is the fancy which he had entertained of being baptised in Jordan, which the providence of God never suffered him to put in execution. Another sort of fanciful men would not be baptised, till they could have one to minister baptism to them, who had some extraordinary qualifications. Gregory Nazianzen takes notice of some such as these, and rebukes them after this manner: “say not thou,<sup>2</sup> a bishop shall baptise me, and that a metropolitan, and also one of Jerusalem: for grace is not the gift of the place, but of the spirit: say not, I will be baptised by one that is of noble birth, and that it will be a reproach to thy noble descent to be baptised by any other: say not, if I am baptised by a Presbyter, it shall be one that is unmarried, and one that is of the continent and angelic order, as if thy baptism were defiled by any other: make not thyself judge of the fitness or qualification of the preacher or baptiser, for there is another that judgeth of these things. Every one is qualified to thee for thy purgation, provided only he be one of those, that are allowed and not condemned, nor a foreigner, nor an enemy of the church. Judge not thy judges, thou that hast need of healing. Tell me not of the dignity of thy purgators; make no difference among thy spiritual fathers; one may be better or more humble than another, but each of them is in an higher rank than thou.” By all this it appears, that a superstitious distinction of times, and places, and persons, had an influence upon some, and was pleaded as a reason for deferring baptism.

SECT. 6.—5. A Pretence to follow the Example of Christ.

Others pleaded for deferring their baptism, till they were thirty years old, from the example of Christ, because he was of that age when he was baptised. Which pretence

<sup>1</sup> Pagi. Critic. in Baron. an. cccxxiv. n. iv.

<sup>2</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 653.

is copiously refuted by Gregory Nazianzen,<sup>1</sup> shewing in answer to it, that Christ, as God, was purity itself, and had no need of purgation, but what he did in that kind, was only for the sake of men; that there was no danger could befall him by delaying or protracting his baptism; that there were particular reasons for his doing so, which did not belong to other men; and that he did many things which we are not concerned to follow his example in; for all his actions were not designed to be copies and examples for our imitation.

He, that would see more of these pleas, may consult the discourses of St. Basil, Nazianzen, and Nyssen upon this subject; or Mr. Walker's Treatise of Infant-Baptism, in the preface to which he enumerates no less than nineteen such causes as these, which were the pretended occasions of men's deferring their baptism. Those, I have already mentioned, are sufficient to our present purpose, to shew, that when men made great delays in this matter, they commonly did it against the rules and orders of the church, and that the ancients with great severity and sharpness always declaimed and inveighed against it as a dangerous and unchristian practice. Therefore, though there may be some particular instances of persons, who thus carelessly and wilfully, through ignorance or false conceits, neglected their own baptism, and perhaps the baptism of their children too; yet these men's actions are of no account to shew us what were the standing measures and methods of proceeding in the church, since they are manifest transgressions of her rule, and deviations from her ordinary practice. The church had but two reasons at any time for deferring the baptism of adult persons year after year; the one was to give sufficient time to the catechumens to prepare them for baptism, and the other to reform their miscarriages, when they happened to turn lapsers or apostates before their baptism. Both these were grounded upon one and the same principle; which was, that men were obliged to give sufficient security and satisfaction to the church, that they intended to live by the rules of the Gospel, before they were admitted to the mysteries of it:

---

<sup>1</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 658.

and the best security that could be given, was from the experiment and trial beforehand, and therefore this discipline was used to make them give testimony of their intentions by a reasonable prorogation of their baptism.

SECT. 7.—The solemn Times appointed for Baptism by the Church were Easter, Pentecost, and Epiphany.

Upon this account the church appointed certain stated seasons and solemn times of baptism in ordinary cases; allowing her ministers still the liberty to anticipate these times, if either catechumens were very great proficient, or in danger of death by any sudden accident or distemper. The most celebrated time among these, was Easter; and next to that, Pentecost or Whitsuntide; and Epiphany, or the day on which Christ was supposed to be baptised. These three are plainly referred to by Gregory Nazianzen,<sup>1</sup> where he brings in some giving this reason why they deferred their baptism: “one said, he staid till the Epiphany,” for the Ancients mean that by *φῶτα* and lumina, not Candlemas, as some mistake it, but Epiphany, the day on which Christ was baptised, and manifested to the world: “another said, he had a greater respect for Easter; and a third, that he waited till the time of Pentecost:” which plainly implies, that these three festivals were then the most noted and solemn times of baptism. But Easter and Pentecost were the chief; for they are sometimes mentioned without the other, and sometimes with an express prohibition of it. St. Jerom speaks of the two former, as usual, but says nothing of the latter. He tells us, some referred that prophecy in Zechary to baptism,<sup>2</sup> “Living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; in summer and in winter shall it be.” The Septuagint reads it, “in the summer and in the spring.” And this they applied to the two solemn times of baptism, Pentecost and Easter, one of which was in summer, and the other in the spring, when the living waters of baptism were distributed to all that thirsted after them. He mentions the same in his Epistle to Pammachius<sup>3</sup> against the errors of

<sup>1</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 654. *Μένω τὰ φῶτα, τὸ πάσχα μοι τιμιώτερον, τὴν πεντεκοστήν κέξομαι, &c.*

<sup>2</sup> Hieron. Com. in Zechar. xiv. 8. *Aquas viventes multi ad Baptismum referunt, quæ in vere et in æstate, hoc est in Pascha et Pentecoste, sitientibus largiendæ sunt.*—Chrys. Hom. xxxvi de Pentecost. T. v. p. 552. Hom. i. in Act. p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron. Epist. lxi.



John of Jerusalem, where he speaks of forty, that were baptised at Bethleem upon Pentecost, and others that offered themselves at Easter, but were rejected by that humoursome bishop, when they were ready for baptism. These two, and no other, are likewise spoken of by Tertullian.<sup>1</sup> He says, “Easter was appointed as the time of Christ’s sufferings, into which we are baptised. And after that, Pentecost is a very large space of time set aside for that purpose. In which time Christ manifested his resurrection to his disciples, and the grace of the Holy Spirit was first given, and the angels predicted his second advent at his ascension.” Where it is very plain, that Tertullian, by the large space of Pentecost, does not mean a particular day, but the whole fifty days between Easter and Whitsuntide, which in his time was one continued festival, as he tells us in other places.<sup>2</sup> And therefore though Vicecomes<sup>3</sup> reprehends Ludovicus Vives for asserting this, as if he had no authority for it; yet Habertus<sup>4</sup> defends him out of this place of Tertullian; and other learned men<sup>5</sup> are of the same opinion. Vicecomes thinks the time of baptising at Easter was only one day, that is, the great Sabbath, or Saturday, when our Saviour lay in the grave. But this is also a mistake: for though this day was the most famous for baptising catechumens and infants also, as we learn from Chrysostom,<sup>6</sup> and the author of the Constitutions,<sup>7</sup> yet the whole time of fifty days was set a part for this purpose, and accounted but as one solemn season for baptism. Which perhaps is the true reason, why some ancient canons allow no other time but that of Easter for baptism; including the whole fifty days from Easter till Pentecost, in the sense of Tertullian. Thus, in the second council of Maseon,<sup>8</sup> a decree was made, that whereas many Christians, not

ad Panmach. c. xvi. Circa dies Pentecostes, quadraginta diversæ ætatis et sexûs presbyteris tuis obtulimus baptizandos.—It. Præcepisti Bethleem presbyteris tuis, ne competentibus nostris in pascha baptismum traderent.

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. cap. xix. Diem baptismo solenniorem Pascha præstat, cum et Passio Domini, in qua tingimur, adimpleta est.—Exinde Pentecoste ordinandis Lavacris latissimum spatium est, quo et Domini Resurrectio inter Discipulos frequentata est, et Gratia Spiritûs Sancti dedicata, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Vid. Tertul. de Idol. cap. xiv. et de Coron. Mil. cap. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Vice-

com. de Ritib. Bapt. lib. i. c. xxv.

<sup>4</sup> Habert. Archieratic. par. viii.

observ. iv. p. 134.

<sup>5</sup> Cave. Prim. Christ. par. i. c. xi. p. 307.

<sup>6</sup> Chrysost. Ep. i. ad Innocent. p. 680.

<sup>7</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. v. c. 19.

<sup>8</sup> Conc. Maseon, ii. can. iii. Comperimus Christianos, non observantes

regarding the lawful time of baptism, were used to bring their children to be baptised upon any holyday or festival of a martyr, so that at Easter there were not above two or three to be baptised; they therefore enacted, that from thenceforward no one should be permitted so to do, excepting those whose children were in extremity of sickness and danger of death. A like decree was made in the council of Auxerre<sup>1</sup> confining all children to the time of Easter, except in case of sickness, when they were allowed to have clinic baptism. And so Socrates says,<sup>2</sup> it was the custom in Thessaly only to baptise at Easter. All which must either be understood to include the fifty days of Pentecost, or else it must be said, these churches had a peculiar custom differing from the rest of the world. For in other rules and canons, express mention is made of Easter and Pentecost, though other festivals are excluded. In the Council of Girone, in Spain,<sup>3</sup> all catechumens are ordered to come only at Easter or Pentecost, because the greater the feast was, the greater ought the solemnity to be. But on all other festivals, none but sick people were to be baptised, who were not to be refused baptism at any time. Siricius, in his Epistle to Himerius,<sup>4</sup> bishop of Tarraco in Spain, intimates indeed, that abundance of people presumed to take greater liberties to be baptised on the nativity of Christ, and the Epiphany, and the festivals of the

legitimum diem baptismi, pene per singulos dies ac natales martyrum filios suos baptizare, ut vix duo vel tres reperiantur in Sancto Pascha, qui per aquam et Spiritum Sanctum regenerentur: idcirco censemus, ut ex hoc tempore nullus eorum permittatur talia perpetrare, præter illos, quos infirmitas nimia aut dies extremus compellit filios suos baptismum suscipere.

<sup>1</sup> Con. Antisiodor. can. xix. Non licet absque Paschæ solennitate ullo tempore baptizare, nisi illos quibus mors vicina est, quos Grabatarios dicunt, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Soerat. lib. v. c. 22.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Gerundens. Can. iv. De Catechumenis baptizandis id statutum est, ut in Paschæ solennitate, vel Pentecostes, quanto majoris celebritatis celebritas major est, tanto magis ad baptizandum veniant. Cæteris autem solennitatibus infirmi tantummodo debeant baptizari, quibus quocunque tempore convenit baptismum non negari.

<sup>4</sup> Siric. Ep. ad Himer. c. 2. Sola temeritate præsumitur, ut passim ac libere Natalitiis Christi, seu Apparitionis, nec non et Apostolorum seu Martyrum Festivitatibus, innumerae (ut asseris) plebes baptismi Mysterium consequantur; cum hoc sibi privilegium et apud nos et apud omnes Ecclesias, dominicum specialiter cum Pentecoste suâ Pascha defendat, quibus solis per annum diebus, ad fidem confluentibus generalia baptismatis tradi convenit Sacramenta, &c.

Apostles and Martyrs; but this was against the rule of the Roman church, and all others, which reserved this privilege peculiarly to Easter, with its Pentecost or fifty days following, at which time baptism was generally administered to all that were qualified, but not at other times, except only to infants, and persons in a languishing condition and in danger of death. In the time of Pope Leo, the custom had prevailed in Sicily to baptise as many on the festival of Epiphany, as at Easter or Pentecost: but he calls<sup>1</sup> this an unreasonable novelty, and a confusion of the mysteries of each time, to think, that no difference was to be made between the day on which Christ was adored by the wise men, and that whercon he arose from the dead. Therefore since these two, Easter and Pentecost, were the only lawful<sup>2</sup> times of baptising the elect catechumens in the church, he gives them an admonition, that they should mingle no other days in the like observance. He gives the same admonition to the bishops of Campania,<sup>3</sup> Samnium, and Picenum, in another epistle, against baptising any, except in case of necessity, on the festivals of the Martyrs. And after him, Gelasius<sup>4</sup> made another decree, directed to the bishops of Lucania, prohibiting baptism to be given at any other time, save Easter and Pentecost, except in case of dangerous sickness, when there might be reasonable fear of the party's dying without the remedy of salvation. So that in the Roman and Western churches this was the general rule, to baptise none of the adult in ordinary cases, save only upon these two great festivals, though the practice in some places was a little dissonant to the injunction of the canons. In the Eastern churches, and in Afric, Epiphany

<sup>1</sup> Leo. Ep. iv. ad Episc. Siculos, cap. 1. Miror vos tam irrationabilem novitatem usurpare potuisse, ut confuso temporis utriusque mysterio, nullam esse differentiam crederetis inter diem quo adoratus est Christus à Magis, et diem quo resurrexit à mortuis, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. c. v. Unde quia manifestissime patet, hæc duo tempora baptizandis in Ecclesiâ electis esse legitima, monemus ut nullos alios dies huic observantiæ miscatis.

<sup>3</sup> Leo. Ep. 78, ad Episc. Campan. c. i.

<sup>4</sup> Gelas. Ep. ix. ad Episc. Lucan. cap. 12. Baptizandi sibi quispiam passim quocumque tempore nullam credat inesse fiduciam, præter Paschate festum et Pentecostes venerabile sacramentum, excepto duntaxat gravissimi languoris incurso, in quo verendum est, ne morbi crescente periculo, sine remedio salutari fortassis ægrotans exitio preventus abscedat.

seems also to have been regarded. For, besides what has been already noted out of Nazianzen, Valesius<sup>1</sup> has observed out of the ancient ritual, called *Typicum Sabæ*, that on this day they were wont to baptise in the Church of Jerusalem. And Joannes Moschus<sup>2</sup> mentions the same custom in other parts of the east. And Victor Uticensis<sup>3</sup> plainly intimates, that it was a solemn time of baptising at Carthage, and in the African Churches. For though he does not name it Epiphany, yet we may easily collect it was either that day or Christ's nativity; for he says, it was but a little before the kalends of February, that fatal day, on which the African bishops were banished, and the church destroyed by the fury of the Arians, in the time of the Vandalic persecution.

SECT. 8.—And in some places, the Festivals of the Apostles and Martyrs, and Anniversary Days of the Dedication of Churches prevailed also.

It was also customary, in some churches, to make the anniversary festival of the dedication of the church a solemn time of baptising. Sozomen<sup>4</sup> observes it to have been so at Jerusalem, from the time that Constantine built that famous church over our Saviour's grave at Mount Calvary, called Anastasis, or *the church of the resurrection*. For every year after that time the church of Jerusalem held an anniversary festival of the dedication, which, to make the solemnity more august, lasted for eight days together, on which they held ecclesiastical meetings, and administered the sacrament of baptism; and many men came from all parts of the world to visit the sacred places upon this occasion. Valesius<sup>5</sup> takes some pains to prove out of several authors, the *Chronicon Alexandrinum*, Nicephorus, the *Greek Menologium*, and *Typicum Sabæ*, that this was on the thirteenth of September; that no one might think it fell in with the festivals of Easter or Pentecost, the other solemn times of baptism. Whether the same custom prevailed in any other churches, is not said; but it is not improbable that it might obtain, because Jerusalem was a leading

<sup>1</sup> Vales. Not. in Theodorit. lib. ii. c. 27. c. 214.

<sup>2</sup> Mosch. Prat. Spirit.

<sup>3</sup> Victor. de Persec. Vandal. lib. ii. Bibl. Patr. tom. vii. p. 603.

<sup>4</sup> Sozom. lib. ii. cap. 26. Ὡς δὲ μνήσεις ἐν αὐτῇ ἑορτῇ τελεῖσθαι, καὶ ὅτι τὴν ἡμέραν ἐφεξῆς ἐκκλησιάζειν.

<sup>5</sup> Vales. Dissert. de Anastasi et Martyrio Hierosolym. ad calcem Eusebii, p. 306.

pattern, and is sometimes styled the mother of all churches. The custom of baptising on the festivals of the apostles and martyrs seems to have prevailed in many of the French and Spanish churches: but this was condemned and forbidden by many canons, and therefore cannot be spoken of as an authentic custom, because it was rather a transgression and encroachment upon the established rules of the church, which in this case might be observed without any detriment, whilst a liberty was granted to baptise at any time upon sudden emergencies and extraordinary cases.

SECT. 9.—No such stated Times in the Apostles' Days.

Indeed in the first plantation of the Gospel there was no such obligation to observe any stated times of baptism, because the Apostles made no law about it. They themselves baptised indifferently at any time, as occasion required, and they left this circumstance wholly to the judgment and prudence of their successors in the church, to act as reason and piety should direct them. This is very evident from the History of the Acts of the Apostles, and the subsequent history of the church compared together. The author of the Comments on St. Paul's Epistles, under the name of St. Ambrose,<sup>1</sup> has diligently noted this difference in the church's discipline, between the first and the following ages. "At first," says he, "every one taught and baptised on all days and times, as occasion required. Philip stayed for no time, nor day, to baptise the eunuch, nor did he use any intermediate fast before it. Neither did Paul and Silas delay the time, when they baptised the keeper of the prison with all his house. Neither did Peter use deacons, nor stay for a solemn day, when he baptised Cornelius and his family.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. Com. in Ephes. iv. Primum omnes docebant et omnes baptizabant, quibuscumque diebus vel temporibus fuisset occasio. Nec enim Philippus tempus quæsit, aut diem, quo eunuchum baptizaret; neque jejunium interposuit. Neque Paulus et Silas tempus distulerunt, quo optionem carceris baptizarent cum omnibus ejus. Neque Petrus diaconos habuit, aut diem quæsit, quando Cornelium cum omni domo ejus batizavit.—Ubi autem omnia loca circumplexa est ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt, et rectores et cetera officia in ecclesiâ ordinata sunt.—Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque diaconi in populo prædicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant; neque quocunque die credentes tinguntur, nisi ægri.

But when the church had spread itself into all parts, then oratories were built, and church-officers were appointed, and several orders made about the administration of baptism: whence it was, that now neither deacons preached; nor any of the inferior clergy, nor laymen baptised; nor was baptism administered at all times to believers, but only to those that were sick. That, which seems to have made the difference in this matter, was the difference in the zeal and readiness of the first converts, and those that came afterwards. For the Church found it necessary in process of time to proceed a little more slowly with the candidates of baptism, both in the instruction and trial of them, because of their dullness and negligence and frequent relapses. And by these means it came to pass, that in some populous churches often vast multitudes were baptised together. As Palladius observes in the Life of St. Chrysostom,<sup>1</sup> that at Constantinople three thousand persons were baptised at once upon one of these greater festivals. And this was the reason why deacons at Rome, who were not allowed to baptise upon any other occasion, no not even in times of sickness, were admitted to do it at Easter, because of the vast numbers of people that came then to be baptised, as I have had occasion to shew out of a canon of one of the Roman councils in another discourse.<sup>2</sup>

SECT. 10.—How far these Rules were obliging in succeeding Ages.

But when these rules about stated times of baptism were in their strictest observation, there were still several cases, wherein it was thought proper to dispense with them, and discharge men of their obligation. The case of sickness and extremity pleaded a just exemption, as we have seen before, in all the canons of the universal church. And the promptness and proficiency of some catechumens above others, gave them an earlier title to baptism, if they desired it, without waiting for a more solemn season, especially in the eastern Churches; as may be collected from the exhortations of Chrysostom and Basil, inviting such, as were

<sup>1</sup> Pallad. Vit. Chrysost. cap. 9. Et Chrys. Hom. xlvi. in Act. p. 19.

<sup>2</sup> Scholast. Hist. of Lay-Baptism, part i. chap. i. p. 406.

duly prepared for baptism, to receive it the first opportunity, without staying for one of these greater festivals. You pretend to stay to the time of Lent, says Chrysostom:<sup>1</sup> but why so? Has that time any thing more than others? The Apostles received not this grace at Easter; but at another time. Neither was it the time of Easter, when the three thousand and the five thousand were baptised, of whom we read in the Acts of the Apostles. Other things, says St. Basil,<sup>2</sup> have their peculiar seasons; there is a time for sleep, and a time for watching; a time for war, and a time for peace: but the time of baptism is man's whole life; all times are seasonable to receive salvation thereby, whether day or night, every hour, every minute, every moment. And Nazianzen,<sup>3</sup> in answering that plea which men used for delay, that they stayed only till Easter, Pentecost, or Epiphany, plainly shews, that he rather thought men ought not to defer their baptism, when once they were qualified for it, lest death should come suddenly upon them in a day they did not expect it, and in an hour they were not aware of. And in this respect it was true, what Tertullian said in the close of his Discourse upon this subject, that every day<sup>4</sup> was the Lord's day, every hour, and every time was fit for baptism, if men were fit and prepared for it. One day might be more solemn than another, but the grace of baptism was the same at all times. So that these solemn times were set apart for prudent reasons by the church, and for as prudent reasons they might be dispensed with, when either the necessities of a languishing distemper, or the zeal and activity of forward proficients made it advisable to anticipate the usual times of baptism, which, like all other parts of discipline, were designed for edification, and not for destruction.

SECT. 11.—Baptism not confined to any Place in the Apostolical Ages.

The like observation may be made with respect to the

<sup>1</sup> Chrys. Hom. i. in Act. tom. iv. p. 615. Edit. Savil.

<sup>2</sup> Basil. Ex-

hort. ad Bapt. Hom. xiii. tom. i. p. 409.

<sup>3</sup> Naz. Orat. 40. de Bapt. p.

654.

<sup>4</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. cap. 19. *Cæterum omnis dies domini est, omnis hora, omne tempus habile baptismo: si de solennitate interest, de gratia nihil refert.*

place of baptism; for this varied also with the state and circumstances of the Church. In the apostolical age and some time after, before churches and baptisteries were generally erected, they baptised in any place where they had convenience, as John baptised in Jordan, and Philip baptised the eunuch in the wilderness, and Paul the jailor in his own house. So Tertullian observes,<sup>1</sup> that Peter baptised his converts in the Tiber at Rome, as John had done in Jordan, and that there was no difference whether a man was baptised in the sea, or in a lake, in a river, or a fountain; for the same spirit sanctified the water in all places, and gave them the power of sanctification, when once they were consecrated by invocation and prayer. After this manner the author of the Recognitions under the name of Clemens Romanus<sup>2</sup> represents Peter preaching to the people, and telling them, they might wash away their sins in the water of a river, or a fountain, or the sea, when they were baptised by invoking the name of the blessed Trinity upon them. And he describes his own baptism, and some others,<sup>3</sup> as given them by Peter in certain fountains in Syria by the sea shore. And so it seems to have continued to the time of Justin Martyr and Tertullian. For Tertullian speaks of their going from the church to the water, and then making<sup>4</sup> their renunciations there as they had done in the church before. And Justin Martyr, describing the ceremony of the action, says,<sup>5</sup> they brought the person who was to be baptised to a place where there was water, and there gave him the same regeneration, which they had received before.

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. c. iv. Nulla distinctio est, mari quis an stagno, flumine an fonte, lacu an alveo diluatur, nec quicquam refert inter eos quos Joannes in Jordane, et quos Petrus in Tiberi tinxit.—Omnes aque de pristina originalis prerogativa sacramentum sanctificationis consequuntur, invocato Deo. Supervenit enim statim spiritus de cœlis, et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semetipso, et ita sanctificata vim sanctificandi combibunt.

<sup>2</sup> Clem. Recognit. lib. iv. c. 32. Ut in præsentem quidem tempore diluantur peccata vestra per aquam fontis, aut fluminis, aut etiam maris, invocato super vos trino beatitudinis nomine. Vid. Clementin. Hom. ix. n. 19.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. lib. vi. n. 15. In fontibus, qui contigui habentur mari, perennis aqua mihi baptismum dedit, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Aquam aditum, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia sub Antistitis manu contestamur nos renunciare Diabolo, &c. Tertul. de Coron. c. 3.

<sup>5</sup> Justin. Apoll. ii. p. 93, Ἐπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐνθάδε ὑδωρεσι, &c.



SECT. 12.—In succeeding Ages confined to the Baptisteries of the Church.

But in after ages baptisteries were built adjoining to the church, and then rules were made, that baptism should ordinarily be administered no where but in them. Justinian,<sup>1</sup> in one of his Novels, refers to ancient laws, appointing, that none of the sacred mysteries of the church should be celebrated in private houses. Men might have private oratories for prayer in their own houses, but they were not to administer baptism or the eucharist in them, unless by a particular licence from the bishop of the place. Such baptisms are frequently condemned in the ancient councils, under the name of *Παραβαπτίσματα*, *baptisms in private conventicles*. As in the council of Constantinople under Mennas<sup>2</sup> complaint is made against Zoaras, the monk, that though the Emperor had forbidden all private baptisms by an edict, yet Zoaras, despising that order, had baptised many in a private house upon the Easter festival. The edict, which that council refers to, was another<sup>3</sup> Novel of Justinian's, made against Severus and his accomplices, who after they were expelled the church held conventicles, in private houses, and received, and baptised, and gave the communion to all that came to them: Which sort of parabaptisations are there condemned. So also in the petition of the monks presented to Mennas and the council under him, these baptisms and communions in private houses are reckoned<sup>4</sup> to be an erecting of strange altars and baptisteries in opposition to the true altar and baptistery or laver of the

<sup>1</sup> Justin. Novel 58. Priscis sancitum est legibus, nulli penitus esse licentiam, domi quæ sacratissima sunt agere.—Sed si quidem domos ita simpliciter aliqui habere putant oportere in sacris suis, orationis videlicet solius gratia et nullo celebrando penitus horum quæ sacri sunt mysterii, hoc eis permittimus, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Constant. sub Menna, act. i. p. 70. Ed. Crab. Quanquam piissimus imperator noster mandaverit non reconventiculari, neque rebaptizare, leg. parabaptizare, Zoaras tamen tale præceptum despexit, et parabaptizavit in die paschæ non paucos.

<sup>3</sup> Justin. Novel. xlii. c. 3. Sancimus quemlibet talium silentium ducere, et non convocare aliquos ad se, neque accedentes recipere, aut parabaptizare audere, aut sacram communionem sordidare.

<sup>4</sup> Libel. Monachor. in act. i. Con. sub. Menna. ap. Crab. tom. ii. p. 28. Isti falsi sacerdotes et veri antichristi in domibus intrarunt, et aliena altaria erexerunt, et baptisteria ædificaverunt, in contrarium veri altaris et sancti lavacri.

church; under which name they are frequently condemned in the acts of that council.<sup>1</sup> And in the council of Trullo the order was again renewed,<sup>2</sup> that no persons should receive baptism in oratories belonging to houses, but that they, who desire illumination, should go to the catholic, that is, the public churches: and on pain of deposition to the clergyman, who was the administrator, and excommunication to the layman, who was the receiver.

SECT. 13.—Except in Case of Sickness, or with the Bishop's Licence to the contrary upon some special Occasions.

Now all these laws and rules were intended for the preservation of decency and good order in the Church, that baptism might be performed in the presence of the whole church, whereof men were then made members, and all the congregation might be spectators and witnesses of their admission. Upon which account it was improper to allow it to be done, either in heretical conventicles, or in private houses. Yet in cases of necessity, sickness, imprisonment, journeying, and the like, these rules could not bind; for they were only made for ordinary cases. Therefore we read of martyrs sometimes baptised in prison, and frequently of clinics, as they were called, who were baptised on a sick bed, and others baptised at sea, or in a journey, which were not interpreted transgressions of this rule, because the exigence and necessity of the case made them lawful. And sometimes baptism was allowed in private oratories by the bishop's licence, as both the law of Justinian and the Canons in some places had provided. For the council of Agde<sup>3</sup> in France allows the eucharist to be celebrated in country chapels at all times by the bishop's leave, not excepting the greater festivals: and it is reasonable to suppose, that, where the eucharist was allowed, there baptism might be administered also, though they were not properly parochial or

<sup>1</sup> Epist. Monachor. 2 Syriæ in act. i. Ibid. p. 67, ca 1. 59. Μηδαμῶς ἐν εὐκτηρίῳ οἴκῳ ἐνδον οἰκίας τυγχάνοντι βάπτισμα ἐπιτελείσθω. Ἄλλ' οἱ μέλλοντες ἀξιοῦσθαι τῆ ἀχράντη φωτισματος, ταῖς καθολικαῖς προσερχέσθωσαν ἐκκλησίαις.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Trull. <sup>3</sup> Con. Agathen. can. 21. Si quis etiam extra parochias, in quibus legitimus est ordinariusque conventus, oratorium in agro habuerit, reliquis festiuitatibus ut ibi missas teneat propter fatigationem familiæ iusta ordinatione permittimus, &c.

baptismal churches. The council of Eliberis<sup>1</sup> in Spain speaks of deacons presiding over a people, and baptising in places, where there was neither bishop nor presbyter, which we must reasonably suppose to have been country villages at some distance from the mother-church, where yet for convenience baptism was allowed to be performed by the hands of a deacon. As St. Jerom<sup>2</sup> also testifies, who says, that in villages and castles, and places remote from the bishop's church, men were baptised both by presbyters and deacons. So that though the bishop's church was the ordinary place of baptism, as he himself was the chief minister of it, and the public baptistery was only at his church; yet upon proper reasons, by his authority and permission, baptism might be administered in other places, especially in those that were a sort of secondary churches; of which, and their several distinctions from the *Ecclesia Matrix, the episcopal or principal church*, I have given a more particular account before in the discourse of churches.

## CHAP. VII.

### *Of the Renunciations, and Professions made by all Persons immediately before their Baptism.*

SECT. 1.—Three Things required of all Persons at their Baptism. 1. To renounce the Devil.

HAVING thus far conducted the catechumens to the place of baptism, that is, to the baptistery of the church; we are next to consider, how the discipline of the church proceeded with them immediately before their baptism. And here we are to observe in the first place, that three things were now indispensably required of them at this season, that is, a formal and solemn renunciation of the devil, a profession of faith made in the words of some received creed, and a promise or engagement to live in obedience to Christ, or by the laws and rules of the Christian religion. For though

<sup>1</sup> Con. Eliber. can. 77. Si quis diaconus regens plebem, sine episcopo vel presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debebit.

<sup>2</sup> Hieron. Dial. cum Lucifer. cap. 4. In villulis et castellis et remotioribus locis, per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati, &c.

these things were in some measure required of them before, during the time of their institution, yet now they were to make a more solemn and public profession of them before the congregation. Tertullian<sup>1</sup> seems to intimate this two-fold profession, when he says, that according to the discipline of the Church in his time, catechumens first made their renunciation of the devil, and his pomp and his angels in the church, when they received imposition of hands from the bishop in his prayers for them, and again when they came to the water to be baptised.

SECT. 2.—The form of this Renunciation, and the Import of it.

The form of this renunciation is more perfectly delivered by the author of the Constitutions, in these words: “I renounce Satan, and his works, and his pomps,<sup>2</sup> and his service, and his angels, and his inventions, and all things that belong to him, or that are subject to him.” Others express it more concisely; some calling it the renunciation of the world, as Cyprian,<sup>3</sup> who sometimes joins the devil and the world together, as where he asks one of the lapsers, who had gone to offer sacrifice at the Capitol, how a servant<sup>4</sup> of God could stand there, and speak, and renounce Christ, who before had renounced the devil and the world? And so it is in St. Ambrose: “Thou wentest into the baptistery, consider what questions were asked thee, and what answers thou gavest to them. Thou didst renounce the devil and his works, the world<sup>5</sup> and its luxury and pleasures.” In like manner St. Jerom<sup>6</sup> joins the devil and the world to-

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Coron. Mil. cap. iii. Aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia, sub Antistitis manu, contestamur nos renunciare diabolo et pompæ et angelis ejus.

<sup>2</sup> Const. Apost. lib. vii. cap. xli. Ἀποτάσσομαι τῷ Σατανᾷ, καὶ τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῖς πομπαῖς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῖς λατρείαις αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ ταῖς ἐφευρέσειν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπ’ αὐτόν.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. Ep. vii. al. 13. ad Rogat. p. 37. Seculo renunciaveramus, cum baptizati sumus.

<sup>4</sup> Cypr. de Lapsis. p. 125. Stare illic potuit Dei servus, et loqui, et renunciare Christo, qui jam diabolo renunciârat et seculo?

<sup>5</sup> Ambros. de Initiatis, cap. ii. Ingressus es regenerationis sacrarium, repete quid interrogatus sis, recognosce quid responderis. Renunciasti diabolo et operibus ejus, mundo et luxuriæ ejus ac voluptatibus.

<sup>6</sup> Hieron. Com. in Mat. v. 26. Renuncio tibi diaboli, et pompæ tuæ et vitiis tuis, et mundo tuo, qui in maligno positus est. Chrys. Hom. xlvii. in Julian. Mart. t. i. p. 613.

gether: I “renounce thee, Satan, and thy pomp, and thy vices, and thy world which lieth in iniquity.” Sometimes the games and shows, which were part of the devil’s pomp, were expressly mentioned in this form of renunciation, as it is in Salvian: I renounce the devil, his pomps, his shows, and his works. For he thus addresses himself to Christians, who still gave themselves liberty to be spectators at the Roman shows: “What is the first profession,<sup>1</sup> that Christians make at baptism? Is it not a protestation, that they renounce the devil, and his pomps, and his shows, and his works? Therefore these shows and pomps, even by our own profession, are the works of the devil. How then, O Christian, canst thou after baptism, follow those shows, which thou confessest to be the work of the devil?” Tertullian made use of the same argument before, to make Christians refrain from following the Roman theatres. But then he had also the charge of idolatry to throw into the scale against them. For, says he,<sup>2</sup> “what is the chief and principal thing to be understood by the devil, his pomps, and his angels, but idolatry? Therefore if all the preparation and furniture of the shows be made up of idolatry, there can be no dispute, but that the renunciation, we make in baptism, relates to those shows, and is a testimony against them.” He argues after the same manner against all such secular offices,<sup>3</sup> and honours, and employments, as could not be held and discharged without partaking in some idolatrous rites and ceremonies; such as the offices of

<sup>1</sup> Salvian. de Provident. lib. vi. p. 197. Quæ est enim in baptismo salutari Christianorum prima confessio? Quæ scilicet, nisi ut renunciare se diabolo ac pompis ejus, atque spectaculis et operibus protestentur? Ergo spectacula et pompæ, etiam juxta nostram professionem opera sunt diaboli. Quomodo, O Christiane, spectacula post baptismum sequeris, quæ opus esse diaboli confiteris? Vid. Cyril. Catech. Myst. i. n. iv.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Spectac. cap. iv. Quid erit summum ac præcipuum in quo diabolus et pompæ et angeli ejus censeantur, quam idololatria?—Igitur si ex idololatria universam spectaculorum paraturam constare constiterit, indubitate præjudicatum erit etiam ad spectacula pertinere renunciationis nostræ testimonium in Lavacro.

<sup>3</sup> Tertul. de Coron. Mil. cap. xiii. Hæ erant pompæ diaboli et angelorum ejus, officia seculi, honores, solennitates postulatrices, falsa vota, humana servitia, laudes vanæ, gloriæ turpes: et in omnibus istis idololatria in solo quoque censu coronarum, quibus omnia ista redimita sunt.

the Flamens, and many others; in which, the very wearing of a crown or garland, or exhibiting some of the public shows to the people, as by such an office they were obliged to do, made them guilty of idolatry, though they abstained from the grosser act of it, that of offering incense and sacrifice to the idols. And so the council of Eliberis<sup>1</sup> determined, that such Flamens as only exhibited the public shows to the people, (which in their language is called, *munus dare*;) though they did not sacrifice to the idols, should be cast out of the Church all their lives, and only be admitted to communion at the hour of death. Whence it is plain, that in the times of heathenism and idolatry, all such offices and employments, as obliged men to exhibit those public games and shows to the people, were supposed to be included in the renunciation of the pomps and works of the devil, because of the idolatry that was interwoven with them. But in the time of Salvian, all this idolatry was abolished, and these pomps and shows were no longer exhibited to the honour of idol-gods: yet they had still so much vanity, lewdness, and profaneness in them, that they were justly complained of as unchristian and diabolical, upon the account of their immorality, and therefore were reputed among those unlawful pomps, which every Christian was supposed to renounce at his baptism. Cyril of Jerusalem, who wrote after idolatry was in a great measure destroyed, still continues the charge<sup>2</sup> against them for their lewdness and cruelty, and reckons them among the pomps of the devil, whilst he is explaining to his catechumens this part of their baptismal profession.

SECT. 3.—The Antiquity of this Renunciation. By some derived from Apostolical Practice.

The antiquity of this renunciation is evidenced from all the writers, that have said any thing of baptism. And by some it is derived from apostolical institution and practice.

---

<sup>1</sup> Conc. Eliber. can. iii. Item flamines, qui non immolaverint, sed munus tantum dederint, eo quod se à funestis abstinerunt sacrificiis, placuit in fine eis præstari communionem, actâ tamen legitimâ penitentiâ. <sup>2</sup> Cyril. Catech. Mystag. i. n. iv. p. 280.

For so they interpret that passage of St. Paul to Timothy, 1 Tim. vi. 12. "Lay hold on eternal life, whereunto thou art called, and hast professed a good profession before many witnesses." The authors of the Comments under the names of St. Ambrose and St. Jerom, supposed to be Hilary, the Roman deacon, and Pelagius, give this interpretation of the place: "Thou hast confessed a good confession in baptism, by renouncing the world and its pomps, before many witnesses, before the priests and ministers, and the heavenly powers."<sup>1</sup> So Pelagius. And Hilary<sup>2</sup> seems to say farther, "That this confession was also entered or enrolled in the monuments of the church." Others do not found it upon this or any other express text of Scripture, but yet derive it from ancient tradition. As Tertullian<sup>3</sup> and St. Basil, the former of which reckons it among many other ecclesiastical rites and usages, which are not expressly determined in Scripture, but yet proceeded from tradition, and are confirmed by custom. And St. Basil ranks it<sup>4</sup> among those mystical rites, which were received in the church, not from any written word, but by private direction and tradition from the apostles. The conjecture of those learned men<sup>5</sup> is not improbable, who think the form of renunciation, made by way of questions and answers, to have been so ancient in the Church, as that the apostle St. Peter may be justly thought to refer to it, when he styles baptism, "The answer of a good conscience towards God," which can reasonably refer to nothing so well as that common custom of answering in baptism, "Dost thou renounce the devil?" &c. I renounce him. "Dost thou believe in God?" &c. I believe.

<sup>1</sup> Pelag. in 1 Tim. vi. 12. Confessus es bonam confessionem in baptismo, renunciando sæculo et pompis ejus, coram multis testibus, coram sacerdotibus, vel ministris, virtutibusque cœlestibus.

<sup>2</sup> Ambros. in 1 Tim. vi. 12. Cujus confessio inter ipsa rudimenta fidei, teste interrogante et respondente, monumentis ecclesiasticis continetur.

<sup>3</sup> Tertul. de Coron. Mil. c. 3. Hanc si nulla Scriptura determinavit, certe consuetudo corroboravit, quæ sine dubio de traditione manavit.

<sup>4</sup> Basil. de Spir. Sancto, c. 27. Τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ πεφυλαγμένων δογμάτων ἔς κερυγμάτων, τὰ μὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐγγράφου διδασκαλίας ἔχομεν, τὰ δὲ ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων παράδοσεως, διαδοθέντα ἡμῖν ἐν μυστηρίῳ.

<sup>5</sup> See Dr. Cave Prim. Christ. lib. i. cap. 11. p. 315. Et Estius et Grotius on 1 Pet. iii. 21.

SECT. 4.—This Renunciation made by Persons standing with their Face to the West. And the Reason of that Practice, with some other Ceremonies.

It is farther to be observed concerning this renunciation, that as soon as baptisteries were built, there was a particular place in them assigned peculiarly to this service. For they commonly had two distinct apartments, as has been shewed before,<sup>1</sup> in the description of churches; first their *προαύλιον οἶκον*, *their porch, or ante-room*, where the catechumens made their renunciations of Satan, and confessions of faith; and then their *ἐσωτέρου οἶκον*, *their inner room*, where the ceremony of baptism was performed. When the catechumens were brought into the former of these, they were placed with their faces to the west, and then commanded to renounce Satan with some gesture and rite expressing an indignation against him, as by stretching out their hands, or folding them, or striking them together; and sometimes by exsufflation and spitting at him, as if he were present: which were all of them so many indications of their abhorrence. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his mystical catechisms to the illuminated,<sup>2</sup> thus describes this part of the action: “Ye were first brought into the ante-room of the baptistery, and placed toward the west in a standing posture, and then commanded to renounce Satan, by stretching out your hands against him, as if he were present.” A little after he explains the meaning of their doing this with their face toward the west. The west, says he, is the place of darkness, and Satan is darkness, and his strength is in darkness. For this reason ye symbolically look toward the west, when ye renounce that prince of darkness and horror. St. Jerom plainly alludes to this custom, when he says, “In our mysteries,” meaning the celebration of baptism, “we first renounce him, that is in<sup>3</sup> the west, who dies to us with our sins: and then turning about to the east, we make a covenant with the sun of righteousness, and promise to be his servants. In like

<sup>1</sup> Book VIII. chap. vii. n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril. Catech. Mystag. i. n. 2.

p. 278. Εἰσήειτε πρῶτον εἰς τον προαύλιον οἶκον τῆ βαπτιστηρίε, ἔκ τῆς πρὸς τὰς δυσμὰς ἐσωτέρας, ἠκέσαστε ἔκ τε προσετάττεσθε ἐκτείνειν τὴν χεῖρα, ἔκ τῆς ὡς παρόντι ἀπετάττεσθε τῷ Σατανᾷ.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron. in Amos, vi. 14. In mysteriis primum renunciamus ei qui in occidente est, nobisque moritur cum peccatis: et sic versi ad orientem, pactum inimus cum sole justitiæ, et ei servituros nos esse promittimus.



manner, St. Ambrose discoursing to some newly baptised persons,<sup>1</sup> “when you entered into the baptistery, and had viewed your adversary, whom you were to renounce, you then turned about to the east. For he, that renounces the devil, is turned unto Christ.” Whence, as Gregory Nazianzen<sup>2</sup> observes, they did not only renounce the devil in words, but in their very habit and gesture; for they did it divested of their clothes, and with their body towards the west, and with hands stretched out against him; to this they added sometimes a collision, or striking of the hands together, and an exsufflation, or a spitting at their adversary, to express their abhorrence of him, as the author under the name of Dionysius<sup>3</sup> describes it.

SECT. 5.—Why this Renunciation was made three Times.

From whom we learn also, that this renunciation was repeated three times. For in another place he thus describes the whole ceremony:<sup>4</sup> the priest makes the person, who is to be baptised, to stand with his hands stretched out toward the west, and striking them together; (the original is, τὰς χεῖρας ἀπωθῆντα, which denotes *collision*, or *striking of the hands together by way of abhorrence*.) then he bids him ἐμφυσῆσαι τοῖς τῷ Σατανᾷ, *thrice exsufflate, or spit in defiance of Satan*: afterwards, thrice repeating the solemn words of renunciation, he bids him thrice renounce him in that form: then he turns him about to the east, and with hands and eyes lift up to heaven, bids him συντάξασθαι τῷ Χριστῷ, *enter into covenant with Christ*. Vicecomes<sup>1</sup> thinks this triple renunciation was made, either because there were three things, which men renounced in their baptism, the devil, his pomps and the world; or to signify the three persons of the Trinity, by whom they were adopted as sons

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Initiatis, cap. ii. Ingressus ut adversarium tuum cerneris cui renunciandum mox putares, ad orientem converteris. Qui enim renunciat diabolo, ad Christum convertitur.

<sup>2</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p.

67. Γνώση ἐς τοῖς χρέμασι ἐς τοῖς ῥήμασιν, ὡς ὄλην ἀποπέμψη τὴν ἀξείαν, ἕτως ὄλη θεότητι συντασσόμενος.

<sup>3</sup> Dionys. de Hierarch. Eccl. cap. ii. p.

258. Γυμνὸν ἐξ ἀνυπόδετον ἴστησι πρὸς δυσμὰς ἀφορῶντα, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid.

p.253.

<sup>5</sup> Vicecom. de Ritib, Bapt. lib. iii. cap. 20. p. 311.

upon their renouncing Satan; or because it was usual in civil adoptions and emancipation of slaves, for the master to yield up his right by a triple renunciation, which he shews from Aulus Gellius, and Sigonius. But as the ancients are silent in this matter, I leave these reasons to the discretion of every judicious reader.

SECT. 6.—The second thing required of Men at their Baptism, was a Vow or Covenant of Obedience to Christ.

The next thing required of men at their baptism, was a vow or covenant of obedience to Christ, which the Greeks call, *συντάσσειναι Χριστῷ*, *giving themselves up to the government and conduct of Christ*. This was always an indispensable part of their obligation, before they could be admitted to the ceremony of regeneration. They first renounced the devil, and then immediately promised to live in obedience to the laws of Christ. Some indeed in St. Austin's time pleaded hard for an exemption in this particular. They were willing to make a profession of faith in Christ, but not of universal obedience; and yet would impudently pretend to demand baptism of the church, notwithstanding their incorrigible temper. Against whom he wrote that excellent book, *De Fide et Operibus*, to shew the necessity of good works, as well as faith, to the being of a Christian; where he answers all the objections and arguments they pretended to bring from Scripture: for they pleaded Scripture for their practice. Amongst other things they urged that famous text of St. Paul, "Other foundation can no man lay, than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest: for the day shall declare it; because it shall be revealed by fire; and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burnt, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire." Upon which they made this perverse comment: that they, who built upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, were such as added good works to their faith in Christ:

but they, who built wood, hay, stubble, were they, that held the same faith in unrighteousness and a wicked life.<sup>1</sup> And they imagined, that even these men might so be purged by certain punishments of fire, as to obtain salvation by virtue of the foundation, which they retained. To which St. Austin replies,<sup>2</sup> that if this was true, “it were a laudable charity indeed, for them to endeavour that all men might indifferently be admitted to baptism, not only adulterers and adulteresses, who pretended false marriages contrary to the express command of Christ, but also public harlots continuing in the basest of all professions; which yet the most negligent Church on earth never pretended to admit to baptism, till they had first forsaken that vile prostitution.” They urged farther, that to deny wicked men the privilege of baptism, was to root out the tares before the time. To which St. Austin replies,<sup>3</sup> that this rejection of them from baptism, was not rooting out the tares, but rather not sowing them, as the devil did: they did not prohibit any that were willing to come to Christ, but only convinced them by their own confession, that they were unwilling to come to him. And therefore though these men called it a novel doctrine and practice to reject harlots and stage-players, and all that made open profession of such abominable arts, from baptism, yet he tells them, this was grounded upon the rules of ancient truth,<sup>4</sup> which manifestly declared, that they

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Fide et Oper. c. xv. tom. iv. p. 30. Quod quidam ita intelligendum putant, ut illi videantur ædificare super hoc fundamentum aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos, qui fidei quæ in Christo est bona opera adjiciunt: illi autem sœnum, ligna, stipulam, qui eum eandem fidem habeant, malè operantur. Unde arbitrantur per quasdam pœnas ignis eos posse purgari ad salutem percipiendam merito fundamenti.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. Hoc si ita est, fatemur istos laudabili charitate conari, ut omnes indiscretè admittantur ad baptismum, non solum adulteri et adulteræ, contra sententiam Domini falsas nuptias prætendentes, verùm etiam publicæ meretrices in turpissimâ professione perseverantes, quas certè nulla etiam negligentissima Ecclesia consuevit admittere, nisi ab illâ primitùs prostitutione liberatas.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. c. xvii. Quando tales ad baptismum non admittimus, non ante tempus zizania evellere conamur, sed nolumus insuper sicut diabolus zizania seminare; nec ad Christum volentes venire prohibemus, sed eos ad Christum venire nolle, ipsâ suâ confessione convincimus.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. c. xviii. Antiquum et robustum morem Ecclesia retinet, ex illâ scilicet liquidissimâ veritate venientem, quâ certum habet, quoniam qui talia agunt, Regnum Dei non possidebunt.

who do such things, shall not inherit the Kingdom of God. And that this was the ancient rule, by which the Church proceeded, is evident from all the writers that have spoken of baptism. Justin Martyr, who describes the ceremonies of baptism with the greatest simplicity, says, it was only given to those, who to their confession of faith added also a promise or vow,<sup>1</sup> that they would live according to the rules of Christianity. And hence came that usual form of words in their profession, *συντάττομαι σοι Χριστέ, I give myself up to thee, O Christ, to be governed by thy laws:* which immediately followed the *ἀπόταξις*, or *renunciation of the devil*, whose service they forsook to choose a new master; as we find it frequently in St. Chrysostom,<sup>2</sup> St. Basil,<sup>3</sup> St. Cyril of Alexandria,<sup>4</sup> the author of the Apostolical Constitutions,<sup>5</sup> and most of the Greek writers, whose words, as being but one and the same form, I think it needless to repeat upon this occasion. The Latins commonly call it *promissum*, *pactum*, and *votum*, a *promise*, a *covenant*, and *vow*, which names they apply indifferently to all parts of the Christian engagement, as well the renunciation of the devil, as the profession of faith and obedience to Christ, which do mutually suppose, and are virtually included in one another. For he, that renounces the devil and the world, does thereby profess himself a soldier and servant devoted to Christ. Therefore St. Ambrose speaking of the renunciation,<sup>6</sup> calls it a promise, a caution, an hand-writing or bond, given to God, and registered in the court of Heaven: because this is a vow made before his ministers, and the angels, who are witnesses to it. Upon which account he says in another place,<sup>7</sup> it is recorded, not in the monuments of the dead, but in the book of the living. St. Austin

<sup>1</sup> Justin. Apol. ii. p. 93. *Καὶ βούλον ἕτοιμος ἀνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται, &c.*

<sup>2</sup> Chrys. Hom. xxi. ad Popul. Antioch. p. 275. Hom. vi. in Colos. p. 1358.

<sup>3</sup> Basil. Hom. xiii. Exhort. ad Bapt.

<sup>4</sup> Cyril. in Joh. xi. 26.

<sup>5</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. c. 41.

<sup>6</sup> Ambros. de Sacrament. lib. i. c. 2. Respondisti, abrenunciatio: memor esto sermonis tui, et nunquam tibi excidat series cautionis tue.—Ubi promiseris considera, vel quibus promiseris: Levitam vidisti, sed minister est Christi. Vidisti illum ante altaria ministrare: ergo chirographum tuum, tenetur, non in terrâ, sed in cælo.

<sup>7</sup> Id. de Initiatis. cap. ii. Tenetur vox tua, non in tumulo mortuorum, sed in libro viventium.

calls it a profession made in the court of angels,<sup>1</sup> and the names of the professors are written in the book of life, not by any man, but by the heavenly powers.<sup>2</sup> St. Jerom styles it a covenant made with the sun of righteousness, and a promise of obedience to Christ. And he so speaks of this ceremony, as to shew it to be a distinct act from the renunciation, though they both tended to the same end, because different rites were used in expressing them. For in renouncing the devil they had their faces to the west, for symbolical reasons which we have heard before; but in making their covenant with Christ they turned about to the east, as an emblem of that light, which they received from the sun of righteousness, by engaging themselves in his service.

SECT. 7.—This Vow of Obedience made by turning to the East:  
And why.

This custom of turning about to the east, when they made their profession of obedience to Christ, is also mentioned by St. Ambrose, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Jerusalem, and the author under the name of Dionysius; for which they assign two reasons. 1. Cyril<sup>3</sup> tells his disciples, that as soon as they had renounced the devil, the paradise of God, which was planted in the east, and whence our first parent for his transgression was driven into banishment, was now laid open to them: and their turning about from the west to the east, which is the region of light, was a symbol of this. For the same reason St. Basil<sup>4</sup> and some others of the ancients tell us, they prayed towards the east, that they might have their faces towards paradise. The other reason, for turning to the east in baptism, was because the east or rising sun was an emblem of the sun of righteousness, to whom they now turned from Satan; “Thou art turned about to the east,” says St.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Symbolo, lib. ii. c. i. tom. ix. *Professi estis renūciare vos diabolo, pompis, et angelis ejus. Videte dilectissimi, quia hanc professionem vestram in curiam profertis angelicam: nomina profitentium in libro excipiuntur vitæ, non à quolibet homine sed à superiore cœlitus potestate.*

<sup>2</sup> Hieron. Com. in Amos, vi. 14. *In mysteriis primū renunciamus ei qui in occidente est: et sic versi in orientem, pactum inimus cum sole justitiæ, et ei servituros nos esse promittimus.*

<sup>3</sup> Cyril. Catech. Mystagog. i. n. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Basil. de Spir. St. cap. xxvii.

Ambrose,<sup>1</sup> “for he that renounces the devil, turns unto Christ.” Where he plainly intimates with St. Jerom, that turning to the east was a symbol of their aversion from Satan, and conversion unto Christ, that is, from darkness to light, from serving idols, to serve Him, who is the Sun of Righteousness and Fountain of Light.

**SECT. 8.**—The Third Thing required of the Party to be Baptised, was a Profession of Faith, in the usual Words of the Creed.

Together with this profession of obedience there was also exacted a profession of faith, of every person to be baptised. And this was always to be made in the same words of the creed, that every Church used for the instruction of her catechumens. They were obliged to repeat it privately to the catechist, and then again publicly in the church, when they had given in their names to baptism; as I have shewed before.<sup>2</sup> But besides this, they were also obliged to make a more solemn profession of it at the time of baptism, and give distinct answers to the several questions, as the minister propounded them, with relation to the several parts of the creed, which contained the summary of Christian faith. There were some indeed in St. Austin’s time, who as they were for excluding the profession of obedience out of the baptismal vow, so were they for curtailing the profession of faith, and reducing it to one single article, “I believe Jesus Christ to be the Son of God.” In favour of this, they pleaded the example of Philip baptising the Eunuch upon this short confession,<sup>3</sup> and that saying of St. Paul to the Corinthians, “I determined to know nothing among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.” Yet they durst never proceed so far as to put

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Initiatis, c. ii. Ad orientem converteris. Qui enim renunciat diabolo, ad Christum convertitur.      <sup>2</sup> Book x. chap. ii. n. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. de Fide et Oper. cap. ix. Spado, inquit, ille quem Philippus baptizavit, nihil plus dixit, quàm, credo Filium Dei esse Jesum Christum. Num ergo placet, ut hoc solum homines respondeant, et continuò baptizentur? Nihil de Spiritu Sancto, nihil de Sanctâ Ecclesiâ, nihil de remissione peccatorum, nihil de resurrectione mortuorum? &c. Si enim Spado cum respondisset, Credo Filium Dei esse Jesum Christum, hoc ei sufficere visum est, ut continuò baptizatus abscederet: cur non id sequimur, atque auferimus cetera quæ necessè habemus, etiam cum ad baptizandum temporis urget angustia exprimere, interrogando ut baptizandus ad cuncta respondeat, etiamsi ea memoriæ mandare non valuit?

their designs in practice; for they still continued to make interrogatories about the other articles, as the Church always did, concerning the Holy Ghost, the holy Church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the dead, the incarnation of Christ, his passion and death upon the cross, his burial and resurrection on the third day, his ascension and session on the right hand of the Father. All which were thought so necessary, that the Church never omitted them even in clinic baptism, when men were baptised upon a sick bed: for if they were able to speak, they answered for themselves, as St. Austin says, to every particular interrogation, though they were not able to commit them to memory; and if they were speechless, their sureties or sponsors answered for them as they did for children, as will be shewed in the next chapter. So that one way or other the whole creed was repeated, and every individual article assented to by men at their baptism. And this was always the practice of the Church from the very days of the Apostles, and in their time also: for though no other article be mentioned in the baptism of the Eunuch, but only his believing Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, yet, as St. Austin observes in the same place,<sup>1</sup> “The Scripture in saying, Philip baptised him, is to be understood as meaning that all things were fulfilled, which used to be observed in baptism, though for brevity’s sake they be not mentioned.” And indeed in all the accounts we have of baptism in ancient writers, there is express mention of this profession, either to believe the doctrines of Christianity in general, as they are delivered in Scripture, or as they are briefly summed up in the articles of the creed. Justin Martyr says,<sup>2</sup> “before men were regenerated, they must both profess to believe the truth of those things which they had been taught, and also promise to live answerably to their knowledge.” Cyprian particularly<sup>3</sup> mentions the use

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Fide et Oper. cap. 9. In eo quod ait, baptizavit eum Philippus, intelligi voluit impleta esse omnia, quæ licet taceantur in Scripturis, gratiâ brevitat, tamen serie traditionis scimus implenda. <sup>2</sup> Justin. Apol. ii. p. 93. “Ὅσοι ἂν πισθεύωσι ἐν πιστεύουσιν ἀληθείῃ ταῦτα τὰ ὑφ’ ἡμῶν διδασκόμενα ἐλεγγόμενα εἶναι, ἐν βίῳ ἔτιος δύνασθαι ὑπισχνῶνται—ἀναγεννῶνται.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. Ep. 70. ad Episc. Numidas, p. 190. Sed et ipsa interrogatio, quæ fit in baptismo, testis est veritatis. Nam cum dicimus, credis in vitam æternam, et

of the creed in baptism, and specifies several of the interrogatories that were made in reference to the particular articles of it; as, whether they believed eternal life, and remission of sins in the holy Church? which were always the concluding articles of the creed. And in another place<sup>1</sup> he speaks both of these, and the articles relating to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as interrogatories used in baptism both by the Catholic Church, and the Novatians. For however they differed in the sense of some of the articles, yet they both agreed in the same form of interrogatories, and both baptised in the same creed. Tertullian<sup>2</sup> also specifies the articles relating to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and the Church, as part of the interrogatories of baptism. And Eusebius, reciting the words of the creed of Cæsarea,<sup>3</sup> says, it was the creed into which he was baptised. The same use was made of the Nicene creed, as soon as it was composed, in most of the eastern churches. For they ordinarily baptised in the profession of that faith, as I have shewed<sup>4</sup> in the last Book. It were easy here to subjoin many testimonies out of St. Ambrose, St. Jerom, Cyril of Alexandria and Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Nazianzen, Basil, Epiphanius, and Salvian, and the author of the Constitutions: but the matter is so incontestible, that the ancients did never baptise into the profession of any single article, but into a complete and perfect creed, that I think it needless to insist upon the proof of it, whilst there is not any pretence of an exception to be made against it in any public or private baptism whatsoever.

SECT. 9.—This Confession made in the most solemn and Public Manner.

There were some circumstances and ceremonies of this confession, which, because they added something to the solemnity of the action, it will not be improper to mention.

---

remissionem peccatorum per sanctam Ecclesiam? Intelligimus remissionem peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesiâ dari, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. Ep. lxxix. al. lxxvi. ad Magnum, p. 183.      <sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. cap. vi. Quum sub tribus et testatio fidei et sponsio salutis pignorentur, necessariò adjicitur Ecclesiæ mentio: quoniam ubi tres, id est, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus, ibi Ecclesia, quæ trium corpus est.      <sup>3</sup> Euseb. Epist. ad Cæsariensis, ap. Soerat. lib. i. cap. viii.      <sup>4</sup> Book x. chap. iv. n. 17.



As first, that it was usually done in public, before many witnesses. Which was a circumstance grounded upon apostolical practice, and very rarely dispensed with. Primasius<sup>1</sup> deduces it from the example of Timothy, who witnessed a good confession before many witnesses: which he interprets of his profession of faith made at baptism. Which is also the exposition given by Ephrem Syrus.<sup>2</sup> And Pope Leo<sup>3</sup> seems to refer to the same, when he exhorts men to stand firm in that faith, which they confessed before many witnesses; that faith in which they were born again of water and the Holy Ghost, and received the unction of salvation, and the seal of eternal life. It was usual at Rome, St. Austin tells us,<sup>4</sup> to make this confession publicly in the church, in some eminent place appointed for the purpose, that they might be seen and heard by all the congregation. But sometimes to favour the modesty of some very bashful persons, who could not speak without trembling in such an awful assembly, the presbyters received their confession in private: and this they offered to Victorinus, a famous rhetorician, upon his conversion; but he chose rather to make his confession in public, saying, there was no salvation in rhetoric, and yet he had always taught that in public: and therefore it would not become him, to be afraid of making a public confession of God's word before the meek flock of Christ, who had never been afraid to repeat his own words in the schools of the heathen, who in comparison of Christians were only to be reputed madmen.

---

<sup>1</sup> Primas. in 1 Tim. vi. 12. Confessus bonam confessionem, in baptismo: coram multis testibus, coram sacerdotibus et ministris, atque virtutibus cœlestibus ac divinis.      <sup>2</sup> Ephrem. de Pœnitent. cap. v.      <sup>3</sup> Leo. Sermon. iv. de Nativ. Domini. p. 17. Permanete stabiles in fide, quam confessi estis coram multis testibus, et in quâ renati per aquam et Spiritum Sanctum, accepistis chrisma salutis et signaculum vitæ æternæ.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. Confess. lib. viii. cap. ii. Ut ventum est ad horam profitendæ fidei, quæ verbis certis conceptisque memoritèr de loco eminentiore in conspectu populi fidelis Romæ reddi solet ab eis, qui accessuri sunt ad gratiam tuam, oblatum esse dicebat Victorino à presbyteris ut secretius redderet, sicut nonnullis qui verecundiâ trepidaturi videbantur, offerri mos erat: illum autem maluisse salutem suam in conspectu sanctæ multitudinis profiteri: non enim erat salus quam docebat in rhetoricâ, et tamen eam publicè professus erat. Quanto minus ergo vereri debuit mansuetum gregem tuum, pronuncians verbum tuum, qui non verebatur in verbis suis turbas insanorum?

## SECT. 10.—With Hands and Eyes lift up to Heaven.

Another circumstance, which added to the solemnity of the action, was the posture of the body, not only looking toward the east, but with hands and eyes lift up to heaven, as if they were immediately fixed on Christ, with whom they were now entering into covenant, as their new Lord sitting on the throne of his glory. For as they renounced the devil with hands stretched out against him, or with collision, or striking them together in defiance of him; so on the contrary, they made their confession and covenant and addresses to Christ in the posture of petition, with hands lift up to the sun of righteousness, and ready to embrace him. So the author under the name of Dionysius describes it,<sup>1</sup> saying, the priest bids the catechumen, after he has renounced Satan, to turn about to the east and make his covenant with Christ, with hands and eyes lift up to heaven.

## SECT. 11.—Repeated Three Times.

This confession also, for greater solemnity, is thought to have been repeated three times, as we have heard before, that it was usual to do in the renunciation of Satan. Cyril of Alexandria says,<sup>2</sup> it was the custom of the Church to require a triple confession of Christ, of all those that proposed to love him and came to his holy baptism: and this after the example of St. Peter, to whom Christ said three times, “Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?” And Peter answered thrice, “Lord, thou knowest that I love thee.” St. Ambrose says,<sup>3</sup> that in the celebration of baptism, three interrogatories were made, and a triple answer was given to them; nor could any one be otherwise baptised. Whence also Peter was asked three times in the Gospel, whether he loved the Lord? that by answering thrice, he might loose

<sup>1</sup> Dionys. de Eccles. Hierarch. cap. ii. p. 253.

<sup>2</sup> Cyril. lib. xii. in

Joh. xxi. tom. iv. p. 1119. Τόπος δὲ πάλιν ταῖς μὲν ἐκκλησίαις ἐντιῦθεν εἰς τὸ χρῆμα τρίτον διερωτᾶν τὴν εἰς Χριστὸν ὁμολογίαν τοῖς ἀγαπᾶν αὐτὸν ἐλομένους, διὰ τῆς ἐξ προσελθεῖν τῷ ἀγίῳ βαπτίσματι.

<sup>3</sup> Ambros. de Spir. Sancto, lib. ii. cap. xi. Ideo in mysteriis interrogatio trina defertur, et confirmatio trina celebratur: nec potest quis nisi trinâ confessione purgari. Unde et ipse Petrus in Evangelio tertio interrogatur, utrum diligat Dominum, ut trinâ responsione vincula, quæ Dominum negando ligavit, absolveret.

those bonds, with which he had bound himself by denying his Lord. But I am not sure that this triple confession always means thrice repeating the whole creed. For St. Ambrose<sup>1</sup> in another place makes this triple confession to be rather answering three times, I believe, to the several parts of the creed. "Thou wast asked, says he, dost thou believe in God, the Father Almighty? And thou didst answer, I believe. Thou wast asked again, dost thou believe in our Lord Jesus Christ, and his cross? And thou didst answer a second time, I believe. Thou wast asked a third time, dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost? And thy answer was, I believe. So thou wast thrice buried under water, that thy triple confession might absolve thee from the manifold offences of thy former life." Where it is plain the triple confession means no more than answering thrice, I believe, to the several parts of the creed. But there might be different customs in different places; for St. Cyril seems to mean something more, when he makes these answers not only to be a confession of the three persons of the Trinity, but a triple confession of Christ, which implies a repetition of the creed three times over, if I rightly understand him.

SECT. 12.—And subscribed with their own Hands, in the Books of the Church, as some think.

There was one circumstance more, which, if true, added great weight to the whole action: which was, that the party, after he had made his confession of faith, subscribed it also with his own hand, if he were able to do it, in the books or registers of the Church. I cannot positively say, that this was any certain or universal practice, but there seem to be some footsteps of it in some ancient records, and the allusions of writers to such a custom. Gregory Nazianzen is thought to refer to it, when exhorting men to continue stedfast to the faith, which they professed at baptism; he says, if thou wast enrolled into any other

---

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Sacram. lib. ii. c. vii. Interrogatus es, Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem? Dixisti, Credo, &c. Iterùm interrogatus es, credis in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum et in crucem ejus? Dixisti, Credo, et mersisti. Tertio interrogatus es, credis et in Spiritum Sanctum? Dixisti, Credo. Tertio mersisti, ut multiplicem lapsum superioris ætatis absolveret trina confessio.

faith<sup>1</sup> than what I have expounded, come and be enrolled again: and then tell those that would draw thee away from it, what I have written I have written." St. Ambrose seems also to allude to this,<sup>2</sup> when he tells the initiated, that their hand-writing was recorded not only in earth, but in heaven, because it was taken both in the presence of men and angels. And St. Austin says,<sup>3</sup> the names of such as made their profession were written in the book of life, not only by men, but by the heavenly powers above. Yet I confess St. Chrysostom has a passage, which seems to go contrary to all this: for speaking of the difference between earthly masters buying slaves, and Christ taking us to be his servants, he reckons this among others, that Christ requires no witnesses, nor hand-writing of us,<sup>4</sup> but only our bare word to say, I renounce thee, Satan, and all thy pomp. Whence it must be concluded, either that this custom was not so universal as the rest, since St. Chrysostom knew nothing of it; or that the fore-cited evidences are not so cogent as at first sight they may seem to be. For St. Ambrose and St. Austin may be so interpreted, where they speak of being written in the book of life, as to be understood only in a figurative sense, for having their names written in heaven. Yet Vicecomes is very positive not only of this,<sup>5</sup> but that men also set their seal to their subscription, and confirmed their profession with an oath. But I do not find any sufficient authority for this, and therefore will not any further insist upon it, which I had rather leave to the further disquisition of the critical and curious reader.

SECT. 13.—The Use of all these Ceremonies and Engagements, to make Men sensible of their Obligations, and stedfast to their Profession.

But by what has been said we may easily perceive, that

<sup>1</sup> Naz. Orat. xi. de Bapt. p. 670. *Εἰ μὲν ἄλλως ἐγγέγραψαι, ἢ ὡς ὁ ἐμὸς ἀπαιτεῖ λόγος, δεῦρο ἢ μετεγγράφηθι.*—*Εἰπέ τοῖς μεταπειθεσὶ σε ὁ γέγραφα, γέγραφα.*

<sup>2</sup> Ambros. de Sacram. lib. i. cap. ii. *Chirographum tuum tenetur, non in terrâ, sed in cælo.* It. de Initialis, cap. ii. *Tenetur vox tua, non in tumulo mortuorum, sed in libro viventium.* <sup>3</sup> Aug. de Symbolo ad Catechumenos, lib. ii. cap. i. *Nomina profitentium in libro excipiuntur vitæ non à quolibet homine, sed à superiore cœlitus potestate.*

<sup>4</sup> Chrys. Hom. xxi. ad Populum Antioch. tom. i. p. 274. *Ὁ μάρτυρας ἡμᾶς, ἔκ ἐγγραφα ἡμᾶς ἀπαιτεῖ, ἀλλ' ἀρκεῖται ψιλῆ τῆ φωνῆ, κἀν εἴπῃς ἀπὸ ἐναντίας,*

*Ἀποτάσσομαί σοι Σατανᾶ, &c.* <sup>5</sup> Vicecom. de Ritib. Bapt. lib. ii. cap. xxvii. p. 343.

the design of the Church in all these ceremonies, and the caution and deliberation used in the whole action, was only to make men truly sensible of the nature of the Christian religion, which admitted of no proselytes without these formal and solemn professions, and of their great obligations to continue stedfast in that faith and obedience to Christ, which they had so solemnly promised with their mouths, and subscribed with their own hands, not only before men, but in the presence of God and the holy angels. This was the greatest engagement imaginable upon them, and of force to influence their whole lives. To which purpose St. Chrysostom often proposes and insists upon it, to make men bear it perpetually in memory, and use it as their best armour and weapon against all temptations. In his last Discourse to the people of Antioch, he expatiates upon this topic, inveighing first severely against all the shows of the Roman theatre, and circus, and observation of days, and presages, and omens, which he reckons among the pomps of Satan. To these he joins enchantments and ligatures: for some Christians made no scruple to hang golden medals of Alexander the Great about their head or feet to cure diseases. With whom he expostulates after this manner.<sup>1</sup> “Are these our hopes and expectations, that after the cross and death of our Lord, we should put our trust for health in the image of an heathen king? Knowest thou not what wonders the cross hath done? How it hath destroyed death, extinguished sin, emptied hell, dissolved the power of the devil? And is it not as fit to be relied on to cure a bodily disease? It hath given resurrection to the world, and canst not thou confide in it? But thou not only procurest ligatures, but also charms, bringing some old drunken staggering woman to thy house for this purpose, and payest reverence to these things, after thou hast been disciplined in the religion of Christ. Nay, when men are admonished of these things, they plead in excuse, that the old woman the enchanter is a Christian, and names nothing but the name of God. For which she is the more to be abhorred, because she abuses the name of God to so scandalous a practice, and whilst she calls herself a Christian, does

---

<sup>1</sup> Chrys. Hom. xxi. ad Popul. Antiochen. tom. i. p. 275.

the works of the heathen. The devils named the name of Christ, and yet were devils for all that, and were rebuked and ejected by our Saviour. Therefore I beseech you, keep yourselves pure from this deceit, and take this word as your staff and armour. As none of you will chuse to walk abroad without his shoes or clothes, so without this word, let none of you venture out in public, but when you go over the threshold of your gate, say first this word, I renounce thee, Satan, and thy pomp, and thy worship; and I make a covenant with thee, O Christ. Never go forth without this word, and it will be your staff, your armour, your invincible tower. And with this word, sign yourselves with the sign of the cross: and then not only man, but the devil himself cannot hurt you, whilst he finds you appearing guarded with this armour." Thus St. Chrysostom exhorts men daily to remember their solemn profession of faith, and baptismal vow, wherein they renounced Satan and embraced Christ, as the best preservative against sin and danger. To which both he and Ephrem Cyrus add this momentous consideration,<sup>1</sup> that an account of this vow will be required of men at the day of judgment. "For by thy words shalt thou be justified, and by thy words shalt thou be condemned." And Christ will say to every wilful transgressor of it, "out of thine own mouth will I condemn thee, O thou wicked servant." As nothing therefore could be more useful than this part of the Church's discipline, in requiring such professions and promises of every man before they entered the service of Christ; as it was usual for masters to do, before they bargained with slaves and took them into their family:<sup>2</sup> so nothing could be more material than the continued impressions of this vow upon men's minds, to keep them under a quick sense of their obligations, on which the whole conduct of their lives so much depended, and their eternal interest at the day of judgment.

---

<sup>1</sup> Ephrem. de Abrenunc. Baptismi. p. 150. Hæc ipsa abrenunciatio et pulchra confessio exigitur à quocunque Christiano in illâ die, &c. Chrys. Hom. xxi. ad Pop. Antioch. p. 274. Hoc igitur dicamus, abrenuncio tibi, Satana: tanquam in illâ die hujus vocis rationem reddituri, ut salvum tunc reddamus depositum.

<sup>2</sup> Chrys. ibid. p. 273.

SECT. 14.—Whether Public and Particular Confession of Sins was required of Men at their Baptism.

There is one thing more remains to be inquired into under this head, that is, whether any public or particular confession of sins was required of men at their baptism, besides what was implied in the general renunciation of Satan and all his works and service? Now this is plainly resolved by St. Chrysostom in the negative. For discoursing of the difference between God's choosing his servants, and the choice which earthly princes and masters make of their soldiers and slaves, he makes the difference chiefly to consist in this: That before men were allowed to enter the lists in any of the famous exercises of the theatre, a public crier must first lead them about by the hand before all, and cry out, saying, does any one accuse this man? though there the engagement was only of the body and not of the soul. But in God's choice of us it is quite otherwise: for though our engagement depends not upon strength of arms, but on the philosophy and virtue of our souls, yet the ruler and governor thereof acts quite contrary: He does not take a man, and lead him about, and say, does any one accuse him? But He cries out, though all men and devils should rise up against him, and accuse him of secret and horrible crimes, I do not reject, I do not abhor him; but I deliver him from his accuser, and absolve him from his iniquity, and so I lead him to the combat. Nor is this the only admirable thing, that he forgives our sins, but that he does not reveal nor disclose them; he neither makes open proclamation of them,<sup>1</sup> nor compels those that come to him to publish their own offences, but requires them to give account, and confess their sins to him alone. He does not, like earthly judges, oblige criminals to make a public confession before all men in hopes of pardon, but he forgives sins upon our private testimony without any other witnesses. This is undeniable evidence, that no public confession was required

<sup>1</sup> Chrys. Hom. xxi. ad Pop. Antioch. p. 270. Οὐ τῆτο δὲ μόνον ἐπὶ θανατοῦν, ὅτι ἀφίησιν ἡμῖν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὰ ἐδὲ ἑκκαλύπτει, ἐδὲ ποιεῖ φανερά ἐν δῆλα, ἐδὲ ἀναγκάζει παρελθόντας εἰς μέσον ἐξεπιεῖν τὰ πεπλημμελημένα, ἀλλ' αὐτῷ μόνῳ ἀπολογήσασθαι κελεύει, ἐν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἱζομολογήσασθαι. Id. Hom. 62. in Paralyticum tom. v. p. 927.

of men for their private offences, when they came to baptism. And therefore when Gregory Nazianzen<sup>1</sup> speaks of confession of sins made at baptism, he is to be understood either of a general confession, or such a particular confession as men voluntarily imposed upon themselves, to testify more eminently the sincerity of their repentance; which some think was done at John's baptism, Mat. iii. 6. and in the baptism of those mentioned Acts, xix. 18. where it is said, that "many who believed, came and confessed and shewed their deeds;" though this was not imposed upon men by any necessary law or rule of the Church. In case of public scandalous crimes they were obliged particularly to promise and vow the forsaking of them: but for private crimes, no particular confession was required to be made, save only to God, with a general renunciation of all sin, in which every private crime was supposed to be included. *Vid. Aug. Serm. 116. de Tempore.*

## CHAP. VIII.

### *Of the Use of Sponsors or Sureties in Baptism.*

SECT. 1.—Three Sorts of Sponsors in the Primitive Church. 1. For Children.

NEXT to the conditions and promises required of men in their baptism, we must examine the office and business of sponsors or sureties, who had always some concern in these obligations. And here it is first to be observed, that there were three sorts of sponsors made use of in the Primitive Church. 1. For children, who could not renounce, or profess, or answer for themselves. 2. For such adult persons, as by reason of sickness or infirmity were in the same condition as children, incapacitated to answer for themselves. 3. For all adult persons in general. For the Church required sponsors also for those, who were otherwise qualified to make their own responses. Now the office of sponsors was diversified a little in its nature, according to these distinctions. They who were sureties or

---

<sup>1</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 657.



sponsors for children, were obliged first to answer in their names to all the interrogatories that were usually put in baptism, and then to be guardians of their Christian education. Some will also needs have it, that they were obliged to give them a perfect maintenance, and take them as it were for their own children by adoption, in case their parents failed, and left them destitute in their minority.

SECT. 2.—Parents commonly Sponsors for their own Children.

But this I take to be a mistake. For whoever were sponsors for children, if ever they became destitute, the burden devolved upon the Church in general, and not upon any others. Which will be evidenced by these two considerations: first that parents were commonly sponsors for their own children: and in that case there can be no dispute where the obligation of maintenance lay, so long as they were alive. For they were obliged to maintain their own children by a natural law, not because they were sponsors, but because they were parents to them. It was not indeed absolutely necessary that parents should be sponsors for their own children, though some in St. Austin's days were inclined to think so, which he reckons an error, and shews<sup>1</sup>, that in many cases there was a necessity it should be otherwise. But yet in most cases the parents were sponsors for their own children, as appears from St. Austin, who speaks of parents in all ordinary cases offering their own children to baptism, and making the proper responses for them:<sup>2</sup> and the extraordinary cases, in which they were presented by others, were commonly such cases, where the parent could not or would not do that kind office for them: as when slaves were presented to baptism by their masters;<sup>3</sup> or children, whose

<sup>1</sup> Ang. Ep. 23. ad Bonifac. Illud autem nolo te fallat, ut existimes reatūs vinculum ex Adam tractum, aliter non posse dirumpi, nisi parvuli ad percipiendam Christi gratiam à parentibus offerantur.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. ibid. Quid est illud, quod quando ad baptismum offeruntur, parentes pro eis tanquam fidedictores respondent, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. ibid. Videas multos non offerri à parentibus, sed etiam à quibuslibet extraneis, sicut à Dominis servuli aliquando offeruntur. Et nonnunquam mortuis parentibus suis, parvuli baptizantur, ab eis oblatis, qui illis hujusmodi misericordiam præbere potuerunt. Aliquando etiam quos crudeliter parentes exposuerunt, nutriendos à quibuslibet, nonnunquam à sacris virginibus colliguntur, et ab eis offeruntur ad baptismum.

parents were dead, were brought by the charity of any who would shew mercy on them; or children exposed by their parents, which were sometimes taken up by the holy virgins of the Church, and by them presented unto baptism. These are the only cases mentioned by St. Austin, in which children seem to have had other sponsors, and not their parents. Which makes it probable, that in all ordinary cases parents were sureties for their own children. Which may be collected also from the author of the Hypognostics, under the name of St. Austin,<sup>1</sup> who speaks of infants being presented to baptism by the hands of their parents, and some of them dying in their arms before the priest could baptise them. Whilst parents therefore were sureties for their own children, they were obliged to maintain them, but this not by the law of sureties, but by the law of nature; and if they failed, this duty devolved upon the whole Church.

Sect. 3.—2. Other Sureties not bound to maintain the Children for whom they were Sponsors.

Secondly, in other cases, where strangers became sureties for children, the burden of maintenance did never devolve upon them by any law of suretiship, except they were obliged by some antecedent law to take care of them. In case a master was sponsor for his slave, he was obliged to maintain him, because he was antecedently in the nature of a father to him: and this obligation arose, not from his suretiship, but from his being his master. But in other cases it was not so. For sometimes children that were exposed, were taken up and presented to baptism by mere strangers, and in that case the burden of maintenance fell upon the Church, and not upon the sponsors. And in some cases, as St. Austin informs us,<sup>2</sup> such children were presented unto baptism by the sacred virgins of the church, who had no other maintenance but what they themselves received from the church:

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Hypognostic. contra Pelag. lib. vi. cap. 7. tom. vii. p. 633. Novimus etiam parvulos, quibus usus liberi arbitrii non est, ut de bonis aut malis eorum meritis judicemus, parentum manibus ad gratiam sacri baptismatis deportatos: et cum in uno eorum per manus sacerdotis mysterium fidei adimpleretur, aliquotiens alterum in parentum manibus factum exanimem, fraudatum gratiâ Salvatoris.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. Ep. 23. ad Bonifac.

and in that case it is evident the children's maintenance must be derived from the same fountain, as the virgins' was, that is, from the public stock of the Church. So that in all cases the Church was charged with this care, and not the sponsors, except there was some antecedent obligation. And there was good reason for this; for, as St. Austin observes,<sup>1</sup> "children were presented to baptism not so much by those in whose hands they were brought, (though by them too, if they were good and faithful men,) as by the whole society of saints. The whole Church was their mother; she brought forth all and every one by this new birth. "And therefore if any were to be charged with maintenance, it was but reasonable that the Church should maintain her own children. So that they, who lay so much stress upon sponsors undertaking for children, as if they thereby undertook to give them maintenance too, have no grounds for their assertion, since it appears from the best light, that we have, to have been otherwise in the practice of the primitive Church. I have not said this to excuse sponsors from any duty that properly belongs to them, but only to take off the force of an unreasonable objection, which some have made against the present use of sponsors in baptism, as if they were of a different sort from those of the ancient Church, because they are not under this particular obligation, which appears not to have any other foundation but the bare surmise of those, who make the objection.

SECT. 4.—But only to answer for them to the several Interrogatories in Baptism.

Two things indeed were anciently required of sponsors as their proper duty: 1. To answer in their names to all the interrogatories of baptism. This seems to be intimated by Tertullian,<sup>2</sup> where he speaks of the promises which the

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Ep. xxiii. ad Bonifac. Offeruntur quippe parvuli ad percipiendam spiritalem gratiam, non tam ab eis quorum gestantur manibus, quamvis et ab ipsis, si et ipsi boni fideles sunt, quàm ab universâ societate sanctorum atque fidelium.—Tota hoc mater Ecclesia, quæ in sanctis est, facit: quia tota omnes, tota singulos parit.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. cap. xviii. Quid enim necesse est sponsors etiam periculo ingeri? Quia et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possint, et proventu malæ indolis falli.

sponsors made in baptism, and of the danger there was of their failing to fulfil them, either by their own mortality, or by the untoward disposition of the party. But if any one thinks these promises related only to what the sponsors promised for themselves, and not in the name of the child, he may be informed more clearly from others. Gennadius<sup>1</sup> tells us, these promises for infants and such as were incapable of learning, were made after the usual manner of interrogatories in baptism. And St. Austin<sup>2</sup> more particularly acquaints us with the form then used, which was, “doth this child believe in God? Doth he turn to God?” Which is the same as renouncing the devil, and making a covenant with Christ. In other places he tells us more expressly,<sup>3</sup> “that the sponsors answered for them, that they renounced the devil, his pomps, and his works.” And disputing against the Pelagians, he proves by this argument, that children were under the power of Satan and the guilt of original sin, and needed pardon; because if a Pelagian himself brought a child to baptism, he must answer for him,<sup>4</sup> because he could not answer for himself, that he renounced the devil, that he turned to God, and that among other things he believed the remission of sins; all which would only be fallaciously said, if children had no concern in them. And he professes, he would not admit any child to baptism, whose sponsor he had reason to believe did not make these promises and responses sincerely for him. Of the form and practice then there is no dispute. Only it

<sup>1</sup> Gennad. de Eccles. Dogmat. cap. lii. Si verò parvuli sunt, vel hebetes, qui doctrinam non capiant, respondeant pro illis qui eos offerunt, juxta morem baptizandi.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. Ep. xxiii. ad Bonifac. Interrogamus eos à quibus offeruntur, et decimus, Credit in Deum? de illâ ætate, quæ utrùm sit Deus, ignoret; respondent, Credit. Et ad cætera sic respondent singula quæ quaruntur, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. Serm. cxvi. de Tempore. tom. x. p. 304. Fidejussores pro ipsis respondent, quòd abrenunciant diabolo, pompis, et operibus ejus.—Ser. 14. de Verb. Apost. c. xi. p. 124. tom. x.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. de Peccator. Meritis, lib. i. cap. xxxiv. Vellem aliquis istorum, qui contraria sapiunt, mihi baptizandum parvulum adferret. Ipse certè mihi erat responsurus pro eodem parvulo quem gestaret, quia ille pro se respondere non posset. Quomodò ergo dicturus erat, eum renunciare diabolo, cujus in eo nihil esset? Quomodò converti ad Deum, à quo non esset aversus? Credere inter cætera remissionem peccatorum, quæ illi nulla tribueretur? Ego quidem si contra eum hæc sentire existimarem, nec ad sacramenta cum parvulo intrare permitterem.

seemed a great difficulty to bishop Boniface, and as such he proposed it to St. Austin, how it could be said with truth, that a child believed, or renounced the devil, or turned to God, who had no thought or apprehension of these things; or if any, yet secret and unknown to us? If any one should ask us concerning a child, whether he would prove chaste or a thief, when he became a man? we should doubtless in that case answer, we know not. Or if the question was, whether a child in his infancy thought good or evil? we should make the same answer, we know not. Since therefore no one would promise either for his future morals, or his present thoughts, how is it that when parents present their children as sponsors in baptism, they answer and say, the children do those things which that age does not so much as think of? As, that they believe in God, and are turned unto him, &c. To this St. Austin answers, that the child is only said to believe, because he receives the sacrament of faith and conversion, which entitles him to the name of a believer. For the sacraments,<sup>1</sup> because of the resemblance between them and the things represented by them, do carry the name of the things represented. "Christ was but once offered in himself, and yet he is offered not only on the annual solemnity of the Passover, but every day for the people; and no one tells a lie, that says, he is offered. As therefore the sacrament of Christ's body after a certain manner is called his body, and the sacrament of his blood is called his blood; so the sacrament of faith is faith. And upon this account, when it is answered, that an infant believes, who has not yet any

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Ep. xxiii. ad Bonifac. Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso? Et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes Pasche sollemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur; nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus cum responderit immolari. Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt non haberent, sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est. Ac per hoc cum respondetur parvulus credere, qui fidei nondum habet affectum, respondetur fidem habere propter fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum propter conversionis sacramentum, quia et ipsa responsio ad celebrationem pertinet sacramenti.—Ser. 14. de Verb. Apost. c. xix. He says, they believe, fide Parvulum.

knowledge, or habit of faith, the meaning of the answer is, that he has faith because of the sacrament of faith, and is converted to God because of the sacrament of conversion, for these answers appertain to the celebration of the sacrament." So that according to St. Austin, when an infant is said to have faith, the meaning is only that he receives the sacrament of faith, which faith he is bound to embrace when he comes to understand it. In the mean time he is called a believer, because he receives the sacrament of faith, and is entered into the covenant of God by his sponsors, who supply that part for him which he cannot perform in his own person. This was the first duty of sponsors toward children.

SECT. 5.—And to be Guardians of their Spiritual Life for the future.

The other was, that they were to be guardians of their spiritual life for the future, and to take care by good admonitions and good instructions, that they performed their part of the covenant they were now engaged in. <sup>1</sup>St. Austin makes sponsors themselves concerned in this covenant with God, and therefore presses it as a duty upon them, "that they should not only by their examples, but by their words and instructions, teach them the great duties of chastity, humility, sobriety, and peace; for as much as they had answered in their stead, that they renounced the devil, his pomps, and his works." And in another place<sup>2</sup> he more particularly specifies their obligations, that they should admonish them to live chastly, and preserve their virginity to marriage, to refrain their tongues from evil-speaking and perjury, not to accustom their mouths to filthy and lascivious songs, not to be proud nor envious, nor to retain anger, nor hatred in their hearts, not to observe divination or sooth-saying, nor to hang phylacteries or diabolical cha-

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Serm. cxvi. de Tempore, tom. x. p. 304. Non solùm exemplis, sed etiam verbis eos ad omne opus bonum admonere debetis.—Posteaquàm baptizati fuerint, de castitate, de humilitate, de sobrietate, vel pace eos admonere vel docere non desinant, et agnoscant se fidejussores esse ipsorum. Pro ipsis enim respondent, quòd abrenuncient diabolo, pompis, et operibus ejus.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. Serm. clxiii. de Temp.

acters upon their own bodies or their relations, to keep and hold the catholic faith, to frequent the church, to hear the Scriptures read with attention, to entertain strangers, and wash their feet, according to what was said to them in baptism, to live peaceably, to be peace-makers among disagreeing brethren, and to honour the priests and their parents with the love of sincere charity. These were such things as they had promised for children in baptism, and therefore they were bound, by compact with God, to use their utmost endeavours to engage their spiritual pupils to perform them.

SECT. 6.—A second sort of Sponsors for such adult Persons as could not answer for themselves.

Another sort of sponsors were such as were appointed to make answers for such persons, as by reason of some infirmity could not answer for themselves. I have observed before, that such adult persons as were suddenly struck speechless, or seized with a phrenzy by the violence of a distemper, might yet be baptised, if any of their friends could testify that they had beforehand desired baptism: and in this case the same friends became sponsors for them, making the very same answers for them as they did for children. This we learn from Cyril of Alexandria, who assures us, that when men were seized with extremity of sickness,<sup>1</sup> and it was thought proper upon that account to baptise them, there were some appointed to make both the renunciations and confessions in their name. And so it is in the account, which Fulgentius<sup>2</sup> gives of the African negro, who just before his baptism fell sick of a fever, which bereaved him of his senses, and made him speechless: he was baptised for all this, having his sponsors to answer in his name, as if it had been for an infant. So that all those canons,<sup>3</sup> which speak of baptising dumb persons in cases of

<sup>1</sup> Cyril. Com. in Joh. xi. 26. tom. iv. p. 683. "Ὑπερ τῶν ἐσχάτῃ νόσῳ κατελημμένων, μελλόντων τε διὰ τῆτο βαπτίζεσθαι, ἐ ἀποτάττονται τινες ἐ συντάττονται.

<sup>2</sup> Fulgent. de Bapt. Æthiopsis, c. vii. p. 610. Factum est, ut confessionem tempore præterito redditam, quia non potuit in horâ baptismi reddere propter infirmitatem corporis, adjutorio fraternæ redderet charitatis. Vid. Gennad. de Eccl. Dogm. c. lii.

<sup>3</sup> See chap. v. n. 2.

extremity, though they do not expressly require sponsors for them, yet are to be understood as intending them, according to the usual practice of the Church. And if the party happened to recover after such a baptism, it was the sponsor's duty, not only to acquaint him, as a witness, with what was done for him, but also, as a guardian of his behaviour, to induce him to make good the promises, which he in his name had made for him. For this was the indispensable duty of sureties in all cases whatsoever.

SECT. 7.—The Third Sort of Sponsors for all adult Persons in general.

The third sort of sponsors were for such sort of adult persons, as were able to answer for themselves. For these also had their sponsors, and no persons anciently were baptised without them. These are spoken of not only by Dionysius<sup>1</sup> and the author of the Apostolical Constitutions,<sup>2</sup> but by many other more unquestionable writers. <sup>3</sup>Victor Uticensis tells us of one Muritta, a deacon, who was sponsor for Elpidiphorus at Carthage. And Palladius says,<sup>4</sup> Evagrius Ponticus performed the same office for Rufinus, the great statesman and Præfectus-Prætorio under Arcadius. St. Austin often mentions them, but then he also acquaints us, That it was no part of their office to make responses for their pupils in baptism, as it was in the case of infants and sick persons, who could not answer for themselves. For though the Church accepted it in the case of infants, by reason of their disability;<sup>5</sup> yet she would not allow adult persons to answer by proxy, who were able to answer for themselves; there being something of natural reason in that saying in the Gospel, “he is of age, let him speak for himself.” The most rustic capacities and meanest understand-

<sup>1</sup> Dionys. Eccl. Hierarch. cap. ii. p. 252.

<sup>2</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. iii.

cap. xvi.

<sup>3</sup> Victor de Persecut. Vandal. lib. iii. Bibl. Patr. tom. vii. p. 613. Hic dudum fuerat apud nos in ecclesiâ Fausti baptizatus, quem venerabilis Muritta diaconus de alveo fontis susceperat generatum.

<sup>4</sup> Pallad. Hist. Lausiæ. c. xii. Bibl. Patr. Gr. Lat. tom. i. p. 915. Ἀποδέχεται τὸν

Ῥεφθρονὸν ἅγιος ἀπὸ τῶ ἀχράντε βαπτίσματος.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib.

iv. cap. xxiv. Cùm alii pro infantibus respondent, ut impleatur circa eos celebratio sacramenti, valet utique ad eorum consecrationem, quia ipsi respondere non possunt. At si pro eo, qui respondere potest, alius respondeat, non itidem valet. &c.



ings, even in the weaker sex, would not ordinarily excuse them from doing this in their own persons, unless, as Gennadius says,<sup>1</sup> they were so heavy and dull, as not to be capable of learning, in which condition their sponsors were required to answer for them as for little children, from whom they differed so little in understanding.

SECT. 8.—Whose Duty was not to answer in their Names, but only to admonish and instruct them before and after Baptism.

But in ordinary cases this was no office of the sponsors, when men were in a capacity to answer for themselves. Their only business was to be curators and guardians of their spiritual life; to which purpose, it was incumbent on them to take care of their instruction and morals, as well before as after baptism. Upon this account the deaconesses were usually employed in the private instruction of women, to teach them how to make their responses in baptism. And this was one qualification required in deaconesses by some ancient canons,<sup>2</sup> “that they should be persons of such good understanding as to be able to instruct the ignorant and rustic women, how to make their responses to the interrogatories, which the minister should put to them in baptism, and how to order their conversation afterward;” as has been observed in another place.<sup>3</sup>

SECT. 9.—This Office chiefly imposed upon Deacons and Deaconesses.

And by some ancient rules this office was chiefly imposed upon deaconesses, to be sponsors for women, as the deacons were obliged to be for men. For so the author of the Apostolical Constitutions seems to represent it,<sup>4</sup> “when he orders a deacon to be susceptor for a man, and a deaconess for a woman in baptism.” And we find the sacred virgins often mentioned as concerned in this office. St. Austin, as we heard before,

<sup>1</sup> Gennad. de Eccl. Dogm. c. 52. Si verò parvuli sunt, vel hebetes, qui doctrinam non capiunt, respondeant pro illis qui eos offerunt juxta morem baptizandi.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Carthag. iv. can. xii. Viduæ vel sanctimoniales, quæ ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur, tam instructæ sint ad officium, ut possint apto et sancto sermone docere imperitas et rusticas mulieres, tempore quo baptizandæ sunt, qualiter baptizatori respondeant, et qualiter accepto baptismate vivant.

<sup>3</sup> See Book ii. chap. xxii. n. 9.

<sup>4</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. xvi. Τὸν μὲν ἄνδρα ὑποδέχεσθω ὁ διάκονος, τὴν δὲ γυναῖκα ἡ διάκονος.

speaks of them,<sup>1</sup> as presenting exposed children to baptism, though they had no children of their own, nor intended to have any. And in the Life of Epiphanius we read,<sup>2</sup> that as one Lucian was his godfather in baptism, so Bernice, a sacred virgin, was godmother to his sister. Whence it appears, that at first the sacred virgins and monastics were thought as proper persons, as any, to take this weighty office upon them. Though afterward, in the French Church by a canon<sup>3</sup> of the Council of Auxerre, monks are prohibited from being sponsors in baptism. And so the prohibition stands in the Romish Church to this day.

SECT. 10.—What Persons prohibited from being Sponsors.

But anciently there was no prohibition of any sorts of men from performing this charitable office, save only of such as unqualified themselves, by going contrary to the rules of the Christian religion. Fathers, as we heard before, were frequently sponsors for their own children; and I know of no prohibition of this before the time of Charles the Great, when the council of Mentz made a decree against it,<sup>4</sup> forbidding fathers to be susceptors to their own sons or daughters at the font in baptism. Anciently also presbyters and deacons were allowed to be sponsors, though this is also now prohibited in some provincial councils of the Romish Church by Cardinal Borromæo in the last age.<sup>5</sup> But the only persons, whom the ancients excluded from this office, were catechumens, energumens, heretics, and penitents, that is, persons who either were yet never in full communion with the church, as being themselves unbaptised; or else such as had forfeited the privileges of their baptism and church-communion by their errors, or crimes, or incapacity to assist others, who needed assistance themselves. And by some canons persons who were never confirmed, were excluded from being sponsors both in baptism and confirmation.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Ep. xxiii. ad Bonifac. Aliquandò etiam quos crudeliter parentes exposuerunt, nutriendos à quibuslibet, nonnunquam à sacris virginibus colliguntur, et ab eis offeruntur ad baptismum. Quæ certè proprios filios non habuerunt ullos, nec habere disponunt. <sup>2</sup> Vita Epiphani. n. 8. tom. ii. p. 324. "Ος ἐκ πατῆρ αὐτῶ ἐγενήθη ἐπὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ φωτισματός.—Βερνίκην τὴν ἁγίαν παρθένον, ἣτις ἐγένετο μήτηρ τῆς ἀδελφῆς Ἐπιφανίως.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Antisiodor. can. 25. Non licet abbati filium de baptismo suscipere; nec monachis commatres habere. <sup>4</sup> Con. Mogunt. an. 813. can. 55. Nullus igitur proprium filium vel filiam de fonte baptismatis suscipiat. <sup>5</sup> Borromæ.

Synod. Diœces. ii. decret. 17. <sup>6</sup> Con. Mogunt. ap. Gratian. de

SECT. II.—But one Sponsor required, and that a Man for a Man, and a Woman for a Woman.

From what has been said, the reader will also easily observe, that anciently no more but one sponsor was required, and that was a man for a man, and a woman for a woman; for we never read of more than one, in all the accounts of the ancients, and one of the same sex for adult persons. In the case of infants, there was no regard had to the difference of sex: for a virgin might be sponsor for a man-child and a father for his own children, whether they were male or female. And one sponsor was sufficient in any case. Some rules forbid more than one, either in baptism or confirmation: as that decree of Leo,<sup>1</sup> cited by Gratian, which says, “no more than one, whether man or woman, shall be admitted as surety for a child in baptism: and the like to be observed in confirmation.” Which rule was renewed and confirmed by the council of Metz,<sup>2</sup> but upon a reason which is something peculiar. For they conclude, that because there is but one God, one faith, one baptism, therefore an infant ought to have only one sponsor, whether man or woman, at his baptism, which I mention not for the excellency of the reason, but only to shew what conformity it bears to the ancient practice.

SECT. 12.—When first it became a Law that Sponsors might not Marry a Spiritual Relation.

Some perhaps will here be desirous to know the original of that practice in the Romish Church, which is the occasion of so many dispensations in matrimonial causes, arising from the prohibition of sponsors or godfathers marrying within the forbidden degrees of spiritual relation. Now that which seems to have given the first tendency towards this was a law of Justinian, still extant in the Code,<sup>3</sup> wherein he forbids any man to marry a woman, whether she be a

---

Consecrat. dist. iv. cap. 102. In baptisate, vel in chrismate, non potest alium suscipere in filium, qui non est ipse vel baptizatus vel confirmatus.

<sup>1</sup> Gratian. de Consecrat. dist. iv. cap. 101. Non plures ad suscipiendum de baptismo infantem accedant, quàm unus, sive vir, sive mulier. In confirmatione quoque id ipsum fiat.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Metens. cap. xii. cited by Vicecomes.

<sup>3</sup> Justin. Cod. lib. v. tit. iv. de Nuptiis. leg. xxvi. Ea

slave or free, for whom he had been godfather in baptism when she was a child: because nothing does induce a more paternal affection, or juster prohibition of marriage, than this tie by which their souls are in a divine manner united together. Now this law extended no further than to prohibit marriage in this immediate relation: and it could not affect very many, whilst parents were commonly sponsors for their own children, and the sacred virgins or the deaconesses or the clergy for others; and men were sponsors for men, and women for women. But afterward this was improved a little further: for the Council of Trullo forbids<sup>1</sup> the godfather not only to marry the infant, but the mother of the infant, for whom he answers; and orders them that have done so, first to be separated, then to do the penance of fornicators. This prohibition was extended to more degrees in the following ages, and grew so extravagant, that the Council of Trent thought it a matter worthy of their reformation; though still by their rules this spiritual relation<sup>2</sup> was extended to more degrees, than either the Laws of Justinian or the Canons of Trullo had prohibited. For they forbid marriage not only between the sponsors and their children, but also between the sponsors themselves; and the father and mother of the baptised is not to marry a sponsor, nor may the baptiser marry the baptised, nor the father or mother of the baptised, because of the spiritual relation that is contracted between them. But they forbid above two sponsors to appear for a child, and if more than two appear, they are not bound by this law of spiritual relation, though the canon-law<sup>3</sup> had determined otherwise in former

---

persona omnimodò ad nuptias venire prohibenda, quam aliquis, sive alumna sit, sive non, à sacrosancto suscepit baptisinate; eùm nihil aliud sic inducere potest paternam affectionem, et justam nuptiarum prohibitionem, quàm hujusmodi nexus, per quem Deo mediante animæ eorum copulate sunt.

<sup>1</sup> Con. Trull. can. liii. "Εγρωμέν τινας ἐκ τῆ βαπτίσματος παῖδας ἀνάδεχ-  
ομένους, ἔ μετὰ τῆτο ταῖς ἐκείνων μητράσι γαμικὸν συναλλάσσοντας συνοκείσιον.  
ὀρίζομεν ἀπὸ τῆ παρόντος μηδὲν τοῦτον παραθῆναι. <sup>2</sup> Con. Trident.

Sess. xxiv. de Reform. Matrimon. cap. ii. Inter susceptores ac baptizatum ipsum, et illius patrem ac matrem, necnon inter baptizantem et baptizatum, baptizatique patrem ac matrem, tantùm spiritualis cognatio contrahatur.

<sup>3</sup> Sext Decretal. lib. iv. tit. iii. de Cognat. Spirit. cap. iii. Si plures accesserint, spiritualis cognatio inde contrahitur, &c.

ages. Yet after all their regulations about this matter, there remain a thousand difficulties to exercise the pens of the Roman casuists, which the reader that is curious may find referred to by Soteallus and Barbosa<sup>1</sup> in their declarations and remissions on the Council of Trent.

SECT. 13.—Why the Names of the Sponsors ordered to be Registered in the Books of the Church.

There is one thing indeed ordered by that council, which was anciently of good use, though not for the purpose for which they appointed it. That is, that not only the names of the baptised, but also the names of the sponsors should be registered in the books of the Church. The Council of Trent orders it, only that men might know what persons were forbidden to marry by this spiritual relation. But anciently it had a much better use, that the Church might know, who were sponsors, and that they might be put in mind of their duty, by being entered upon record, which was a standing memorial of their obligations. This custom we find mentioned in the author under the name of Dionysius, where he describes the ceremony of admitting catechumens together with their sponsors. The bishop first explains to the catechumen the laws and rules of a divine life and conversation, and then asks him whether he purposes so to live, which when he has promised, he lays his hand upon his head, and orders the priests to register both the man and his sponsor.<sup>2</sup> Afterward he speaks of reciting their names out of these registers, when men were presented by their sponsors immediately to be baptised. And thus much of the use of sponsors in the primitive Church.

<sup>1</sup> Canon. Con. Trid. Cum Remissionibus Barbosa, Colon. 1621.

<sup>2</sup> Dionys. de Hierarch. Eccl. cap. ii. p. 253. Ἱεράρχης ἀπογράφασθαι κελεύει τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τὸν ἄνδρα ἢ τὸν ἀνάδοχον. It. p. 240. Καὶ τινος ἱερέως ἐκ τῆς ἀπογραφῆς αὐτόν τε ἢ τὸν ἀνάδοχον κηρύξαντος, &c.

## CHAP. IX.

*Of the Unction and the Sign of the Cross in Baptism.*

## SECT. 1.—Of the first original of Unction in Baptism.

WE find in some of the ancient ritualists, but not in all, mention made of an unction preceding baptism, and used by way of preparation for it. They, who first describe it, speak of it as used either immediately after the confession of faith, as the author of the Constitutions;<sup>1</sup> or else between the renunciation and the confession, as Cyril of Jerusalem describes it.<sup>2</sup> But there is no mention of this unction either in Justin Martyr or Tertullian. For though Tertullian speaks of an unction among the ceremonies of baptism; yet as Daille rightly observes,<sup>3</sup> it was not this unction preceding baptism, but the unction which followed after it in confirmation, accompanied with imposition of hands, which belongs to another subject. For it is plain from Tertullian that neither of these were given before baptism,<sup>4</sup> but when men were come out of the water, then they were anointed with the holy unction, and had imposition of hands, in order to receive the Holy Ghost. Whence I think Daille's conjecture very just and reasonable, that the unction preceding baptism is of later date, and was not as yet adopted among the ceremonies of baptism in the time of Tertullian.

## SECT. 2.—Of the Difference betwixt this and Chrism in Confirmation.

But the writers of the following ages speak distinctly of two unctions, the one before, the other after baptism: which they describe by different names and different ceremonies, to distinguish them one from the other. The first they commonly call *χρίσιν μυρικῆ ἑλαίᾱς*, *the unction of the mystical oil*, and the other *χρίσιν μύρου*, or *χρίσμα*, *the unction of chrism*. They both agree in this, that the bishop only consecrated them, whether for the use of baptism or confirmation. The author of the Constitutions gives

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. cap. xli.<sup>2</sup> Cyril. Catech. Myst. ii. n. 3.<sup>3</sup> Dallæ. de Confirmat. lib. ii. cap. xi. p. 181.<sup>4</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. cap.

vii. Exinde egressi de lavaero perungimur benedictâ unctione de pristinâ disciplinâ, quâ ungui oleo de cornu in sacerdotium solebant, &amp;c.

us a form of consecration to be used by the bishop in sanctifying oil for this unction before baptism, where he prays to God,<sup>1</sup> that he would sanctify the oil in the name of the Lord Jesus, and grant it spiritual grace, and efficacious power, that it might be subservient to the remission of sins, and the preparation of men to make their profession in baptism, that such as were anointed therewith, being freed from all impiety, might become worthy of the initiation according to the command of his only-begotten Son. And this power of consecration is reserved to the bishop in all the canons of the ancient councils, of which more, when we come to speak of confirmation. In the mean time I observe, First, That these two went by different names. The author of the Constitutions calls the first<sup>2</sup> mystical oil, and the other mystical chrism, and has a distinct form of consecration for each of them. And the same distinction in name is observed by Cyril of Jerusalem<sup>3</sup> and the authors under the name of Justin Martyr,<sup>4</sup> and Dionysius.<sup>5</sup> Secondly, they differed in the time of administering them. For the one was given before the party went into the water, the other after he came out of it again. Which is clear from all the forementioned authors, and from St. Ambrose,<sup>6</sup> who speaks of an unction with oil before baptism. As also the author of the Recognitions, under the name of Clemens Romanus,<sup>7</sup> who tells persons, “that were to be baptised, that they were first to be anointed with oil consecrated by prayer.” Thirdly, they differed in respect to the persons concerned in the administration. For the unction before baptism, was often done by a deacon or a deaconess: but that after baptism by the bishop himself most commonly, or at least by a presbyter in some peculiar cases. The author of the Constitutions,<sup>8</sup> speaking parti-

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. cap. xlii.

<sup>2</sup> Constit. lib. vii. c. xlii.

Μυστικὸν ἔλαιον. Lib. vii. cap. xlii. Μυστικὸν μύρον. Vid. lib. iii. cap. xvii.

<sup>3</sup> Cyril. Catech. Myst. ii. n. 3. and Catech. iii. n. 3.

<sup>4</sup> Justin. Resp. ad Orthodox. q. 137.

<sup>5</sup> Dionys. de Eccl. Hierar.

cap. ii. p. 253.

<sup>6</sup> Ambros. de Sacramentis. lib. i. cap. ii. Venimus ad fontem.—Unctus es quasi athleta Christi, quasi luctamen hujus sæculi luctaturus.

<sup>7</sup> Clem. Recognit. lib. iii. c. lxxvii. Baptizabitur autem unusquisque vestrum—perunctus primò oleo per orationem sanctificato.

<sup>8</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. xv. et xvi.

cularly of the unction before the baptism of women, orders the bishop to anoint the head, the deacon the forehead, and the deaconesses the other parts of the body. But the chrism after baptism is reserved to the bishop only. Lastly, they differed in the design and intent of them. For the design of the first unction was to prepare them for baptism, and enter them on their combat with Satan, as champions of Christ; the other was to consummate and confirm their baptism with the consignation or seal of the Holy Spirit.

SECT. 3.—The Design of this unction, and the Reason of it.

Cyril of Jerusalem speaking of the former unction says,<sup>1</sup> men were anointed from head to foot with this exorcised or consecrated oil, and this made them partakers of the true olive-tree, Jesus Christ. For they being cut out of a wild olive-tree, and ingrafted into a good olive-tree, were made partakers of the fatness of the good olive-tree. Therefore that exorcised oil was a symbol of their partaking of the fatness of Christ, and an indication of the flight and destruction of the adverse power. For as the insufflations of the saints, and invocation of God, do like a vehement flame, burn and put the devils to flight; so this exorcised oil by prayer and invocation of God gains such a power, as not only to burn up and purge away the footsteps of sin, but also to repel all the powers of the invisible wicked one, the devil. St. Ambrose compares it to the anointing of wrestlers before they enter their combat.<sup>2</sup> “Thou camest to the font,” says he, “and wast anointed as a champion of Christ, to fight the fight of this world.” The author under the name of Justin Martyr,<sup>3</sup> distinguishing between the two unctions, says, “men were first anointed with the ancient oil, that they might be Christ’s, that is, the anointed of God; but they were anointed with the precious ointment, after baptism, in remembrance of him who

<sup>1</sup> Cyril. Catech. Myst. ii. n. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Ambros. de Sacram. lib. i. cap.

ii. Venimus ad fontem.—Unctus es quasi athleta Christi, quasi luctamen hujus sæculi luctaturus.

<sup>3</sup> Justin. Respon. ad Orthodox. q. 137.

Χριστόμεθα δὲ τῷ παλαιῷ ἔλαιῳ, ἵνα γινώμεθα χριστοί. τῷ δὲ μύρῳ, πρὸς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς τῆν χρίσιν τῆς μύρῳ ἐνταφιασμὸν ἐαυτῶ λογιζόμενε.



reputed the anointing of himself with ointment to be his burial." The author of the Constitutions likewise uses the same distinction:<sup>1</sup> "thou shalt first of all anoint him with the holy oil, then baptise him with water, and afterward sign him with the ointment: that the anointing with oil may be the participation of the holy spirit, and the water may be the symbol of death, and the signing with ointment may be the seal of the compact made with God. But if there be neither oil, nor ointment, water is sufficient both for the unction and the seal and the confession of him with whom we die." So that this was only a ceremony of baptism, which might be omitted without any detriment to the substance or essential part of it. To these may be added the testimony of St. Chrysostom, who says,<sup>2</sup> "every person, before he was baptised, was anointed as wrestlers entering the field: and this not as the high priest was anointed of old, only on the head, or right hand, or ear, but all over his body, because he came not only to be taught, but to exercise himself in a fight or combat." This is the account which they give of this unction preceding baptism.

SECT. 4.—The Sign of the Cross frequently used in the Ceremonies of Baptism. First, in the Admission of Catechumens. And, secondly, in the Time of Exorcism.

Dr. Cave<sup>3</sup> and some other learned persons are of opinion, that together with this unction, the sign of the cross was made upon the forehead of the party baptised. And there is no question to be made of this, though all the passages they refer to are not direct proofs of it. For many of them relate to the sign of the cross in the unction of chrism, or confirmation. As particularly, that unction which Tertulian speaks of, and the sign of the cross accompanying it, was not the unction before baptism, but that which followed in confirmation, as I have shewed before in the beginning

<sup>1</sup> Const. Apost. lib. ii. cap. xxii. Χρίσεις δὲ πρῶτον τῷ ἑλαίῳ ἁγίῳ· ἔπειτα βαπτίσεις ὕδατι, ἢ τελευταῖον σφραγίσεις μύρον· ἵνα τὸ μὲν χρίσμα μετοχή ἢ τῶ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ σύμβολον τῆς θανάτου, τὸ δὲ μύρον σφραγίς τῶν συνθηκῶν, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Chrys. Hom. vi. in Colos. p. 1358. Ἀλείφεται ὡσπερ οἱ ἄθληται εἰς σάδιον ἰμβησόμενοι, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Cave. Prim. Christ. par. i. cap. x. p. 318.

of this chapter. Therefore to understand this matter exactly, we are to distinguish at least four several times, when the sign of the cross was used during the preparation or consummation of the ceremonies of baptism. First, at the admission of catechumens to the state of catechumen-ship and the general name of Christians. Secondly, in the time of exorcism and imposition of hands, while they were passing through the several stages of catechumens. Thirdly, at the time of this unction before baptism. Fourthly, and lastly, at the unction of confirmation, which was then usually the conclusion of baptism, both in adult persons and infants; and many of the passages, which speak of the sign of the cross in baptism, do plainly relate to this, as an appendage of baptism, and closely joined to it, as the last ceremony and consummation of it. The use of this sign in the admission of catechumens, I have already shewed before from St. Austin, and the life of Porphyrius, bishop of Gaza.<sup>1</sup> And the frequent use of it in exorcism, and imposition of hands and prayer, during their catechetical exercises, has also been noted<sup>2</sup> in treating of them from St. Austin and St. Ambrose, which I therefore need not here repeat.

SECT. 5.—Thirdly, in this Unction before Baptism.

The third use of it was in this unction before baptism. For so the author under the name of Dionysius, describing the ceremony of anointing the party before the consecration of the water, says,<sup>3</sup> “the bishop begins the unction by thrice signing him with the sign of the cross, and then commits him to the priests to be anointed all over the body, whilst he goes and consecrates the water in the font.” St. Austin also may be understood of this, when he says,<sup>4</sup> “the cross is always joined with baptism.” And by this we may interpret several passages in Cyprian, as where he tells Demetrian, “they only escape who are born again, and

<sup>1</sup> See Book x. chap. i. sect. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Book x. chap. ii. sect. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Dionys. de Hierar. Eccl. cap. ii. p. 253. Ὁ δὲ τῆς χρίσεως διὰ τῶν σφραγίσαι τρις ἀπαρξάμενος, τὸ λοιπὸν τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τὸν ἄνδρα χρίσαι πανσώμως παραδίδει, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. Serm. ci. de Tempore, p. 290. Semper enim cruci baptisma jungitur.

signed with the sign of Christ." And what that sign is, and on what part of the body it is made, the Lord signified in another place, saying, "Go through the midst of Jerusalem, and set a mark upon their foreheads."<sup>1</sup> And so again in his Book of the Unity of the Church speaking of Uzziah's leprosy, he says,<sup>2</sup> "he was marked for his offence against the Lord in that part of his body, where those are signed who obtain his mercy." Which seems plainly to refer to the sign of the cross made in baptism. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions is very express in this matter. For, explaining the meaning of the several parts and ceremonies used in baptism, he says,<sup>3</sup> "The water is to represent Christ's burial, the oil to represent the Holy Ghost, the sign of the cross to represent the cross, and the ointment or chrism, the confirmation of men's professions." And not improbably St. Jerom might refer to this, though his words be not so restrained to this time of unction, when he says, "he was a Christian, born of Christian parents, and carried the banner of the cross in his forehead."<sup>4</sup> Some add also those words of Cyprian,<sup>5</sup> "Let us guard our foreheads, that we may preserve the sign of God without danger." And those of Pontius in his Life,<sup>6</sup> where speaking of the Christian confessors, who were branded by the heathen in the forehead, and sent as slaves into the mines, he says, "they were marked in the forehead a second time," alluding to the sign of the cross which as Christians they had received before. But these passages do not necessarily relate to baptism, but are only general expressions that may refer to the use of the sign of the cross upon any other oc-

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. ad Demetrian. p. 194. Evadere eos solos posse, qui renati et signo Christi signati fuerint, alio loco Deus loquitur.—Quod autem sit hoc signum et quâ in parte corporis positum, manifestat alio in loco Deus, dicens: 'Transi per mediam Jerusalem, et notabis signum, super frontes virorum, &c.'

<sup>2</sup> Cypr. de Unit. Eccl. p. 116. In fronte maculatus est, eâ parte corporis notatus, offenso Domino, ubi signantur qui Dominum promerentur.

<sup>3</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. xvii. Τὸ εἰς ἕδωρ ἀντὶ ταφῆς, ἔτι τὸ ἐλαίου ἀντὶ Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, ἢ σφραγὶς ἀντὶ τῶν σαυρῶν, τὸ μύρον βεβαίωσις τῆς ὁμολογίας.

<sup>4</sup> Hieron. Ep. 113. Præfat. in Job, tom. iii. Ego Christianus, et de parentibus Christianis natus, et vexillum crucis in meâ fronte portans.

<sup>5</sup> Cypr. Ep. l. al. lviii. p. 125. Muniatur frons, ut signum Dei incolume servetur.

<sup>6</sup> Pontius. Vit. Cypr. p. 4. Confessores frontium notatarum secundâ inscriptione signatos.

casion: it being usual in those times, to sign themselves upon the forehead in the commonest actions of their lives, upon every motion, as Tertullian expresses it,<sup>1</sup> “at their going out and coming in, at their going to bath, or to bed, or to meals, or whatever their employment or occasions called them to.” Yet thus far it may be argued from them, that they who used it so commonly upon all other occasions, would hardly omit it in this solemn unction of baptism. And therefore these allegations may be allowed to be a sort of collateral evidence of the practice.

SECT. 6.—Fourthly, in the Uction of Confirmation.

Lastly, it was always used in the unction of confirmation; and that being then an appendage to baptism, what was done in it, was many times said to be done in baptism: and so both the unction and sign of the cross used in confirmation are ascribed to baptism, and upon that account sometimes mistaken for the former unction and consignation preceding baptism. There was no unction before baptism in the time of Tertullian; but there was one immediately after it, which together with imposition of hands, had also the sign of the cross joined with it; and all these were properly ceremonies of confirmation, which came after baptism, and are not to be confounded with the former. Tertullian says,<sup>2</sup> “The flesh is washed, that the soul may be cleansed; the flesh is anointed, that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is signed, that the soul may be guarded; the flesh is overshadowed by imposition of hands, that the soul may be illuminated by the Spirit; the flesh is fed by the body and blood of Christ, that the soul may receive nourishment or fatness from God.” Here he describes all things in order, as they were done after baptism to the eucharist. There was an unction and a signing with the sign of the

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Coron. Mil. cap. iii. Ad omnem progressum atque promotum, ad omnem aditum et exitum, ad vestitum, ad calceatum, ad lavacra, ad mensas, ad lumina, ad cubilia, ad sedilia, quæcunque nos conversatio exercet, frontem crucis sigaculo terimus. Vid. Cyril. Catech. iv. n. 10. Catech. xiii. n. 18. Chrysost. Hom. xxi. ad Popul. Antioch. Hom. xiii. in Phil. p. 1295. says it was used in baptism and ordination.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Resur. cap. viii. Caro abluitur, ut anima emaculetur. Caro ungitur, ut anima consecretur. Caro signatur, ut et anima muniatur. Caro manûs impositione adumbratur, ut et anima spiritu illuminetur. Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de Deo saginetur.

cross, and imposition of hands, and then the eucharist. So that this sign of the cross plainly relates to the unction which came after baptism, and was an usual ceremony of imposition of hands or confirmation. And thus we are to understand that other passage of Tertullian, where he says,<sup>1</sup> “the devil apes the ceremonies of the divine sacraments in his idol-mysteries; he baptises those that believe in him; he promises them expiation of sins in his laver, as now it is in the mysteries of Mithra; he signs his soldiers in the forehead; he celebrates also the oblation of bread, &c.” Where most probably signing in the forehead relates to the sign of the cross in confirmation, which comes between baptism and the eucharist. And so in Pope Leo,<sup>2</sup> “all that are regenerated in Christ, the sign of the cross makes them kings, and the unction of the Spirit consecrates them priests;” meaning in the same sense as St. Peter says, “all Christians are a royal priesthood.” Which privileges are commonly by the Ancients ascribed to the unction in confirmation, as here by Leo, who makes the sign of the cross an attendant of this unction after baptism. St. Austin’s words are a little more general;<sup>3</sup> but yet learned men think<sup>4</sup> they refer to the sign of the cross in confirmation, when he says, “several sacraments or sacred rites are received in different ways; some, you know are received in the mouth, (meaning the eucharist;) others in the whole body, (meaning baptism, wherein the whole body is washed with water;) others in the forehead, as the sign of the cross;” where because he distinguishes the sign of the cross as a sacrament in the large sense of the word, both from baptism and the eucharist, it seems most reasonable to suppose that he intended the use of it in confirmation: which therefore

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Præscript. cap. xl. Ipsas quoque res sacramentorum divinarum, in idolorum mysteriis æmulatur. Tinguunt et ipse quosdam, utique credentes et fideles suos. Expiationem de lavacro repromittit, et sic adhuc initiat Mithræ. Signat illic in frontibus milites suos, celebrat et panis oblationem.

<sup>2</sup> Leo. Serm. iii. in Anniversario Diei suæ Assumptionis, p. 3. Omnes in Christo regeneratos crucis signum efficit reges; Sancti verò Spiritûs unctio consecrat sacerdotes.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. Ennarrat. Psal. cxli. p. 671. Multa sacramenta aliter atque aliter accipimus. Quædam, sicut nostis, ore accipimus, quædam per totum corpus accipimus. Quia verò in fronte erubescitur.—Crucem Christi quam pagani derident, in loco pudoris nostri constituit.

<sup>4</sup> Dallæ. de Confirm. lib. ii. cap. xxiv. p. 294.

the Greeks often call *σφραγίς*, *the sign or seal of the Holy Ghost*.<sup>1</sup> And sometimes the sign of the cross is more distinctly called *εναρροειδὴς σφραγίς*, *the sign made in the form of the cross*, which was used not only in baptising and confirming, but also in the ordination of priests, as I have had occasion elsewhere<sup>2</sup> to shew out of Chrysostom and Dionysius,<sup>3</sup> and in the consecration of the waters of baptism, which is the next thing that comes now in order to be considered.

## CHAP. X.

### *Of the Consecration of the Water in Baptism.*

SECT. 1.—The Consecration of the Water made by Prayer.

IMMEDIATELY after the unction the minister proceeded to consecrate the water, or the bishop if he were present consecrated it, while the priests were finishing the unction. For so the author under the name of Dionysius represents it. “While the priests,” says he,<sup>4</sup> “are finishing the unction, the bishop comes to the mother of adoption,” (so he calls the font,) “and by invocation sanctifies the water in it, thrice pouring in some of the holy chrism in a manner representing the sign of the cross.” This invocation or consecration of the water by prayer, is mentioned by Tertullian. For he says,<sup>5</sup> “The waters are made the sacrament of sanctification by invocation of God. The Spirit immediately descends from Heaven, and resting upon them sanctifies them by himself, and they being so sanctified, imbibe the power of sanctifying.” And Cyprian declares,<sup>6</sup> “that the water must

<sup>1</sup> Con. Gen. Constantinop. i. can. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Book iv. chap. vi. s. 12.

<sup>3</sup> Chrys. Hom. iv. in Matth. p. 475. Dionys. de Hierarch. Eccl. cap v. p. 312 and 314.

<sup>4</sup> Dionys. de Hierarch. Eccl. cap. ii. p. 253. *Αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τὴν μητέρα τῆς υἰοθεσίας ἔρχεται, ἢ τὸ ταύτης ὕδωρ ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἐπικλησι καθαγιάσας, &c.*

<sup>5</sup> Tertul de Bapt. cap. iv. Sacramentum sanctificationis consequuntur, invocato Deo. Supervenit enim statim Spiritus de cœlis, et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semetipso, et ita sanctificatæ vim sanctificandi combibunt.

<sup>6</sup> Cyprian. Ep. lxx. ad Januar. p. 190. Oportet verò mundari et sanctificari aquam priùs à sacerdote, ut possit baptismo sua peccata hominis, qui baptizatur, abluere.

first be cleansed and sanctified by the priest, that it may have power by baptism to wash away the sins of man." And so the whole Council of Carthage,<sup>1</sup> in the time of Cyprian, says, "the water is sanctified by the prayer of the priest, to wash away sin." Optatus has respect to this, when speaking of the name of *Piscis*, ἰχθῦς, the technical name that was given to Christ, from the several initial letters of his titles, which signifies *a fish*, he says,<sup>2</sup> "this is the fish," (meaning Christ,) "which is brought down upon the waters of the font in baptism by invocation and prayer." St. Austin often mentions this invocation in his books of baptism.<sup>3</sup> "That water is not profane and adulterated, over which the name of God is invoked, though the invocation be made by profane and adulterous men." In another place, he says,<sup>4</sup> "This invocation was used both in consecrating the waters of baptism, and the oil for unction, and the eucharist, and in giving imposition of hands. And the sacraments were valid, though it were a sinner or a murderer that made the prayer." And again, answering the objection of the Cyprianists and Donatists, "that a wicked man or an heretic could not sanctify the water," he says,<sup>5</sup> "every error in the prayer of consecration does not destroy the essence of baptism, but only the want of those evangelical words," he

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carthag. ap. Cypr. p. 233. Aqua sacerdotis prece sanctificata abluit delicta.

<sup>2</sup> Optat. lib. iii. cont. Parmen. p. 62. Ille est piscis, qui in baptisate per invocationem fontalibus undis inseritur.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. iii. cap. x. Non est aqua profana et adultera, super quam nomen invocatur, etiamsi à profanis et adulteris invocetur.

<sup>4</sup> Id. de Bapt. lib. v. cap. xx. Si ergò ad hoc valet, quod dictum est in Evangelio, Deus peccatorem non audit, ut per peccatorem sacramenta non celebrentur; quomodò exaudit homicidam deprecantem, vel super aquam baptismi vel super oleum, vel super eucharistiam, vel super capita eorum, quibus manus imponitur? Quæ omnia tamen et fiunt et valent etiam per homicidas. &c.

<sup>5</sup> De Bapt. lib. vi. cap. xxv. Si non sanctificatur aqua, cum aliqua erroris verba per imperitiam preator effundit, multi non solum mali, sed etiam boni fratres in ipsâ Ecclesiâ non sanctificant aquam. Multorum enim preces emendantur quotidie, si doctioribus fuerint recitatæ, et multa in eis reperiuntur contra fidem catholicam. Nunquid si manifestarentur aliqui baptizati, cum illæ preces dictæ super aquam fuissent juberentur denuò baptizari?—Certa illa evangelica verba, sine quibus non potest baptismus consecrari, tantum valent, ut per illa sic evacuentur quæcumque in prece vitiosâ contra Regulam Fidei dicuntur, quemadmodum demoniium Christi nomine excluditur.

means the form of baptising in the name of the Trinity instituted by Christ, without which baptism cannot be consecrated) “for otherwise, if the water were not consecrated, when the minister uses any erroneous words in his prayer, then not only wicked men, but many good brethren in the Church did not sanctify the water: for many of their prayers were daily corrected, when they were rehearsed to those that were more learned, and many errors were found in them contrary to the catholic faith.” Yet they that were baptised when such prayers was said over the water, were not baptised again. This is a plain evidence, that prayers of consecration were then generally used both among the Catholics and Donatists, though neither the use nor the orthodoxy of them were reckoned to be of absolute necessity to the very being and essence of baptism, which might consist with great errors in such prayers. It were easy to add many other testimonies of this ancient practice out of St. Ambrose,<sup>1</sup> St. Basil,<sup>2</sup> Theodoret,<sup>3</sup> Gregory Nyssen,<sup>4</sup> Theophilus of Alexandria,<sup>5</sup> Victor Utiensis,<sup>6</sup> and some others. But I think it needless to repeat them all at length, after such full evidence from St. Austin and those writers that came before him.

SECT. 2.—An ancient Form of this Prayer in the Constitutions.

Only I shall add two or three observations more concerning this prayer of consecration, which may give a little light to some usages and some doctrines also of the ancient Church. And first, we find, that as they had forms for other parts of the divine service, so they had a form for this consecration-prayer, or benediction of the water; though that not so universal and invariable as the form of baptism. For St. Austin observes, “that the one never varied, but the

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Sacram. lib. i. c. v. lib. v. c. ii. De Spir. Sancto, lib. i. c. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Basil. in Psal. xxviii. It. de Spir. Sancto. c. xxvii.

<sup>3</sup> Theodor. in 1 Cor. vi. 11. tom. iii. p. 144.

<sup>4</sup> Nyssen. de Bapt.

Christ. tom. iii. p. 370. It. adv. eos qui Baptism. differunt, tom. ii. p. 219.

<sup>5</sup> Theophil. Ep. Paschal. i. Bibl. Patr. tom. iii. p. 87.

<sup>6</sup> Victor.

Utic. de Persec. Vandal. lib. ii. p. 602. Gelas. Cyzicen. et Pseudo-Athanas. De Communi Essentia, &c.



other was subject to some errors and corruptions, by reason of the liberty that was left to human composers." One of these forms is now extant in the Constitutions,<sup>1</sup> which it will not be amiss here to insert, it goes under the title of a thanksgiving over the mystical water. The priest blesses and praises the Lord God Almighty, the Father of the only begotten God, giving him thanks, for that he sent his Son to be incarnate for us, that he might save us; that he took upon him in his incarnation to be obedient in all things, to preach the kingdom of Heaven, the remission of sins, and the resurrection of the dead. After this he adores the only begotten God, and for him gives thanks to the Father, that he took upon him to die for all men upon the cross, leaving the baptism of regeneration as a type or symbol of it. He further praises God, the Lord of all, that in the name of Christ and by the Holy Spirit, not rejecting mankind, he shewed himself at divers times in divers providences towards them; giving Adam an habitation in a delicious paradise; then laying upon him a command in his providence, upon the transgression of which he expelled him in his justice, but in his goodness did not wholly cast him off, but disciplined his posterity in divers manners, for whom in the end of the world he sent his Son, to be made man for the sake of men, and to take upon him all the affections of men, sin only excepted. After this thanksgiving the priest is to call upon God, and say "Look down from Heaven, and sanctify this water; give it grace and power, that he that is baptised therein, according to the command of Christ, may be crucified with him, and die with him, and be buried with him, and rise again with him to that adoption which comes by him; that dying unto sin, he may live unto righteousness." Any one that will compare the form in our Liturgy, with this ancient form, will find a great resemblance between them, both in the thanksgiving and the particular prayer of consecration.

SECT. 3.—The Sign of the Cross used in this Consecration.

Secondly, I observe, that together with this prayer, it was usual to make the sign of the cross also, not as before,

---

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. cap. xliii.

upon the person to be baptised, but as a circumstance of the consecration. This we learn not only from Dionysius,<sup>1</sup> but from St. Austin,<sup>2</sup> who says, “the water of baptism was signed with the cross of Christ.” And St Chrysostom says,<sup>3</sup> “they used it in all their sacred mysteries; when they were regenerated in baptism, when they were fed with the mystical food in the eucharist, when they were ordained, that symbol of victory was always represented in the action, whatever religious matter they were concerned in.” To which we may add the author under the name of St. Austin,<sup>4</sup> who runs over all the solemn consecration of the Church, and tells us, “the symbol of the cross was used in every one, in catechizing of new converts, in consecrating the waters of baptism, in giving imposition of hands in confirmation, in the dedication of churches and altars, in consecrating the eucharist, and in promoting priests and Levites to holy orders.”

SECT. 4.—The Effects and Change wrought by this Consecration, the same as in the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist.

Thirdly, I observe concerning the effects of this consecration, that the very same change was supposed to be wrought by it in the waters of baptism, as by the consecration of bread and wine in the eucharist. For they supposed not only the presence of the Spirit, but also the mystical presence of Christ's blood to be here after consecration. Julius Firmicus,<sup>5</sup> speaking of baptism, bids men here “seek

<sup>1</sup> Dionys. de Hier. Eccl. cap. ii. p. 254.      <sup>2</sup> Aug. Hom. xxvii. ex 50. tom. x. p. 175. Quia baptismus, id est, aqua salutis, non est salutis, nisi Christi nomine consecrata, qui pro nobis sanguinem fudit, cruce ipsius aqua signatur.

<sup>3</sup> Chrys. Hom. 54. al. 55. in Mat. p. 475. ed. Commelin. Πάντα ἕν ἀπὸ τοῦ τελεῖται τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς· κἄν ἀναγεννηθῆναι ἔγω, εὐαγρόδ παραγίνεται κἄν τραφῆναι τὴν μητρὴν ἐκείνην τροφὴν κἄν χειροτονηθῆναι, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. Hom. 75. de Diversis, in Append. tom. x. p. 702. Hujus crucis mysterio rudes catechizentur, eodem mysterio fons regenerationis consecratur, ejusdem crucis signo per manus impositionem baptizati dona gratiarum accipiunt. Cùm ejusdem crucis caractere basilicæ dedicantur, altaria consecrantur, altaris sacramenta cum interpositione domesticorum verborem conficiuntur. Sacerdotes et Levite per hoc idem ad sacros ordines promoventur.

<sup>5</sup> Firmic. de Error. Profan. Relig. c. xxviii. Quære fontes ingenuos, quære puros liquores, ut illic te post multas maculas cum Spiritu Sancto Christi sanguis incandidet.

for the pure waters, the undefiled fountain, where the blood of Christ after many spots and defilements, would whiten them by the Holy Ghost." Gregory Nazianzen<sup>1</sup> and Basil<sup>2</sup> say upon this account, "that a greater than the temple, a greater than Solomon, a greater than Jonas is here," meaning Christ by his mystical presence and the power of his blood. St. Austin says,<sup>3</sup> "baptism or baptismal water is red, when once it is consecrated by the blood of Christ; and this was prefigured by the waters of the Red Sea." Prosper is bold to say,<sup>4</sup> "that in baptism we are dipped in blood, and therefore martyrs are twice dipped in blood; first in the blood of Christ at baptism, and then in their own blood at martyrdom." St. Jerom uses the same bold metaphor,<sup>5</sup> explaining those words of Isaiah, "wash ye, make ye clean," "be ye baptised in my blood by the laver of regeneration." And again,<sup>6</sup> speaking of the Ethiopian eunuch, he says "he was baptised in the blood of Christ, about whom he was reading." After the same manner, Cæsarius says,<sup>7</sup> "the soul goes into the living waters, consecrated and made red by the blood of Christ." And Isidore says,<sup>8</sup> "what is the Red Sea, but baptism consecrated in the blood of Christ?" Others tell us, "that we are hereby made partakers of the body and blood of Christ, and eat his flesh," according to what is said in St. John's Gospel; "except ye eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." Upon which words Fulgentius<sup>9</sup> founds the necessity of bap-

<sup>1</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 657.

<sup>2</sup> Basil. de Bapt. lib. i. c. ii.

tom. i. p. 558.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. Tract. xi. in Joh. p. 41. Significabat mare rubrum baptismum Christi. Unde rubet baptismum Christi, nisi Christi sanguine consecratus?

<sup>4</sup> Prosper. de Promissis. lib. ii. cap. ii. In cocco his tineto martyria sancta rutilant, semel baptismo Christi sanguine tinguntur, atque suo effusionis cruore denuò retinguntur.

<sup>5</sup> Hieron. in Esai. i. 16. Baptizemini in sanguine meo per lavacrum regenerationis.

<sup>6</sup> Id. in Esai. lviii. 7. Statim baptizatus in Agui sanguine quem legebat. vii. meruit appellari, et apostolus genti Æthiopum missus est.

<sup>7</sup> Cæsar. Arelatens. Hom. vi. de Paschat. Bibl. Patr. tom. ii. p. 276. Ingreditur anima vitales undas velut rubras sanguine Christi consecratas.

<sup>8</sup> Isidor. Hispal. in Exod. xix. Quid est mare rubrum, nisi baptismum Christi sanguine consecratum?

<sup>9</sup> Fulgent. de Bapt. Æthiop. cap. xi. p. 611. Quisquis secundum mysterii veritatem considerare poterit, in ipso lavacro sanctæ regenerationis hoc fieri providebit.—Quod etiam sanctos patres indubitanter credidisse ac docuisse cognoscimus.

tism: forasmuch as it may be perceived by any considering man, that the flesh of Christ is eaten and his blood drunk in the laver of regeneration. Hence Cyril of Alexandria says<sup>1</sup> “we are partakers of the spiritual lamb in baptism.” And Chrysostom,<sup>2</sup> “that we thereby put on Christ, not only his divinity; or only his humanity, that is, his flesh, but both together.” And Nazianzen,<sup>3</sup> “that in baptism we are anointed and protected by the precious blood of Christ, as Israel was by the blood upon the door-posts in the night.” St. Chrysostom says again,<sup>4</sup> “that they that are baptised, put on a royal garment, a purple dipped in the blood of the Lord.” Philo-Carpathius says,<sup>5</sup> “the spouse of Christ, his Church, receives in baptism the seal of Christ, being washed in the fountain of his most holy blood.” Optatus,<sup>6</sup> as we have heard before, says, “Christ comes down by the invocation, and joins himself to the waters of baptism.” Nay, Chrysostom,<sup>7</sup> in one of his bold rhetorical flights, scruples not to tell a man that is baptised, “that he immediately embraces his Lord in his arms, that he is united to his body, nay compounded or consubstantiated with that body which sits above, whither the devil has no access.” Some tell us, as Isidore,<sup>8</sup> “that the water of baptism is the water that flowed out of Christ’s side at his passion:” and others, as Laurentius Novariensis,<sup>9</sup> “that it is water mixed with the sacred blood of the Son of God.” Others tell us,<sup>10</sup> “that the water is transmuted or changed in its nature by the Holy Ghost, to a sort of divine and in-

<sup>1</sup> Cyril. in Exod. xii. lib. ii. tom. i. p. 270. Μέτοχος τῆ νοητῆ προβάτου, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Chrys. Serm. xxvii. de Cruce. tom. vi. p. 293.

<sup>3</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 646.

<sup>4</sup> Chrys. Hom. lx. ad Illuminandos, tom. i. p. 796.

<sup>5</sup> Philo. in Cantic. iv. 12. Fons signatus sponsa dicitur, quia in batismate signaculum Jesu Christi accepit, ex ejus sacratissimi sanguinis fonte perlota.

<sup>6</sup> Optat. lib. iii. p. xxxii. Hic est piscis, qui in batismate per invocationem fontalibus undis inseritur.

<sup>7</sup> Chrys. Hom. vi. in Colos. p. 1359. Αὐτὸν εὐθέως περιλαμβάνεις τὸν δεσπότην, ἀνακραννύσαι τῷ σώματι, ἀναφήρη, leg. ἀνφύρη τῷ σώματι τῷ ἄνω κειμένῳ, &c.

<sup>8</sup> Isidor. de Offic. Eccl. lib. ii. cap. xxiv. Aqua est, quæ tempore passionis Christi de latere profluxit.

<sup>9</sup> Laurent. Novar. Hom. i. de Pœnitentia. Bibl. Patr. tom. ii. p. 127. Asperges me aquâ Filii tui sacro sanguine mixtâ.—Abluitur Adam corpore Christi, &c.

<sup>10</sup> Cyril. in Joh. iii. 5. p. 147. Διὰ τῆς τῆ Πνεύματος ἐνέργειας τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὕδωρ πρὸς θεῖαν τιὰ ἐ ἀρρητον ἀνατοιχιῶται δύναμιν. Vid. Albertinum de

effable power." So Cyril of Alexandria, who frequently uses the word μεταποιχέωσις, *transelementation*, both when he speaks of the water in baptism, and the bread and wine in the eucharist, or of any other changes that are wrought in the mysteries of the Christian religion. Cyril of Jerusalem, and Gregory Nyssen have the same observation upon the change that is wrought in the oil, after consecration, which they make to be the same with that of the bread and wine in the eucharist. "Beware," says Cyril,<sup>1</sup> "that you take not this ointment to be bare ointment: for as the bread in the eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is not mere bread, but the body of Christ; so this holy ointment after invocation, is not bare or common ointment, but it is a gift of God, that makes Christ and the Holy Spirit to be present in the action." In like manner, Gregory Nyssen makes the same change to be in the mystical oil, and in the altar itself, and in the ministers by ordination, and in the waters of baptism, as in the bread and wine in the eucharist after consecration. "Do not contemn," says he,<sup>2</sup> "the divine laver, nor despise it as a common thing, because of the use of water; for great and wonderful things are wrought by it. This altar, before which we stand, is but common stone in its own nature, differing nothing from other stones, wherewith our walls are built; but after it is consecrated to the service of God, and has received a benediction, it is an holy table, an immaculate altar, not to be touched by any but the priests, and that with the greatest reverence. The bread also is at first but common bread, but when once it is sanctified by the holy mystery, it is made and called the body of Christ. So the mystical oil, and so the wine, though they be things of little value before the benediction, yet after their sanctification by the Spirit, they both work wonders. The same

---

Eucharistia, lib. ii. p. 481. Where he has collected all the passages that speak of this transelementation.

<sup>1</sup> Cyril. Catech. Myst. iii. n. iii. "Ὅρα μὴ ὑπονοήσῃς ἐκεῖνο τὸ μύρον ψιλὸν εἶναι ὡσπερ ἐὶ ὁ ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας, μετὰ τὴν ἐπίκλησιν τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι. ἐκ ἐπι ἄρτος λιτὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ· ἔγω τὸ ἅγιον τῷτο μύρον ἐκ ἐπι ψιλὸν, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Nyssen. de Baptismo Christi. tom. iii. 369.

power of the word makes a priest become honourable and venerable, when he is separated from the community of the vulgar by a new benediction. For he who before was only one of the common people, is now immediately made a ruler, and president, a teacher of piety, and a minister of the secret mysteries: and all these things he does without any change in his body or shape; for to all outward appearance he is the same that he was, but the change is in his invisible soul, by an invisible power and grace." Pope Leo goes one step further, and tells us,<sup>1</sup> "that baptism makes a change not only in the water, but in the man that receives it, for thereby Christ receives him, and he receives Christ, and he is not the same after baptism that he was before, but the body of him that is regenerated is made the flesh of him that was crucified." From all which it is easy to observe, that in all these cases, the change which they speak of is not made in the substance of the things, but in the qualities only; the water is not the blood of Christ substantially and really, but only symbolically and mystically: nor is a man changed into the flesh of Christ thereby any other way, than as he is made a living member of his mystical body, participating of that Spirit whereby he rules and governs his Church, as the head of it. So that when the Ancients speak of a divine change or *transelementation* (for as yet the word *transubstantiation* was not known) in the bread and wine in the eucharist, they are to be interpreted, as here we do in baptism, of a change in qualities and powers, and not in substance: since all the words they used to express that change, are equally verified in the waters of baptism after consecration.

SECT. 5.—How far these Prayers of Consecration were reckoned necessary in the Church.

I must further observe, to avoid all mistakes, that when the Ancients speak of an absolute necessity of invocation of God to consecrate the waters of baptism, they then do

---

<sup>1</sup> Leo, Serm. xiv. de Passione. p. 62. Susceptus à Christo, Christumque suscipiens, non idem est post lavacrum, qui ante baptismum fuit, sed corpus regenerati fit caro crucifixi.

not mean any new forms of prayer instituted by the Church, but the very form of baptism instituted by Christ, which they rightly suppose to be an invocation of the Holy Trinity: in which sense, no baptism can be duly performed without an invocation to consecrate the water, though it may be performed in times of exigency, without the additional prayers of the Church.<sup>1</sup>

## CHAP. XI.

### *Of the different Ways of Baptising by Immersion, Trine Immersion, and Aspersion in the Case of Clinic Baptism.*

SECT. I.--All Persons anciently divested in Order to be baptised.

HAVING thus far considered all things preceding the very act of baptising, we are now to inquire into the manner how that was usually performed, whether by dipping and total immersion, or by aspersion and sprinkling, which is now the more general practice of the Church. There is no question made but that either of these ways does fully answer the primary end of baptism, which is to purify the soul and not the body, by washing away sin. But yet the Ancients thought, that immersion or burying under water, did more lively represent the death and burial and resurrection of Christ, as well as our own death unto sin, and rising again to righteousness: and the divesting or unclothing the person to be baptised, did also represent the putting off the body of sin in order to put on the new man, which is created in righteousness and true holiness. For which reason they observed the way of baptising all persons naked and divested, by a total immersion under water, except in some particular cases of great exigency, wherein they allowed of sprinkling, as in the case of clinic baptism, or where there was a scarcity of water. That persons were divested in order to be baptised is evident, partly from what has been said before of the unction, which was administered not only on the

---

<sup>1</sup> Vid. Albertin. de Eucharist. lib. i. p. 18. v. 22.

head, but on other parts of the body; partly from express testimonies which affirm it; and also from the manner of baptising by immersion, which necessarily presupposes it. St. Chrysostom speaking of baptism, says,<sup>1</sup> “men were as naked as Adam in paradise, but with this difference: Adam was naked because he had sinned, but in baptism a man was naked that he might be freed from sin: the one was divested of his glory, which he once had, but the other put off the old man, which he did as easily as his clothes.” St. Ambrose says,<sup>2</sup> “men came as naked to the font, as they came into the world;” and thence he draws an argument by way of allusion, to rich men, telling them, “how absurd it was, that a man who was born naked of his mother, and received naked by the Church, should think of going rich into heaven.” Cyril of Jerusalem takes notice of this circumstance,<sup>3</sup> together with the reasons of it, when he thus addresses himself to persons newly baptised: “As soon as ye came into the inner part of the baptistery, ye put off your clothes, which is an emblem of putting off the old man with his deeds: and being thus divested ye stood naked, imitating Christ, that was naked upon the cross, who by his nakedness spoiled principalities and powers, publicly triumphing over them in the cross. O, wonderful thing! ye were naked in the sight of men, and were not ashamed, in this truly imitating the first man Adam, who was naked in paradise, and was not ashamed.” So, also, Amphilocheus, in the Life of St. Basil,<sup>4</sup> speaking of his baptism, “says, he arose with fear and put off his clothes, and with them the old man. And Zeno Veronensis reminding persons of their baptism,<sup>5</sup> bids them rejoice, “for they went

---

<sup>1</sup> Chrys. Hom. vi. in Colos. p. 1358. *Ἐνταῦθα γυμνότης, καὶ ἐκὶ γυμνότης· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖ μὲν ἀμαρτήσας ἐγυμνώθη, ἐπειδὴ ἤμαρτεν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ, ἵνα ἀπαλλαγῇ γυμνῆται, &c.*

<sup>2</sup> Ambros. Serm. x. *Nudi in sæculo nascimur, nudi etiam accedimus ad lavacrum.—Quàm autem incongruum ac absurdum est, ut quem nudum mater genuit, nudum suscipit Ecclesia, dives introire velit in cælum?*

<sup>3</sup> Cyril. Catech. Myst. ii. n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Amphilocheus. Vit. Basil. cap. v.

<sup>5</sup> Zeno Invitat. ii. ad Bapt. Bibl. Patr. tom. ii. p. 442. *Gaudere, in fontem quidem nudi demergitis, sed æthereâ veste vestiti, mox candidati inde surgitis, quam qui non polluerit, regna cælestia possidebit.*



down naked to the font, but rose again clothed in a white and heavenly garment, which if they did not defile they might obtain the kingdom of Heaven." Athanasius in his invectives against the Arians, among other things lays this to their charge, "that by their persuasions the Jews and Gentiles broke into the baptistery, and there offered such abuses to the catechumens as they stood with their naked bodies, as was shameful and abominable to relate."<sup>1</sup> And a like complaint is brought against Peter bishop of Apamea in the Council of Constantinople under Mennas,<sup>2</sup> "that he cast out the Neophytes, or persons newly baptised, out of the baptistery, when they were without their clothes and shoes." All which are manifest proofs, that persons were baptised naked, either in imitation of Adam in paradise, or our Saviour upon the cross, or to signify their putting off the body of sin, and the old man with his deeds.

SECT. 2.—No Exception in this Case either with respect to Women or Children.

And this practice was then so general, that we find no exception made, either with respect to the tenderness of infants, or the bashfulness of the female sex; save only where the case of sickness or disability made it necessary to vary from the usual custom. St. Chrysostom is an undeniable evidence in this matter. For writing about the barbarous proceedings of his enemies against him on the Great Sabbath, or Saturday before Easter, among other tragical things which they committed, he reports this for one,<sup>3</sup> "That they came armed into the church, and by violence expelled the clergy, killing many in the baptistery, with which the women who at that time were divested in order to be baptised, were put into such a terror, that they

<sup>1</sup> Athan. Ep. ad Orthodoxos, tom. i. p. 946. <sup>2</sup> Con. Constant. act. i. p. 53. Ed. Crab. Cum essemus in baptisterio neophytistarum, sine tunicis et calceamentis existentium, venit episcopus noster Petrus, et ejecit nos foras unà cum neophytis, &c. <sup>3</sup> Chrys. Ep. ad Innocent. p. 680. Γυναῖκες πρὸς τὸ βάπτισμα ἀποδυσάμενοι κατ' αὐτὸν τὸν καιρὸν, γυμναὶ ἔφυγον ὑπὸ τῷ φόβῳ τῆς χαλεπῆς ταύτης ἐφόδου· ἠδὲ τὴν πρέπασαν γυναῖξιν εὐσχημοσύνην συγχωρόμεναι περιθίσσαι. Vid. Moschum Prat. Spir. c. 104.

fled away naked, and could not stay in the fright to put on such clothes as the modesty of their sex required. “And that so it was in the case of children also, is evident from the custom of immersion which continued in the Church for many ages; as also from what is particularly said of infants in the *Ordo Romanus*<sup>1</sup> and Gregory’s *Sacramentarium*, “that after the priest has baptised them with three immersions, they are to be clothed, and brought to the bishop to be confirmed.” For this clothing supposes that they were unclothed before in order to be baptised.

**SECT. 3.**—Yet Matters were so ordered as that no Indecency might be committed.

But yet that no indecency might appear in so sacred an action, two things were especially provided for by ancient rules. First, that men and women were baptised apart. To which purpose the baptisteries were commonly divided into two apartments, the one for the men, the other for the women, as I have had occasion to shew from St. Austin<sup>2</sup> in another place.<sup>3</sup> Or else the men were baptised at one time and the women at another, as Vossius<sup>4</sup> observes out of the *Ordo Romanus*, Gregory’s *Sacramentarium*, Albinus Flaccus, and other writers. Secondly, there was anciently an order of deaconesses in the Church, and one main part of their business was to assist at the baptism of women, where for decencies sake they were employed to divest them, and so to order the matter, that the whole ceremony both of unction and baptising might be performed in such a manner as became the reverence that was due to so sacred an action; of all which I have given sufficient proofs in a former Book,<sup>5</sup> which I need not here repeat.

<sup>1</sup> Gregor. Sacram. de Bapt. Infant. Baptizat eum sacerdos sub tribâ mersoine, &c. Et vestitur infans. II. Ordo Roman. Cap. de Die Sabbati S. Paschæ. Cùm vestiti fuerint infantes, pontifex confirmet eos. Vid. Albanus. de Parabolis Evangel. q. 94. Τὸ γὰρ καταδύσαι τὸ παιδίον, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de Civ. Dei. lib. xxii. c. 8. <sup>3</sup> Book. viii. chap. vii. s. 1. <sup>4</sup> Voss. de Bapt. disp. i. p. 36. <sup>5</sup> Book ii. chap. xxiii. s. 8.

## SECT. 4.—Baptism usually performed by Immersion.

Persons thus divested or unclothed were usually baptised by immersion or dipping of their whole bodies under water, to represent the death and burial and resurrection of Christ together; and therewith to signify their own dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and their resurrection to a new life. There are a great many passages in the Epistles of St. Paul, which plainly refer to this custom, Rom. vi. 4. "We are buried with him by baptism, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." So again, Col. ii. 12. "Buried with him in baptism; wherein ye are also risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead." And as this was the original Apostolical practice, so it continued to be the universal practice of the Church for many ages, upon the same symbolical reasons as it was first used by the Apostles. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions says,<sup>1</sup> "baptism was given to represent the death of Christ, and the water his burial." St. Chrysostom proves the resurrection from this practice: "for," says he, "our being baptised and immersed in the water,<sup>2</sup> and our rising again out of it, is a symbol of our descending into hell or the grave, and of our returning from thence." Wherefore St. Paul calls baptism our burial. "For," says he, "we are buried with Christ by baptism into death." And in another place,<sup>3</sup> when we dip our heads in water as in a grave, "our old man is buried;" and when we rise up again, "the new man rises therewith." Cyril of Jerusalem makes it an emblem of the Holy Ghost's effusion upon the Apostles: for as he that goes down into the water<sup>4</sup> and is baptised, and surrounded on all sides by the water; so the Apostles were baptised all over by the Spirit: the water surrounds the body externally, but the Spirit incom-

<sup>1</sup> Const. Apost. lib. iii. c. 17. Ἐπὶ τοίνυν τὸ μὲν βάπτισμα εἰς τὸν θάνατον τῶ Ἰησοῦ διδομένον, τὸ δὲ ὕδωρ ἀντὶ ταφῆς.

<sup>2</sup> Chrys. Hom. xl. in I Cor. p. 6-9. Τὸ γὰρ βαπτίζεσθαι, ἢ καταδύεσθαι, εἶτα ἀνανεῖναι, τῆς εἰς

Ἄβρα καταβάσεως ἐστὶ σύμβολον, ἢ τῆς ἐκεῖθεν ἀνάστα, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Chrys. in

Joh. iii. 5. Hom. 25. p. 656.

<sup>4</sup> Cyril. Catech. xvii. n. 8. p. 247.

prehensibly baptises the interior soul. The fourth Council of Toledo keeps to the former reason,<sup>1</sup> “The immersion in water, is as it were the descending into the grave, and the rising out of the water a resurrection.” And so St. Ambrose<sup>2</sup> explains it, “Thou wast asked, dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty? And thou didst answer, I believe: and then thou wast immersed in water, that is, buried.” It appears also from Epiphanius and others, that almost all heretics, who retained any baptism, retained immersion also. Epiphanius says,<sup>3</sup> the Ebionites received baptism as it was practised in the Church, but they added to it a quotidian baptism, immersing themselves in water every day. So the Marcionites were guilty of many errors in other respects about baptism: they would baptise no persons but either virgins,<sup>4</sup> or widows, or unmarried men; they repeated their baptism three times;<sup>5</sup> and introduced some other errors about it: but still the baptisms, which they administered, were in this respect conformable to those of the Church, that they baptised by a total immersion, as Tertullian witnesses of them.<sup>6</sup> Other heretics, as the Valentinians, to their baptism by water, added another baptism by fire,<sup>7</sup> which is mentioned by Tertullian. But yet we find no charge brought against them for their first baptism, as if it were administered in any other way than by a total immersion. The only heretics, against whom this charge is brought, were the Eunomians, a branch of the Arians, of whom it was reported by Theodoret,<sup>8</sup> that they baptised only

<sup>1</sup> Con. Tolet. iv. can. 5. In aquis mersio quasi ad infernum descensio est: et rursus ab aquis emersio resurrectio est.

<sup>2</sup> Ambros. de Sacram. lib. ii. cap. vii. Interrogatus es, ‘Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem?’ dixisti, ‘Credo,’ et mersisti, hoc est, sepultus es.—Add also Tertul. de Bapt. c. ii. Homo in aquam demissus, et inter pauca verba tinctus, non multo vel nihilo mundior resurgit. Paulin. Ep. xii. ad Severum. Mira Dei pietas; peccator mergitur undis, &c. Nyssen. de Bapt. Christi, tom. iii. p. 372. Athanas. de Parabolis. q. xciv. tom. ii. p. 422.

<sup>3</sup> Epiphanius. Hær. xxx. Ebion. n. 2 and 16.

<sup>4</sup> Tertul. cont. Marc. lib. i. c. 29. Non tingitur apud illum caro, nisi virgo, nisi vidua, nisi cœlebs, &c.

<sup>5</sup> Epiph. Hær. xlii. n. 3. Οὐ μόνον παρ’ αὐτῶν ἐν λητρῶν διδοται, ἀλλὰ ἔως τριῶν λητρῶν, &c.

<sup>6</sup> Tertul. Cont. Marc. lib. i. cap. xxviii. Carnem mergit exortem salutis.

<sup>7</sup> Tertul. Carmen. Cont. Marc. lib. i. cap. vii. Namque Valentino Deus est insanus.—Bis docui tingui, transducto corpore flammâ. Vid. Hieron. in Ephes. iv.

<sup>8</sup> Theod. Hær. Fab. lib. iv. cap. iiii.

the upper parts of the body as far as the breast. And this they did in a very preposterous way, as Epiphanius relates,<sup>1</sup> τὰς πόδας ἄνω, ἐν τὴν κεφαλὴν κάτω, *with their heels upward, and their head downward.* Which sort of men are called *histopedes*, or *pederecti*. Whence the learned Gothofred<sup>2</sup> conjectures, that in one of the laws of Theodosius, where it is now read *Eunomiani Spadones*; it should be *Eunomiani Histopedes*, which signifies men hanged up by the heels, as he proves from Pausanias, Pollux, Hesychius, Harpocration, and others. So that these were the only men among all the heretics of the ancient Church, that rejected this way of baptising by a total immersion in ordinary cases.

SECT. 5.—Yet Aspersions or Sprinklings allowed in some extraordinary Cases.

Indeed the Church was so punctual to this rule, that we never read of any exception made to it in ordinary cases, no, not in the baptism of infants. For it appears from the *Ordo Romanus*, and Gregory's *Sacramentarium*, that infants as well as others were baptised by immersion; and the rules of the Church, except in cases of danger, do still require it. But in two cases a mitigation of this rule was allowed. First, in case of sickness and extreme danger of life. Here that excellent rule, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice," was always allowed to take place. Therefore that which the Ancients called clinic baptism, that is, baptism by aspersion, or sprinkling upon a sick bed, was never disputed against as an unlawful or imperfect baptism, though some laws were made to debar men, who were so baptised, from ascending to the dignities of the Church. For if men by neglect deferred their baptism to a sick bed, the Church in her prudence and discipline, because this delay was a fault she always declaimed against, thought fit to deny such men the privilege of ordination, as I have had occasion to shew in a more proper place.<sup>3</sup> But yet she did not at any time attempt to annul such baptisms, or judge them

<sup>1</sup> Epiphanius. Hæret. lxxvi. Anomœorum, p. 992.  
fred. in Cod. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. v. de Hæreticis, leg. 17.

<sup>2</sup> Book iv. chap. iii. s. 11.

<sup>3</sup> Gotho-

imperfect as to what concerned the essence or substance of the action. This very question was moved by some, together with that of heretical baptism, in the time of Cyprian: but Cyprian, who determined against the validity of heretical baptism, makes no scruple in this case, but offers arguments to prove such elinic baptism by aspersion, to have all the necessary conditions of a true baptism. For though this was the case of Novatian, who had not been washed, but only sprinkled upon a sick bed; yet Cyprian<sup>1</sup> had no objection against his Christianity upon that account: but declares, that, as far as he was able to judge, all such baptisms were perfect, where there was no defect in the faith of the giver or the receiver: for the contagion of sin was not washed away, as the filth of the body is, by a carnal and secular washing. There was no need of a lake or other such-like helps to wash and cleanse it. The heart of a believer was otherwise washed; the mind of a man was cleansed by the merit of faith. In the sacraments of salvation, when necessity requires, God grants his indulgence by a short way of performing them. This lawfulness of aspersion in such cases he proves from those words of God in Ezekiel, xxxvi. 25. "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthinesses, and from all your idols will I cleanse you." And from several other texts, Numb. xix. 19. viii. 7. xix. 9. where the water of sprinkling is called "the water of purification." Whence he concludes, that the sprinkling of water was as effectual as washing: and what the Church did in this case, in compliance with necessity and men's infirmities, was neither dis-

---

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. Ep. lxxvi. al. lxxix. ad Magnum, p. 185. Quæstisti, etiam, fili charissime, quid mihi de illis videatur, qui in infirmitate et languore gratiam Dei consequuntur, an habendi sint legitimi Christiani, eo quòd aquâ salutari non loti sint, sed perfusi.—Nos quantum concipit mediocritas nostra, æstimamus in nullo mutilari et debilitari posse beneficia divina, nec minus aliquid illic posse contingere, ubi plenâ et totâ fide et dantis et sumentis accipitur, quod de divinis muneribus hauritur. Neque enim sic in sacramento salutari delictorum contagia, ut in lavacro carnali et seculari sordes cutis et corporis, abluuntur, &c. Aliter pectus credentis abluuntur, aliter mens hominis per fidei merita mundatur. In sacramentis salutaribus, necessitate cogente, et Deo indulgentiam suam largiente, totum credentibus conferunt divina compendia.

pleasing to God, nor detrimental to the party baptised, who received a full and complete sacrament by the power of God, and the truth of his own faith together. And therefore he blames those who nick-named these men clinics, instead of Christians. It further appears from the canons which speak of these,<sup>1</sup> that they were only denied orders, not the name of Christians. The Council of Neo-Cæsarea allows them in time of great exigency, or in case of great merit, to be ordained, as Novatian was, for his pregnant parts, and the hopes which the Church had conceived of him, as Eusebius out of the Epistle of Cornelius informs us.<sup>2</sup> The Council of Laodicea<sup>3</sup> appoints such, if they recover, to learn the creed, but says not a word of rebaptising them. And it appears from the Council of Auxerre<sup>4</sup> that these clinics were allowed to be baptised at any time when necessity required, without staying for a solemn festival. So that many things were indulged to them, which were not allowed by the ordinary rules of the Church. Secondly, another case in which sprinkling was accepted instead of immersion, was in times of difficulty, when a sufficient quantity of water could not be procured. As when a martyr was to be baptised in prison, or was to baptise any other under such a confinement. Thus we read in the ancient Acts of St. Laurence, referred to by Walafridus Strabo,<sup>5</sup> how one Romanus, a soldier, was baptised by him in a pitcher of water. And again, how one Lucillus was baptised by the same martyr,<sup>6</sup> only by pouring water upon his head. But as both these were extraordinary cases, they only shew us, how far the Church could dispense with this rule upon reasons of necessity or charity, not what was her standing and ordinary practice. Some learned persons<sup>7</sup> think Tertullian alludes to the allowance of sprinkling in extraordinary cases, when

<sup>1</sup> Con. Neo-Cæsar. can. 12.<sup>2</sup> Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43.<sup>3</sup> Con.

Laod. can. 47.

<sup>4</sup> Con. Antissiodor. can. 18. Non licet absque Paschæ solennitate ullo tempore baptizarre, nisi illos quibus mors vicina est, quos Grabatarios dicunt.<sup>5</sup> Acta Laurentii, ap Surium, tom. iv. Unus ex militibus, Romanus nomine, urceum afferens cum aquâ, opportunitatem caplavit, quâ eam offerret B. Laurentio, ut baptizaretur. Vid. Strabo, de Rebus Eccles. cap. xxvi.<sup>6</sup> Acta, ibid. Cùm expoliasset eum, fudit aquam

super caput ejus.

<sup>7</sup> Vid. Bevereg. Not. in Can. Apost. 1.

speaking of men's pretending to be baptised, without true repentance, he says, no man would grant such false penitents so much as one aspersion of water.<sup>1</sup> And Gregory Nyssen perhaps refers to it also in that famous story, which he tells of one Archias, who having neglected his opportunity of receiving baptism, was at last suddenly surprised by death at a season when there was no possibility of obtaining it: and then he cried out in that languishing condition,<sup>2</sup> O ye mountains and woods, baptise me; O ye trees, and rocks and fountains, give me this grace: and with these words being wounded to death, he expired in the hands of his enemies. This man's condition he compares to those, who have the sudden summons of death upon a sick bed: they then begin to call for a vessel of water, a priest, and words to prepare them for baptism; but the violence of their disease prevents them from obtaining it. This seems to imply, that such a sprinkling as men might have upon a sick bed, in cases of extremity was reputed a saving baptism; and it was an unhappiness in some, that they could not obtain even that at their last hour, which the Church allowed as the last refuge only in such extraordinary cases.

SECT. 6.—Trine Immersion, the general Practice for several Ages.  
The Reasons of this.

But I must observe further, that they not only administered baptism by immersion under water, but also repeated this three times. Tertullian speaks of it as a ceremony<sup>3</sup> generally used in his time: we dip not once, but three times, at the naming every person of the Trinity. The same is asserted by St. Basil,<sup>4</sup> and St. Jerom,<sup>5</sup> and the author under the name of Dionysius,<sup>6</sup> who says likewise, that it was done at the distinct mention of each person of the blessed

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Pœnitent. cap. vi. Quis enim tibi tam infidæ pœnitentiæ viro asperginem unam cujuslibet aquæ commodabit? <sup>2</sup> Nyssen de Bapt. tom. ii. p. 220.

<sup>3</sup> Tertul. Cont. Prax. cap. xxvi. Nec semel, sed ter, ad singula nomina in personas singulas tingimur. Id. de Coron. Mil. cap. iii. Dehinc ter mergitatur, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Hieron. adv. Lucif. c. iv.

<sup>5</sup> Basil. de Spir. Sancto, c. xxvii.

<sup>6</sup> Dionys. de Hierarch. Eccles. cap. ii. Chrys. Hom. xxiv. in Johan. p. 155.



Trinity. St. Ambrose is most particular in the description of this rite: "Thou wast asked,"<sup>1</sup> says he, "dost thou believe in God, the Father Almighty? And thou repliedst, I believe, and wast dipped, that is, buried. A second demand was made, dost thou believe in Jesus Christ, our Lord, and in his cross? Thou answeredst again, I believe, and wast dipped. Therefore thou wast buried with Christ. For he that is buried with Christ rises again with Christ. A third time the question was repeated, dost thou believe in the Holy Ghost? And thy answer was, I believe. Then thou wast dipped a third time, that thy triple confession might absolve thee from the various offences of thy former life." Two reasons are commonly assigned for this practice. First, that it might represent Christ's three day's burial, and his resurrection on the third day. We cover ourselves in the water, says Gregory Nyssen,<sup>5</sup> as Christ did in the earth, and this we do three times to represent the grace of his resurrection performed after three days. In like manner Cyril of Jerusalem,<sup>3</sup> and the author of the Questions upon the Scripture under the name of Athanasius.<sup>4</sup> Thus likewise Pope Leo, among the Latins,<sup>5</sup> "The trine immersion is an imitation of the three days burial; and the rising again out of the water, is an image of Christ rising from the grave." Secondly, another reason was, that it might represent their profession of faith in the holy Trinity, in whose name they were baptised. <sup>6</sup>St. Austin joins both

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Sacram. lib. ii. cap. vii. Interrogatus es, 'Credis in Deum Patrem Omnipotentem?' dixisti, 'Credo,' et mersisti, hoc est, sepultus es. Iterum interrogatus es, 'Credis in Dominum nostrum, Iesum Christum?' dixisti, 'Credo,' et mersisti. Ideo et Christo es consepultus. Qui enim Christo consepelitur, cum Christo resurgit. Tertiò interrogatus es, 'Credis et in Spiritum Sanctum?' dixisti, 'Credo?' Tertiò mersisti, ut multiplicem lapsum superioris ætatis absolveret trina confessio.

de Bapt. Christi, tom. iii. 372.

<sup>3</sup> Cyril Catech. Myst. ii. n. 4.

<sup>4</sup> Athan. de Parabolis Script. q. 94.

<sup>5</sup> Leo. Ep. iv. ad Episc.

Siculos, cap. iii. Sepulturam triduanam imitatur trina demersio, et ab aquis elevatio resurgentis adinstar est de sepulcro.

<sup>6</sup> Aug. Hom.

iii. ap Gratian. de Consecrat. Dist. iv. cap. lxxviii. Postquam vos credere promisistis, tertiò capita vestra in sacro fonte demersimus. Qui ordo baptismatis duplici mysterii significatione celebratur. Rectè enim tertiò mersi estis, qui accepistis baptismum in nomine Trinitatis. Rectè tertiò mersi estis, qui accepistis baptismum in nomine Jesu Christi, qui die terciâ re-

reasons together, telling us there was a two-fold mystery signified in this way of baptising. The trine immersion was both a symbol of the holy Trinity, in whose name we are baptised, and also a type of the Lord's burial, and of his resurrection on the third day from the dead. For we are buried with Christ by baptism, and rise again with him by faith. St. Jerom makes this ceremony to be a symbol of the Unity, as well as the Trinity.<sup>1</sup> For, says he, "we are thrice dipped in the water, that the mystery of the Trinity may appear to be but one: we are not baptised in the names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but in one name, which is God." And therefore he adds, "that though we be thrice put under water to represent the mystery of the Trinity, yet it is reputed but one baptism."

SECT. 7.—The Original of this Practice.

The original of this custom is not exactly agreed upon by the Ancients. Some derive it from apostolical tradition; others from the first institution of baptism by our Saviour; whilst others esteem it only an indifferent circumstance or ceremony, that may be used, or omitted, without any detriment to the sacrament itself, or breach of any divine appointment. Tertullian,<sup>2</sup> St. Basil,<sup>3</sup> and St. Jerom, put it among those rites of the Church, which they reckon to be handed down from apostolical tradition. St. Chrysostom seems rather to make it part of the first institution. For he says,<sup>5</sup> Christ delivered to his disciples one baptism in three immersions of the body, when he said to them, "Go teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And Theodoret was

surrexit à mortuis. Illa enim tertio repetita demersio typum Dominicæ exprimit sepulturæ, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. lib. ii. in Ephes. iv. p. 222. Ter mergimur, ut Trinitatis unum appareat sacramentum, et non baptizamur in nominibus Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, sed in uno nomine, quod intelligitur Deus.—Potest et unum baptismum ita dici, quod licet ter baptizemur propter mysterium Trinitatis, tamen unum baptismum reputetur.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Coron. Mil. c. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Basil. de Spir. Sanct. c. xxvii.

<sup>4</sup> Hieron. Cont. Lucif. cap. iv. It. Sozomen. lib. vi. c. xxvi.

<sup>5</sup> Chrys. Hom. de Fide. tom. vii. p. 290.

Edit. Savil. Ἐν τρισὶ καταδύσει τῷ σώματι ἐν βάπτισμα τοῖς ἑαυτῶ μαθηταῖς παραδίδοκε, &c.

<sup>6</sup> Theod. Hæret. Fab. lib. iv. c. iii. p. 236.

of the same opinion : for he charges Eunomius as making an innovation upon the original institution of baptism, delivered by Christ and his Apostles, in that he made a contrary law, that men should not be baptised with three immersions, nor with invocation of the Trinity, but only with one immersion into the death of Christ. Pope Pelagius brought the same charge against some others in his time,<sup>1</sup> who baptised in the name of Christ only with one immersion, which he condemns as contrary to the Gospel command given by Christ, who appointed every one to be baptised in the name of the Trinity, and that with three immersions, saying to his disciples, “ Go, baptise all nations, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” And this was so far esteemed a divine obligation by the authors of the Apostolical Canons,<sup>2</sup> that they order every bishop or presbyter to be deposed, who should administer baptism not by three immersions, but only one in the name of Christ; because Christ said not, baptise into my death, but, go, baptise all nations in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It is plain, all these writers thought this a necessary circumstance from our Saviour’s institution. And the Eunomians, who first rejected this, are condemned by Theodoret and Sozomen, as making a new law of baptising, not only against the general practice, but against the general rule and tradition of the Church.

SECT. 8.—When first the Church allowed of any Alteration in it.

Yet there happened a circumstance in the Spanish Churches in after ages, which gave a little turn to this affair. For

---

*Αὐτὸς ἔν τῃ ἁγίῃ βαπτίσματος ἀνέτρεψε ἀνέκαθεν παρὰ τῶ Κυρίου ἔν Ἀποστόλων παραδοθέντα θεσμόν, ἔ ἀντικρως ἐνομοθέτησε, μὴ χρῆναι λέγων τρεῖς καταδύνειν τὸν βαπτιζόμενον, &c.*

<sup>1</sup> Pelag. Ep. ad Gaudentium, ap Gratian. de Consecrat. Dist. iv. c. lxxxii. Multi sunt, qui in nomine solummodò Christi, unâ etiam mersione se asserunt baptizare. Evangelicium verò præceptum, ipso Deo et Domino salvatore nostro Iesu Christo tradente, nos admonet, in nomine Trinitatis, trinâ etiam mersione sanctum baptismum unicuique tribuere, dicente Domino discipulis suis; ‘ Ite, baptizate omnes gentes in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti.’

<sup>2</sup> Canon. Apost. can. xlix. al. 1.

the Arians in Spain, not being of the sect of the Eunomians, continued for many years to baptise with three immersions: but then they abused this ceremony to a very perverse end, to patronize their error about the Son and Holy Ghost's being of a different nature or essence from the Father. For they made the three immersions to denote a difference, or degrees of divinity in the three divine persons. To oppose whose wicked doctrine, and that they might not seem to symbolize with them in any practice that might give encouragement to it, some catholics began to leave off the trine immersion, as savouring of Arianism, and took up the single immersion in opposition to them. But this was like to prove matter of scandal and schism among the catholics themselves. And therefore in the time of Gregory the Great, Leander, bishop of Sevil, wrote to him for his advice and resolution in this case. To which he returned this answer,<sup>1</sup> "Concerning the three immersions in baptism, you have judged very truly already, that different rites and customs do not prejudice the holy Church, whilst the unity of faith remains entire. The reason why we use three immersions at Rome is to signify the mystery of Christ's three days burial, that whilst an infant is thrice lifted up out of the water the resurrection on the third day may be expressed thereby. But if any one thinks this is rather done in regard to the Holy Trinity, a single immersion in baptism does no way prejudice that: for so long as the unity of substance is preserved in three persons, it is no harm whether a child be baptised with one immersion or three; because three immersions

---

<sup>1</sup> Gregor. lib. i. Ep. xli. ad Leand. De trinâ mersione baptismatis nil responderi verius potest, quàm quod ipsi sensitistis, quòd in unâ fide nil officit sanctæ Ecclesiæ consuetudo diversa. Nos autem quod tertiò mergimus triduanæ sepulturæ sacramenta signamus, ut dum tertiò infans ab aquis educitur, resurrectio triduanæ temporis exprimatur. Quod si quis fortè etiam pro summâ Trinitatis veratione existimet fieri; neque ad hoc aliquid obsedit baptizando semel in aquis mergere: quia dum in tribus personis una substantia est, reprehensibile esse nullatenùs potest, infantem in baptismate vel ter, vel semel immergere; quando et in tribus mersionibus Personarum Trinitas, et in unâ potest Divinitatis singulari designari. Sed quia nunc hujusque ab hæreticis infans in baptismo tertiò mergebatur, fiendum apud vos esse non censeo: ne dum mersiones numerant, Divinitatem dividunt; dumque quod faciebant faciunt, se morem vestrum vicisse glorientur.

may represent the Trinity of persons, and one immersion the Unity of the Godhead. But forasmuch as heretics use to baptise their infants with three immersions, I think you ought not to do so; lest this multiplication of immersions be interpreted a division of the Godhead, and give them occasion to glory, that their custom has prevailed." Yet this judgment of Pope Gregory did not satisfy all men in the Spanish Church: for still many kept to the old way of baptising by three immersions, notwithstanding this fear of symbolising with the Arians. Therefore some time after, about the year 633, the fourth Council of Toledo, which was a general council of all Spain, was forced to make another decree to determine this matter, and settle the peace of the Church. For whilst some priests baptised with three immersions, and the others but with one, a schism was raised,<sup>1</sup> endangering the unity of the faith. For the contending parties carried the matter so high, as to pretend, that they, who were baptised in a way contrary to their own, were not baptised at all. To remedy which evil the fathers of this Council first repeat the judgment of Pope Gregory, and then immediately conclude upon it, that though both these ways of baptism were just and unblameable in themselves, according to the opinion of that great man; yet as well to avoid the scandal of schism, as the usage of heretics, they decree, that only one immersion should be used in baptism, lest if any used three immersions, they

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Tolet. iv. can. v. De baptismi autem sacramento, propter quod in Hispaniis quidam sacerdotes trinam, simplam quidam mersionem faciunt, à nonnullis schisma esse conspicitur, et unitas fidei scindi videtur. Nam dum partes diversæ in baptizandis aliquo contrario modo agunt, ab aliis non baptizatos esse contendunt.—Quapropter, qui de utroque sacramento, quod fit in sancto baptismo, à tanto viro reddita est ratio, quod utrumque rectum, utrumque irreprehensibile in sanctâ Dei Ecclesiâ habeatur: propter vitandum autem schismatis scandalum, vel hæretici dogmatis usum, simplicem teneamus baptismi mersionem; ne videantur apud nos, qui tertiò mergunt, hæreticorum approbare assertionem, dum sequuntur et morem. Et ne fortè cuiquam sit dubium hujus simpli mysterium sacramenti, videat in eo mortem et resurrectionem Christi significari. Nam in aquis mersio, quasi ad infernum descensio est: et rursus ab aquis emersio, resurrectio est. Item videat in eo Unitatem Divinitatis, dum semel mergimus: Trinitatem, dum in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti baptizamus.

might seem to approve the opinion of heretics, whilst they followed their practice. And that no one might be dubious about the use of a single immersion, he might consider, that the death and resurrection of Christ were represented by it. For the immersion in water was as it were the descending into hell or the grave, and the immersion out of the water was a resurrection. He might also observe the Unity of the Deity, and the Trinity of Persons to be signified by it. The Unity by a single immersion, and the Trinity by giving baptism in the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Some learned persons<sup>1</sup> find fault with this council for changing this ancient custom upon so slight a reason, as that of the Arians using it: which, if it were any reason, would hold as well against a single immersion, because the Eunomians, a baser sect of the Arians, were the first inventors of that practice. And therefore the exception made by this Spanish Council in the seventh century, cannot prejudice the more ancient and general practice of the Church, which as Strabo observed, still prevailed after this council; and if Vossius says true, the trine immersion, or what corresponds to it, the trine aspersion, is the general practice of all Churches upon earth at this day. And such a custom could not well be laid aside, without some charge of novelty, and danger of giving offence and scandal to weaker brethren. I have now gone over the several circumstances and ceremonies accompanying baptism, so far as to make it a complete sacrament, and the instrument of salvation to all worthy receivers, if they happened to die without any further consummation, as sometimes they did, when baptism was administered to them with less solemnity, either in times of sickness, or at some distance from the mother Church; in both which cases they had the substance of the sacrament, but not all the ceremonies that were appointed to attend it. They were supposed to be made partakers of Christ's body and to eat his flesh, and to be washed in his blood, which was drinking it by faith, in baptism, as well as in the eucharist. And

---

<sup>1</sup> Strabo de Offic. Eccl. cap. xxvi. Vossius de Bapt. Disp. ii. Thes. iv. p. 46.

if they survived, they were also admitted immediately to the symbols of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist. But there were some other ceremonies following baptism as it were to finish the solemnity of it; some of which were introductory and preparatory to the eucharist, as the second unction accompanying baptism, which we commonly call imposition of hands, or confirmation. Of which, because it will be necessary to speak a little more distinctly, I shall make it and the remaining ceremonies of baptism the subject of another book.

## BOOK XII.

OF CONFIRMATION, AND OTHER CEREMONIES  
FOLLOWING BAPTISM, BEFORE MEN WERE MADE  
PARTAKERS OF THE EUCHARIST.

## CHAP. I.

*Of the time when, and the Persons to whom Confirmation was administered.*

SECT. 1.—Confirmation anciently given immediately after Baptism, if the Bishop were present.

IMMEDIATELY after the persons came up out of the water, if the bishop was present at the solemnity, they were presented to him, in order to receive his benediction, which was a solemn prayer for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon such as were baptised: and to this prayer there was usually joined the ceremony of a second unction, and imposition of hands, and the sign of the cross; whence the whole action many times took these names, *Χρίσμα*, the unction, *Χειροθεσία* the imposition of hands, and *Σφραγίς*, the sign or seal of the Lord, which are names much more common among the Ancients, than that of confirmation. But by all these names they understood one and the same thing, which was the bishop's prayer for the descent of the Spirit upon persons newly baptised. This was always administered together with baptism, if the bishop, who was the ordinary minister of it, were present at the action. But if he was absent, as it usually happened to be in churches at a distance from the mother church, or when persons were baptised in haste upon a sick-bed, then confirmation was deferred till the



bishop could have a convenient opportunity to visit them. This we learn from St Jerom,<sup>1</sup> who speaks of it as customary in the Church, for bishops to go and invoke the Holy Spirit by imposition of hands on such as were baptised by presbyters and deacons in villages and places remote from the mother church. And it many times happened, that such persons died before the bishop could come to give them imposition of hands. To prevent which inconvenience, the canons in some places obliged bishops to visit their whole dioceses once every year; and if they were so large that they could not do so, then they were to divide their dioceses and make them less, as we find it decreed and practised in some of the Spanish Councils.<sup>2</sup> But in case persons were baptised in the presence of the bishop, then without any delay they were immediately confirmed with imposition of hands and the holy unction. Tertullian says very plainly,<sup>3</sup> “that as soon as they came out of the water, they were anointed with the oil of consecration, and then received imposition of hands, inviting down the Holy Spirit by that benediction.” And so Cyril of Jerusalem represents it, when he tells the neophytes,<sup>4</sup> “that as soon as they come up out of the waters of the font, they received the chrism of unction, with the antitype of which, that is the Holy Ghost, Christ was anointed when he came up out of Jordan.” In like manner the author of the Constitutions, describing the ceremonies of baptism,<sup>5</sup> orders the priest “as soon as he has baptised any one, to anoint him

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. cont. Lucifer. cap. iv. Non abnuo hanc esse Ecclesiarum consuetudinem, ut ad eos qui longè in minoribus urbibus per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati sunt, episcopus ad invocationem Sancti Spiritûs manum impositurus excurrat.—And a little after, In villulis aut in castellis, aut in remotioribus locis per presbyteros aut diaconos baptizati, ante dormierunt, quàm ab episcopis inviserentur. Vid. Con. Eliber. can. lxxvii.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Lucens. Con. tom. v. p. 874.

<sup>3</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. c. vii.

Exinde egressi de lavacro perunguimur benedictâ unctione.—Cap. viii. Dehinc manus imponitur, per benedictionem advocans et invitans Spiritum Sanctum.

<sup>4</sup> Cyril. Catech. Myst. iii. n. 1. Ὑμῖν ὁμοίως ἀναβεβηκόσιν ἀπὸ τῆς κολυμβήθρας τῶν ἱερῶν ναμάτων, ἐδόθη χρίσμα, τὸ ἀντίτυπον ἔχρισθη Χριστὸς τῷ τῷ δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ Ἅγιον Πνεῦμα. <sup>5</sup> Const. Apost. lib. vii. cap. xliiii. and xliii. Μετὰ τῷ τῷ βαπτίσας αὐτὸν, χριστάτω μύρω, ἐπιλέγων, &c.

with the holy chrisim, and give him imposition of hands, saying a prayer," which is there appointed. Thus we find in the Life of St. Basil,<sup>1</sup> how Maximinus the bishop, who baptised him and Eubulus together, immediately clothed them with the white garments, and anointed them with the holy chrisim, and gave them the communion. The same may be observed in the description of the ceremonies of baptism given by the author under the name of Dionysius,<sup>2</sup> St. Ambrose, Optatus, Pacian, and all others amongst the Ancients, who have made any mention of the time of administering confirmation.

SECT. 2.—And this as well to Infants as adult Persons: Which is evidenced, First, From some plain Testimonies.

Nor was this only true with respect to adult persons, but also with respect to infants, who were anciently confirmed by imposition of hands and the holy chrisim or unction, as soon as they were baptised. Which perhaps will seem a paradox to many, who look no further than to the practice of later ages: but it may be undeniably evidenced these two ways. First, from plain testimonies of the Ancients declaring it so to be. And, secondly, from that known custom and usage of the Church in giving the eucharist to infants, which ordinarily presupposes their confirmation. First, for the testimonies of the Ancients, nothing can be plainer than those words of Gennadius,<sup>3</sup> "If they be infants that are baptised, let those that present them to baptism, answer for them according to the common way of baptising: and then let them be confirmed with imposition of hands and chrisim, and so be admitted to partake of the eucharist." In like manner Pope Innocent, in one of his decrees, says,<sup>4</sup> "Infants

<sup>1</sup> Amphiloch. Vit. Basil. c. v. Baptizavit Maximinus episcopus Basilium et Eubulum, et vestivit albis, atque ungens eos sancto chrisimate, tradidit eis communionem.

<sup>2</sup> Dionys. de Hierarch. Eccl. cap. ii. p. 260, Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iii. c. 2. Optat. lib. iv. p. 81. Pacian. Serm. de Baptismo. Bibl. Patr. tom. iii. p. 77.

<sup>3</sup> Gennad. de Dogmat. Eccles. cap. lii. Si parvuli sint—respondeant pro illis, qui eos offerunt, juxta morem baptizandi, et sic manûs impositione et chrisimate communiti, eucharistiæ mysteriis admittantur.

<sup>4</sup> Innoc. Ep. i. cap. iii. De consignandis verò infantibus manifestum est non ab alio, quàm ab episcopo fieri licere.

are not to be consigned or confirmed by any but the bishop. And in the Collection of Canons made by Martin Bracaraensis<sup>1</sup> out of those of the Greek Church, this is one, "that a presbyter may not consign infants in the presence of the bishop, except he be particularly appointed by the bishop to do it." This practice continued in the Church for many ages; for it is mentioned by Pope Gregory both in his *Sacramentarium* and in his *Epistles*,<sup>2</sup> and after him by all the writers in the eighth and ninth centuries. Alcuin, who wrote about the Offices of the Church in the time of Charles the Great, speaking of infant-baptism says,<sup>3</sup> "after an infant is baptised, he is to be clothed, and brought to the bishop, if he be present, who is to confirm him with chrism, and give him the communion; and if the bishop be not present, the presbyter shall communicate him." The same is in the *Ordo Romanus*, a book written and used as a liturgy about the same time: where, after the bishop has given the white garment to infants, he lifts up his hand and lays it upon their heads,<sup>4</sup> praying for the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them; and signing them with the sign of the cross in the forehead, he says, "I confirm thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." Baluzius, in his *Notes upon Regino*,<sup>5</sup> gives us two ancient manuscript Pontificals of the ninth century, wherein this order for confirming infants is continued. And to these he adds an *Epistle of Jesse*,<sup>6</sup> bishop

<sup>1</sup> Martin Bracar. Collect. Canon. cap. lii. Presbyter præsentate episcopo non signet infantes, nisi fortè ab episcopo fuerit illi præceptum.

<sup>2</sup> Gregor. lib. iii. ep. ix. <sup>3</sup> Alcuin. de Offic. Cap. De Sabbato Paschæ. Bibl. Patr. tom. x. p. 259. Postea vestiatur infans vestimentis suis. Si verò episcopus adest, statim confirmari eum oportet chrismate, et postea communicare; et si episcopus deest, communicetur à presbytero.

<sup>4</sup> *Ordo Romanus*. Cap. de Bapt. Bibl. Patr. tom. x. p. 83. Pontifex, elevatâ et impositâ manu super capita omnium dat orationem super eos cum invocatione septiformis gratiæ Spiritûs Sancti.—Et, tincto pollice in chrismate, faciat crucem in frontibus singulorum, ita dicendo, Confirmo te in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti.

<sup>5</sup> Baluz. Not. in Regino, lib. i. cap. lxxix. Ex Pontificali Vet. M.S. Statim autem confirmetur infans, et communicetur ab episcopo, ita dicente, Corpus et sanguis Domini.—Item ex altero Pontificali. Si episcopus adest, statim confirmari eum oportet chrismate, et postea communicari.

<sup>6</sup> Jesse Ambianens. Ep. de Ordine Baptismi, ap. Baluz. ibid. Post trinam mersionem episcopus puerum chrismate confirmet in fronte, novissimè autem corpore et sanguine Christi confirmetur seu communicetur, ut Christi membrum esse possit.

of Amiens, describing the order of baptism, where the rule is for the bishop, after the child has been baptised with three immersions, to confirm him with chrism in the forehead, and then “to confirm him (for so it is worded) or communicate him with the body and blood of Christ.” These testimonies are so plain and convincing, that all learned men, who have exactly considered this matter, as well Papists as Protestants, are agreed, that this was the ancient and general practice of the Church, to confirm infants as soon as they were baptised. For so I find not only Baluzius, but Peter de Marca,<sup>1</sup> Hugo Menardus,<sup>2</sup> Maldonat,<sup>3</sup> Estius,<sup>4</sup> Galenus,<sup>5</sup> among the Papists, and Bishop Taylor<sup>6</sup> and Daille<sup>7</sup> among the Protestants, readily consenting. And some tell us,<sup>8</sup> the same practice continues among the Greeks to this day. The learned reader may add to the former testimonies the authority of St. Austin, who witnesses for this practice in his own person; for he says,<sup>9</sup> he himself was used to give imposition of hands, or confirmation, to infants, that they might receive the Holy Spirit.

SECT. 3.—And Secondly, From the Custom of giving the Eucharist to Infants for many Ages.

If this matter needed further proof, we might insist upon that known practice and custom in the ancient Church, of giving the eucharist to infants, which continued in the Church for several ages. It is frequently mentioned in Cyprian, Austin, Innocentius, and Gennadius, writers from the third to the fifth century. Maldonat confesses it was in the Church for six hundred years. And some of the authorities just now alleged, prove it to have continued two

<sup>1</sup> Marca, Not. ad Concil. Claramontan. p. 312.  
ad Librum Sacramentor. p. 144.

<sup>2</sup> Menard. Not.

<sup>3</sup> Maldonat. de Confirmat. q. ii.

<sup>4</sup> Estius Sentent. lib. iv. dist. vii. n. 23. p. 101.

<sup>5</sup> Galen. Cate-

chism. ap. Dallæ. de Confirm. p. 21.

<sup>6</sup> Taylor's Worthy Com-

municant, chap. iii. sect. 2. p. 269.

<sup>7</sup> Dallæ de Confirmat. lib. iii.

cap. xiii.

<sup>8</sup> Pet. du Moulin's Buckler of Faith, p. 381.

<sup>9</sup> Aug. Tract. vi. in 1 Joh. iii. tom. ix. p. 254. Quando imposuimus manum istis infantibus, attendit unusquisque vestrum utrum linguis loquerentur? Et cum videret eos linguis non loqui, ita perverso corde aliquis vestrum fuit, ut diceret, non acceperunt isti Spiritum Sanctum?

or three ages more, and to have been the common practice beyond the time of Charles the Great. Now all men know, that in the common course of things confirmation always preceded the eucharist, unless there was some special cause, as sometimes it happened in the case of clinic baptism, or the bishop's absence, to prevent it. For in these two cases the eucharist was many times given before confirmation, as now it is in our large dioceses, where the bishop's presence cannot always be had to give confirmation, in places at a great distance, before the communion: but in all other cases the usual way was to let confirmation usher in the communion. And therefore since it is evident, that the communion itself was given to infants, and that immediately from the time of their baptism; it would be reasonable to conclude from hence, were there no other evidence, that confirmation also was given to infants together with baptism, because this rite by all ordinary rules and custom was prior and introductory to the communion.

SECT. 4.—Whence it appears, that Confirmation was not esteemed a proper Sacrament distinct from Baptism.

This observation may help us to understand some difficult passages in the Ancients, and answer an objection which the Romanists draw from them, as if confirmation were a proper sacrament distinct from baptism. The Ancients, it must be owned sometimes give it the name of a sacrament, and call baptism and confirmation two sacraments. But then it is very evident, they take the word sacrament in a large sense for any sacred ceremony, rite, or mystery belonging to baptism: in which sense they suppose two sacraments, or chief mysterious ceremonies to be in baptism, that is, the immersion in water, and the unction with the holy chrisms; both which are spoken of as sacraments or ceremonies belonging to baptism. Thus in the Council of Carthage under Cyprian, Nemesianus à Tubunis says<sup>1</sup>, “ it was not sufficient for men to be regenerated only by imposition of hands, but they ought to be born again by both the

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carthag. ap. Cypr. n. v. p. 231. Malè sibi quidam interpretantur, ut dicant, quod per manus impositionem Spiritum Sanctum accipiant, et sic recipiantur: cùm manifestum sit utroque sacramento debere eos renasci in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ.

sacraments in the Catholic Church ;” that is, as well by washing in water, as imposition of hands, both which he makes sacraments, that is, sacred rites of the same sacrament of regeneration. In the same sense Cyprian himself<sup>1</sup> says “ both the sacraments of regeneration were required to complete men’s sanctification.” Which plainly shews, that by two sacraments he means no more but two of the principal ceremonies that belonged to a complete and perfect baptism, because he says, men were regenerated or born again by them both. In like manner Optatus makes imposition of hands and unction to be only parts and ceremonies completing baptism. For, speaking of the baptism of Christ, he says,<sup>2</sup> “ He went not into the water, as if any thing in God could need cleansing; but it was necessary the water should go before the unction that was to follow after, to initiate and order and complete the mysteries or sacramental rites of baptism. When he was washed by the hands of John, the order of the mystery was settled; the Father fulfilled what the Son had asked, and what the Holy Ghost had foretold. The spiritual oil immediately descended in the image of a dove, and sate upon his head, and anointed him; from whence he began to be called Christ, because he was anointed of God the Father. And that imposition of hands might not seem to be wanting, the voice of God was heard from the cloud, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased!” Here Optatus professes to describe the order and parts, and mysteries of baptism, from the similitude of the baptism of Christ. In each of these he makes three sacraments or principal mysteries, the washing, the unction,

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. Ep. lxxii. ad Stephan. p. 196. Parùm est eis manum imponere ad recipiendum Spiritum Sanctum, nisi accipiant et Ecclesiæ baptismum. Tunc enim demum plenè sanctificari et esse filii Dei possint, si sacramento utroque nascantur.

<sup>2</sup> Optat. lib. iv. p. 81. Descendit in aquam, non quia erat quod in Deo mundaretur, sed venturum oleum aqua debuit antecedere, ad mysteria initianda et ordinanda et complenda baptismatis. Lotus cum in Joannis manibus haberetur, secutus est ordo mysterii et complevit Pater quod rogaverat Filius, et quod nunciaverat Spiritus Sanctus. Apertum est cælum, Deo Patre unguente. Spiritale oleum statim in imagine columbæ descendit, et insedit capiti ejus, et perfudit eum; unde cœpit dici Christus, quandò unctus est à Deo Patre. Cui ne manûs impositio defuisse videretur, vox audita est Dei de nube dicentis, ‘ Hic filius est meus,’ &c.

and imposition of hands: which are not properly three distinct sacraments, but three parts or rites of the same sacrament of baptism, which according to Optatus, were ordered, and shadowed, and completed in the baptism of Christ. Unless we take the word sacrament in this large sense, we shall have three proper sacraments in baptism; which neither Optatus nor any of the Ancients ever thought of, when they speak of the mysteries of baptism; but they allow both unction and imposition of hands to be sacraments, as they are parts or rites of the mystery of baptism. After this manner Pacianus, bishop of Barcelona, makes also three sacraments of the mystery of baptism, viz. the laver or washing of water, the unction of the Spirit, and the hand and mouth of the priest. For he says, the “seed of Christ, that is the Spirit of God, brings forth a new man, by the hands of the priest, out of the womb of the Church, which is the font, faith being the bride-maid to all this.<sup>1</sup> And without these three sacraments, the laver, the chrism, and the priest, this new birth is not effected. For by the laver sin is purged away; by the chrism the Holy Spirit is poured down upon us; and both these we obtain by the hand and mouth of the priest; and so the whole man is regenerated and renewed in Christ.” Here we must of necessity say, either that the laver, the chrism, and words and action of the priest, are three sacraments: or else, that they are but three parts or ceremonies of the same sacrament of baptism. Which is what Pacian plainly intended; for he is speaking of the manner how men are regenerated in baptism, and he makes chrism to be one means of this regeneration; whence it is evident, he had no other notion of it, but as of an integral part of baptism, though not absolutely essential to it. This then is one plain reason, why the Ancients sometimes call the immersion in the water, and the unction of chrism, two sacraments, because they are parts, or rites, or cere-

---

<sup>1</sup> Pacian. Serm. de Bapt. Bibl. Patr. tom. iii. p. 77. Christi semen, id est, Dei Spiritus, novum hominem, alvo sacerdotis effundit, fide tamen pronubâ.—Hæc autem compleri aliâs nequeunt, nisi lavaeri, et chrismatis, et antistitis sacramento. Lavacro enim peccata purgantur, chrismate Sanctus Spiritus superfunditur; utraque verò ista manu et ore antistitis impetramus, atque ita totus homo renascitur et innovatur in Christo.

monies of the mystery of baptism. And there is nothing more usual with the Ancients than this way of speaking, to call every sacred rite or ceremony used in the Church, by the name of a sacrament or mystery. As St. Austin calls exorcism a sacrament.<sup>1</sup> And the salt which was given to the catechumens before baptism is called the sacrament of the catechumens, both by St. Austin<sup>2</sup>, and the third Council of Carthage,<sup>3</sup> as has been observed in another place, where I speak particularly of this sacrament of the catechumens. Cyprian speaks of sacraments in the Lord's Prayer.<sup>4</sup> And to insist no longer upon these, it is usual also with the Ancients to divide the proper sacraments, baptism and the eucharist, each of them into two or more, meaning the several parts or rites belonging to them. Thus Isidore speaks of four sacraments in the Church,<sup>5</sup> which are, baptism, chrism, the body of Christ, and the blood of Christ. As therefore the bread and wine are called two sacraments, though they be but two parts of the same eucharist; so the washing and the unction are called two sacraments though they be but two rites of the same sacrament of baptism. The like style is used by Pope Innocent when he calls the bread and wine sacraments in the plural.<sup>6</sup> And Fulbertus Carnotensis is more express, when he says,<sup>7</sup> "there are two sacraments of life, the body and blood of Christ." No wonder therefore the same author<sup>8</sup> should call the immersion in water and the unction of chrism, conveying the Spirit, by the name of the two sacraments of baptism. For nothing can be plainer, than that immersion and chrism are not properly two sacraments of baptism, but only two rites of it: as the bread and wine are not strictly two sacraments of the eucharist, but only different parts of the same communion. It were easy to add abundance more of such expressions out of other authors, many of which the reader may find collected toge-

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Hom. lxxxiii. de Diversis. Exorcismi sacramento quasi molebamini.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de Peccator. Meritis. lib. ii. cap. xxvi.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Carthag. iii.

can. v. See these cited, book x. chap. ii. s. 16.

<sup>4</sup> Cypr. de Orat.

Dom. p. 142.

<sup>5</sup> Isidor. Origin. lib. vi. c. xix. Sunt autem sacramenta

baptismus, et chrisma; corpus et sanguis Christi.

<sup>6</sup> Innoc. Ep. i. ad

Decent. cap. v. Non longè porlanda sunt sacramenta.

<sup>7</sup> Fulbert. Ep.

i. Bibl. Patr. tom. iii. p. 434. Duo vitæ sacramenta, id est, Dominici corporis et sanguinis.

<sup>8</sup> Fulbert. *ibid.* p. 436. Requiritur sanè in baptismatis sacramentis aqua propter sepulturam, et Spiritus Sanctus propter vitam æternam.



ther by the learned Daille.<sup>1</sup> I shall only add the words of Haimo Haberstatensis, where he expressly makes confirmation a rite or ceremony of baptism, always accompanying, and administered at the same time with it, as the consummating act and perfection of it: "The gift of the Holy Spirit," says he,<sup>2</sup> "is given in baptism by the imposition of the bishop's hands." So that when the Ancients call confirmation a sacrament, they always mean, that it is a part or ceremony of the sacrament of baptism. In which sense they give the name of sacraments to many other things, which were only parts, or ceremonies, or attendants on it, such as exorcism, and the sign of the cross, which were sacraments in the same sense as confirmation.

SECT. 5.—No, not when it was separate from Baptism, as in the Case of Heretics, who were baptised out of the Church.

But it may be said, that confirmation, imposition of hands, or unction, was many times given to men at some years distance from baptism; as in the case of heretics and schismatics, who were baptised in infancy out of the Church, and were received by imposition of hands, when they returned to the Church afterwards. To which I answer that the imposition of hands, which the Church gave in this case separate from baptism, was what could not be avoided, because the Church had no opportunity of administering it before; and therefore no argument is to be drawn from what she was forced to do upon such an exigence, being only an exception to her ordinary practice. It is owned, that the Church gave imposition of hands to all heretics upon their return to the Church: and this as I have shewed at large in another discourse,<sup>3</sup> was to supply the deficiencies of that outward form of baptism, which could not grant them the graces of the Spirit, whilst they remained in heresy or schism. And there I also observed, that some heretics retained the unction and imposition of hands as well as bap-

<sup>1</sup> Dallæ. de Confirm. lib. i. cap. viii. p. 150. It. lib. iii. cap. xiii. p. 386.

<sup>2</sup> Haimo in Hebr. xiii. cited by Daille. *Donum Spiritûs Sancti datur in baptismate per impositionem manûs episcoporum.* <sup>3</sup> Scholast. Hist. of *Lay* Baptism, chap. i. sect. xxi.

tism, and administered it to infants together with baptism: which was the practice of the Donatists, and it may be, of several others. But yet the Church, though she neither repeated the outward form of baptism, nor always the unction of chrism; especially in the western parts, where St. Austin, Optatus, Alcimus, and Avitus lived; yet she always gave a new imposition of hands with prayer, to implore the descent of the Holy Ghost upon them. And though this was separating confirmation from baptism, yet it was only in an extraordinary case, when the Church was not capacitated to do otherwise. In other cases she always joined these two ceremonies together, as well in infants as adult persons, as I suppose the allegations and proofs alleged in this chapter, do abundantly shew to any candid reader beyond possibility of contradiction.

SECT. 6.—No Necessity of giving Confirmation to Infants now, any more than the Eucharist, from the Example of the Primitive Church.

But some will be apt to object, that, if this were the case, then all Churches at present, as well Protestant as Popish, differ from the practice of the primitive Church in this particular, that now they never administer confirmation to infants, but only to adult persons, who can confirm their baptismal vow in their own persons. And this difference is readily owned, as to practice. But then if the question be about right, which is the more suitable and agreeable practice? and, whether we ought not to conform in every circumstance to the practice of the primitive Church? I suppose every Church in this case is best judge for herself, what is most for the edification of her children. And as no Church now thinks herself under any obligation to give the eucharist to infants, because the primitive Church for eight hundred years did so: so neither does any Church judge herself bound to give confirmation to infants from the same example. Though some learned persons have pleaded for both, as Bishop Bedel<sup>1</sup> among the Protestants for the communion of infants, and Matthew Galen<sup>2</sup> among the Papists for giving them confirmation. Whilst others judge the modern

<sup>1</sup> See Bishop Usher's Letters, Ep. 163. p. 442.  
ap. Dallæ. de Confirm. lib. 1. p. xxi.

<sup>2</sup> Galen. Catechism

practice the more edifying way and think there are no sufficient arguments to engage the Church to make an alteration.

## CHAP. II.

### *Of the Minister of Confirmation.*

SECT. 1.—The Consecration of Chrism reserved only to the Office of Bishops by the Canons.

NEXT to the persons to whom confirmation was given, we are to make inquiry about the ministry of it, and see by whom it was usually given. And here it will be necessary to distinguish the several parts and ceremonies of confirmation, and cases ordinary and extraordinary; as also the consecration of the chrism from the use of it, and the practice and custom of some Churches from others: for one rule was not precisely observed in all these. Confirmation consisted of several acts, as we shall see in the next chapter. There was first the consecration of the chrism, which was always the bishop's act; then there was the unction itself, or the use of it, with consignation or the sign of the cross on the forehead or other parts of the body; then imposition of hands with prayer. There were also cases ordinary, when the bishop was present at baptism; and cases extraordinary when he was absent, and the party in danger of death. There were also different practices according to the rules of the different Churches: and according to these distinctions the answer must be given to this general question. The consecration of the chrism was generally reserved to the bishop in all Churches, and so the use of it was derived from his authority in all cases whatsoever. The second Council of Carthage<sup>1</sup> forbids presbyters to have any concern in it, and refers to a former Council, wherein the like prohibition was made before. The third Council of Carthage

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carth. i. can. iii. Memini præterito Concilio statutum fuisse, ut chrisma, vel reconciliatio pœnitentium, nec non et puellarum consecratio à presbyteris non fiant.

allows presbyters by the commission of the bishop to consecrate virgins, but never to consecrate the chrism.<sup>1</sup> The fourth Council of Carthage<sup>2</sup> obliges presbyters in country-churches to go to the bishop yearly before Easter, or else to send their sacrist to him for the chrism. In some Churches of Spain, the presbyters took upon them to consecrate it themselves; which occasioned the first Council of Toledo to renew the decree against this as an usurpation,<sup>3</sup> forbidding any beside the bishop to do it from that day forward, and obliging presbyters, as before, to go to their own bishop for it before Easter. The like injunctions are made in the first Council of Vaison,<sup>4</sup> the Council of Auxerre,<sup>5</sup> the Council of Barcelona,<sup>6</sup> the first and second Councils of Bracara,<sup>7</sup> and in the Collection of Greek Canons made by Martin Bracarenis;<sup>8</sup> as also in the Roman Decrees made by Pope Innocent,<sup>9</sup> Leo,<sup>10</sup> and Gelasius,<sup>11</sup> which I need not repeat at length upon this occasion. So that by this means the bishop's authority was secured, even in such cases where presbyters were allowed to have their share in this holy unction.

SECT. 2.—The Use of the Chrism divided between the Office of Bishops and Presbyters.

Now this unction or consignation in many Churches, par-

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carthag. iii. can. 36. Ut presbyter, inconsulto episcopo, virgines non consecret, chrisma verò nunquam conficiat

<sup>2</sup> Con. Carth. iv. can. 36. Presbyteri, qui per diœceses Ecclesias regunt, non à quibuslibet episcopis, sed à suis, nec per minorem clericum, sed omni anno aut perseipos, aut per illum qui sacrarium tenet, ante Paschæ solennitatem chrisma petant.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Tolet. i. can. 20. Quamvis penè ubique custodiatur, ut absque episcopo chrisma nemo conficiat, tamen quia in aliquibus locis vel provinciis, presbyteri dicuntur chrisma conficere, placuit, ex hâc die nullum alium nisi episcopum chrisma conficere, et per diœcesim destinare, ita ut de singulis ecclesiis ad episcopum ante diem Paschæ diaconi destinentur, aut subdiaconi, qui confectum chrisma ab episcopo destinatum ad diem Paschæ possint ad tempus deferre.

<sup>4</sup> Con. Vasense. i. can. iii.

<sup>5</sup> Con. Antissiodor. can. vi.

<sup>6</sup> Con. Barcinon.

can. ii. <sup>7</sup> Con. Bracar. i. can. xxxvii. Bracar. ii. can. iv. <sup>8</sup> Martin Bracar. Collect. can. cap. li.

<sup>9</sup> Innoc. Ep. i. ad Decentium, cap. iii.

<sup>10</sup> Leo Ep. lxxxviii. ad Gallos.

<sup>11</sup> Gelas. Ep. ix. ad Episcopos Lucania. cap. viii.

ticularly in the Roman Church, was distinguished into two sorts, the consignation of the forehead, and the consignation of the other parts of the body. And the former in such Churches where this distinction was made, was generally reserved to the bishop to be administered with imposition of hands; but the latter was given by presbyters also. All Churches, did not allow of this distinction of chrism into two sorts, but such as did allow of two, granted authority to presbyters to administer the one but not the other. The double chrismation was first brought in by Pope Innocent, and he thus divides the office between bishops and presbyters. "A presbyter," says he<sup>1</sup>, "baptising either in the bishop's presence or absence, may anoint the baptised party with chrism, provided it be consecrated before-hand by the bishop, but he may not sign him in the forehead with the same oil, because it belongs to bishops only when they give the Holy Ghost." And so it is in the Decrees of Gelasius<sup>2</sup>, and Pope Gregory<sup>3</sup> his successor in the Roman see. But this double chrismation was not received in France, nor in any of the Eastern Churches. In France, it was the office of presbyters, and the imposition of hands was only reserved to the bishop. This is undeniably evident from the Council of Orange,<sup>4</sup> which orders every minister, who had received the office of baptising, wherever he went, to have the chrism with him; because it was agreed, that chrism should only be once used in baptism: but if by any necessity it had been omitted in baptism, then the bishop should be put in mind of that omission in confirmation. For it was agreed to have only one chrismation. This canon is repeated and referred

<sup>1</sup> Innoc. Ep. i. ad Decent. c. iii. Presbyteris, seu extra episcopum, seu præsentem episcopum, baptizant, chrismate baptizato ungere licet, sed quod ab episcopo fuerit consecratum; non tamen frontem ex eodem oleo signare, quod solis debetur episcopis cum tradant Spiritum Sanctum Paracletum.      <sup>2</sup> Gelas. Ep. ix. c. viii.      <sup>3</sup> Greg. Ep. ix. lib. iii.

<sup>4</sup> Con. Arausican. i. can. i. Nullus ministrorum, qui baptizandi recipit officium, sine chrismate usquam debet progredi, quia inter nos placuit semel in baptizate chrismari. De eo autem, qui in baptizate, quæcunque necessitate faciente, non chrismatus fuerit, in confirmatione sacerdos commovebitur. Nam inter nos chrismatis ipsius non nisi unâ benedictio est.

to again in the second Council of Arles,<sup>1</sup> and Valesius adds<sup>2</sup> to them an inscription in Gruter, confirming the same thing, that the bishop did not minister the chrism, except it had been omitted by the presbyter before. In the Eastern Churches they had but one unction after baptism, and that performed by the bishop, except in some particular and extraordinary cases. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions makes this the office of the bishop<sup>3</sup> to anoint those that were baptised with the holy chrism. And this, he says, “was the confirmation of the professions which they had made in baptism.”<sup>4</sup> The author under the name of Dionysius says the same,<sup>5</sup> “that after the presbyters have baptised a man, they bring him to the bishop, and he anoints him with the divine chrism, and pronounces him capable of partaking of the holy eucharist.” Now this episcopal unction was not only in the forehead, as was usual in the Roman Church, but in all other parts of the body. For, as Cyril of Jerusalem tells those that were baptised,<sup>6</sup> “they were first anointed in the forehead, to wipe away that shame which the first man by his transgression had contracted; and that they might now with open face behold the glory of the Lord. Then they were anointed on the ears, that they might have ears to hear the divine mysteries. After that on the nose and breast, that they might be a sweet savour unto the Lord; and being armed with the breast-plate of righteousness, might be able to withstand all the insults of the devil.” Thus also all such heretics as were to be received into the Church without rebaptisation, as having been baptised in due form before,<sup>7</sup> are appointed to be received by

<sup>1</sup> Con. Arelaten. ii. can. xxvii. Nullum ministrum, qui baptizandi recepit officium, sine chrismate usquam debere progredi, quia inter nos juxta synodi constitutionem, placuit semel chrismari. <sup>2</sup> Vales. not in Euseb. lib. vi. cap. xliii. p. 135. ex Gruter. p. 1177. De Marca, has this distich;

Tuque sacerdotes docuisti, chrismate sancto  
Tangere bis nullum, judice, posse, Deo.

<sup>3</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. iii. cap. xvi. Μετὰ τῆτο ὁ ἐπίσκοπος χρίτω τὰς βαπτισθέντας τῷ μύρω. <sup>4</sup> Ibid. cap. xvii. Τὸ μύρον βεβαίωσις τῆς ὁμολογίας. vid. lib. vii. cap. xlii.

<sup>5</sup> Dionys. de Hier. Eccl. c. ii. p. 254. <sup>6</sup> Ο ἱεράρχης τῷ μύρῳ τὸν ἄνδρα σφραγισάμενος, &c. <sup>7</sup> Cyril. Catech. Myst. iii. c. iii. Πρῶτον χρίσσει ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον, &c. <sup>8</sup> Con. Constant. i. can. vii.

consignation or unction of the holy chrism; first on the forehead, then on the eyes, nose, mouth, and ears, with this form of words; "The seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit." But though this whole ceremony of unction in the Eastern Church was ordinarily to be performed only by the bishop, and not divided, as in the Roman, between the bishop and presbyters; yet in some special cases, in some particular Churches this office devolved upon the presbyters. For at Alexandria, if the bishop was absent, it was usual for the presbyters to give this consignation at the same time that they baptised. As I think the words of the author under the name of St. Ambrose are to be understood, when he says,<sup>1</sup> that in Egypt the presbyters consign in the bishop's absence. And this another author under the name of St. Austin calls consecration:<sup>2</sup> which some learned persons, I know, take for the consecration of the eucharist. But that was nothing singular, but common to all the world, for presbyters to consecrate the eucharist in the bishop's absence in all Churches, and therefore needed not to be noted as a peculiar custom in Egypt. Therefore I rather judge it to mean some consecration, which presbyters in many other Churches were not allowed in the absence of the bishop, as the consecrating or consigning such as were baptised, with the chrism of confirmation, which a presbyter might not do in the Roman Churches. But in some of the Eastern Churches this was allowed, for the author of the Constitutions, speaking of the celebration of baptism, addresses himself both to bishops and presbyters, telling them in what order they should perform it; "Thou bishop, or presbyter, shalt first anoint the party to be baptised with the holy oil; then thou shalt baptise him with water; and last of all thou shalt sign him with the holy chrism."<sup>3</sup> Where we see not only the unction preceding baptism, but that which followed

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. in Ephes. iv. 11. Denique apud Ægyptum presbyteri consignat, si præsens non sit episcopus. <sup>2</sup> Aug. Quæst. in Vet. et Nov. Test. q. 101. In Alexandria, et per totam Ægyptum, si desit episcopus, consecrat presbyter.

<sup>3</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. cap. xxi. Ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἢ πρεσβύτερος, πρῶτον χρίσει ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ, ἔπειτα βαπτίσει ὕδατι, καὶ τελευταίου σφραγίσει μύρω.

after, which was the unction of confirmation, is commanded to the presbyter as well as the bishop; which must at least be interpreted to mean his doing it in the absence of the bishop; or in his presence, if he has a particular command and delegation. So that, as to what concerned this first ceremony of confirmation, the unction of chrism, the practice of different Churches varied much upon it. Some Churches, as the Roman, divided the office between bishops and presbyters. Others, as those of France, committed it wholly to presbyters, reserving to the bishop only the consecration of the oil, and imposition of hands in confirmation. Others, as those of the East, reserved not only the consecration of the chrism, but the use of it to the bishop entirely, when he was personally present, and in all ordinary cases; only allowing it to be used by presbyters in his absence, or some such extraordinary cases.

SECT. 3.—The other Ceremony of imposition of Hands reserved more strictly to the office of Bishops.

As to the other ceremony of imposition of hands in confirmation, we find that more universally and strictly reserved to the office of bishops; yet not so absolutely and entirely, but that the Canons authorised presbyters to do it in subordination to their bishop in some certain cases. It is certain Cyprian speaks of it as the ordinary office of bishops or chief ministers of the Church.<sup>1</sup> For, mentioning the imposition of hands given by the Apostles, to those whom Philip had baptised, Acts 8. he says, “the same custom was now observed in the Church, that those who were baptised, were presented to the governors of the Church, that by their prayer and imposition of hands, they might receive the Holy Ghost, and be consummated with the seal of the Lord.” In like manner, Firmilian, bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia, who was cotemporary with Cyprian, makes bishops the ordinary ministers of this office,<sup>2</sup> whilst

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 202. Quod nunc quoque apus nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesiâ baptizantur, præpositis Ecclesiæ offerantur, et per nostram orationem ac manûs impositionem Spiritum Sanctum consequantur, et signaculo Dominico consummentur. <sup>2</sup> Firmil. Ep. lxxv. ap. Cypr. p. 221. Nisi si his episcopis, de quibus nunc, minor fuit Paulus; ut hi qui-



he draws a comparison between St. Paul giving imposition of hands to those whom he baptised at Ephesus, Acts xix., and the bishop's giving imposition of hands to such as returned from heresy or schism to the unity of the Catholic Church. So likewise the Anonymous Author,<sup>1</sup> who writes of Baptism of Heretics, at the end of St. Cyprian's works, makes imposition of hands the office of bishops, in imitation of the Apostles giving imposition of hands to those who were baptised by Philip, the deacon, Acts viii. And in another place he says,<sup>2</sup> "If bishops were present at baptism, they gave imposition of hands together with baptism; but if any were baptised by the inferior clergy, in time of necessity, then the bishops supplied this afterwards, or else the Lord supplied it as he saw fit." The Council of Eliberis not long after made two canons to this purpose. In one of which it is ordered,<sup>3</sup> "that if a layman baptised a catechumen, when he was dangerously sick at sea, or where there was no church near at hand, he should afterward bring him to the bishop, that he might perfect his baptism by imposition of hands." And in the other canon it is also ordered,<sup>4</sup> "that in case a deacon governing a country-people, where there is no bishop or presbyter present, shall baptise any of them, the

---

dem possint per solam manûs impositionem venientibus hæreticis dare Spiritum Sanctum; Paulus autem idoneus non fuerit, qui à Joanne baptizatus Spiritum Sanctum per manûs impositionem daret, nisi eos prius etiam Ecclesiæ baptismo baptizasset.

<sup>1</sup> Anonym. de Bapt. Hæreticorum. ap. Cypr. p. 23 in Appendice. Per manûs impositionem episcopi datur unicuique credenti Spiritus Sanctus, sicut Apostoli circa Samaritanos post Philippi baptisma manum eis imponendo fecerunt.

<sup>2</sup> Id. p. 25. Et ideò cùm salus nostra in baptismate Spiritûs, quod plerumque cum baptismate aquæ conjunctum, sit constituta, siquidem per nos baptisma tradetur, integrè et solenniter et per omnia quæ scripta sunt, adsignetur, atque sine ullâ ullius rei separatione tradatur: aut si à minore clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, eventum expectemus, ut aut suppleatur à nobis, aut à Domino supplendum reservetur.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Eliber can. 38. Peregrè navigantes, aut si ecclesia in proximo non fuerit, posse fidelem, qui lavacrum suum integrum habet, nec sit bigamus, baptizare in necessitate positum catechumenum: ita ut si supervixerit, ad episcopum eum perducatur, ut per manûs impositionem perficere possit.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. can. 77. Si quis diaconus regens plebem, sine episcopo vel presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debet. Quòd si ante de seculo recesserint, sub fide quæ quis crediderit, poterit esse justus.

bishop shall afterward perfect them by his benediction. Or if they chanced to die before this could be done, they were to be reputed in a salvable condition, by the faith in which they were baptised." We have heard St. Jerom before testifying of this,<sup>1</sup> as the general practice of the Church, for bishops to go about the country villages and remoter places in their dioceses, to give imposition of hands to such as were baptised by presbyters and deacons: and some of these died before the bishop could come to them; which implies, not only that it was the bishop's ordinary office, but that presbyters and deacons did not administer imposition of hands, even in such cases of necessity; otherwise the party who wanted it, could not have died without it. This was evidently the practice of the Roman Church, where, though the office of chrismation was in part allowed to presbyters, yet the consignation in the forehead with imposition of hands, was still reserved to the bishop, as his peculiar office in confirmation: as we learn from the Letters of Pope Innocent,<sup>2</sup> Gelasius,<sup>3</sup> and Gregory the Great,<sup>4</sup> which have already been mentioned in the last section. To which we may add the testimony of Cornelius, who lived before all these in the time of Cyprian, as it is recorded by Eusebius. He there,<sup>5</sup> speaking of Novatian, who was baptised only with clinic baptism, upon a sick bed, says, "when he recovered from his distemper, he never received those things, which by the laws of the Church he was obliged to receive, to wit, consignations by the hand of the bishop, &c." All those testimonies likewise, which require heretics to have imposition of hands from the bishop, in order to obtain the gift of the Holy Ghost, are a further evidence of this practice. To which purpose we have the Decrees of Pope Leo,<sup>6</sup> and Siricius,<sup>7</sup> who particularly observes this to have been the

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. Dial. cont. Lucifer. cap. iv. See before, chap. i. s. 1.

<sup>2</sup> Innocent. Ep. i. ad Decentium, cap. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Gelas. Ep. ix. ad

Episc. Lucan. cap. viii.

<sup>4</sup> Gregor. lib. iii. Ep. ix.

<sup>5</sup> Euseb. lib. vi. c. xliii. Οὐδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἔτυχε, διαφυγῶν τὴν νόσον, ὧν χρῆ μεταλαμβάνειν κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἐκκλησίας κανόνα, τῷ τε σφραγισθῆναι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου.

<sup>6</sup> Leo Ep. 37. ad Leonem Raven. cap. ii. Si ab hæreticis baptizatum quempiam fuisse constiterit—hoc tantum quod, ibi deficit, conferatur, ut per episcopalem manûs impositionem virtutem Sancti Spiritûs consequatur.

<sup>7</sup> Siric Ep. i. ad Himerium, cap. i. Arianos nos

general practice of the whole Church, both Eastern and Western, as well as the Church of Rome, in the reception of those who had been baptised in any heresy or schism. And as to all persons baptised in the Church, St. Austin is a further witness, who says,<sup>1</sup> “that in propriety of speech, neither the Apostles, nor any other man, but Christ alone, as He is God, could give the Holy Ghost: for the Apostles only laid hands on men, that the Holy Ghost by their prayers might descend upon them; which custom the Church now observed and practised by her bishops or governors also.” In like manner, St. Ambrose says,<sup>2</sup> “the spiritual seal, or seal of the Spirit, which was the completion of baptism, came after the font, when by the prayer of the priest, (that is, in his language, the bishop,) the Holy Ghost was poured upon them.” From all which testimonies it is most undeniably evident, that the bishop in all ordinary cases, was the only standing and regular minister of this part of confirmation, which consisted in imposition of hands and prayer, to invoke the gift of the Holy Ghost.

SECT. 4.—Yet in some special Cases, Presbyters by Commission allowed to minister it also. As, 1st, when Bishops particularly required their Presbyters to do it, to such as were baptised in the Church.

Yet there were some special and extraordinary cases, in which some Churches, if not all, granted a license by canon to presbyters, to minister this part of confirmation also. As when bishops, either in their presence or absence, appointed a presbyter by a particular delegation or command to do it. This was no encroachment upon the bishop's authority, nor infringement of his privilege and power,

---

cum Novatianis—per invocationem solam septiformis Spiritûs, episcopalis manûs impositione catholicorum conventui sociamus. Quod etiam totus Oriens Occidensque custodit.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Trin. lib. xv. cap. 26. Neque enim aliquis discipulorum ejus dedit Spiritum Sanctum. Orabant quippe ut veniret in eos quibus manum imponebant, non ipsi eum dabant. Quem morem in suis præpositis etiam nunc servat Ecclesia.

<sup>2</sup> Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iii. cap. ii. Sequitur spirituale signaculum, quod audistis hodiè legi, quia post fontem superest ut perfectio fiat quando ad invocationem sacerdotis Spiritus Sanctus infunditur.

because what was done, was only done in subordination to him, and in pursuance of his command. This license we find sometimes granted to presbyters, even in the bishop's presence. As is clear from that canon in the Collection of Martin Bracarenis,<sup>1</sup> out of the Canons of the Greek Church: "A presbyter shall not consign infants in the presence of his bishop, unless it be particularly enjoined him by his bishop." Here three things are manifestly implied; 1. That this consignation or imposition of hands with the sign of the cross and prayer, was ordinarily the sole office of the bishop. 2. That by a special commission he might authorise presbyters to do it even in his presence. 3. That in his absence they were authorised to do it by a general commission, rather than infants or any other baptised persons should die without confirmation. And this agrees very well with what has been said before in the last section, concerning the practice of the Churches of Alexandria and Egypt; though in the Western Churches it was otherwise, as is evident from what has been alleged before out of Pope Innocent,<sup>2</sup> and St. Jerom,<sup>3</sup> who tell us, "that presbyters neither in the presence of the bishop, nor in his absence, were allowed to do it, but many men were forced to die without confirmation or imposition of hands, because the bishop did not come time enough to administer it to them."

SECT. 5.—2dly, Presbyters might administer to the *Ænergumens*.

Yet also in the Western Churches there were some special cases, in which this consignation was allowed to be performed by presbyters. Nay, and in one case by deacons also. As it was in the case of *energumens*, or persons possessed with evil spirits after baptism; concerning whom Pope Innocent makes this decree, in the same Epistle where he prohibits presbyters from consigning in all ordinary cases:<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Martin. Bracar. Collect. Canon. can. 52. Presbyter, presente episcopo, non signet infantes, nisi fortè ab episcopo fuerit illi præceptum.

<sup>2</sup> Innoc. Ep. i. ad Decent. cap. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron. Cont. Lucif.

cap. iv.

<sup>4</sup> Innoc. Ep. i. ad Decent. cap. vi. De his verò baptizatis, qui postea à dæmonio, aut vitio aliquo, aut peccato in-

“That if any one was seized with an evil spirit after baptism, the bishop might give orders to a presbyter or a deacon to consign him in that condition. It was not to be done but by the bishop’s authority: for he only had the power of imposition of hands; but because an energumen, who was at a great distance from the bishop, might have several chances in his journey, it was therefore thought more proper for the bishops to grant a commission to a presbyter or deacon, to give him imposition of hands at home, than to venture his falling into his distemper, by either coming to the bishop or returning.”

SECT. 6.—3dly, And to such as were baptised in Heresy or Schism, in Case they were in danger of Death.

Another extraordinary case in which this office of imposition of hands was granted to presbyters, was, when any who had been baptised by heretics or schismatics, were, upon their return to the Church, seized with a violent sickness, and in imminent danger of death, before they could go to the bishop, or the bishop come to them, to give them imposition of hands, and confirm them with that grace of the Spirit, which they could not have in heresy or schism. In that case, rather than such persons should die without this office, a commission was granted to presbyters to administer it. This we find most expressly in the first Council of Orange,<sup>1</sup> “that heretics, if they be in extremity, and apparent danger of death, when they desire to become catholics, shall, in the bishop’s absence, be consigned by the presbyters with chrism and benediction,”

---

terveniente, arripiuntur, quæsit dilectio tua, si à presbytero vel diacono possint aut debeant consignari: quòd hoc nisi episcopus concesserit, non licet: nam eis manus imponenda non est, nisi episcopus auctoritatem dederit id faciendi. Ut autem fiat, episcopi est imperare, ut manus eis vel à presbytero, vel à cæteris clericis imponatur. Nam quomòdò id fieri sine magno labore poterit ut longè constitutus energumenus ad episcopum deducatur, cùm, si talis casus ei in itinere acciderit, nec perferri ad episcopum, nec referri ad sua facillè possit.

<sup>1</sup> Con. Arausican. i. can. ii. Hæreticos in mortis discrimine positos, si catholici esse desiderent, si desit episcopus, à presbyteris cum chrismate et benedictione consignari placet.

that is, imposition of hands in the benediction-prayer. And the like decree is made in the Council of Epone,<sup>1</sup> “that if any heretics, who lay desperately sick, upon a death-bed, desired suddenly to be converted, in that case for the salvation of their souls, which was heartily desired, a presbyter should be permitted to give them the consolation of chrism; which they that were in health were to go to the bishop for, at their conversion.” Where we may observe, that the chrismation here spoken of was not the chrismation which presbyters were ordinarily allowed to give in the Western Church, but that which was joined with imposition of hands, which was peculiarly reserved to the bishop, except in such cases of extremity, when a presbyter was allowed to give it, rather than a converted heretic should die without it. And the reason of this concession was, because heretics, who were baptised out of the Church, were supposed to be without the grace of the Spirit, till they received it by imposition of hands in the Catholic Church. For which reason, all heretics as well those who used imposition of hands at baptism, as those that did not, received a new benediction when they returned to the unity of the Church; as I have shewed from St. Austin,<sup>2</sup> Optatus,<sup>3</sup> and Alcimus Avitus,<sup>4</sup> in another place. See Scholast. Hist. of Lay-Baptism, part i. chap. i. near the end of sect. 21.

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Epaunens. can. xvi. Presbytero, propter salutem animarum, quam in cunctis optamus desperatis et in lecto recumbentibus hæreticis, si conversionem subitam petant, chrismate subvenire permittimus. Quod etiam omnes convertendi, si sani sunt, ab episcopo noverint expetendum. Vid Pontifical. Damasi, Vit. Sylvestri, p. 229. ap. Crab. tom. i.

<sup>2</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. iii. p. 16.

<sup>3</sup> Optat. lib. vii. p. 109.

<sup>4</sup> Avitus, Ep. xxiv. ad Stephanum.

## CHAP. III.

*Of the Manner of Administering Confirmation, and the Ceremonies used in the Celebration of it.*

SECT. 2.—The first Ceremony of Confirmation, was the **Uction** of Chrim

HAVING thus far considered both the subject of confirmation, or persons to whom it was administered, and the persons by whom it was administered, we are in the next place to take a view of the form and manner of its administration; in which we may observe four distinct ceremonies besides the consecration of the chrim, which were, the unction, the sign of the cross, imposition of hands, and prayer. The unction was commonly first in order, as we learn from that of Tertullian,<sup>1</sup> “As soon as we are come out of the water, we are anointed with the blessed unction.”—“And then we receive imposition of hands, invocating the Holy Spirit by a benediction.”

SECT. 2.—The Original of this Uction.

The first rise and original of this unction in the Church, is not exactly known, and the sentiments of learned men are various about it. The late famous writer, under the feigned name of Petrus Aurelius, in his Book called *Orthodoxus against Sirmond*, takes a great deal of pains to prove it an apostolical practice. But Habertus<sup>2</sup> calls this a dream and a mad undertaking, against the general stream and current of learned men. And Estius says,<sup>3</sup> “The common opinion is, that the Apostles in the beginning of their preaching, used no chrim in the administration of this sacrament,” as

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. cap. vii. Exinde egressi de lavacro perungimur benedictâ unctione.—Ibid. cap. viii. Dehinc manus imponitur, per benedictionem advocans et invitans Spiritum Sanctum.

<sup>2</sup> Habert. Archieratic. p. 702. Quod divininare quidam nos volunt, Apostolos in libro Praxapostolorum confirmasse cum chrismate, id rationem fugit. Præfractè id contra summos theologorum persuadere nititur Petrus Aurelius in *Orthodoxo contra Sirmondum*.

<sup>3</sup> Estius in Sent. lib. iv. dist. vii. sect. 7. Communior sententia est, Apostolos initio suæ prædicationis non usos fuisse chrismate in administratione hujus sacramenti.

he calls it. So that what the Romanists now make the matter of their new sacrament is confessed to be without any foundation in Scripture. Bishop Pearson<sup>1</sup> is of opinion, that the use of it came into the Church shortly after the time of the Apostles. Basnage<sup>2</sup> and Daille<sup>3</sup> think not till the third century, when it is first mentioned by Origen<sup>4</sup> and Tertullian. Some indeed allege an author more ancient than either of these, which is Theophilus Antiochenus,<sup>5</sup> who says, “that we are therefore called Christians, because we are anointed with the oil of God.” But the unction he speaks of, is a spiritual and mystical unction; such as, he says, the whole air and earth under heaven is anointed with, viz. the unction of light and the Spirit of God. So that there being no author before Tertullian, who mentions the material unction, as used in confirmation, it is most probable it was a ceremony first begun about his time, to represent the unction of the Holy Ghost.

SECT. 3.—The Form and Manner of Administering it, together with the Effects of it.

But when it was once admitted, it was usually magnified as the symbol, and sometimes the instrumental cause of very great effects. The consecration of it was supposed to work a mystical change in its nature, answerable to the change wrought in the waters of baptism, and the bread and wine in the eucharist, which Cyril of Jerusalem compares together.<sup>6</sup> It was this unction, as the completion of baptism, to which they ascribed the power of making every Christian in some sense partaker of a royal priesthood. Which is not only said by Origen in the passage last mentioned, but by Pope Leo,<sup>7</sup> St. Jerom,<sup>8</sup> and many others.<sup>9</sup> To it they also ascribed

<sup>1</sup> Pearson. Lect. in Act. v. n. 6. p. 69.      <sup>2</sup> Basnag. Critic. in Baron. p. 76.      <sup>3</sup> Daill. de Confirm. lib. ii. cap. ii. p. 116, &c.      <sup>4</sup> Origen in Levit. Hom. 9. p. 156. Omnes, quicunque unguento sacri chrismatis delibuti sunt, sacerdotes effecti sunt, sicut et Petrus ad omnem dicit Ecclesiam, “vos regale sacerdotium.”      <sup>5</sup> Theophil. ad Autolycum, lib. i. Bibl. Patr. G. L. tom. i. p. 110. Καλέμεθα χριστιανοί, ὅτι χρίόμεθα ἔλαιον θεῶν.  
<sup>6</sup> Cyril. Catech. Myst. iii. n. 3.      <sup>7</sup> Leo. Ser. iii. de Assumptione suā. p. 3.      <sup>8</sup> Hieron. cont. Lucif. cap. ii.      <sup>9</sup> Vid. Prosper. Sentent. 342. Ambros. de Initiatis, cap. vi. Aug. Ser. iii. post xl. à Sirmondo editis, in appendice. tom. x. p. 847.



the noble effects of confirming the soul with the strength of all spiritual graces on God's part, as well as the confirmation of the professions and covenant made on man's part. The author of the Constitutions<sup>1</sup> makes it to be on man's part "βεβαίωσις τῆς ὁμολογίας, ἢ συνθηκῶν, *the confirmation of the confessions and compacts,*" made with God in baptism; and on God's part, "the collation of the Holy Spirit," represented by this ceremony of anointing. Which is so frequently mentioned in every Greek writer upon this subject, that it is superfluous to refer any learned reader to them. It will be sufficient only to hint the forms of prayer, which they used upon this occasion; for these will evidently shew what spiritual effects they expected from this unction. Now of these we have two ancient forms remaining, a shorter and a longer, the one an express, and the other an implicit prayer. The shorter form was conceived in these words, "Σφράγις δωρεᾶς Πνεύματος Ἁγίου, *the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit,*" as we find it in the first General Council of Constantinople,<sup>2</sup> where they order such as were baptised by heretics, to be confirmed by the unction of chrism in this form of words. And so again, in the Council of Trullo<sup>3</sup> and some private writers.<sup>4</sup> Not to mention now, that this is the form still in use in the Euchologium of the present Greek Church. But beside this shorter form, which was only an implicit prayer, as if they had said, let this unction be unto thee the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit, they had also some larger forms, which were more express prayers; one of which is in the author of the Apostolical Constitutions, under the title of "an Εὐχαριστία περὶ τῆς μυστικῆς μύρης, *a thanksgiving or benediction to be used in the unction of the mystical chrism,*" where the bishop is ordered to anoint the party baptised, saying these words,<sup>5</sup> "O Lord God, the Unbegotten, who hast no Lord, who art Lord of all, who madest the sweet savour of the knowledge of the Gospel to go forth among all nations, grant now, that this chrism may be effectual in this baptised person, that the sweet savour

<sup>1</sup> Const. Apost. lib. iii. cap. xvii. lib. vii. c. xxii.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Constant.

i. can. 7.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Trull. can. xcv.

<sup>4</sup> Asterius Amasen. de

Filio Prodigio. ap. Photium, Cod. 271. p. 1499.

<sup>5</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii.

c. xliv.

of thy Christ may remain firm and stable in him, and that he being dead with Him, may rise again and live with Him." Now this unction in the Greek Church, was not only in the forehead, but in several other parts of the body, all performed by the bishop in one and the same act; but the Latins divided the office in some places between the bishop and presbyters, as has been observed before. But whether united or divided, it was all reckoned the unction of confirmation: which is evident from that canon of the Council of Barcelona, which speaking of presbyters receiving the consecrated chrism from their bishops, which they themselves were to use, says expressly,<sup>1</sup> "that it was for confirming neophytes, or persons newly baptised." Which is a manifest proof, that that part of the ceremony of unction, which was committed to presbyters, was reckoned a part of confirmation: And so much of it might be committed to presbyters, acting in subordination to their bishop, as the rules of every Church allowed. For this part of confirmation being wholly of ecclesiastical institution, it was in the power of the Church to make orders in all things concerning it, both in what manner, and by what persons she would have it performed. Which is the true reason of so much variety, as we have observed, in different Churches, in the administering this first ceremony of confirmation.

SECT. 4.—The second Ceremony of Confirmation was the Sign of the Cross.

Together with this unction they usually joined the sign of the cross. For this ceremony they used upon all occasions, and therefore would not omit it in this solemn act of confirmation. Of this we have several clear proofs in Tertullian, Pope Leo, and others: which, because they have been already recited at large,<sup>2</sup> in speaking of the use of the sign of the cross in baptism, I will not here repeat them; but only add, that the name *consignation*, which is so often used by the Latin writers to denote confirmation,<sup>3</sup> seems to have

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Barcinon. can. ii. Stratum est, ut cum chrisma presbyteris diœcesanis pro neophytis confirmandis datur, nihil pro liquoris pretio accipiantur, &c. <sup>2</sup> Book xi. chap. ix. s. 6. <sup>3</sup> Innoc. Ep. i. ad Decent. e. 3. De consignandis verò infantibus, &c. Martini Bracaren. can. lii.

had its rise from this ceremony and custom of signing with the sign of the cross, when they gave the unction to persons baptised. And this in some measure answers to the Greek name *Σφραγίς*, which many times, though not always, denotes *the sign* of the cross, as used in baptism or confirmation, or any other office of religion; of which I need not here be more particular.

SECT. 5.—The third and most noted Ceremony, Imposition of Hands; and fourthly, Prayer joined therewith.

The most noted ceremony in this whole affair, and that which most universally prevailed, was imposition of hands; a ceremony used in all sorts of benedictions, but more peculiarly applied to ordination, reconciling of penitents, and confirmation. The Latin writers commonly speak of confirmation under this title. But some think it was not in use among the Greeks, who, they say, only used chrism, and not imposition of hands in confirmation. But this is a great mistake: for the author of the Constitutions<sup>1</sup> in the same chapter, where he rehearses the prayer of the mystical chrism, immediately subjoins, “This is the power of imposition of hands necessary for every one: for unless he that is baptised have this invocation of the holy priest, he only goes into the water as a Jew, and puts off the filth of the body, but not the filth of the soul.” Therefore though this imposition of hands be not so frequently mentioned in the Greek writers, yet it is always to be understood, as chrism is in the Latin writers, where only imposition of hands is mentioned.

SECT. 6.—The Original of this Ceremony of Imposition of Hands.

The antiquity of this ceremony is by all ancient writers carried as high as the Apostles, and founded upon their example and practice. There are three passages in Scripture from which they generally deduce it: Acts viii. where mention is made of the Apostles laying hands on those whom

Presbyter non signet infantes, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Const. Apost. lib. vii. cap. xliii. Ἐκάστος γὰρ ἡ δύναμις τῆς χειροθεσίας ἐὰν γὰρ μὴ εἰς ἕκαστον τῶτων ἢ ἐπικλήσις γένηται παρὰ τῶ ἐπισκόπου ἱερώως τοιαύτη τις εἰς ὕδωρ μόνον καταβαίνει ὁ βαπτιζόμενος, ὡς Ἰεδαῖοι, &c.

Philip had baptised. Acts xix. where St. Paul laid his hands on those whom he baptised after John's baptism. And Heb. vi. 2. where mention is made of imposition of hands among the first principles of religion. Cyprian derives it from the practice of the Apostles laying their hands on those whom Philip baptised:<sup>1</sup> for, says he, "the same custom is now observed in the Church, that they who are baptised, are presented to the governors of the Church, that by their prayer and imposition of hands they may receive the Holy Ghost." And in other places,<sup>2</sup> he refers it in general to apostolical institution and practice. The Anonymous Author of the Book concerning Heretical Baptism, at the end of Cyprian,<sup>3</sup> deduces it likewise from the same example of the Apostles laying hands on the Samaritans, whom Philip baptised. Firmilian compares the bishop's imposition of hands to invoke the Holy Spirit, to that of St. Paul upon those whom he baptised at Ephesus.<sup>4</sup> St. Jerom owns the Luciferians' argument to be good, when he derives this custom from the Acts of the Apostles,<sup>5</sup> and the case of the Samaritans receiving the imposition of hands after Philip had baptised them: though he thinks the practice and tradition of the Church sufficient to authorise such a custom in this case, as well as in several other rites belonging to baptism and other things, which had the authority of laws, though they were no where expressly commanded in Scripture; as the triple immersion in baptism, and the tasting of milk and honey in token of a new birth. St. Austin in like manner affirms,<sup>6</sup> that this observation descended to the governors of

<sup>1</sup> Cypr. Ep. 73. ad Jubaian. p. 202. Quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesiâ baptizantur, præpositis Ecclesiæ offerantur, ut per nostram orationem et manûs impositionem Spiritum Sanctum consequantur.

<sup>2</sup> Cypr. Ep. lxxii. ad Stephan. p. 196.

<sup>3</sup> Anonym. de Bapt. Heretic.

ap. Cypr. in Append. p. 23. Per manûs impositionem episcopi datur unicuique credenti Spiritus Sanctus, sicut Apostoli circa Samaritanos post Philippi baptismum manuum eis imponendo fecerunt.

<sup>4</sup> Firmil. Ep. lxxv. ap.

Cypr. p. 221.

<sup>5</sup> Hieron. cont. Lucifer. cap. iv. An nescis et jam Ecclesiarum hunc esse morem, ut baptizatis postea manus imponatur, et ita invocetur Spiritus Sanctus? Exigis ubi scriptum sit? in Actibus Apostolorum. Etiam si Scripturæ auctoritas non subesset, totius orbis in hæc parte consensus iustar præcepti obtinet. Nam et multa alia quæ per traditionem in Ecclesiis observantur, auctoritatem sibi scriptæ legis usurpaverunt; velut in lavacro ter caput mergitare; deinde egressos lactis et melis prægustare concordiam ad infantie significationem.

<sup>6</sup> Aug. de Trin. lib. xv. c.

the Church from the Apostles, who prayed over those on whom they laid their hands, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. And because it might be objected, that the Apostolical practice was for a quite different end, to confer on men the miraculous gift of the Spirit, empowering them to speak with new tongues. He is very careful once or twice to answer this objection, and shew, that notwithstanding any such difference, this practice of imposition of hands in order to obtain the Holy Spirit, might be said to descend from the Apostles. For, says he,<sup>1</sup> “by the Holy Ghost, which is given only in the Catholic Church by imposition of hands our forefathers would have us to understand that which the Apostle says, ‘The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost which is given us.’ For that is the charity, which they have not who are cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church; and though they speak with the tongues of men and angels, and know all mysteries and all knowledge, it profits them nothing. For they have not the love of God, who love not the unity of the Church; upon which account it is rightly said that the Holy Spirit is not received but only in the Catholic Church. For now the Holy Spirit, which is given by imposition of hands, does not appear with sensible and temporal miracles to attest it, as it was heretofore given to recommend the first plantation of faith, and to dilate the

---

xxvi. Orabant ut veniret in eos quibus manus imponebant, non ipsi eum dabant. Quem morem in suis præpositis etiam nunc servat Ecclesia.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. iii. cap. xvi. Spiritus autem Sanctus, quòd in solâ Catholicâ permanens impositionem dari dicitur, nimirum hoc intelligi majores nostri voluerunt, quod Apostolus ait, “Quoniam caritas Dei diffusa est in cordibus nostris per Spiritum Sanctum, qui datus est nobis.” Ipsa enim est caritas, quam non habent qui ab Ecclesiæ Catholicæ communione præcisi sunt; ac per hoc etiam si linguis hominum loquantur et angelorum, si sciant omnia sacramenta et omnem scientiam, &c. nihil eis prodest. Non autem habent Dei charitatem, qui Ecclesiæ non diligunt unitatem; ac per hoc rectè intelligitur dici, non accipi nisi in Catholicâ Spiritus Sanctus. Neque enim temporalibus et sensibilibus miraculis attestantibus per manûs impositionem modò datur Spiritus Sanctus; sicut antea dabatur ad commendationem rudis fidei, et Ecclesiæ primordia dilatanda. Quis enim nunc hoc expectat, ut ii quibus manus ad accipiendum Spiritum Sanctum imponitur, repentè incipiant linguis loqui? Sed invisibiliter et latenter intelligitur per vinculum pacis eorum cordibus divina caritas inspirari, ut possint dicere, “Quoniam caritas, &c.”

Church in its infancy. For who now expects, that they, to whom imposition of hands is given to receive the Holy Spirit, should immediately begin to speak with new tongues? But the love of God is supposed to be inspired into their hearts invisibly and latently by the bond of peace so as they may truly say, ‘The<sup>r</sup> love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost that is given us.’ He gives the same answer to this pretended difficulty in another place.<sup>1</sup> “Hereby,” says he, “we know that He dwells in us, by the Spirit which He hath given us. If thou findest in thy heart the love of God, thou hast the Spirit to give thee knowledge. Which is a very necessary thing. In the first age the Holy Ghost fell on them that believed, and they spake with tongues, which they had never learned, as the Spirit gave them utterance. These were signs proper for that time; for then it was necessary that the Holy Ghost should be thus demonstrated in all kinds of tongues; because the Gospel was to run throughout the whole world in all sorts of languages. But this demonstration once made, it ceased: for does any man now expect to hear them speak with new tongues, who receive imposition of hands as a means to obtain the Holy Spirit? Or, when we laid hands on these infants, did any of you look when they should speak with tongues? And when they did not speak with tongues, was any one so perverse in

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. Tract. vi. in I Joan. iii. tom. ix. p. 254. In hoc cognoscimus quia manet in nobis, de Spiritu quem dedit nobis. Si enim inveneris te habere caritatem, habes Spiritum Dei ad intelligendum. Valde enim necessaria res, est. Primis temporibus cadebat super credentes Spiritus Sanctus, et loquebantur linguis quas non didicerant, quomodo Spiritus debet eis pronuciare. Signa erant tempori opportuna. Oportebat enim ita significari in omnibus linguis Spiritum Sanctum: quia Evangelium Dei per omnes linguis cursum erat toto orbe terrarum. Significatum est illud, et transiit. Nunquid modò quibus imponitur manus ad accipiendum Spiritum Sanctum, hoc exspectatur, ut linguis loquantur? Aut quando imposuimus manum istis infantibus, attendit unusquisque vestrum, utrum linguis loquerentur? Et cum videret eos linguis non loqui, ita perverso corde aliquis vestrum fuit, ut dicerit, Non acceperunt isti Spiritum Sanctum? nam si acceperissent, linguis loquerentur, quemadmodum tunc factum est. Si ergò per hæc miracula modò testimonium presentiae Spiritus Sancti non fit: unde cognoscit quisque acceperisse se Spiritum Sanctum? Interroget cor suum: si diligit fratrem manet Spiritus Dei in illo.

heart, as to say, they have not received the Holy Ghost? For if they had received it, they would have spoken with tongues, as was done heretofore. If, therefore, there be no such miracles now, to testify the presence of the Spirit: how knows any man that he has received the Holy Ghost? Let him ask his own heart: if he loves the brethren, the Spirit of God abideth in him." Thus St. Austin derives imposition of hands for conveying the Spirit from the practice of the Apostles, though there were very different effects then from what there are now. Though men had not the gift of tongues conferred upon them as in the days of the Apostles; yet they might have other graces, sufficient both to testify the presence of the Spirit, and to entitle the act of imposition of hands to the dignity of an apostolical institution. From whence also we may observe, that charity and unity, or stedfastness in the love of God and religion, was a particular grace of the Spirit given by imposition of hands: which because heretics could not have, who were baptised out of the Church, therefore they always received imposition of hands upon their return to the Church,<sup>1</sup> whether they had received it in pretence among their own party before or not. For some heretics gave imposition of hands together with baptism, and others did not: but both of them received imposition of hands again upon their return to the Catholic Church. There is one passage more, upon which some of the Ancients found this practice, which is Heb. vi. 2., where the Apostle joins imposition of hands with baptism. Upon which the author under the name of St. Ambrose notes,<sup>2</sup> "that it means that imposition of hands, which is supposed to confer the Holy Ghost, which is ordinarily given by the chief priests or bishops after baptism, for the confirmation of men in the unity of the Church of Christ." Which exposition is re-

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. v. cap. xxiii. Propter charitatis copulationem, quod est maximum donum Spiritus Sancti, sine quo non valeant quæcunque alia sancta in homine fuerint, manus correctis hæreticis imponitur.

<sup>2</sup> Ambros. in Heb. vi. 2. Impositionis manuum per quam Spiritus Sanctus accipi posse creditur: quod post baptismum ad confirmationem unitatis in Ecclesia Christi à pontificibus fieri solet.

peated by Haymo,<sup>1</sup> and some later writers, and allowed as probable by Grotius and Calvin. There is one writer more, who seems to derive it from the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles at the day of Pentecost. He goes under the name of Eusebius Emissenus; but learned men suppose him to be Eucherius of Lyons, or Hilary of Arles, or some other writer about the time of Pope Leo, in the middle of the fifth century. Whoever he was, the account he gives of confirmation is very particular and instructive, and therefore the whole passage may be worth translating. "That, which imposition of hands," says he,<sup>2</sup> "now gives to every one in confirming neophytes, the same did the descent of the the Holy Ghost then confer on all believers. But because we have said, that imposition of hands and confirmation confers something on him that is born again and regenerated in Christ; perhaps some one will be ready to think with himself, and say, what can the ministry of confirmation profit me after the mystery of baptism? if after the font we want the addition of a new office, then we have not received all that was necessary from the font. It is not so, beloved. For, if you observe, in the military life when the emperor has chosen any one to be a soldier, he does not only set his mark or character upon him, but furnishes him with competent arms for fighting; so it is in a baptised person, the benediction is his armour. Thou hast made him a soldier, give him also the weapons of warfare. What doth it profit, though a father confer a great estate upon his child, if he do not also provide him a tutor? Now the Holy Ghost is the keeper, and comforter, and tutor to those who are regenerated in Christ. As the Scripture saith, 'Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.' Therefore the Holy Ghost, which descends with his saving presence on the waters of baptism, there gives us the plentitude of perfection to make us innocent; but in confirmation, He gives us an augmentation of grace. Because in this world we are to live all our lives among invisible enemies, and to walk in the midst of dangers; in baptism we are born again to life, but after baptism we are confirmed to fight; in baptism we are washed, but

<sup>1</sup> Haymo in Heb. vi. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Euseb. Emissen. Hom. de Pentecost.



after baptism we are strengthened, and so the benefits of regeneration are sufficient for those who presently leave this world; but to them who are to live in it, the auxiliary aids of the confirmation are also necessary. Regeneration by itself alone saves those, who are presently received in peace into a better world; but confirmation arms and prepares those, who are reserved to fight the battles and combats of this world. He that after baptism goes immaculate, with the innocence which he has acquired, to death, is confirmed by death; because he cannot sin after death. If here we shall ask, what advantage the Apostles had by the coming of the Holy Spirit after the passion and resurrection of Christ? the Lord himself evidently shews us, saying, 'I have many things to say unto you, but ye cannot bear them now: howbeit, when He, the Spirit of Truth is come, He will guide you into all truth.' You see, when the Holy Ghost is given, the heart of a believer is dilated and enlarged with prudence and constancy. Before the descent of the Holy Ghost, the Apostles were terrified even to the denial of Christ; but after his visitation they were armed with a contempt of death, even to suffer martyrdom for his sake. Thus it is that we have redemption by Christ, but the Holy Ghost gives us the gift of spiritual wisdom, by which we are illuminated, edified, instructed, and consummated to perfection." This is the account which the Ancients generally give of the original of imposition of hands: which ceremony is now wholly laid aside and disused in the Roman Church, though they pretend to make another sacrament of confirmation. But this only by the way.

SECT. 7.—What Opinion the Ancients had of the Necessity of Confirmation.

From the account given by this author, we clearly learn, what the Ancients supposed confirmation superadded to the benefit of regeneration. The new-birth gave innocence and pardon of sins; but the invocation of the Spirit added wisdom and strength to preserve and establish men in innocence to perfection. He also shews us, what opinion the Ancients had of the necessity of confirmation. It was not absolutely the same as that of baptism. For if men died

immediately after baptism, without imposition of hands, they were saved by their innocence which they had acquired in baptism: they needed no other confirmation but death, which was a security against all other dangers. Confirmation was only necessary to those, who were to live and fight with the world and invisible powers. And this is the sense of all other writers, who speak the highest of the necessity of the confirmation. The Council of Eliberis having said,<sup>1</sup> “ that it was necessary for the bishop to consummate those by his benediction, who were baptised by deacons ;” adds, “ yet if any one die before this can be done, he is justified by the faith which he professed in baptism.” And so the author of the Apostolical Constitutions says,<sup>2</sup> “ If there be neither oil nor chrism, the water alone is sufficient both for the unction of the Holy Ghost, and the seal of the covenant.” By which we are to mollify that other harsh expression of his in another place,<sup>3</sup> where he says, “ that baptism without this imposition of hands, and prayer of the priest, is only a bodily washing, like that of the Jews, purging the filth of the body, but not of the soul.” For unless some very candid interpretation be put upon this expression, it will be highly injurious and derogatory to the saving power of baptism, which purges away sin by a spiritual regeneration. And therefore it is but reasonable to let the harsh expressions of this author be interpreted by himself, when he owns that the water of baptism is sufficient to answer all the ends of chrism or confirmation, where that is omitted not by any contempt, but for want of opportunity to receive it. And this is plainly St. Jerom’s meaning, when he says<sup>4</sup>, “ that though the practice

<sup>1</sup> Con. Eliber. can. lxxvii. Si quis diaconus regens plebem, sine episcopo vel presbytero, aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debet. Quod si antè de seculo recesserint, sub fide, quâ quis crediderit, poterit esse justus.

<sup>2</sup> Const. Apost. lib. vii. c. xxii.

Εἰ δὲ μήτε ἔλαιον ἢ, μήτε μύρον, ἀρκεῖ ὕδωρ, καὶ πρὸς χρίσιν καὶ σφραγίδα.

<sup>3</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. c. 44.

<sup>4</sup> Hieron. cont. Lucifer. c. iv. Quòd si obloqueris, Quarè in Ecclesiâ baptizatus, nisi per manus episcopi non accipiat Spiritum Sanctum, quem nos asserimus in vero baptismate tribui? disce hanc observationem ex eâ auctoritate descendere, quòd post ascensum Domini Spiritus Sanctus descendit. Multis in locis id tamen esse factum reperimus ad honorem potius sacerdotii, quàm ad legis necessitatem. Alioquin si episcopi tantùm imprecatione Spiritus Sanctus defluit, lugendi sunt

of imposition of hands descends from the Acts of the Apostles; yet in many places it was observed rather for the honour of the chief priesthood, than for any absolute necessity of the thing. For otherwise, if the Spirit was only obtained by the prayer of the bishop, those men must be in a deplorable condition, that were baptised in villages and castles and remote places by presbyters and deacons, and died before the bishop could come to visit them." All therefore that was necessary to salvation, was conferred in baptism, which ministered such a portion of the Spirit, as was sufficient to cleanse men from sin, and qualify them for eternal life. So that when some of the Ancients say, "That baptism does not minister the Spirit, which was only given by imposition of hands in confirmation," as Cornelius pleads in his letter against Novatian;<sup>1</sup> and Tertullian,<sup>2</sup> who says, "that we do not obtain the Holy Ghost in baptism, but are only cleansed in the water, and prepared for the Holy Ghost;" they are to be understood, as meaning only that the Holy Ghost is not given in that full measure at baptism, as afterward by imposition of hands. They do not deny, that baptism grants men remission of sins by the power of the Holy Ghost; but only, that there are some further effects and operations of the Holy Spirit, which are not ordinarily conferred on men but by the subsequent invocation of the Spirit, the increase of which men were to desire, and to receive imposition of hands in order to obtain it. In which sense it is said in the Gospel, "that the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because the Apostles had not yet received that plentiful effusion of it in the gift of tongues, which they afterwards had on the day of Pentecost," though they had before received such a measure of it, as both enabled them to work several sorts of miracles, and also qualified them in every respect for the kingdom of Heaven.

---

qui in Villulis aut in castellis aut in remotioribus locis per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati ante dormierunt, quàm ab episcopis inviserentur.

<sup>1</sup> Ap. Euseb. lib. vi. cap. xliiii. Τὸ τὸ μὴ τυχῶν, πῶς ἀν τῷ Ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι ἐτυχε.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. cap. vi. Non quòd in aquâ Spiritum Sanctum consequamur, sed in aquâ emundati, sub angelo Spiritui Sancto præparamur.

SECT. 8.—How they punished those that neglected it.

But though the Ancients did not think this imposition of hands so absolutely necessary, as that the want of it should exclude those, who were baptised, from the kingdom of Heaven: yet they thought fit to punish the neglect of it, by setting some marks of disgrace and public censure upon such, as voluntarily and carelessly omitted it, when they had opportunity to receive it. Such men were ordinarily denied the privilege of ecclesiastical promotion and holy orders. As appears from the objection made against Novatian, “that he ought not to be ordained, because being baptised privately with clinic baptism, he had afterward neglected to receive his consummation from the hands of the bishop, which he ought to have done by the laws of the Church,<sup>1</sup>” and to this purpose the Council of Neo-Cæsarea<sup>2</sup> has a canon, forbidding such to be ordained; which is made part of the code of the Universal Church. The Council of Eliberis also<sup>3</sup> excludes such, as have not “*Lavacrum integrum*,” their own baptism completed by imposition of hands, from the privilege of giving baptism to others, which in cases of necessity they allowed to all other laymen. So far they thought fit to discountenance the contempt and neglect of confirmation, though they neither esteemed it a distinct sacrament from baptism, nor of absolute necessity to salvation, but only as a proper means to strengthen men in their Christian warfare.

#### CHAP. IV.

##### *Of the remaining Ceremonies of Baptism following Confirmation.*

SECT. 1.—Persons newly baptised, clothed in White Garments.

MUCH about the same time as the unction of confirmation was administered to persons newly baptised, they were also

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43.  
<sup>3</sup> Con. Eliber. can. 38.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Neo Cæsar. can. 12.

clothed in white garments. In the Latin Church it came immediately before confirmation; but in the Greek Church it seems to have followed after. For Cyril of Jerusalem speaks of it as following the unction.<sup>1</sup> This was to represent their having “put off the old man with his deeds, and having put on the new man Christ Jesus.” Hence they were called *Λευχειμονῶντες*, et *Grex Christi Candidus et niveus*, the *white flock of Christ*,<sup>2</sup> as we find in Lactantius and many others. Palladius, in the Life of St. Chrysostom,<sup>3</sup> notes it particularly, as a great piece of barbarity in Arcadius, that, when St. Chrysostom’s presbyters in his exile had baptised three thousand persons at one festival, the Emperor sent his soldiers to disperse them, as they were *λευχειμονῶντες*, *clothed in their white garments*. This was otherwise called, the garment of Christ, and the mystical garment. For so Socrates<sup>4</sup> and Sozomen<sup>5</sup> speaking of the ordination of Nectarius, bishop of Constantinople, which was immediately given him after his baptism, say, “He was ordained whilst he had his mystical garment on,” meaning this white robe, which had just before been given him at his baptism. St. Jerom also,<sup>6</sup> writing to Fabiola, seems to allude to this, when he says, “We are to be washed with the precepts of God, and when we are prepared for the garment of Christ, putting off our coats of skins, we shall put on the linen garment, that hath nothing of death in it, but is all white, that rising out of the waters of baptism, we may gird about our loins with truth, and cover the former filthiness of our

<sup>1</sup> Cyril. Catech. Myst. iv. n. 2. Ἐνδυσάμενος τὰ πνευματικά λευκά, *chrē leuχειμονεῖν διαπαντός*, &c.      <sup>2</sup> Lactant. Carmen de Resur. Dom.

Fulgentes animas vestis quoque candida signat,  
Et grege de niveo gaudia pastor habet.

—Moschus Prat. Spir. cap. ccvii. Ἰδόντες αὐτήν λευκοφορῆσαι, &c. Paulin. Ep. 12. ad Sever. p. 145.

Unde parens sacro ducit de fonte sacerdos  
Infantes niveos corpore, corde, habitu.

<sup>3</sup> Pallad. Vit. Chrysost. cap. ix.

<sup>4</sup> Socrat. lib. v. cap. viii.

<sup>5</sup> Sozom. lib. vii. cap. viii. Τὴν μυσικὴν ἐσθήτα ἐτι ἡμφιεσμένος, &c.

<sup>6</sup> Hieron. Ep. ccxviii. ad Fabiol. Præceptis Dei lavandi sumus, et cum parati ad indumentum Christi, tunicas pelliceas deposuerimus, tunc induemur veste lineâ, nihil in se mortis habente, sed totâ candidâ, ut de baptismo consurgentes, cingamus lumbos in veritate, &c.

breasts." Some also allege two other passages in his Epistles to Pope Damasus,<sup>1</sup> where he speaks of "his having put on the garment of Christ at Rome." But others who have more exactly<sup>2</sup> considered the time of St. Jerom's baptism, and the same phrase as used by him in other places, more probably conclude, that he means the monastic habit, which he elsewhere calls the garment of Christ,<sup>3</sup> and not the *Albes* of baptism. However, not insisting on those dubious passages of St. Jerom, the ancient custom is sufficiently attested from other authors.

SECT. 2.—These sometimes delivered to them with a solemn Form of Words.

Some of which also tell us, that these garments were wont to be delivered to the neophytes with a solemn form of words, in the nature of a charge: such as that in Gregory's Sacramentarium,<sup>4</sup> "Receive the white and immaculate garment, which thou mayest bring forth without spot before the tribunal of our Lord Jesus Christ, that thou mayest have eternal life. Amen."

SECT. 3.—Worn eight Days, and then laid up in the Church.

These garments were commonly worn eight days, and then laid up in the church. St. Austin, or some one under his name,<sup>5</sup> speaks of the Sunday after Easter, as the time

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. Ep. lvii. ad Damas. Cathedram Petri, et fidem apostolico ore laudatam censui consulendam; inde meæ animæ postulans cibum, unde olim Christi vestimenta suscepi. It. Ep. lxxviii. ad Damasum. Christi vestem in Romanâ Urbe suscipiens, nunc barbaro Syriæ limite teneor.

<sup>2</sup> See Wall of Infant-Baptism, Par. ii. chap. iii. sect. 10.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron. Ep. xxii. ad Eustoch. et Ep. xxvii. Epitaph. Paulæ.

<sup>4</sup> Gregor. Sacrament. de Bapt. Infant. Vestitur infans, dicente presbytero; "Accipe vestem candidam et immaculatam, quam perferas sine maculâ ante tribunal domini nostri Jesu Christi, ut habeas vitam æternam. Amen." Ordo Roman. de S. Sabbato. Bibl. Patr. Tom. x. p. 83. Deportantur ipsi infantes ante eum, et dat singulis stolam candidam et decem siliquas et chrismale, dicens, "Accipe vestem candidam, &c."

<sup>5</sup> Aug. Hom. lxxxvi. de Diversis, in Octavis Paschæ, tom. x. p. 709. Paschalis solennitas hodiernâ festivitate concluditur, et ideo hodie neophytorum habitus commutatur; ita tamen, ut candor, qui de habitu deponitur, semper in corde teneatur.

appointed for this purpose. That was the conclusion of the Paschal Festival, and then the neophytes changed their habit; whence that day is thought to have the name of *Dominica in Albis*; and *White Sunday* is said to be so called from this custom of wearing white robes after baptism. These being laid aside, were carefully preserved in the vestries of the church, as an evidence against men, if afterward they violated those professions which they had made in baptism. A remarkable instance of which we have, related in Victor Uticensis, concerning one Elpidiphorus, a citizen of Carthage, who having a long time lived in the communion of the Church at last turned Arian, and became a bitter enemy to the Orthodox in the Vandalic persecution. Among others, whom he summoned before him as their judge, was one Muritta, a deacon, who had been sponsor for him at his baptism. He being ready to be put upon the rack, produced against him those white robes, with which he had been clothed at his baptism; and with words melting all the whole city into tears, he thus bespoke him:<sup>1</sup> “ These are the garments, O Elpidiphorus, thou minister of error, which shall accuse thee, when the majesty of the great judge shall appear; these I will diligently keep as a testimony of thy ruin, which shall depress thee to the bottom of the lake that burns with fire and brimstone. These are they, that were girt about thee, when thou camest immaculate out of the holy font; these are they that shall bitterly pursue thee, when thou shalt begin to take thy portion in the flames of Hell; because thou hast clothed thyself with cursing as with a garment, and hast cast off the sacred obligation of thy baptism, and the true faith which thou didst then profess and take upon thee.” So that the design of this significant ceremony was first to represent that innocence and angelical purity, which every man obtained by the remission of his sins in baptism, and then

---

<sup>1</sup> Victor. de Persec. Vandal. lib. iii. Bibl. Patr. tom. vii. p. 613. Hæc sunt linteamina, Elpidiphore, minister erroris, quæ te accusabunt, dum majestas venerit judicantis, custodiente diligentia meâ ad testimonium tuæ perditionis, ad demergendum te in abyssu putei sulphurantis. Hæc te immaculatum cinxerant de fonte surgentium; hæc te acriter persequetur, flammantem Gehennam cum corporis possidere, &c.

to remind them of the obligations and professions they had entered into, which if they violated, would rise up as so many accusers at the Day of Judgment.

SECT. 4.—The Ceremony of Lights and Tapers. What intended by it. And at whose Charge both these were provided.

To this ceremony of wearing white robes, they added another of the like nature, which was the carrying of lighted tapers in their hands. I cannot say this was so universal a practice as the former, but it is mentioned by Gregory Nazianzen among other ceremonies following baptism. “The station,” says he,<sup>1</sup> “when immediately after baptism thou shalt be placed before the altar, is an emblem of the glory of the life to come; the psalmody with which thou shalt be received, is a foretaste of those hymns and songs of a better life; and the lamps, which thou shalt light, are a figure of those lamps of faith, wherewith bright and virgin souls shall go forth to meet the bridegroom.” Others refer it to another reason, that it might be a symbol of their own present illumination, and as done in allusion to that saying of our Saviour, “So let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in Heaven.” In some baptisms also of great men, we find these ceremonies enlarged and set off with greater pomp; for not only they themselves, but all their retinue and attendance were clothed in white garments, and all carried lamps in their hands. As it was in the magnificent baptism of the younger Theodosius, related in an Epistle of Marcus Gazenzius published by Baronius;<sup>2</sup> where he says; “The procession from the church to the palace was extremely splendid: for the leaders of the people were all clothed in white, which made the company look as if it

<sup>1</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 672.

<sup>2</sup> Ap. Baron. an 401. tom. v. p. 134. Baptizato Juniori Theodosio, et ab ecclesiâ egresso in palatium, licebat rursus intueri decorem eorum qui præerant multitudini, et vestem eorum refulgentem. Erant enim omnes candidati, ut existimaretur multitudo esse nive repleta. Præcedebant, autem patricii, illustres, et omnis dignitas cum ordinibus militaribus, omnes portantes cereos, ut putarentur astra cerni in terrâ.



had been covered with snow: and all the senators, and men of quality, and soldiers in their ranks carried lamps in their hands, that one would have thought the stars had appeared upon earth." The expense of these things, especially when so very sumptuous and magnificent, we may reasonably suppose, was defrayed by every person at his own proper cost and charge. And so the objection, which some make in Gregory Nazianzen against Baptism, upon the account of the charge attending it, plainly intimates. For they thus object against it: "Where is the gift that I shall offer at baptism? where is the garment of light in which I must shine? where-withal shall I entertain my baptisers?" To which Nazianzen replies, "That in great things men should not be concerned about such small matters as these. For the sacrament itself was far above these visible objects. Therefore offer thyself for a gift, put on Christ for a garment, and let thy entertainment of me the minister, be an holy conversation. God requires no great thing of us, which the poor cannot give." From whence we may conclude, that either these ceremonies were omitted in the baptism of poor men, or else the Church herself was at the charge of them. Which some think may be inferred from the donations of Constantine made to the baptisteries of Rome, mentioned in the Pontifical in the Life of Pope Sylvester; but it may more certainly be proved from the Epistles of Pope Gregory,<sup>2</sup> where he often mentions his giving these garments to the poor, who could not provide them for themselves.

SECT. 5.—The Kiss of Peace given to Persons newly baptised.

Another ceremony used to congratulate such as were newly baptised, upon their admission and incorporation into the Church, was the kiss of peace. Which was observed even towards infants, as we learn from that objection raised against it in Cyprian: where the opponents pleaded

<sup>1</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt. p. 655. Πᾶ δὲ ἐμφώτειος ἐσθίης ἢ λαπρυνθήσομαι, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Greg. lib. vii. Ep. xxiv. ad Faustin. Quoscumque ex iis pauperes, et ad vestem sibi emendam non sufficere posse cognoscis: te eis restem quam ad baptismum habeant, comparare volumus ac præbere. Vid. lib. iv. Ep. xvi.

for deferring baptism till the child was eight days old, because children at their birth were unclean, and every one abhorred to kiss them, as was necessary to be done after baptism, to testify their right of fraternity upon their adoption into God's family. To which Cyprian replied,<sup>1</sup> "That this was no impediment to their baptism; for all things were clean to them that were clean. No one ought to abhor that which God had vouchsafed to make. For though an infant was but just born, yet he was then in such a condition, as no one ought to abhor in giving him the grace of baptism, or imparting to him the kiss of peace." This custom is also mentioned by St. Austin,<sup>2</sup> and it seems to be founded upon that Apostolical rule, observed in the eucharist and other holy offices, of saluting one another with an holy kiss, in token of their most cordial affection, and acknowledging one another as brethren. St. Chrysostom gives another reason why it was called, the peace, or the kiss of peace, because men were now reconciled to God by baptism, and restored to His peace and favour. For elegantly comparing the two nativities of man together, the natural and the spiritual, he says,<sup>3</sup> "The first birth is always attended with tears and lamentations, nature as it were presaging the subsequent sorrows and miseries of life: but in the second birth it is otherwise; here are no tears or mournings, but salutations, and kisses, and embracings of the brethren, who acknowledge the person baptised as one of their own members, and receive him as one returning from a long peregrination out of his own country. For because before his baptism he was an enemy, but after baptism is made a friend of our common Lord, we therefore all

<sup>1</sup> Cyp. Ep. lix. al. lxiv. ad Fidum, p. 160. Nam et quòd vestigium infantis in primis partùs sui diebus constitutù, mundum non esse dixisti, quod nusquam nostràm adhuc horreat exosculari; nec hoc putamus ad cœlestem gratiam dandam impedimento esse oportere: scriptum est enim, omnia munda sunt mundis. Nec aliquis nostràm id debet horrere, quod Deus dignatus est facere. Nam etsi adhuc infans à partu novus est, non ita est tamen, ut quisquam illum in gratiâ dandâ atque in pace faciendâ exosculari horrere debeat, &c. <sup>2</sup> Aug. cont. Epist. Pelag. lib. iv. cap. viii.

<sup>3</sup> Chrys. Serm. 1. de Util. Legendæ Scripturæ, tom. v. p. 656. Διὰ τῆτο δὲ τὸ φίλημα εἰρήνη καλεῖται, ἵνα μάθωμεν ὅτι πόλεμον κατέλυσεν ὁ θεός, καὶ πρὸς τὴν οἰκίωσιν ἐπαρήγαγε τὴν εἰρήνην.

rejoice with him: and upon this account the kiss has the name of peace, that we may learn thereby that God has ended the war, and received us into familiarity and friendship with himself." Hence it is, that to give the peace to any one, is the same thing many times in the writings of the Ancients, as to salute him with the holy kiss, in the phrase of the Apostle.

SECT. 6.—And a Taste of Honey and Milk, in Token of their new Birth.

They were used also to give to the newly baptised a little taste of honey and milk: which Salmasius<sup>1</sup> and some others suppose to be given them instead of the eucharist: but that is a mistake, for the eucharist was given them at the same time: the Ancients themselves give another reason for it. St. Jerom<sup>2</sup> and Tertullian<sup>3</sup> say it was to signify their new birth, and that they were now as children adopted into God's family. Tertullian says moreover,<sup>4</sup> that the Marcionites retained the custom for the same reason, as they did many other usages of the Church. St. Jerom says further,<sup>5</sup> that in some of the Western Churches the mixture was made up of milk and wine instead of honey, and this in allusion to those passages of the Apostle, "I have fed you with milk, and not with strong meat." And St. Peter's saying, "As new-born babes desire the sincere milk of the word." For milk denotes the innocency of children. Clemens Alexandrinus also takes notice of this custom, saying,<sup>6</sup> "As soon as we are born we are nourished with milk, which is the nutriment of the Lord. And when we are born again,

<sup>1</sup> Salmas. ap. Suicer. Thesaur. <sup>2</sup> Hieron. Cont. Lucif. cap. iv. Deinde egressos lactis et mellis prægustare concordiam ad infantiaë significationem.

<sup>3</sup> Tertul. de Coron. Mil. c. iii. Inde suscepti lactis et mellis prægustamus concordiam.

<sup>4</sup> It. Cont. Marcion. lib. i. cap. xiv. Sed et ille usque nec aquam reprobavit Creatoris, quâ suos abluit, nec oleum, quo suos unxit, nec mellis et lactis societatem, quâ suos infantat, nec panem, quo ipsum corpus suum representat.

<sup>5</sup> Hieron. in Esai, lv. 1. Lac significat innocentiam parvulorum. Qui mos ac typus in occidentis Ecclesiis hodiè usque servatur, ut renatis in Christo vinum lacque tribuatur. De quo lacte dicebat et Paulus, "Lac vobis potum dedi, non solidum cibum." Et Peirus, "Quasi modo nati parvuli rationale lac desiderate."

<sup>6</sup> Clem. Alex. Pædagog. lib. i. cap. vi. p. 103.

we are honoured with the hope of rest by the promise of Jerusalem which is above, where it is said to rain milk and honey. For by these material things we are assured of that sacred food." We learn further from the third Council of Carthage,<sup>1</sup> that this milk and honey had a peculiar consecration distinct from that of the eucharist. It is there said, "to be offered at the altar on a day most solemn, (which means the great Sabbath, or Saturday before Easter, which was the most solemn time of baptism,) and there to have its proper benediction for the mystery of infants, that is, persons who are newly baptised, who are commonly called infants in the mystical sense, that it might be distinguished from the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ." This part of the canon indeed is omitted in some Collections, but Labbee says it was in the ancient manuscripts, and it is now so read in the body of the African Code,<sup>2</sup> which puts the matter beyond all dispute. I have given this canon with a little explanatory paraphrase, because some learned men complain of the obscurity of it, and profess themselves to be in the dark about the mystery of infants, which seems to me evidently to refer to this custom of giving milk and honey to the newly baptised.

SECT. 7.—Then required to say the Lord's Prayer.

When persons were thus adopted into God's family, and acknowledged as brethren in Christ, then they were admitted as sons to call upon God their Father, and immediately required to do it in the form of words taught us by Christ. The author of the Constitutions<sup>3</sup> bids them repeat the Lord's Prayer standing upright, because they were now risen with Christ from the dead: and after that repeat this other short form: "Almighty God, the Father of Christ, thy only-begotten Son, give me an immaculate body, a pure heart, a watchful soul, an unerring knowledge, with

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carth. iii. Can. xxiv. Primitiæ verò, seu mel et lac, quod uno die sollempnissimo pro infantis mysterio solet offerri, quamvis in altari offeratur, suam tamen habet propriam benedictionem, ut à sacramento Dominici corporis aut sanguinis distinguatur.

<sup>2</sup> Codex Eccles. Afric. Can. 37. ap. Justellum.

<sup>3</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. vii. cap. 44 et 45.

the influence of the Holy Ghost, that I may possess and enjoy the fulness of the truth, through thy Christ, by whom all glory be to thee in the Holy Ghost for ever. Amen." St. Chrysostom<sup>1</sup> also mentions their repeating the Lord's Prayer presently after their coming up out of the water; and that standing also, not falling upon their faces, but looking up to Christ, to whose body they are united, as he sits above in Heaven, where Satan has no access. And this was the first time they were allowed to use this prayer. For till men were baptised, and made sons of God by regeneration, they were not allowed to call God their Father. And though they learned the Lord's Prayer before baptism, yet they were not permitted till after baptism to use it as a prayer publicly in the Church.

SECT. 8.—Received with Psalmody.

Among other ceremonies after baptism, Gregory Nazianzen mentions their reception with psalmody,<sup>2</sup> which he says, was a *præludium* or foretaste of those hymns and praises which should be the employment of the life to come. But whether this means any particular psalms appointed to be sung at baptism, or the common psalmody of the Church he does not inform us. If I may be allowed to conjecture, I should conclude for the former, because the common psalmody of the Church was no more than what Catechumens were allowed to hear before, as being part of the *Missa Catechumenorum*, or first service, at which not only catechumens, but professed Jews and Heathens might be present. Perhaps they sung the *cxviii*th psalm, in which are these words, "This is the day which the Lord hath made, we will rejoice and be glad in it," because St. Austin speaking of the Easter festival seems to refer to it, saying,<sup>3</sup> "This is the day which the Lord hath made, higher than all, brighter than all, in which he hath acquired to himself a new people by the

<sup>1</sup> Chrys. Hom. vi. in Colos. p. 1359.

<sup>2</sup> Naz. Orat. xl. de Bapt.

p. 672. <sup>3</sup> Aug. Serm. 163. de Tempore, tom. x. p. 332. *Hic est dies, dilectissimi, quem fecit Dominus, celsior cunctis, lucidior universis, in quo sibi novam plebem, ut videtis, regenerationis Spiritu conquisivit. &c.*

spirit of regeneration, and hath filled our minds with joy and gladness." And Paulinus<sup>1</sup> speaks of singing Hallelujahs upon this occasion. But in doubtful matters I will not be over positive to determine.

SECT. 9.—And admitted immediately to the Communion of the Altar.

It is more certain, that as soon as the ceremonies of baptism were finished, men were admitted to a participation of the eucharist. For this was τὸ τέλειον, *the perfection*, or *consummation* of a Christian, to which he was entitled by virtue of his baptism. Therefore all the ancient writers speak of this as the concluding privilege of baptism, which in those days was always immediately subjoined to it. And this was observed, not only with respect to adult persons, but children also. For proof of which custom at present it will be sufficient to allege the testimony of Gennadius,<sup>2</sup> who joins the baptism of infants, and confirmation, and the eucharist all together. And this continued to the Ninth Century, as appears from the Rituals of the age, some of which have been produced before,<sup>3</sup> and many others might be added; but these belong to another place, where it will be more proper to treat of the communion of infants among other things, that relate to the subject of the eucharist, which together with the ancient psalmody, reading the Scriptures, preaching and prayers, which make up the whole ordinary service of the Church, under the name of Missa Catechumenorum, and Missa Fidelium, will be the subject of the next volume, which is intended to give an account of the Liturgy of the Church.

SECT. 10.—Of the Ceremony of Washing the Feet, retained in some Churches.

There was one ceremony more, used in some Churches, but rejected by others, which it will not be improper to give

<sup>1</sup> Paulin. Ep. 12. ad Fever. p. 145.

Hinc senior sociæ congaudet turba catervæ,

Alleluia novis balat ovile choris.

<sup>2</sup> Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm. cap. 52. Si parvuli sint, qui doctrinam non capiunt, respondeant pro illis qui eos offerunt, juxta morem baptizandi: et sic manûs impositione et chrismate communiti, eucharistæ mysteriis admittantur.

<sup>3</sup> Book xii. chap. i. n. 2.

some account of here in the close. That was the custom of washing the feet of the baptised. Vicecomes thinks,<sup>1</sup> at first it was a ceremony preceding baptism, and used on Maundy-Thursday, or the same day that our Saviour, from whose example it was taken, washed his disciples' feet. And this seems to be clear, he says, from St. Austin's words, who has occasion to mention it in two of his Epistles. But in the former Epistle,<sup>2</sup> St. Austin is speaking of the custom of bathing the whole body before Easter, that the catechumens, who had neglected themselves in the observation of Lent, might not appear offensive, when they came to be baptised: therefore Maundy-Thursday was chosen as the day to cleanse themselves by bathing from the bodily filth, which they had contracted. And because this was allowed to the catechumens, many others chose to bathe themselves with them on that day also, and relax their fast, because fasting and bathing would not agree together. So that this washing was not the washing of the feet, however Vicecomes came to mistake it, but the bathing of the whole body; and not used as a religious ceremony, but as a ceremony of convenience and civil decency, that they might not be offensive to the senses of others, when they came to baptism. In the other Epistle he speaks particularly of washing the feet, but that was after baptism, on the third day or the octaves, or such other time as those Churches which retained the ceremony, thought fit to appoint it. For many Churches,<sup>3</sup> he says,

<sup>1</sup> Vicecom. de Ritib. Bapt. lib. iii. cap. 20.      <sup>2</sup> Aug. Ep. 118 ad Januarium, p. 213. Si autem quæris, cur etiam lavandi mos ortus sit: nihil mihi de hâc re cogitanti probabilius occurrit, nisi quia baptizandorum corpora per observationem Quadragesimæ sordidata, cum offensione sensûs ad fontem tractarentur, nisi aliquâ die lavarentur. Istum autem diem potius ad hoc electum, quo cœua Domini anniversariè celebratur. Et quia concessum est hoc baptismum accepturis, multi cum his lavare voluerunt, jejuniisque relaxare.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. Ep. exix. ad Januar. cap. xviii. De lavandis verò pedibus, cum dominus hoc propter formam humilitatis, propter quam docendam venerat, commendaret, sicut ipse consequenter exposuit, quæsitum est, quonam tempore potissimàm res tanta etiam facto doceretur, et in illud tempus occurrit, quo ipsa commendatio religiosius inhæreret. Sed ne ad ipsum sacramentum baptismi videretur pertinere, multi hoc in consuetudinem recipere noluerunt. Nonnulli etiam de consuetudine auferre non dubitarunt. Aliquî autem, ut hoc sacratiore tempore commendarent,

would never admit of this custom at all, lest it should seem to belong to the sacrament of baptism, when our Saviour only intended it as a lesson of humility. And other Churches for the same reason abrogated the custom, where it had been received. And others, who retained it, that they might recommend it by fixing it to some more sacred time, and yet distinguish it from the sacrament of baptism, chose either the third day of the Octaves, or the Octave after baptism itself, as most convenient for this purpose. Among the Churches, which wholly refused, or abrogated this custom, the Spanish Church is one, which in the Council of Eliberis made a canon against it; forbidding at once, the exacting any gift or reward for administering baptism, lest the priest should seem to sell what he freely received; (of which I have given a full account,<sup>1</sup> in speaking of the revenues of the Church;) and also forbidding the priests,<sup>2</sup> or any other of the clergy, to wash the feet of such as were baptised. Among those Churches which never received this custom, we may reckon the Roman Church; and among those which always received it, the Church of Milan, whose practice is opposed to the Roman by St. Ambrose, or whoever was the author of the Book “De sacramentis, et de iis qui mysteriis initiantur,” among his works. He says,<sup>3</sup> in the Church of Milan, the bishop

---

et à baptismi sacramento distinguerent vel diem tertium octavarum, quia ternarius numerus in multis sacramentis maxime excellit, vel etiam ipsum octavum, ut hoc facerent, elegerunt.

<sup>1</sup> Book v. chap. iv. s. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Eliber. can. 48. Emendari

placuit, ut hi qui baptizantur (ut fieri solet) nummos in concham non mitant, ne sacerdos, quod gratis accepit, pretio distrahere videatur. Neque pedes eorum lavandi sunt à sacerdotibus vel clericis.

<sup>3</sup> Ambros.

de Sacram. lib. iii. cap. i. Succinctus summus sacerdos pedes tibi lavit.— Non ignoramus quòd Ecclesia Romana hanc consuetudinem non habeat, cujus typum in omnibus sequimur et formam: hanc tamen consuetudinem non habet, ut pedes lavet. Vide ergò ne propter multitudinem declinarit. Sunt tamen qui dicant, et excusare conentur, quia hoc non mysterio faciendum est, non in baptisate, non in regeneratione: sed quasi hospiti pedes lavandi sunt. Aliud est humilitatis, aliud sanctificationis. Dénique audi, quia mysterium est, et sanctificatio. “Nisi laverò tibi pedes, nõn habebes mecum partem.” Hoc ideo dico, non quòd alios reprehendam, sed mea officia ipse commendem. In omnibus cupio sequi Ecclesiam Romanam, sed tamen et nos homines sensum habemus. Ideò quod alibi rectiùs servatur, et nos rectè custodimus.



was used to wash the feet of the baptised. But the Roman Church had not this custom: and he thinks, they might decline it, because of the multitude of those that were baptised. But they of the Roman Church pleaded, "that it was not to be done by way of mystery in baptism or regeneration, but only by way of humility, as the custom of washing the feet of strangers." But on the contrary, the Church of Milan pleaded, "that this was not merely a business of humility, but of mystery and sanctification, because Christ said to Peter, except I wash thy feet, thou hast no part with me." "This I urge," says our author, "not to reprehend others, but to commend my own office. For though we desire to follow the Roman Church, yet we are men that have our senses about us. And therefore we observe that practice which we conceive to be righter in other churches." He adds further,<sup>1</sup> "that this was not done to obtain remission of sins, for that was already done in baptism: but because Adam was supplanted by the devil, and the serpent's poison was cast upon his feet, therefore men were washed in that part for greater sanctification, that he might have no power to supplant them any further." These were the reasons given by the Church of Milan, for their adhering to this practice: but they were not so strong as to prevail with others, and so this custom never got any great footing in the Christian Church.

SECT. 11.—A General Reflection upon the whole preceding Discourse, with Relation to the Practice of the present Church.

I have now gone over the most material ceremonies and usages of the Church observed about the administration of baptism, as well those that went before, as those that accompanied the action itself, and those that followed after; and, as near as I could, delivered them in the same order and manner as she herself observed

---

<sup>1</sup> Ibid. in *Baptismate omnis culpa diluitur. Recedit ergò culpa; sed quia Adam supplantatus à Diabolo est, et venenum ei suffusum est supra pedes, ideo lavas pedes ut in eâ parte, in quâ insidiatus est serpens, majus subsidium sanctificationis accedat, quo postea te supplantare non possit.* He repeats this reason in his *Book de Initiatis*, cap. vi.

them. And shall here close the discourse only with one general reflection, which may be of some use to vindicate the practice of the present Church, and give satisfaction to such sober dissenters as scruple our office of baptism, for the sake of an innocent significant ceremony or two retained in it. The candid reader may observe throughout this discourse, that not only one or two, but many significant ceremonies were observed by the Ancient Church in the administration of baptism; particularly the sign of the cross was used at least four or five times in the whole process of the action. Therefore they, who now raise objections against the present office, had they lived in the primitive times, must have had much more reason to complain of the ancient practice. And yet we do not ordinarily find objections raised against the baptism of the Church, upon the account of the ceremonies she used therein; no, not even by those who in other things differed from her. Which consideration, methinks, should a little satisfy those, who really value the peace and unity of the Church, and be an argument to them not to dissent from the practice of the present Church, for those things which must more forcibly have obliged them to have been dissenters in all ages. I know not how far this consideration may prevail upon any, but I know how far it ought to prevail upon all that love the peace, and study the quiet of the Church, and therefore I could not but in this place here, seasonably suggest it.

## CHAP. V.

### *Of the laws against Rebaptization both in Church and State.*

SECT. 1.—But one Baptism, properly so called, allowed by the Church:  
and why?

To what has been said about baptism, it will not be improper to add something about the laws made both in Church and State, against the repetition of it, when once duly performed. The Ancients generally determine against a re-

petition of baptism; though Vossius thinks<sup>1</sup> their reasons are not always strictly conclusive. Some argued, that baptism was not to be repeated, because we are baptised into the death of Christ, who died but once. So St. Basil<sup>2</sup> and St. Austin.<sup>3</sup> But Vossius thinks there is no weight in this argument, because that which is but once done, may be often represented: as the sacrament of the eucharist is often repeated, though it also be in remembrance of the Lord's death till he come. Others prove it from those words of our Saviour, John, xiii. 10. "He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." This argument is used by Optatus, St. Austin, Fulgentius, Pacianus, and St. Ambrose. But Vossius thinks there is as little force in this reason as the former: because men may become polluted and unclean after baptism, and so have need of a second washing, if there were no other reason against it. Others argued from those words of the Apostle, Heb. vi. 4. "It is impossible for those who are once enlightened,—if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance." The ancient expositors, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Primasius, Sedulius, and Haimo, understand this as a prohibition of renewing men to repentance again by a second baptism; for they do not deny absolutely the possibility of a second repentance or pardon, but only upon a second baptism. And so, Vossius says, it is also expounded by Epiphanius,<sup>4</sup> Cyril of Alexandria,<sup>5</sup> St. Jerom,<sup>6</sup> St. Austin,<sup>7</sup> and St. Ambrose.<sup>8</sup> But he thinks their exposition not so agreeable to this place, as that of others, who interpret the "falling away," either to mean the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, or what St. John calls "a sin unto death," or a total apostacy from the Christian religion, for which there is no renewal of repentance. But I will not be so positive as Vossius, that any of these are better interpretations of that text, which is so unanimously urged by the Ancients against the Novatians, as a prohibition, not simply of a second repentance, but of a

<sup>1</sup> Voss. de Bapt. Disp. xvii. n. 5. p. 210.

<sup>2</sup> Basil. de Spir. Sancto,

cap. xv.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. de Ver. et Fals. Pœnit. cap. iii.

<sup>4</sup> Epiphanius.

Hær. lix. Novatianor.

<sup>5</sup> Cyril. lib. v. in Joan. xvii.

<sup>6</sup> Hieron.

cont. Jovin. lib. ii.

<sup>7</sup> Aug. Com. in Rom.

<sup>8</sup> Ambros. de Pœnit.

cont. Novat. lib. ii. cap. ii.

repentance by a second baptism. Others made use of those words of the Apostle, Eph. iv. "one faith, one baptism." Which is the argument urged by Cyril of Jerusalem and Pope Leo, against rebaptisation. But this, as Vossius observes, probably was not intended as a prohibition of a second baptism, but only to declare the community of that baptism, which is received one and the same by all, without exception. As the Apostle calls the eucharist "one bread," not because it was only once to be received, but because it was that common bread, of which all were partakers. The true reason, Vossius thinks, why baptism is not to be repeated, is the Divine will that so appointed it. For there is no command to reiterate baptism, as there is to repeat the eucharist, in the words of institution. Neither is there any example of any rebaptisation in Scripture, though we often read of men's falling into gross and scandalous sins after baptism. To which may be added, that baptism succeeds in the room of circumcision, being the entrance and seal of the covenant, which, on God's part, is never broken: so that as circumcision was never repeated, though the passover was yearly; in like manner, men enter into the covenant by baptism, and their breaches of the covenant are not to be repaired by repeated baptisms, but by confession and repentance, which is the method prescribed by the Apostle for restoring fallen brethren. St. Jerom observes,<sup>1</sup> that though there were many heretics in the Apostles' days, as the Nicolaitans and others, yet there was no command given to rebaptise them upon their repentance. And Optatus<sup>2</sup> makes the unity of circumcision a good argument for the unity of baptism, in which both the Catholics and Donatists agreed. For though the Donatists rebaptised the Catholics, yet they did it not under the notion of a second baptism, but as supposing they had received no true baptism before.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. cont. Lucifer. cap. viii. De Apocalypsi quoque approbemus, hæreticis sine baptisate debere pœnitentiam concedi. Nunquid dixit, Rebaptizentur, qui in Nicolaitarum fidem baptizati sunt?      <sup>2</sup> Optat. lib. i. p. 35. Quid magis diei pro nobis, et nostrum esse potest, quàm quod dixisti, in comparationem baptismatis semel factum esse diluvium? Et singularum circumcisionem salubriter profecisse populo Judæorum, magis pro nobis, quasi noster locutus es.

SECT. 2.—Only the Marcionites allowed Baptism to be thrice repeated.

Indeed among all the ancient heretics, we find none for a plurality of baptisms, but only the Marcionites. Which Epiphanius observes to have been an invention of Marcion, their first founder, in regard to his own conversation:<sup>1</sup> for he having been guilty of deflowering a virgin, invented a second baptism, asserting, that it was lawful to repeat baptism three times for the remission of sins. So that if any man fell, he might receive a second baptism after the first, and a third after that, upon his repentance. Which he pretended to ground upon those sayings of our Saviour, “I have a baptism to be baptised with, and I have a cup to drink;” which have no reference to any other baptism in water, but to his baptism in blood, that is, his death and passion. Of which the Ancients speak much, as they do of some other sorts of baptism, which are only metaphorical, as the baptism of afflictions, the baptism of tears and repentance, and the baptism of fire at the last day. But here the question is only about proper baptism by water, which the Marcionites affirmed might be repeated three times in the same way, which the Church never allowed of.

SECT. 3.—What the Church did in doubtful Cases, not reckoned a Re-baptisation.

It is true indeed, there were some doubtful cases, in which it might happen accidentally that a man might be a second time baptised; but these were such cases only, in which the party was reputed not to have received any former baptism at all. As when a man could neither give any account of his own baptism, nor were there any other credible witnesses that could attest it. Which often happened to be the case of those, who were taken captives in their infancy, and made slaves by the heathen. When any such were redeemed or recovered by the Christians, the Church made no scruple to baptise them; because though they might perhaps have received a former baptism, yet no evidence of it

<sup>1</sup> Epiphani. Hæc. 42. Marcionit. n. 3.

appeared. And so this was not reputed a rebaptisation. A decree was made to this purpose in the fifth Council of Carthage<sup>1</sup> upon a question put by the bishops of Mauritania, who affirmed that they redeemed many such captive children from the hands of the barbarians: the Council ordered, “that in this case, as often as it happened that there were no certain witnesses found, who could give undoubted testimony of their baptism; nor were they able of themselves to affirm, by reason of their age, that they ever had received it; they should be baptised without any scruple, lest an hesitation in this case should deprive them of the purgation of the sacraments.” The like determination was also given in one of the Roman Synods under Leo upon the same case where it was concluded,<sup>2</sup> that in such a doubtful case, neither the baptiser nor the baptised incurred the crime of rebaptisation. And Leo resolves the matter himself after the same manner in other places.<sup>3</sup> Neither was it reckoned any crime, though it afterward appeared that the party had been baptised before, because it was done in ignorance: but yet, like clinic-baptism, it was a sort of blemish to him, that deprived him of ecclesiastical promotion, except in some extraordinary case, as we learn from Theodore’s<sup>4</sup> Pœnitentiale cited by Gratian.

SECT. 4.—Nor when she baptised those, who had been unduly baptised before in Heresy or Schism.

Neither was it reckoned properly a second baptism, when

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carthag. v. can. vi. Placuit de infantibus, ut quoties non inveniuntur certissimi testes, qui eos baptizatos esse sine dubitatione testentur, neque ipsi sint per ætatem idonei de traditis sibi sacramentis respondere, absque ullo scrupulo eos esse baptizandos, ne ista trepidatio eos faciat sacramentorum purgatione privari. Hinc enim legati Maurorum fratres nostri consulerunt, quia multos tales à barbaris redimunt. Vid. Cod. Eccl. Afric. can. lxxv. et. Con. Trull. can. lxxxiv.

<sup>2</sup> Leo, Ep. xxxvii. ad Leon. Raven. Non potest in iterationis crimen devenire, quod factum esse omnino nescitur. <sup>3</sup> Id. Ep. xcii. ad Rustic. xv. Si nulla existant indicia inter propinquos aut familiares, nulla inter clericos aut vicinos, quibus hi, de quibus quæritur, baptizati fuisse doceantur; agendum est ut renascantur, ne manifeste pereant, in quibus quo non ostenditur gestum, ratio non sinit ut videatur iteratum.

<sup>4</sup> Theodor. Pœnitent. ap. Gratian, Dist. iv. de Consecrat. cap. cxvii. Qui bis

the Church baptised any who had before been unduly baptised in heresy or schism.<sup>1</sup> For then she did it only on presumption that they had received no true baptism before. Some heretics corrupted baptism by altering the necessary form, and others corrupted it by changing the matter of it into some other substance of their own appointing: and the baptisms of all such were looked upon as no baptisms, and therefore the Church ordered all those to be baptised upon their return to her communion, in the very same manner as Jews and Gentiles, as supposing their former pretence of baptism to be nothing at all, but her own baptism the first true baptism that was given them. And even the Cyprianists, who baptised all that had been baptised in any heresy or schism whatsoever without distinction, did it still only upon this supposition, that the baptism which they had received before, was no baptism at all, but a mere nullity. But if any had been baptised in the Catholic Church, and after that turned heretics or schismatics, or even apostates, Jews or Gentiles, they never gave such another baptism upon their return to the Church again.

SECT. 5.—Apostates never rebaptised in the Catholic Church.

For the Cyprianists in this agreed with the rest of the Catholic Church, that catholic baptism was never to be repeated in the greatest apostates. This doctrine is not only inculcated by St. Austin,<sup>1</sup> but even by Cyprian himself and his followers, where they plead so much for baptising those, who had been baptised in any heresy or schism; they still except those heretics who had originally been baptised in the Catholic Church; though they turned apostates, they were not to be received again by baptism,<sup>2</sup> but only by repentance, as was determined in the Council of Carthage, over

---

*ignoranter baptizati sunt, non indigent pro eo pœnitere: nisi quod secundum canones ordinari non possunt, nisi magna aliqua necessitas cogat.*

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. ii. cap. i. Cont. Liter. Petil. lib. ii. cap. vii. et xlviii. Cont. Crescon. lib. ii. cap. xvi.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Carthag. ap. Cypr. n. viii. p. 232. Censeo omnes hæreticos et schismaticos, qui ad Catholicam Ecclesiam voluerint venire, non ante ingredi, nisi exorcisati et baptizati prius fuerint; exceptis his sane qui in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ fuerint ante baptizati, ita tamen ut per manûs impositionem in pœnitentiam Ecclesiæ reconcilientur. See the same, *ibid.* n. 22. And Cypr. Ep. 71. ad Quintum, p. 194. Ep. 74. ad Pompeium, p. 216.

which Cyprian presided. St. Austin refers us to this very passage, and thence concludes this was a point agreed upon universally in the Catholic Church, that no lapse or crime could make it necessary to give a second baptism to any, who had once been truly baptised within the pale of the Church. A longer penance indeed was imposed upon such deserters and apostates, as had been baptised in the Church, than upon those who had been baptised among heretics originally, as the Rules of Pope Innocent inform us;<sup>1</sup> the one were obliged to go through a long course of penance for their apostacy, but the other were admitted immediately by imposition of hands upon their recantation: yet still the Church kept strict to her rule, that whatever way she admitted them, she would not do it by a second baptism.

SECT. 6.—What Heretics rebaptised the Catholics.

Several heretics pretended to observe the same rule: for they rebaptised the Catholics, yet they said this was not a second baptism; because the Catholics were reputed heretics with them, and therefore their baptism of no value in their account. Upon this ground the Novatians rebaptised the Catholics, as we learn from Cyprian<sup>2</sup> and the Epistle of Pope Innocent last cited. The Donatists followed the Novatians in this sacrilegious practice, as the charge is often brought against them by St. Austin<sup>3</sup> and many others. And the Eunomians not only rebaptised the Catholics, but all others of the Arian sects, that were not of their own particular faction, as is noted by Epiphanius<sup>4</sup> in his account of them. And the other Arians, though they were at first averse to this practice, (as Papebrochius<sup>5</sup> and Pagi<sup>6</sup> rightly observe, in order

<sup>1</sup> Innoc. Ep. 2. ad Victricium. cap. viii. Ut venientes à Novatia nis vel Montensibus, per manûs tantum impositionem suscipiantur. Quia quamvis ab hæreticis, tamen in Christi nomine sunt baptizati: præter eos, si qui fortè à nobis ad illos transeuntes, rebaptizati sunt: hi si repiscentes et ruinam suam cogitantes, redire maluerint, sub longâ pœnitentiæ satisfactione admitendi sunt.

<sup>2</sup> Cypr. lxxiii. ad Jubaian. p. 198. Nec nos movet, quod in literis tuis complexus es Novatianenses rebaptizare eos, quos à nobis sollicitant.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. cont. <sup>4</sup> Fulgent. cap. vii. Da mihi aliquem sanctorum post Trinitatem rebaptizare, quod facis. It. de Hæres. c. lxix. Audent etiam rebaptizare Catholicos, &c. Vid. Cod. Theodos. lib. xvi. tit. vi. Ne sanctum baptisma iteretur. leg. iv. Honorii.

<sup>5</sup> Papebroch. Vit. Constant. maj. xxi. tom. v. p. xvii.

<sup>6</sup> Pagi Critic. in Baron. an. 324. n. xii.



to refute the story of Constantine's being baptised by Pope Sylvester, and rebaptised by Eusebius of Nicomedia; for at that time the Arians had not taken up the practice of rebaptising the Catholics :) yet afterwards they gave way to it about the time of St. Austin. For he charges it upon them more than once,<sup>1</sup> that they rebaptised the Catholics. And it appears from Victor Uticensis<sup>2</sup> that they insisted stiffly upon it in the time of the Vandalic persecution, and we afterwards meet with the same in the Epistles of Vigilius.<sup>3</sup> Valesius<sup>4</sup> cites the Life of Fulgentius and the author of the *Breviarum Fidei*, published by Sirmondus, to the same purpose. By which last author<sup>5</sup> we find, that the Arians not only rebaptised the Catholics, but also made an argument of it (as some Romanists in another case have since argued against the Protestants) that their baptism was better than the Catholics, because the Catholics never rebaptised those that came over from the Arians, but reconciled them only by imposition of hands: but the Arians, whenever they could seduce any from the Catholics, always gave them a second baptism.

SECT. 7.—What Punishments were inflicted on the Baptisers, by the Laws of Church and State.

Now to prevent this petulant humour from spreading in the Church, many and severe laws were made against it, both by the ecclesiastical and the secular power. The Church by her Canons<sup>6</sup> not only censured and condemned all such rebaptisations, as impious and sacrilegious, as a crucifying of Christ again, a doing despite to the Spirit, as a mockery of the Divine mysteries, and derision of holy things; but also inflicted penalties on all those, who were either actively or passively concerned in them. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Hæres. cap. xlix. Rebaptizari quoque ab his Catholicos novimus, utrum et non Catholicos nescio. It. de v. Hæres. cap. vii. Baptizato, ingerit baptismum, &c. <sup>2</sup> Victor de Persec. Vandal. lib. i. Bibl. Patr. tom. vii. p. 590. <sup>3</sup> Vigil. Ep. ii. ad Eleutherium, cap. iii. It. Con. Tolet. iii. Præfat. <sup>4</sup> Vales. Not. in Sozomen. lib. vi. cap. xxvi. <sup>5</sup> Breviar. Fidei adversus Arianos. Dicere etiam solent de baptismo, quod in eo melius sit ipsorum baptismum, quam nostrum; quia qui de illis ad nos convertuntur, non eos rebaptizamus, sed per manus impositionem reconciliamus. Illi verò si quos de nostris seducere possint, inconsideranter rebaptizant. <sup>6</sup> Vid. Cod. Eccles. Afric. can. lii. Constit. Apost. lib. vi. cap. xv.

Council of Lerida<sup>1</sup> forbids the faithful so much as to eat with persons that suffered themselves to be rebaptised. The Canons of Pope Innocent<sup>2</sup> enjoin them a long penance to make satisfaction. And those of Pope Leo<sup>3</sup> require even those, who through fear or terror were rebaptised against their wills, to do penance at the discretion of the bishop, before they were admitted again to communion. If they were bishops, presbyters, or deacons, who thus suffered themselves to be rebaptised, then they were to be degraded, and obliged to do penance all their lives, without being suffered to communicate with the Church either in the prayers of the faithful, or the prayers of the catechumens, and were only to be admitted to lay-communion at the hour of death, because they had not only denied their orders, but their Christianity, and openly professed themselves pagans, by being rebaptised. This we find in the decrees of Felix the III. made in a Roman Council<sup>4</sup> with respect to the African Churches, where such rebaptisations were often practised by the power of the Arians, who compelled the Catholics to be rebaptised. This was the ancient discipline of the Church toward those, who were only passive in admitting a second baptism, after they had once been truly baptised with catholic baptism before. Then again for those who were actively concerned in such rebaptisations, the Canons appointed, that if any bishop or presbyter presumed to give a second baptism after a true one once received, he should be degraded:<sup>5</sup> and this penalty was confirmed by

<sup>1</sup> Con. Ilerdens. can. xiv. Cum rebaptizatis fideles religiosi nec in cibo participant.

<sup>2</sup> Innoc. Ep. ii. ad Victric. cap. ix. Qui rebaptizati sunt, sub longâ pœnitentiâ et satisfactione admittendi sunt.

<sup>3</sup> Leo Ep. 77. ad Nicetam. cap. vi. Qui et iterandum baptismum vel metu coacti sunt—non nisi per pœnitentiâ remedium, et per impositionem episcopalis manûs, communionis recipiant unitatem.

<sup>4</sup> Felix Ep. i. cap. 2. Eos quos episcopos, presbyteros, vel diaconos fuisse constiterit, et seu optantes forsitan seu coactos lavacri illius unici salutarisque claruerit fecisse jacturam; et Christum, quem non solùm dono regenerationis, verùm etiam gratiâ percepti honoris induerant, exuisse; cùm constet neminem ad secundam tinctionem venire potuisse, nisi se palam Christianum negaverit, et professus fuerit se esse paganum;—usque ad exitus sui diem, si respiscunt, jacere conveniet, nec orationi non modò fidelium, sed nec catechumenorum omnimodis interesse, quibus communio laica tantùm in morte reddenda est.

<sup>5</sup> Vid. Canon. Apost. can. 47.

the civil law; for Valentinian put forth an edict against such rebaptisers, declaring them unworthy of the priesthood.<sup>1</sup> But because such sort of penalties did not much affect either the Donatists or Eunomians, who were already out of the Church, and little regarded her censures: therefore Honorius reinforced the former laws by adding a civil penalty to them. For in two laws made against the Donatists, who were chiefly concerned in this crime, he enacted,<sup>2</sup> that it should be confiscation of all a man's goods, whoever was found to rebaptise another. And Theodosius Junior,<sup>3</sup> laid the same penalty upon the Eunomians, and those that were rebaptised by them, commanding their goods to be confiscated, and their persons to be banished. Such was the care both of the civil and ecclesiastical governors to preserve the unity of baptism in the Catholic Church. But as Gothofred, I think, rightly observes, these laws seem only intended against heretics rebaptising Catholics. For if heretics rebaptised heretics, as the Eunomians did the other Arians; it does not appear, that in that case the penalties of these laws affected them, but only were designed to restrain their insolencies against the Catholic Church. Some Catholics continued still, after the Cyprianic way, to rebaptise all heretics and schismatics whatsoever, without distinguishing those that were baptised in the name of the Trinity from those that were not: and though this was contrary to the general custom and discipline of the Church, yet I conceive the penalties of these laws did not affect them neither. And the same may

<sup>1</sup> Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 6. De non iterando Bapt. Leg. Antistitem, qui sanctitatem baptismi iteratâ usurpatione geminaverit, et contra instituta omnium eam gratiam iterando contaminaverit, sacerdotio indignum esse censemus.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. iv. Quisquis post hæc fuerit rebaptizasse detectus—facultatum omnium publicatione multatus, inopiæ pœnam expendat. Vid. ibid. Leg. 5. Honorii.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. Leg. vii. Theodosii. Nefarios Eunomianorum cœtus, ac funesta conventicula penitûs arceri jubemus eos qui episcoporum, seu clericorum, vel ministrorum nomine usurpato, hujusmodi cœtibus præsumunt—cùm in hoc fuerint scelere deprehensî, stilum proscriptionis incurrere, et honorum amissione coerceri. Eos verò qui fide, ut dictum est, imbutos immiani furore rebaptizare deteguntur, cum his qui rebaptizantur (arceri jubemus.)

be said of those, who thought themselves obliged to rebaptise those, who were only baptised by laymen. For though it was reckoned a rebaptisation by those Churches which practised otherwise, yet it was not that criminal rebaptisation, against which these laws were chiefly intended: and these being something more of doubtful and disputed cases, about which good Catholics themselves were divided, a greater allowance was made in these, so long as men only observed the custom and practice of the Churches, in which they lived, about them: which was St. Basil's advice to the Churches of Asia, which were divided upon these questions.

THE END OF THE FOURTH VOLUME IN THE ORIGINAL EDITION.

## ADVERTISEMENT TO THE READER.

---

*After much consideration,—for I cannot presume to deviate in the slightest degree from the order of publication, which my learned and revered ancestor adopted, without great caution, and unaffected apprehension of being in error,—after, however, having been sincerely guided by these sentiments, I have determined on introducing at the end of this third volume, and the beginning of the next, the “ Two Parts of the Scholastical History of the Practice of the Church in Reference to the Administration of Baptism by Laymen,” which the author felt himself in the midst of his laborious Work compelled to discuss at considerable length, in consequence of the appearance of a book, on the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, which was published at the very moment, when he was preparing for the press the preceding pages, which form the greater part of this volume according to the present edition, on the subject of baptism, confirmation, &c.*

*I should not have taken upon myself to have introduced these dissertations here, merely from the suggestions of my own mind, had I not found, in the preface thereto, the author himself professing, that his first design was to have made the whole of the following discourse only a single chapter of this volume of his *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*.*

*From hence I have been induced to imagine, that the reader would probably be pleased to find the author's very interesting and elaborate history of the practice of the ancient Church, in this matter, immediately following the more*

ADVERTISEMENT.

*general history of the ancient forms and ceremonies of baptism, &c. &c. and intervening between that and the subject of which the author's next volume treats.*

*A minor inducement with me to adopt this arrangement has been, that I am thus enabled to keep the volumes more nearly to the number of pages, which I have engaged for in my prospectus, and more uniform with each other in their appearance. Should any subscriber to, or purchaser of the work disapprove however of this mode of introducing the two parts of the Scholastical History of Baptism by Laymen, nothing will be more easy than to direct his binder to separate them from the other portions of the respective volumes, to which they are now attached, and to bind them as a distinct treatise.*

**RICHARD BINGHAM,**

*the Editor.*

*New House,*

*Gosport,*

*17th June, 1825.*

A  
SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY

OF THE

PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH,

In reference to the Administration of

BAPTISM BY LAYMEN.

---

PART I.

---

WHEREIN

An Account is given of the Practice of the Primitive Church, the Practice of the modern Greek Church, and the Practice of the Churches of the Reformation.

WITH

An Appendix, containing some Remarks on the Historical Part of Mr. Lawrence's Writings, touching the Invalidity of Lay-Baptism, his Preliminary Discourse of the various Opinions of the Fathers concerning Re-baptisation and Invalid Baptisms, and his Discourse of Sacerdotal Powers.

---

BY THE REV. JOSEPH BINGHAM, M.A.

Rector of Headbourn Worthy, and Havant, Hants, and sometime Fellow of University-College, in Oxford.





THE  
AUTHOR'S DEDICATION.

---

TO  
HIS MOST SACRED MAJESTY,  
GEORGE,  
BY THE GRACE OF GOD KING OF GREAT BRITAIN,  
FRANCE, AND IRELAND, DEFENDER OF THE  
FAITH, &c.

---

MOST GRACIOUS SOVEREIGN,

I HUMBLY beg leave to lay at your Majesty's feet a part of a larger work, which was at first designed to promote those great and worthy ends, which your Majesty in your princely wisdom by your royal declarations has lately thought fit to recommend to your Universities and Clergy: that is, the promotion of Christian piety and knowledge, and such useful learning, as may instil good principles into the minds of younger students; upon which the prosperity of Church and State will in this and all succeeding ages so much depend. The practice of the primitive ages of the Church, when reduced into one view, seems to be one of the most proper means to effect these honourable designs; and with that

consideration I have hitherto proceeded in this laborious work, not without the countenance and approbation of many worthy men, and now hope to finish it under your Majesty's favour and protection: humbly beseeching Almighty God to bless your Majesty's great designs for the good of this Church and Nation, and the Protestant interest abroad: which is, and ever shall be, the hearty prayer of

Your Majesty's

most loyal

and obedient servant,

JOSEPH BINGHAM.

THE

## PREFACE.



THE first design of the following discourse, was only to have been a single chapter of the next volume<sup>1</sup> of my *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, where the order, I have proposed to observe in that work, will lead me next to pursue the several offices of the ancient Liturgy, and services of the Church, and among them, in the first place, the institution of the catechumens, together with the offices of baptism and confirmation. Here the subject matter would necessarily lead me to speak of the minister of baptism, and of rebaptisations, and the power granted to laymen, in some certain cases, to baptise. But I quickly found, that to do justice to the present subject, especially at a time when some controversies had been raised about it, it would be requisite to handle it a little more largely than would consist with the usual method I have observed in my *Origines*, where great variety of matter obliges me to treat upon all subjects as compendi-

---

<sup>1</sup> The 4th of the author, but the 3d in this edition.

ously and succinctly as possible: and therefore I have chosen to treat of this one particular subject in a separate discourse by itself, that I might have room to enlarge upon it, and give such an historical account as was proper upon the present occasion. I had observed several mistakes to be committed, in relation to this matter, by some late learned writers: and though I love not to enter into dispute with any men, yet it was necessary for me in this discourse, with due respect and civility, to take notice of them: in which case I think no great names so venerable, as to be of sufficient authority to lead others by their dictates only, especially in matters of fact and history, unless they assign just grounds and reasons for their assertions. Upon this account I have taken the liberty to shew the mistakes of the learned Dr. Forbes, in reference to the baptisms of deacons and laymen, and how he wrong understands the meaning of St. Chrysostom and St. Jerom, upon those subjects. And because, in the point of rebaptisation, Stephen, bishop of Rome, has been much misrepresented, as if he were for receiving the baptism of all heretics in general, without exception, I could not but do justice to his character in that respect, by setting matters in their proper light, though several great names, and Bp. Pearson's among the rest, had given current credit and authority to the contrary opinion. I had observed also great stress laid upon the sense of the modern Greek Church, and the practice of the Churches of the Reformation, by some late learned writers, in reference to the point of laymen's baptising in cases of necessity, or otherwise, to prove the invalidity of all such baptisms; and therefore I have made a particular inquiry into the judgment and practice of all those Churches, and corrected several plain mistakes committed in the accounts that have been given of them, by those that have pleaded their authority in this behalf. I have also made a particular inquiry into the sense and practice of the Church of Eng-

land, from the beginning of the Reformation to this present time, and shewed, that she has no rule, nor was ever understood to have any, for rebaptising those, who, in time of necessity, were baptised by laymen. And because the baptism of heretics and schismatics, and excommunicate and degraded clerks, is a matter of great concern, with which the Church Universal has always been exercised; and the Church of England in particular has a considerable interest depending upon the validity of it, I have been at some pains to inquire into the bottom of this question, and state it with exactness from the ancient writers; shewing that such baptism, though given in contradiction to authority, is notwithstanding reputed valid; and though it has its deficiencies, yet they are such as might be supplied by the Church without rebaptisation. And because it seems a great difficulty to account for the legal authority of the Church of England to baptise, whilst it is confessed that she had her baptism from the heretical and schismatical Church of Rome, I have pointed out the true method of solving this difficulty, by shewing that she regained her just authority, by returning to the unity of the Holy Catholic Church at her Reformation. And that no one might object, that there were then no visible professors in the Holy Catholic Church, beside those of the Church of Rome, I have shewed that there was a very great and numerous body of such professors always preserved among the Albigenses or Waldenses, to the very time of the Reformation; and I have vindicated their character, as I thought myself in justice bound to do, from the misrepresentations and odious reflections, which some among ourselves have unwarily, if not designedly, cast upon them. Finally, because the writings of Mr. Lawrence, an ingenious layman, who, out of a scruple of conscience, desired to be rebaptised, have made great impressions upon many, who reckon the acuteness of his reasonings, and the exactness of his historical accounts unanswerable

ble, I have made such remarks upon them, as came properly in my way, to shew both him and the world, that he has committed several great mistakes in point of ancient history; that he also frequently confounds the terms of lay-baptism, unauthorised-baptism, and invalid-baptism together, which yet in the history of the Church are terms of very different importance; and that he builds his whole book upon this mistaken foundation, supposing those terms to be equivalent, which are vastly wide of one another. But that, which I have chiefly remarked in Mr. Lawrence's way of handling this argument, is the fatal tendency of the notions he has advanced concerning the invalidity of heretical and schismatical baptism, which, in their direct and immediate consequence, do unchurch and unbaptise the whole Church of England, unless it can be shewed, that we had our baptism from some other Church originally than from the heretical and schismatical Church of Rome. This is a consideration so momentous, that I hope neither Mr. Lawrence, nor any others, who indiscriminately imbibe his notions, will be displeas'd at me for observing it, since so much of our Christianity depends upon it in these latter ages of the Church. But if any obloquy or reproach befalls me for saying this, I can easily be content to receive and suffer it for the good of the Church Universal and the Church of England, whose true interests I have always been serving; by writing the *Antiquities of the one* and *Apologies*<sup>1</sup> for the other; in pursuance of both which designs I have published the present discourse, not only to give an account of the practice of the ancient Church, but to vindicate the just right and power of the Church of England, when, under pretence of magnifying her power, such arguments

---

<sup>1</sup> "The French Church's Apology for the Church of England;" which will be found in a subsequent volume of this Edition.

and methods of reasoning are used, as tend to overthrow her constitution, and leave her naked, exposed, and destitute even of true Christian baptism. Which has been the misfortune of Mr. Lawrence's way of reasoning, if I am capable of understanding him. I can readily acknowledge my great respects for Mr. Lawrence, as a man of a sharp wit, and in many things an acute reasoner: and I can as heartily pity any man in his circumstances, who out of a pure scruple of conscience, doubting of the validity of his baptism, desires leave of the Church to be rebaptised for satisfaction. For in some cases, though not exactly in his, where a man doubted whether he were baptised or not, the primitive Church allowed of a rebaptisation, to take away all scruples, that might arise upon that account. But when a man uses such arguments in his own defence, as destroy the very power of baptising in that Church, from whom he desires to receive baptism; then it would be uncharitable to him, and unjust to the Church, not to shew him his errors, and vindicate the validity of such baptisms in the Church, as his arguments tend to overthrow. And with this view only, I have made remarks upon him, as it became one to do, to whose province it is fallen to explain the laws and practices of the ancient Church, and assert the just rights and privileges of the Church of England.

There is one thing more I would humbly beg leave to offer, with all due respect to the consideration of our superiors, legally assembled in convocation, that is, whether it might not be proper to have a peculiar form of confirmation or imposition of hands, for such as were baptised by heretics and schismatics, upon their return to the unity of the Church; considering what frequent occasion there is for such a form, by reason of great multitudes that have been baptised in heresy or schism, and are admitted into the Church upon repentance and renunciation of errors without rebaptisation.

The ancient Church had such forms peculiar to this occasion: for they did not think confirmation was to be given exactly in the same way to those, who were baptised by heretics or schismatics, as they did to those that were baptised in the Church; because though they did not esteem the baptism of such to be simply null and invalid, yet they looked upon it as deficient in several respects, of which I have given a particular account in the following discourse; and therefore they appointed particular forms for the confirmation of such, before they admitted them to the eucharist, upon their return to the Church. One of these forms, because it will give some light in this matter, and illustrate what I am discoursing of, I shall here subjoin out of De Marca,<sup>1</sup> who says, he had it from a manuscript collection of an ancient writer in the French King's library, written above eight hundred years ago. And it plainly appears to be drawn in conformity to the decrees of the Second General Council of Constantinople, and the Council of Trullo, which order some heretics to be received as mere heathens, by a new baptism, and others only by imposition of hands, with the unction of chrism or confirmation. The ceremony of receiving those of the latter kind is thus described: first they are to learn the orthodox faith and give themselves to fasting and prayer for ten or fifteen days together, being instructed and disciplined after the manner of the catechumens. Then they are publicly to renounce and anathematize their former heresies, and make profession of the Catholic faith. After which profession, kneeling down before the priest, he lays his hands upon them and recites this prayer: "O God our Saviour, who wouldest have all men to be saved, and

---

<sup>1</sup> De Marca Notæ ad Concilium Claromontanum, p. 323.



come to the knowledge of the truth; receive this thy servant, who is scarce yet thoroughly awakened out of error, but desirous to come to the knowledge of thy truth. For Thou hast said, ‘I have other sheep which are not of this fold, and them I must bring, and they shall hear my voice, and there shall be one fold and one shepherd.’ Feed him with the doctrine of thy truth, as thou hast revealed it by thy holy and glorious Apostles; vouchsafe to give him the seal of the divine unction, and the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, and make him partaker of the blessed body and blood of Christ: and consummate this thy servant, that he may be numbered with thy flock, to the glory and praise of thy greatness, for thine is the kingdom and the power!”

Then anointing him with the chrism, after the manner of those that are newly baptised, he uses the same form of words as is used to them: and afterwards repeats this prayer; “O Lord our God, who hast vouchsafed to perfect and consummate this thy servant with the true faith in thee, and with the seal of thy holy unction, Thou Lord of all things, keep and preserve this true faith in him, make him to increase in righteousness, and adorn him with all the graces of thy Spirit.” After this he is admitted to partake of the holy eucharist.

It is easy to observe, that this form of confirmation was not for such as were baptised in the Church, but peculiar to those who were baptised in heresy or schism: for mention is made of their errors in the very words of the prayers, and they are obliged to confess and anathematise their heresies upon their return to the Church. Since, therefore, we have no such peculiar form in our Liturgy, I leave it to the wisdom and discretion of our superiors to consider, whether such a form might not be proper to be added to it, when the form

of reconciling penitents, and others of the like nature, come next under consideration. This was the way, which the ancient Church took to supply the deficiencies of such baptisms, as she thought fit to receive as valid, though not every way perfect, without rebaptisation.

# CONTENTS.

---

## CHAP. I.

### *An Account of the Practice of the Ancient Church.*

SECT. 1.—THE State of the Controversy about Lay-baptism.—2. The Commission given to the Apostles to baptise; by them communicated to others at Discretion.—3. Bishops invested with the same Power which the Apostles had, as their Successors.—4. By what Power Presbyters anciently baptised in ordinary or extraordinary cases.—5. Of the Power granted anciently to Deacons to baptise.—6. Whether the Inferior Clergy were allowed to baptise.—7. Laymen prohibited to baptise in ordinary Cases.—8. Yet allowed to do it sometimes in Cases extraordinary. This proved from the Testimony of Tertullian.—9. The Council of Eliberis.—10. The Determination of Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, with the consentient Testimony of Ruffin, Socrates, and Sozomen.—11. Of St. Jerom.—12. Of St. Austin.—13. Gelasius, Bishop of Rome.—14. Isidore of Sevil.—15. The Objection from St. Chrysostom, Basil, and Cyprian, answered.—16. Whether the usurped and unauthorised Baptism of Laymen was allowed to be Valid.—17. Of the Baptism of Women. Whether they had any Authority to baptise.—18. Whether the usurped Baptism of Women was esteemed Valid.—19. Whether Heretical and Schismatical Priests, and degraded Clergymen, had any legal Authority to baptise.—20. Whether the Baptism of Heretics and Schismatics was valid. The Practice of Stephen, Bishop of Rome, vindicated against the Cyprianists, and shewed to be the same with that of the Post-Nicene Fathers.—21. What Defects the Ancients supposed to be in the Baptism of Heretics and Schismatics, and how those Defects were supplied.—22. Whether the Baptism of Heretics and Schismatics and Degraded Clergymen, be any more than the Baptism of unauthorised Laymen.—23. How the Church of England comes to have Authority to baptise, though she had her Baptism only from the Heretical Church of Rome.—24. Of the Church of Rome's allowing the Baptism of Turks, Jews, and Infidels. This shewed to be without Precedent in the Practice of the Primitive Church.

## CHAP. II.

### *The Practice of the modern Greeks and Moscovites.*

## CHAP. III.

*The Practice of the Churches of the Reformation.*

SECT. 1.—The practice of the Lutherans.—2. Of the Zuinglians or Helvetic Churches.—3. Of the Calvinists or French and Dutch Churches.—4. Of the Palatine Churches.—5. Of the Church of England before the Conference at Hampton Court, and afterward.

## APPENDIX.

Containing some Remarks on the historical part of Mr. Lawrence's Writings, touching the invalidity of Lay-Baptism, his preliminary Discourse of the various opinions of the Fathers concerning Rebaptisation and Invalid-baptisms, and his discourse of sacerdotal powers.

A

SCHOLASTICAL HISTORY

OF THE

PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH,

IN REFERENCE TO THE

ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM BY LAY PERSONS.

---

CHAP. I.

*An Account of the Practice of the Ancient Church.*

SECT. I.—The State of the Controversy about Lay-Baptism.

To understand the state of the present controversy aright, it will be necessary in the entrance of this discourse, to distinguish these several questions from one another. 1. Whether the commission to baptise was so given to the Apostles, as that they might communicate it to any others? 2. Whether bishops were invested with the same right, which the Apostles had? 3. Whether the bishops may communicate this power only to presbyters or priests, as invested with sacerdotal powers? 4. Whether deacons may baptise either in ordinary or extraordinary cases? 5. Whether the minor clergy, below deacons, may have anything of the same power communicated to them? 6. Whether mere laymen, who were never called to any ecclesiastical office, may promiscuously administer baptism in ordinary cases? 7. Whether bishops may give them a right to do it in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity? 8. Whether, if they do it with or without such commission, their baptism be wholly null and invalid? 9. Whether women may

be allowed to baptise in cases of the like necessity, and their baptism be valid? 10. Whether heretical and schismatical priests be any better qualified to administer baptism than catholic laymen? 11. Whether their baptism be either legal or valid? 12. Lastly, Whether baptism administered by Turks, Jews, or Infidels, be of any account in the Christian Church? The distinct consideration of these several questions will take in every thing that relates to this subject: and what I propose is, to give some resolution of them, so far as may be collected from the general sense and practice of the Church, both ancient and modern; beginning first with the practice of the ancient Church; then examining the rules of the modern Greek Church, and last of all, the Churches of the Reformation.

SECT. 2.—The Commission given to the Apostles to baptise; by them communicated to others at Discretion.

To begin with the practice of the ancient Church; it is certain the commission to baptise was originally given by our Saviour to the eleven Apostles: for so it is expressly said, Matt. xxviii. 16, &c. “Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, all power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth; go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.” Now, by the tenour of this commission, it is certain they were invested with authority not only to baptise themselves, but to communicate this power to others: for the commission and power of baptising was not to die with them, but to continue to the end of the world. But then two questions arise from hence; Whom they actually authorised to baptise? and, To whom they gave commission to authorise others to baptise? For both these things were necessary to preserve the Church according to the order of Christ, at least in future ages. As to the first question, it is evident from the Apostolical history, that they gave commission to bishops, presbyters, and dea-

cons to baptise: for Philip, who was but a deacon, baptised the Eunuch, as we read Acts viii. 38. But still it remains a question, whether they extended this commission to any others, either in ordinary or extraordinary cases? The ancient author, under the name of St. Ambrose,<sup>1</sup> was of opinion, that the Apostles first found it necessary, for the augmentation and increase of the Church, to grant a general commission to all Christians both to teach and baptise; but 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. Hence it came to pass, that neither deacons were allowed to preach, nor the inferior clergy, nor laymen to baptise. This author seems to have been of opinion, that the commission which our Saviour left with his Apostles, was a discretionary power to authorise such others to baptise, as they in their wisdom, under the direction of the Holy Ghost, should think proper to answer the present necessities and emergent occasions of the Church: and that therefore, as no one can have a power of baptising, but he that receives, some way or other, a commission from them; so when the necessities of the Church required it, they had power to authorise others, besides the standing ministers, to baptise; 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 allowed deacons, and sometimes laymen in extraordinary cases, to baptise: for they looked upon themselves as invested with the same commission and power that

---

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. Com. in Ephes. iv. p. 948. Ut cresceret plebs et multiplicaretur, omnibus inter initia concessum est et evangelizare et baptizare et Scripturas in ecclesiâ explanare. At ubi autem omnia loco circumplexa est Ecclesia, conventicula constituta sunt, et rectores et cætera officia in ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de clero auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere officium quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum. Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque diaconi in populo prædicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant.

the Apostles had, as their successors; that is, as has been said, not only a power to baptise themselves, but to authorise others to baptise, either in ordinary or extraordinary cases. By virtue of which they made presbyters their assistants in ordinary cases, and used their discretionary power sometimes to grant authority also to deacons to minister baptism in ordinary cases, and sometimes to restrain them wholly from it, and confine them only to extraordinary cases, and great necessities of the Church, allowing them no other power than what in the like cases they allowed to laymen. For though no other writer among the Ancients has so plainly expressed his mind upon this point, as this author, under the name of St. Ambrose; yet it is plain, all of them, who maintained the power of bishops to authorise deacons and laymen to baptise, or, at their discretion, to restrain them from it, must needs go upon the same principle, viz. that such a power was lodged in the hands of the bishops of the Church, as the Apostles' successors, to authorise what men should baptise, and in what cases, according as they should think necessary in their wisdom and discretion, for the greater or lesser exigencies of the Church. For without this principle it will be impossible to account for the practice of the ancient bishops, who sometimes restrained deacons from baptising as well as laymen, and sometimes granted authority to them both.

SECT. 3.—Bishops invested with the same Power which the Apostles had as their Successors.

That thus the matter was in fact, is very evident from many passages of the ancient writers, where they speak of the original power of administering baptism, as lodged solely and entirely in the hands of the bishops, as the Apostles' immediate successors, and derivatively conveyed from them to others, whom they authorized 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 exigencies of the Church. Hence it was, that anciently in many small dioceses, bishops were the usual and ordinary ministers of baptism themselves. There was but one baptistery belonging to a



city or a diocese, and that at the cathedral or mother-church, where the bishop resided, and whither all persons came at the two solemn festivals, Easter and Pentecost, for baptism. In larger cities and dioceses, where more baptisteries were necessary, they were still erected by the bishop's appointment and only such persons allowed to officiate in them as had his consent and authority, that nothing might be done in opposition or contradiction to him, but in a due subordination to him as their superior. Thus it is remarked by the author of the Pontifical, in the Life of Marcellus,<sup>1</sup> that while he was bishop of Rome, he appointed five and twenty churches, as so many little dioceses, for the convenience of baptising pagans upon their conversion, and an equal number of presbyters to minister in them. But still all these were subordinate to that one bishop, and acted by the authority and commission, which they received from him. So that as one of the Roman Councils expresses it ;<sup>2</sup> " Though both presbyters and deacons, at some solemn times, were allowed to baptise at Rome in the bishop's presence, yet they were but officials to him, and what they did was reckoned his act, and went in his name." It is peculiarly remarked to this purpose by one of the bishops present at the Council of Carthage, under Cyprian,<sup>3</sup> " that Christ gave the commission to his Apostles, and to them alone, the power which was given him by his Father ; and that bishops were the Apostles' successors, in governing the Church with the same power, and granting baptism to believers." Hence it became a general standing rule in the Church, that presbyters and deacons were to perform no offices<sup>4</sup> without

<sup>1</sup> Pontifical. Vit. Marcelli, ap. Crabbe Concil. tom. i. p. 204. Hic viginti quinque titulos in urbe Roma constituit, quasi dioceses, propter baptismum et pœnitentiam multorum, qui convertebantur ex Paganis, et propter sepulturas martyrum.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Rom. Can. vii. ap. Cotelier. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. ix. Paschæ tempore presbyter et diaconus per parochias dare remissionem peccatorum, et ministerium implere consueverunt, etiam præsentem episcopo : in fontem quoque ipsi descendunt, illi in officio sunt : sed illius nomini facti summa conceditur.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Carthag. ap. Cyr. n. 79. p. 241. Manifesta est sententia Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Apostolos suos mittentis, et ipsis solis potestatem à Patre sibi datam permittentis ; quibus nos successimus, eâdem potestate Ecclesiam Domini gubernantes et credentium fidem baptizantes.

<sup>4</sup> Canon. Apost. c. 39. "Αρευ γνώμης τῆ ἐπισκόπου μηδὲν ἐπιτελείωσαν" &c.

the authority and consent of their bishop, because the Lord's people were committed to his trust, and he was to answer for their souls. This was particularly specified in the office of baptism by most of the ancient writers. The rule was as old as Ignatius, who delivers himself after this manner in relation to this point;<sup>1</sup> "It is not lawful either to baptise or celebrate the eucharist without the bishop; but that which he allows is well-pleasing to God." He does not say, that no one beside the bishop might administer baptism but that it was not regularly done without his commission or delegation: he being the chief minister of baptism, as well as all other offices in the Church. In like manner, Tertullian<sup>2</sup> asserts the bishop's original right as chief priest, independent of any other; and then the right of presbyters and deacons to baptise; but this in dependence of their bishop: for they are not to do it without his authority, for the honour of the Church, in the preservation of which peace is preserved. St. Cyprian<sup>3</sup> and another bishop, one of his contemporaries,<sup>4</sup> who writes of the Baptism of Heretics, speak of themselves as the prime ministers of baptism; who only had power to give it, with all the ceremonies and solemnities belonging to it: and when it was given by the inferior clergy, in cases of necessity, as to the clinics upon a sick bed, the want of those ceremonies was either supplied by the bishop in confirmation, upon the party's recovery, or by God himself, in calling them to the state of martyrdom. This shews, that they 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

<sup>1</sup> Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. *Ὁυκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τῆ ἐπισκόπου, ἕτε βαπτίζειν, ἕτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν.* &c. <sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. c. xvii. Dandi

quidem jus habet summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus: dehinc presbyteri et diaconi; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter Ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo salva pax est.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. de Exhort. Martyr. in Præfat. p. 168. Nos tantum, qui Domino permittente primum baptismum credentibus dedimus, ad aliud quoque singulos præparemus.

<sup>4</sup> Anonym. de Bapt. Hæreticorum, ad Calcem Cypriani, p. 26. Siquidem per nos baptismum tradetur, integrè et solemniter et per omnia quæ scripta sunt adsignetur, atque sine ullâ ullius rei separatione tradatur: aut si à minore clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, eventum expectemus, ut aut supplicetur à nobis aut à Domino supplendum reservetur.

in the circumstances of the solemnity, in a subsequent confirmation. The same is also asserted by St. Ambrose,<sup>1</sup> “that though presbyters do baptise, yet they derive the authority of their ministry from the chief priest,” that is, the bishop. And the author of the Comments upon St. Paul’s Epistles,<sup>2</sup> under the name of St. Ambrose, says in general, “none of the clergy were to meddle with any office, to which they were not appointed.” But no one expresses himself more fully or plainly upon this head than St. Jerom:<sup>3</sup> “The welfare of the Church,” says he, “depends upon the dignity and veneration of the chief priest; on whom, if there was not some extraordinary and eminent power conferred, there would be as many schisms in the Church as there are priests. Hence it is, that neither presbyters nor deacons have any right to baptise without the chrism and command of their bishop.” So that this point was clear among the Ancients, beyond all dispute, that presbyters had only a derivative and subordinate power to baptise 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 established rules and orders of the Church: but if they set themselves in opposition to their bishop, and either acted without or against his consent, as absolute and independent of him, then their baptisms and all their other offices and ministrations were irregular and unlawful, because done in a schismatical way, and in a professed contempt of authority, and all the standing rules and laws of the Church.

**SECT. 4.**—By what Power Presbyters anciently baptised, in ordinary or extraordinary Cases.

Yet though such baptisms were very sinful and irregular in respect of the persons ministering, they were not esteemed

<sup>1</sup> Ambros. de Sacram. lib. iii. c. 1. Licet presbyteri fecerint, tamen exordium ministerii à summo est sacerdote.

<sup>2</sup> Ambros. in Ephes. iv. p. 948. Rectores et cætera officia in ecclesiis sunt ordinata, ut nullus de clero auderet, qui ordinatus non esset, præsumere officium quod sciret non sibi creditum vel concessum.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron. Dial. cum Lucifer. c. 4. Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate ac veneratione consistit: cui si non exors quædam et ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesiis efficiuntur schismata, quot sacerdotes. Inde ideò venit ut sine chrismate et jussione episcopi, neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habeant baptizandi.

to be utterly void and null in respect of the persons baptised. Whence it follows, 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. It is therefore here very material to inquire into this, how it came to pass, that baptism ministered by a presbyter illegally and without commission, was nevertheless esteemed valid, notwithstanding the sinfulness of the act of ministration. It is resolved by some into the indelible character and power of the priesthood, which is given to a presbyter at his ordination, by which they think all his ministerial acts stand good, though 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. But this could not be the ground upon which the Ancients went, for several reasons. 1. Because they 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 administered by deacons, if they had the bishop's commission; and by laymen, in extraordinary cases of pressing necessity, if they had the bishop's license and authority to do it, as we shall see hereafter. 2. The indelible character of a priest does not authorise or qualify him to act contrary to the commission of his bishop: for then his baptising would be both authorised and unauthorised, regular and irregular, lawful and unlawful at the same time, and in the very same act and respect, which is a manifest contradiction. Then also a priest could never be deposed from his office, or have his commission recalled, or his function legally taken from him, be his crimes never so great, and deserving ecclesiastical censure: once a priest he would be always a priest, and they who gave him his commission would have no authority to withdraw his commission, and reduce him to the state of a layman, in the most urgent and necessary case that could be conceived: which is contrary to the whole tenour of ecclesiastical discipline, and quite cuts the sinews of episcopal power in the Church. For these reasons it is evident, the Ancients could not think the legal power of baptising be-

longed to a man barely as he was a priest, but as he was a man invested with such power by his legal superior, whether he was priest or deacon; and that power subject to certain laws, which if he did not observe, his acts were irregular and unlawful; and if he persisted obstinately to contradict such rules, the same superior, who gave him his legal authority to baptise, had a legal power to withdraw it again, and exclude him from the ordinary exercise of any office of the ecclesiastical function. Whence it follows, that the irregular baptisms of such priests being esteemed valid, so as not to be repeated, though irregularly and unlawfully given, could not be thought valid upon the notion of their being once ordained priests, and having an indelible character of the priesthood upon them; but upon some other notion and foundation, which equally extended to deacons as well as priests, and made the baptism of a deacon, though irregularly and unlawfully performed, as valid as that of a priest in the same circumstances: and that must be upon one of these two grounds, either that baptism by whomsoever Christian performed, was valid and not to be repeated, provided it was done with due matter and form; or else that the bishops of the Church, as chief ministers of baptism, had power to receive and confirm those baptisms, which were otherwise irregularly, and in opposition to their authority and commission performed in the Church. But however it was, 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 laymen, who had not the character of priests, was sometimes authorised and allowed as valid; which is evident from plain matters of fact, which I now proceed to give a further account of.

SECT. 5.—Of the Power granted anciently to Deacons to baptise.

Deacons, by some ancient canons, are invested with the power of baptising in ordinary cases, as well as priests. It is plain, Tertullian so understood it: for he puts presbyters and deacons together,<sup>1</sup> as the ordinary ministers of baptism

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. c. 17. *Dandi quidem jus habet summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus; dehinc presbyteri et diaconi; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, &c.*

next after the bishop, and under his direction: he makes no distinction in the power given to those two orders; for the one had as much power to baptise as the other, and they both alike subordinately acted under the bishop, in whom, as chief priest, the original power of baptising was lodged, and and from whose authority they received their power. St. Jerom was of the same mind; for he says,<sup>1</sup> “without the commission of the bishop; neither presbyter nor deacon had any right to baptise:” which implies, that by his commission they had each of them the ordinary power. Thus it was in the Churches of Spain, at the time of the Council of Eliberis, in one of whose canons there is a provision made,<sup>2</sup> “that if a deacon, who presides over a people, shall baptise any persons without a bishop or presbyter, the bishop in that case shall perfect what was wanting in the ceremony by his benediction.” It is not said he shall rebaptise them, because they were only baptised by a deacon; but he shall ratify the baptism by his consummating act, which was his imposition of hands in confirmation. From whence it is evident, that deacons in Spain were then allowed to be the ordinary ministers of baptism. The same appears from St. Cyril’s Catechetical Discourses,<sup>3</sup> to have been the custom of the Churches in Palestine: for he tells his catechumens, when the time of baptism came, they might go either to bishops, or presbyters, or deacons: “for the grace of God was to be had in villages as well as cities, and came upon the unlearned as well as learned, upon bond as well as free; seeing that grace was not from men, but a gift of God by the hand of men.” This denotes, that deacons in country-villages had the ordinary power of baptising. And so we find, in the first Council of Orleans,<sup>4</sup> a decree implying, that the same

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. Dial. cum Lucifer. c. 4. Sine jussione episcopi neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habent baptizandi. Ibid. In villulis, et castellis, et remotioribus locis, per presbyteros et diaconus baptizati, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Eliber. c. 77. Si quis diaconus regens plebem, sine episcopo vel presbytero aliquos baptizaverit, episcopus eos per benedictionem perficere debet. <sup>3</sup> Cyril. Catech. xvii. n. 17. <sup>4</sup> Con. Aurel. i. c. xiv.

Si diaconus vel presbyter pro reatu suo se ab altaris communione sub pœnitentis professione submoverit; sic quoque, si alii defuerint, et causa certæ necessitatis exoritur pœnitentem baptismum liceat baptizare.

power was allowed them in the French Churches. For in one of the canons of that Council deacons and presbyters are joined together as ministers of baptism, both in ordinary and extraordinary cases: for it is said, “that if a deacon or a presbyter shall, for any private guilt, have withdrawn himself from the communion of the altar, under the profession of a penitent, yet, even in that case, such a deacon or presbyter, if there happen a case of evident necessity, and no others can be had, may baptise any man that desires baptism.” Certainly they, who authorised deacons in such singular circumstances and disadvantages to baptise, even when they were under a sort of discipline and penance, must needs allow them the same privilege as presbyters had to baptise in all other ordinary cases. Yet some other ancient rules seem absolutely to forbid deacons to minister baptism in ordinary cases, confining the office only to bishops and presbyters. Among those called the Apostolical Canons there are four that speak of the ministers of baptism, and those are there only bishops and presbyters, but no mention is made of deacons. One canon says,<sup>1</sup> “if a bishop or presbyter receives the baptism of heretics, he is to be disposed.” Another says,<sup>2</sup> “if a bishop or presbyter rebaptises one that has been truly baptised before, or does not baptise again one that has been profanely polluted in baptism by the impious, he shall be deposed, as one that derides the cross and death of Christ, and makes no difference between true and false priests.” Another Canon says,<sup>3</sup> “If any bishop or presbyter observe not the form of baptism prescribed by our Lord, In the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; but baptises in the name of three unoriginated principles, or three Sons, or three Holy Ghosts, he shall be deposed.” And a fourth Canon also pronounces the same censure against any bishops or presbyters,<sup>4</sup> “who did not use three immersions in the sacred mystery.” In all these Canons there is not the least mention of deacons, because by them only bishops and priests are supposed to be the ordinary ministers of baptism, and not deacons. So likewise in the Constitutions,

<sup>1</sup> Canon Apost. xlvi.  
xlix.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. Can. l.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. Can. xlvii.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. Can

under the name of the Apostles, all the inferior clergy, among which the deacons are comprehended, are prohibited to minister baptism: "We do not permit," say they,<sup>1</sup> "the rest of the clergy to baptise, as readers, singers, doorkeepers, subdeacons, but only bishops and presbyters, to whom the deacons are to minister. And they, that presume to act otherwise, shall bear the judgment of Corah and his company." The deacons are here wholly excluded from the office of baptism, as well as the rest of the inferior clergy; and in some ancient copies they were excluded by name; for in Georgius Hamartolus' citation of this passage, as Cotelarius has observed,<sup>2</sup> the prohibition names deacons expressly among the rest that are forbidden to baptise; and if they had not been excepted by name, yet it were so to be understood: for he that confines baptism only to the office of bishops and presbyters, must be supposed thereby to exclude deacons, unless it be pretended that deacons are of the same order either with bishops or presbyters; which the Constitutions are so far from asserting, that they make deacons only ministers to the other two orders. But in another place, the Constitutions speak yet more expressly against deacons baptising; for they thus distinguished the offices of presbyter and deacon from each other.<sup>3</sup> "A presbyter is to teach, to offer the eucharist, to baptise, and to give the blessing to the people; but a deacon is only to minister to the bishop and the presbyters, and not to perform the rest." And again,<sup>4</sup> "A deacon does not give the blessing but receive it from the bishop or the presbyter; he does not baptise; he does not offer the eucharist; but when the bishop or presbyter has offered, he distributes it to the people, not as a priest, but as one that ministers to the priests." Yet, notwithstanding this, it is asserted by the same author,<sup>5</sup> that

<sup>1</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. 11. 'Αλλ' ἔτε τοῖς λοιποῖς κληρικοῖς ἐπιτρέπομεν βαπτίζειν οἷον ἀναγνώστας, ἢ ψάλτας, ἢ πυλωροῖς, ἢ ὑπηρέταις, ἢ (Leg. ἀλλ' ἢ) μόνοις ἐπισκόποις, δὲ πρεσβυτέροις, ἔξυπεριτεμένων αὐτοῖς τῶν ἑτακόντων.

<sup>2</sup> Cotelar. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. 29.

<sup>4</sup> Ibid. lib. viii. c. 28.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid. lib. viii. c. 46.



a deacon may baptise, if he has a commission and authority from his bishop to do it, as he supposes Philip the deacon, and Ananias to have had a special call from God. "If any one," says he, "shall plead the example of Philip the deacon, and Ananias the faithful brother; the one of which baptised the eunuch, and the other me Paul; they understand not what we say: for we say, that no man takes to himself the dignity of the priesthood, but either he is called of God, as Melchisedec and Job; or he receives it from the chief priest, as Aaron from Moses. Therefore Philip and Ananias did not appoint themselves, but were chosen by Christ the chief priest, the incomparable God." St. Chrysostom seems to have been of the same opinion, that the ordinary office of baptising belonged only to priests, and not to deacons, though deacons, in cases of necessity, might do it. In his Discourses of the Priesthood he thus argues for, and magnifies the power of the priest: "It is plain madness to despise so great a power, 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 eateth not the flesh of the Lord, and drinketh not his blood, is deprived of eternal life; and all these things are performed by no other<sup>1</sup> 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?" It is certain St. Chrysostom, in these words, excludes deacons from the ordinary power of baptising, as much as he does laymen. Which the learned Dr. Forbes,<sup>2</sup> who first produced this passage against lay-baptism, was so sensible of, that he equally concludes the baptism of deacons to be invalid, as well as that of laymen. But he mistakes St. Chrysostom's meaning; for he did not intend so to confine baptism to the hands of a priest, as to make it simply and absolutely unlawful, in any case whatsoever, for a deacon to administer it: for, in case of

<sup>1</sup> Chrys. de Sacerdot. lib. iii. c. 5. Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα οἱ ἑτέροι μὲν ἕτερος, μόνον δὲ διὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκείνων ἐπιτελεῖται χειρῶν, τῶν τῆ ἱερέως λέγω, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Forbes Instruct. Histor. Theol. lib. x. c. 14. n. 12.

necessity, he not only permits, but positively enjoins deacons to baptise. “For,” says he,<sup>1</sup> “if there be a necessity, and a child be found unbaptised, and ready to die, it is lawful for a deacon to baptise it.” Which shews, that he only made priests the ordinary ministers of baptism; and that it was the contempt of their ministry only, when it might be had, which he so inveighs against, and not the bare want of it, when it could not be had in cases extraordinary and of extreme necessity, in which it might be supplied by a deacon. And this must be the meaning of Epiphanius,<sup>2</sup> when he says, “that deacons are not permitted to celebrate any mystery or sacrament in the Church, but only to minister in the celebration;” that is, they were not to do it in ordinary cases, when a priest was at hand, but only to assist the priest, as the principal agent, in the performance of it. St. Hilary was of the same mind:<sup>3</sup> for he reckons baptism a part of the apostolical office and ministry, and that it was therefore only an extraordinary exigence that made Philip the deacon baptise the Eunuch, who had such an impatient desire of baptism, that he could not stay to be baptised by an Apostle. The canons of the Church are many times peremptory against deacons baptising in ordinary cases, but they always except the case of necessity, the time of sickness, and disability or want of other ministers. Among the decrees of Gelasius this is one:<sup>4</sup> “Let not a deacon presume to baptise without the bishop or presbyter, unless they be far absent, and an extreme necessity compel him: in which cases it is sometimes allowed to lay-Christians to do it.” Cotelerius<sup>5</sup> and Sirmond give us a canon out of one

<sup>1</sup> Chrys. Hom. lxi. tom. vii. Edit. Savil. p. 423. Ἐὰν γένηται ἀνάγκη, κἢ εἴρησθῃ πικρῶν ἀβαπτιστῶν, ἢ μέλλῃ τελευτᾶν, ἔξω τὸν διάκονον βαπτίσεια.

<sup>2</sup> Epiphian. Haer. lxxix. Collyrid. n. 4. Καὶ γὰρ ὅτε διάκονοι ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησιαστικῇ τάξει ἐπιεὶσθησάν τι μυστήριον ἐπιτελεῖν, ἀλλὰ μόνον διακονεῖν τὰ ἐπιτελέμενα.

<sup>3</sup> Hilar. Com. in Psal. lxxvii. p. 242. Sacramentum ipsum baptismi adeo impatientis desiderii cupiditate praveniens, ut à diacono ministerium apostolici officii, salutis suae cupidus, exigeret.

<sup>4</sup> Gelas. Ep. ix. ad Episc. Lucan. c. 9. Absque episcopo vel presbytero baptizare non praesumat diaconus; nisi praedictis fortassè officii longius constitutis, necessitas extrema compellat: quod et laicis Christianis facere plerumque conceditur.

<sup>5</sup> Con. Rom. Can. vii. ap. Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. iii.

of the Roman Councils, which forbids deacons to baptise at any other time beside Easter: but at that time deacons, as well as presbyters, are allowed to grant remission of sins; that is, to baptise in the parish-churches: at other times, even in case of sickness, none but a presbyter is authorised to do it, because he only had power to offer the oblation. The reason of this difference in the Roman Church seems to have been this: that in a great and populous city, where there were many churches and many presbyters, and but seven deacons, there could never scarce any such case of necessity happen by the sickness of a catechumen, but that a presbyter might be had, rather than a deacon, to give him baptism; but at the solemn time of Easter such multitudes came together at once to be baptised, that the bishop and all his presbyters were hardly sufficient to perform the whole ministry, and therefore deacons, in that exigence, were taken in to be their assistants. Where we may observe two things; first, that they did this by the bishop's license and authority: and, secondly, that only in a time of great exigence, when a case of necessity required it. Isidore of Sevil, who wrote a considerable time after this, observes the like of deacons ministering baptism in the age he lived in. "It is evident," says he,<sup>1</sup> "that the ministry of baptism belongs only to priests; nor is it lawful for deacons themselves to perform the mystery without the bishop or a presbyter: unless in their absence, when the extreme necessity of sickness requires and compels them to do it: in which case it is often permitted to faithful laymen." And thus it continued for many ages after in the English

---

c. 9. Paschæ tempore presbyter et diaconus per parochias dare remissionem peccatorum, et ministerium implere consueverunt, etiam præsentem episcopo: in fontem quoque ipsi descendunt, illi in officio sunt: sed illius nomini facti summa conceditur. Reliquis verò temporibus, ubi ægritudinis necessitas consequi unumquemque compellit, specialiter presbytero licentia est per salutaris aquæ gratiam dare indulgentiam peccatorum, quoniam et munus ipsi licet, causâ mundationis, offerre: diaconis verò nulla licentia invenitur esse concessa; sed quod semel fortè contigit usurpare, per necessitatem dicuntur excusati, &c.

<sup>1</sup> Isidor. de Offic. lib. ii. c. 24. Constat baptismum solis sacerdotibus esse tractandum; ejusque mysterium nec ipsis diaconis explere est licitum absque episcopo vel presbytero: nisi his procul absentibus, ultima languoris necessitas cogat. Quod et laicis fidelibus plerumque permittitur, &c.

Church, as appears from the Canons of the Council of York,<sup>1</sup> held in the year 1195; and the Council of London,<sup>2</sup> in the year 1200; and the Canons of St. Edmund, in the year 1236, mentioned in Linwood's Provincial.<sup>3</sup> In all which deacons are forbidden to baptise, except upon urgent necessity, when the priest cannot, or is absent, or through folly and indiscretion will not, and a child or a sick person is in imminent danger of death. And so it was in some parts of the Greek Churches in former ages, as is clear from St. Chrysostom's testimony alleged before; and from Theodoret,<sup>4</sup> who says, "when a presbyter was not at hand, if a pressing necessity required, even a deacon was compelled to give baptism to any one that wanted it." He might not then do it ordinarily, but only in cases of necessity, when a presbyter or priest could not be found to do it. And so it continued to be the rule of the Church of Constantinople for several ages after; as we learn from the Canons of Nicephorus, the patriarch, in the ninth century, where, in extraordinary cases of necessity,<sup>5</sup> a simple monk and a deacon are equally qualified to baptise. Which implies, that neither of them were qualified to do it in ordinary cases: for the simple monks were not in holy orders, but properly laymen, being opposed to those, whom the Greeks called *Ἱερομοναχοὶ*, or *monks in sacred orders*, who pertained to the ecclesiastical hierarchy and function; as I have more fully shewed in another place.<sup>6</sup> Now then deacons being joined with simple monks, could not be supposed to be the ordinary ministers of baptism, but only qualified to do it in extraordinary cases. Hence it is most evident, that so many

<sup>1</sup> Con. Eboracen. c. v. Diaconus non baptizet, nec corpus Christi cuiquam erogat, nisi gravi necessitate urgente. ap. Roger. Hoveden. Hist. an. 1195. et Concil. tom. x. <sup>2</sup> Con. London. c. iii.

<sup>3</sup> Linwood Provinc. lib. iii. tit. xxiv. de Baptismo. Præcipimus quod diaconi baptizare non præsumant, nisi in his casibus, cum sacerdos non potest, vel absens est, vel stultè vel indiscretè non vult, et mors imminet puero vel aegrotò. <sup>4</sup> Theodor. Com. in 2 Paralipom. cap. xxix. q. 1. p. 389.

Πρεσβυτέρη ε' παρόντος, ἐ τῆς χρείας ἐπειγέσης, ἀναγκάζεται ἡ διάκονος προσφέρειν τῷ δεομένῳ τὸ βάπτισμα.

<sup>5</sup> Nicephor. Can. xiii. ap. Leunclavium Jur. Græc. Rom. tom. i. lib. iii. p. 196. Κατὰ περίσσειαν ἡ μοναχὸς λιτὸς βαπτίζει. ὡσαύτως ἡ διάκονος κατὰ περίσσειαν βαπτίζει. <sup>6</sup> Origin. Eccles. lib. vii. cap. ii. s. 7. &c.

of the Ancients as excluded deacons from the ordinary ministration of baptism, did it upon this supposition, that the ordinary ministration of baptism was the proper office of the priests or presbyters alone, who were a superior order above deacons; but yet that in cases of extreme necessity it was lawful for others, besides priests, to minister baptism by the bishop's authority; and upon this ground, in such cases, it was esteemed also the office of deacons. 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 preserved, and yet deacons allowed, on the other hand, to minister baptism in some cases, though they were not priests in the strict sense, in the opinion of those who allowed them to do it.

SECT. 6.—Whether the Inferior Clergy were allowed to baptise.

The next question is concerning subdeacons, and the rest of the inferior orders, who went by the name of the minor clergy in the primitive Church. These were not properly of divine, but only of ecclesiastical institution, for helps to the superior clergy in their ministration, as has been fully proved against the Romanists in another Book.<sup>1</sup> Now the question about these at present is,—Whether in any cases they had power to baptise? That they had no power in ordinary cases, is evident from what has been before discoursed of deacons: for if deacons themselves had not generally such a power allowed them, it would be absurd to think that the inferior orders below them should have it. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions excludes them all by name from this office,<sup>2</sup> readers, singers, doorkeepers, subdeacons, threatening them with the punishment of *Corah*, if they presumed to invade it. But this is to be understood of the ordinary ministration of baptism, from which deacons also were excluded. The question then runs out further,—Whether in any extraordinary cases they were allowed to

<sup>1</sup> Origin. *Eccles. lib. iii. cap. i.*  
c. 11. So Ambros. *Com. in Ephes. iv.* Neque clerici vel laici baptizant.

<sup>2</sup> *Constit. Apost. lib. iii.*

give it? But there are few among the Ancients that have, in direct terms, decidèd this question; so we must judge only by parity of reason what they thought upon it. The ancient author of the Book concerning the Baptism of Heretics, published by Rigaltius and Bishop Fell, among the works of St. Cyprian, seems to say, that the minor clergy,<sup>1</sup> in cases of necessity, might baptise. But learned men are not agreed what that author means by the minor clergy. Cotelerius<sup>2</sup> and Valesius<sup>3</sup> are of opinion, that it signifies all the inferior clergy below bishops and presbyters. And, if so, it were a plain proof indeed that the inferior clergy, in cases of necessity, might baptise. But Rigaltius and Bishop Fell, in their Notes upon the place, think the minor clergy only means presbyters and deacons, who were called so in respect of the bishop their superior, who commonly administered baptism himself, and when he could not do it in person, gave his commission to presbyters and deacons in his stead. I will not venture to decide so nice a controversy between these learned men: but I think the main question may easily be decided another way; for if the Ancients granted liberty to mere monks and laymen to baptise, 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 laymen. We cannot therefore better determine this question, than by proceeding to that other, concerning the power granted to laymen in reference to the administration of baptism, which is the grand question in this whole affair.

SECT. 7.—Laymen prohibited to baptise in ordinary Cases.

Now here first of all it is certain, that laymen were always debarred from meddling with the administration of baptism in all ordinary cases. All the former allegations, which make it the proper office of bishops and presbyters, even to the exclusion of deacons, are certainly of much greater force against the usurpations of laymen. Besides, they are

<sup>1</sup> Anonym. de Bapt. Hæret. ad calcem Cypriani, p. 26. Si à minore clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. 9.

<sup>3</sup> Vales. Not. in Euseb. lib. vi. c. 43.

sometimes prohibited in particular by name: as in the Apostolical Constitutions three times at least.<sup>1</sup> “ We do not permit laymen to perform any sacerdotal office, as the sacrifice of the eucharist, or baptism, or imposition of hands, or the lesser or the greater benediction: for no man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God. This dignity is given only by the laying on of the bishop’s hands; but he, that takes it to himself without commission, shall sustain the punishment of Uzzias.” The author, under the name of St. Ambrose,<sup>2</sup> says therefore, “ that from the time of the Apostles, the inferior clergy and laymen were prohibited to baptise.” Which at least must be understood of a prohibition to usurp the office, and do it in ordinary cases.

SECT. 8.—Yet allowed to do it sometimes in Cases extraordinary.

But still the grand question remains,—Whether ever they were allowed to do it in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity, when no public minister could be procured to do it? and this must be resolved in the affirmative, as to the general practice of the Church, though there are some exceptions of particular Churches to the contrary. Tertullian, I think, is the first writer that speaks directly to this point, and he delivers himself thus upon the matter: “ 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 preserved. In another respect laymen have also a right to give it;<sup>3</sup> for what is re-

<sup>1</sup> Const. Apost. lib. iii. c. 10. Οὐτε λαϊκοῖς ἐπιτρέπομεν ποιῆν τι τῶν ἱερατικῶν ἔργων· οἷον θυσίαν, ἢ βάπτισμα, ἢ χειροθεσίαν, ἢ εὐλογίαν μικρὰν ἢ μεγάλην. &c. Vid. Const. Apost. lib. ii. c. 27. It. lib. viii. c. 46.

<sup>2</sup> Ambros. Com. in Ephes. iv. p. 948. Hinc ergo est, unde nunc neque diaconi in populo prædicant, neque clerici vel laici baptizant.

<sup>3</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. c. 17. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est. Quod enim ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo dari potest; nisi episcopi jam aut presbyteri aut diaconi vocantur, dicentes, Domini sermo non debet abscondi ab ullo. Proinde et baptismus æquè Dei census ab omnibus exerceri potest: sed quanto magis laicis disciplina verecundiæ et modestiæ incumbit, cum ea majoribus competat, ne sibi adsumant dicatum episcopis officium episcopatus? Æmulatio schismatum mater est. ‘Omnia, licere,’ dixit sanctissimus Aposto-

ceived in common, may be given in common. Baptism is God's peculiar, and may be conferred by all. But laymen are in a much greater degree obliged by the rules of modesty in the use of their power, since they, who are superior to them, are obliged not to assume to themselves the office, which belongs to the bishop only. Emulation is the mother of strife. 'All things are lawful,' says the holy Apostle, 'but all things are not expedient.' Therefore it ought to suffice them to use this power in necessities, when the condition of the place, or time, or person, requires it: for then their charitable assistance is accepted, when the circumstance of one in danger presses them to it. And in this case he would be guilty of a man's destruction, that omitted to do what he lawfully might." Mr. Dodwel<sup>1</sup> and some others except against this passage of Tertullian, as expressing only his own private opinion, and not the common practice of the Church. But no learned man before ever thought so, as Mr. Dodwel himself confesses, and acknowledges his own opinion to be a paradox. And there is this prejudice against it from the coherence of Tertullian's discourse: that in the former part of it 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 laymen. But however this be, Tertullian's sense was in the next age confirmed by some public acts of the Church.

SECT. 9.—The Testimony of the Council of Eliberis.

About an hundred years after Tertullian, the Spanish bishops assembled in the Council of Eliberis made a public decree about this matter:<sup>2</sup> they there appointed, "That when

---

lus, 'sed non omnia expedire.' Sufficiat scilicet, in necessitatibus ut utaris; sicubi aut loci, aut temporis, aut personæ conditio compellit. Tunc enim constantia succurrentis excipitur, cum urget circumstantia periclitantis. Quoniam reus erit perditæ hominis, si supersederit præstare quod libere poterit.

<sup>1</sup> Dodwel, de Jure Laicorum Sacerdotali, cap. ii. n. 2. p. 52.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Eliber. can. xxxviii. Peregrè navigantes, aut si ecclesia in prox-



men were upon a voyage at sea, or in any place where no church was near at hand, if a catechumen happened to be extremely sick, and at the point of death, that then any Christian, who had his own baptism entire, and was no bigamist, might baptise him." This authority was not given to all Christians in all cases, but with several limitations and restrictions. 1. It must be a case of absolute necessity, when baptism could not otherwise be had. 2. The person baptising must have his own baptism entire: which Albaspinus understands of not lapsing after baptism.<sup>1</sup> Vossius,<sup>2</sup> with better reason, supposes it to be opposed to clinic baptism, which was a less solemn and imperfect baptism, which made a man uncapable of holy orders ever after, as I have shown elsewhere,<sup>3</sup> from the ancient laws of the Church. And it was very often attended with another defect, which was the want of confirmation, and the gift of the Holy Ghost by imposition of the hands of the bishop, which was not ordinarily sought for by clinics, who were baptised in haste upon a deathbed. For this reason these Spanish bishops denied such the privilege of baptising in any case, whilst they allowed it to others. 3. They require also, that the man must be no bigamist, because that also unqualified a person for sacred orders. And it was their intent, when a priest could not be had to administer baptism, only to authorise such laymen to do it, as had those proper qualifications that were requisite to obtain orders, and so bring them as near priests as they could. This is the most probable account I can give at present of these limitations; however, in the main, the matter is indisputable, that they plainly intended, in some extraordinary cases, to give laymen a licence and authority to administer baptism, which could not then be said to be unauthorised in Spain, since it had the best authority the Church could give it, which is the determination and authority of a Council. It will not here be material for any one to object, that this was but the determination of a private national Council; for we

---

imo non fuerit, posse fidelem, qui lavacrum suum integrum habet, nec sit bigamus, baptizare in necessitate infirmitatis positum catechumenum.

<sup>1</sup> Albaspin. Not in Locum.

<sup>2</sup> Vossius de Baptismo Disp. xi. n. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Origin. Eccles. lib. iii. cap. iii. s. 12.

are not now inquiring, 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. The Church of Rome varied from the rule of this Council many ages ago; for they allowed bigamists to baptise, as Auxilius informs us,<sup>1</sup> though that was forbidden by the determination of this Spanish Council. But I proceed.

SECT. 10.—Of the Church of Alexandria.

Whilst this matter was thus determined in the West, there happened 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 historians Socrates, Sozomen, and Ruffin, who all relate it. Ruffin says, he had the story from the mouth of those who lived and conversed with Athanasius; and the account of it, according to his relation, is this: “Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, on a certain day, being the festival of Peter the Martyr, after the solemn service 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 perplexed, he sent immediately for his clergy, and showed them what he himself had seen; ordering them withal to go and bring the boys before him. Who being asked, what play they were at, and what they had done, and after what manner; they at first denied all the whole matter, as children used to do through fear, but afterward they told every thing in order as it was done, confessing that they had baptised certain catechumens by the hands of Athanasius, who acted the part of the bishop in the play. Then examining further of those

---

<sup>1</sup> Auxil. de Ordinatione Formosi, ad calcem Morini de Ordinationibus, c. 10. Baptizati bigami, si necessitas incumbit, baptizare possunt; sacrum verò ordinem canonicè accipere nequeunt.

who were said to be baptised,<sup>1</sup> what questions they were asked, and what answers they made; and being likewise informed 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 conferred with a council of his clergy, he is said to have determined, that the baptism of those on whom water had been poured, with the proper interrogatories and responses, ought not to be repeated, but only have those things added, which the priests were used to perform." Socrates<sup>2</sup> and Sozomen<sup>3</sup> have the same story, and the author of the Life of Athanasius in Photius,<sup>4</sup> with Johannes Moschus,<sup>5</sup> and many others. They, who find themselves pressed with this relation, take several ways to evade the force of it. Michaël Glycas, a Greek historian, plainly inverts the bishop's determination, and says, he ordered them to be re-baptised. Which is so manifest a prevarication, and affront to the faith of all the old historians, that it deserves no other answer, but to give it its true name of a bold falsification, and imposture. Others incline to call in question the whole story, and tell us, that learned men now generally also incline to reject it as a fiction. I know Spanheim, and some few others do so; but the generality of learned men are not of that opinion. Archbishop Whitgift, Abbot, Cotelerius, Pagi, and many others that might be named, men of character in their age, have appeared in its behalf, and defended it as a genuine piece of history. And it is some confirmation, that Ruffin says, he had it from the mouth of those who conversed with Athanasius. And Nicephorus Callistus, who also relates the story,<sup>6</sup> gives a parallel instance of another fact much like this, which happened in his own time at Constantinople. Which shews it not to be altogether so singular and incredible a case, as some are apt to imagine.

<sup>1</sup> Ruffin. Hist. lib. i. c. 14. Tum ille diligenter inquirens ab his qui baptizati dicebantur, quid interrogati fuerint, quidve responderint, simul et ab eo qui interrogaverat, ubi videt secundum religionis nostræ ritum cuncta constare, conlocutus cum concilio clericorum, statuisset traditur, illis, quibus integris interrogationibus et responsionibus aqua fuerat infusa, iterari baptismum non debere, sed adimpleri ea quæ à sacerdotibus mos est, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Socrat. Hist. lib. i. c. 15.

<sup>3</sup> Sozom. lib. ii. c. 17.

<sup>4</sup> Phot. Cod. 238.

<sup>5</sup> Moschus Pratum Spir. c. 197.

<sup>6</sup> Niceph.

Hist. lib. iii. c. 37.

But admit it were a fabulous report, yet we must charitably believe of the ancient historians, both Greek and Latin, that they believed 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; as some modern Greeks have done, who like not the thing, and therefore censure it, not as a fabulous story, but an irregular action: which the 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. But there is another exception made to this case by Matthew Blastares,<sup>1</sup> a modern Greek canonist, who says, it was only a single example, and done against canon. Which is an answer that has more modesty, and in one part of it seems to carry more weight in it than either of the former. For I believe there is no canon that does antecedently authorise one youth, without necessity, to baptise another. But then he a little mistakes the question, which is not about the fact of Athanasius, but the determination of Alexander upon it: for as to the fact of Athanasius, any one will readily own, that there was neither canon, nor precedent perhaps, to warrant the doing of it; and it would be strange if any such canon should be made in the Church. But for the determination of Alexander, that a baptism given in due form, though irregularly, by the hand of a layman, may be so valid, as not to need repeating; I believe it will not be so easy a matter, as Blastares imagined, to produce an ancient canon directly to confront it, by declaring that such irregular baptisms are utterly null and void, though they have the post-nate allowance of the Church where they are done, which was the peculiar circumstance of the present case: for 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Blastar. Syntagma Canon. ap. Bevereg. Pandect. tom. ii. p. 24.

of it. And thus, it is plain, the baptisms given by Athanasius were allowed and confirmed by Alexander in the Church.

SECT. 11.—Of St. Jerom.

In the latter end of the Fourth Century lived St. Jerom, and St. Austin, who have both spoken very plainly of the practice of the Church, as to what concerns the allowance of lay-baptism in some certain cases. St. Jerom, as has been observed before, derives the power of presbyters and deacons to baptise, from the original power of the bishop: yet, in cases of necessity, he says,<sup>1</sup> it was also allowed frequently to laymen: for in such cases he that had received baptism might give it to others. This testimony of St. Jerom is so full and plain, that I have often wondered how so learned and acute a man as Dr. Forbes,<sup>2</sup> and the ingenious Mr. Reeves,<sup>3</sup> could run into such a mistake, as to say, “that after the council of Nice, this proposition, that those whom a laic baptiseth are to be rebaptised, was looked upon to be so true, that it was the undoubted principle, whereby the Orthodox confuted the Luciferians.” Who, that reads these words in these learned writers, and looks no further, would not at first sight be tempted to think, that the Council of Nice had somewhere made an order, that persons baptised by laymen should be rebaptised; and that the Catholics generally made use of this as an undoubted principle to confute the Luciferians? And yet in fact there was no such thing. The Council of Nice never made any decree about the rebaptisation of persons baptised by laymen, but only by heretical priests. Nor did the Catholics use that proposition as an undoubted principle against the Luciferians. St. Jerom wrote against the Luciferians, but he is so far from asserting, universally, that those whom a laic baptiseth are to be rebaptised, that he expressly maintains the con-

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. Dial. c. Lucif. c. iv. Sine chrismate et jussione episcopi neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habent baptizandi. Quod frequenter (si tamen necessitas cogit) scimus etiam licere laicis. Ut enim accipit quis, illa et dare potest.

<sup>2</sup> Forbes Instruct. Hist. lib. x. cap. 14. n. 5.

<sup>3</sup> Reeves Note on Vincent, Lirin. p. 263.

trary,—that, if necessity required, laymen had liberty granted them to baptise. Mr. Reeves has once done me the honour to let my opinion and judgment be of some esteem with him, and I believe, when he considers this matter again, he will see reason to alter his opinion in this particular, being as ingenuous as he is learned; and the rather, because the world is apt to be led into error by persons of note and authority, and to take things upon trust, when delivered to them by men of a superior character. If there had not been this fear, I could not have prevailed with myself to have noted this mistake in a person, for whose useful labours I have so great a veneration.

SECT. 12.—Of St. Austin.

St. Austin was cotemporary with St. Jerom, and of the same opinion with him in this matter. In his Epistle to Fortunatus, which is preserved in Gratian,<sup>1</sup> he says, “In time of necessity, when a bishop, or a presbyter, or other minister could not be found, and a man desired baptism who was in danger of death, in that case laymen were used to give him that sacrament which they had received, rather than he should end his life without it.” And this custom he founds upon authority descended by bishops from the Apostles: for in the same Epistle he says,<sup>2</sup> “baptism is holy in itself, if it be given in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and thereis 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 laymen descending from the same stock and original.” He there also relates a story of a certain catechumen, who being at sea, and in danger of being cast away in a storm, was bap-

<sup>1</sup> Ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. Dist. iv. c. 21. In necessitate, cum episcopi aut presbyteri aut quilibet ministrorum non inveniuntur, et urget periculum ejus qui petit, ne sine isto sacramento hanc vitam finiat, etiam laicos solere dare sacramentum, quod acceperunt, solemus audire.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. ap. Gratian. c. xxxvi. Sanctum est baptismum per seipsum, quod datum est in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti: Ita ut in eodem sacramento sit etiam auctoritas traditionis per Dominum nostrum ad Apostolos, per illos autem ad episcopos, et alios sacerdotes, vel etiam laicos Christianos ab eadem origine et stirpe venientes.

tised by a penitent, because there was no other Christian in the ship with them. And he concludes upon it,<sup>1</sup> “that though such a fact had not happened, yet it was a case that, every 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 unbaptised.” But if any one thinks these passages doubtful, because they are only related by Gratian, he may read the same in St. Austin’s undoubted works. In his books against Parmenian, the Donatist,<sup>2</sup> he uses this argument to prove, that the baptism of heretics ought not to be repeated; “Because though it be but a layman that gives baptism to a man in extreme 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 compelled by necessity, it is either no fault at all, or but a very light one.”

SECT. 13.—Of Gelasius. Anno 492.

The next writer after St. Austin, who has said any thing of this matter, is Gelasius, bishop of Rome, who, in his Epistle to the bishops of Lucania, Brutia, and Sicily,<sup>3</sup> restrains the office of baptising 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 allowed to lay-Christians to perform it. So that laymen had as much

---

<sup>1</sup> Ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. c. xxxvi. Non potest quisquam dicere reliquendum esse illum, qui morte imminente baptizari desiderat. Quem baptizatum à pœnitente quisquis non credat contigisse, oportet ut credat posse contingere. <sup>2</sup> Aug, cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. ii. c. 13. Et si laicus aliquis pereunti dederit, necessitate compulsus, quod cum ipse acciperet, dandum esse addidit, nescio an piè quisquam dixerit esse repetendum. Nullâ enim necessitate si fiat, alieni muneris usurpatio est: si autem necessitas urgeat, aut nullum, aut veniale delictum est. <sup>3</sup> Gelas. Ep. ix. ad Episcop. Lucan. c. 9. Absque Episcopo vel presbytero, baptizare non præsumat diaconus; nisi prædictis fortasse officiis longiùs constitutis, necessitas extrema compellat: quod et laicis Christianis facere plerumque conceditur.

authority to perform it, in the absence of deacons, as deacons had to do it in the absence of the presbyters and bishop.

SECT. 14.—Of Isidore, Bishop of Seville, Anno 595.

Isidore, bishop of Seville, lived about an hundred years after Gelasius, and he delivers himself to the same effect:<sup>1</sup> “That it is unlawful either for private men, or the inferior clergy to baptise; 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,<sup>1</sup> 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 retained.’ And in another place, ‘Go teach all nations, baptising 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 sickness compel them to do it; in which case also lay Christians are often permitted to do it; lest any one should be called out of the world without the remedy or means of salvation.” Thus we have seen for six hundred years the general sense and practice of the ancient 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Isidor. de Offic. Eccles. lib. ii. c. 24. Quod nec privatis, nec clericis sine gradu, baptizare liceat, nisi tantum sacerdotibus: in Evangelio legimus, Apostolis tantum permissum, Jesu post resurrectionem dicente; ‘Sicut misit me Pater, et ego mitto vos. Et hoc cum dixisset, insufflavit et ait eis, Accipite Spiritum Sanctum; quorum remiseritis peccata, remittentur eis; et quorum retinueritis, retenta erunt.’ Et in alio loco, ‘Ite, docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti.’ Unde constat baptismum solis sacerdotibus esse traditum; ejusque mysterium nec ipsis diaconibus explere est licitum absque episcopis vel presbyteris: nisi, illis absentibus, ultima languoris cogat necessitas: quod et laicis fidelibus plerumque permittitur; ne quisquam sine remedio salutari de seculo evectur.



others to baptise; and that either to presbyters and deacons, or to presbyters alone in ordinary cases; and in cases extraordinary and of extreme necessity, to deacons and laymen.

SECT. 15.—The Objection from St. Chrysostom, Basil, and Cyprian answered.

To this general consent of antiquity, Dr. Forbes<sup>1</sup> and some others, who follow him, have opposed the testimony of St. Chrysostom, St. Basil, and St. Cyprian; whose evidence, if it were entirely on the objector's side, 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 the present inquiry. But I have shewed before, sect. 5. that St. Chrysostom's meaning is utterly mistaken by Dr. Forbes. For 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 laymen: and yet Chrysostom allows deacons to baptise in cases of necessity; which makes it evident, that his discourse only relates to the ministration of baptism in ordinary cases. I do not here repeat St. Chrysostom's words, because the reader may find them alleged above, in speaking of the power of deacons. As to St. Basil, it will be readily owned, that he had somewhat of a singular opinion in this matter: for he was for rebaptising all persons that were only baptised by laymen, as he was also for rebaptising all that were baptised by heretical and schismatical priests; for he brings in Cyprian, and Firmilian, his predecessor in the see of Cæsarea, arguing after this manner,<sup>2</sup> “ Heretics and schismatics are broken off from the Church, and become laymen, and therefore have no power to baptise, or to ordain, being no longer able to give the gift of

<sup>1</sup> Forbes Instruct. Hist. Theol. lib. x. cap. xiv.

<sup>2</sup> Basil. Ep. i. ad Amphiloich. cap. i. *‘Οι δὲ ἀπορράγηντες, λαϊκοὶ γενόμενοι, ἅτε τῷ βαπτίζεω, ἅτε τῷ χειροτονεῖν εἶχον ἕξουσίαν, ἐκέτι δυνάμενοι χάριτι Πνεύματος Ἁγίου ἑτέροις παρέχειν, ἧς αὐτοὶ ἐκπεπτώκασι. Διὸ ὡς παρὰ λαϊκῶν βαπτισομένους τὸς παρ’ αὐτῶν, ἐκέλευσαν ἐρχομένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῷ ἀληθινῷ βαπτίσματι, τῷ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀνακαθαίρεσθαι.*

the Holy Ghost to others, which they have lost themselves. Therefore such as are baptised by them, when they return to the Church, are to be rebaptised with the true baptism of the Church, as being only baptised by laymen." If it were not for St. Basil's testimony, I should doubt, whether Cyprian had ever made use of such an argument as this.

1. Because no such argument, that I know of, is to be found in his works.
2. Because Tertullian, whom Cyprian commonly called his master, made a great distinction between the baptism of heretics and the baptism of catholic laymen, at least in cases of necessity, as we have seen before. For he was against rebaptising those that were so baptised by laymen, though he was as much for rebaptising those that were baptised by heretics,<sup>1</sup> as Cyprian himself.
3. Cyprian always paid a far greater deference to catholic laymen 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 abandoned and abhorred, as men that had abandoned the faith, and renounced their Christianity by their heretical doctrine. 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. But however this matter was, St. Basil was not so stiff to this opinion, and the particular practice of his own Church, as to unchristian those that were baptised by schismatics, or break the communion of the Church upon it: for he gives his advice in the words immediately following, "that men should quietly comply with the rules and practice of their own Church where they lived." "But forasmuch," says he,<sup>2</sup> "as some of the Asiatic Churches think otherwise, that the baptism of such, by way of dispensation for the sake of great multitudes, ought to be received, let it be received." Whence, I think it may be inferred, that though St. Basil,

<sup>1</sup> See Tertul. de Bapt. c. xv.  
 ἔτι ὅλως ἰδοῦν ἔτισι τῶν κατὰ τὴν Ἀσίαν, οἰκονομίας ἕνεκα τῶν πολλῶν, δεχθῆναι αὐτῶν τὸ βάπτισμα, ἕτω δεκτόν.

<sup>2</sup> Basil. Ep. Canon. i. can. i. Ἐπιθεῖν

in his own opinion, did not approve of the baptism either of schismatics or laymen, 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 Ancients, that a latitude of power was left, with the rulers and governors of the Church, to ratify such baptisms, when they found it necessary for the benefit and edification of the Church. But, if otherwise, St. Basil's opinion or St. Cyprian's, cannot prejudice the contrary doctrine, or be thrown into the balance against the common consent and practice of the Church. And yet it may be observed, that St. Basil speaks, perhaps not of lay-baptism in cases of necessity, but of usurping the office, as heretics did in ordinary cases: which makes a wide difference in the case, and belongs to a more difficult question, that is, whether unauthorised baptisms were ever ratified and made good by the subsequent confirmation and reception of the Church? Which is the next point that comes now in order to be considered.

**SECT. 16.**—Whether the usurped and unauthorised Baptism of Laymen was allowed to be valid.

This question, as I said, has much more difficulty than the former: because a great many of the authors who have justified the lawfulness of lay-baptism in cases of necessity, are wholly silent upon this point: for 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. And the author of the Apostolical Constitutions seems to pronounce severely of usurped and unauthorised actions, as utterly null and void. He has a whole chapter with this title, “That 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:” and he thus expresses himself upon it,<sup>1</sup> “as it was not lawful for a stranger, that was not of the tribe of Levi

---

<sup>1</sup> Const. Apost. lib. ii. c. xxvii. 'Ει δὲ τις ἄνευ τῆ ἐπισκόπου ποιῆ τι, εἰς μάτην ποιῆ αὐτό. 'Ου γὰρ αὐτῷ εἰς ἔργον λογισθήσεται. ὡς γὰρ ὁ Σαὺλ ἄνευ τῆ Σαμυὴλ προσενέγκας, ἤκτισεν, ὅτι μεματαιώται σοι ἔτω ἔξ πάς λαϊκός ἄνευ τῆ ἱερέως ἐπιτελῶν τι, μάταια ποιεῖ.

to offer any thing, or approach the altar without a priest; so do ye nothing without the bishop. For if any man does any thing without the bishop, he does it in vain: it shall be not reputed to him as any service. As Saul, when he had offered sacrifice without Samuel, was told, that he had done vainly; so whatever layman does any thing without a priest he labours in vain. And as King Uzzias, when he had invaded the priest's office, was smitten with leprosy for his transgression, so every layman shall bear his punishment that contemns God, and insults his priests, and takes honour to himself, not imitating Christ, who glorified not himself, but stayed till his Father said, 'Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek.' " Now this discourse, when applied to baptism, will amount to this, that every one, who usurps the office of baptising, which belongs not to him, is a great transgressor in the sight of God; and all his acts are vain, as to what concerns himself; for they shall never be accounted to him as acceptable service, worthy of a reward, but rather inevitably make him liable to wrath and punishment. But still the question remains, whether such acts, though vain in respect of the administrator, be utterly vain and void in respect of the receiver also? And as this author has not precisely determined this point so I will not pretend to determine it from him. On the other hand, the determination, that was given by Alexander and the Church of Alexandria, is plain, that such baptisms, though unauthorised and very irregular in the administrator, are not wholly null and void as to the effect in the party baptised. Athanasius, it is certain, could have no law of the church to authorize him to baptise in that case and manner in which he performed it; and yet Alexander would not suffer those to be rebaptised, who had been so baptised by him. St. Austin was of the same judgment: he freely owns, that when baptism is performed by a layman, without necessity, it is an usurpation of another man's office: but yet he thinks it is not wholly null and void as to the receiver, but a true baptism, which ought not to be repeated: his words are these;<sup>1</sup> " Though it be usurped without necessi-

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. cont. Epist. Parmen. lib. ii. cap. xiii. Sed etsi nullâ necessitate

ty, and given by any man to another, that which is given cannot be said not to be given, though 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 received it unlawfully: but yet it cannot be accounted as not given. No devout soldier ever violates the royal stamp, though it be usurped by private men: for though some by stealth, and in a clandestine way set the royal stamp, not to the public money, but their own; yet the money so stamp'd, when they are either punished or pardoned for their offence, having the royal standard upon it, it is not defaced, but brought into the king's treasury." Whence it is plain he thought, that baptism given by laymen in ordinary cases, which was an usurpation 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,<sup>1</sup> "if he were a member of such a synod, wherein this question was debated, he should not scruple to assert all those to have baptism, wheresoever; or by whomsoever baptised, that had received it in faith, and without dissimulation, in that form of words which is prescribed by the Gospel: though if they wanted charity, and were out of the Catholic Church, it would not profit them to salvation, or any other spiritual concerns." Optatus

---

usurpetur, et à quolibet cuilibet detur; quod datum fuerit, non potest dici non datum, quamvis rectè dici potest illicitè datum. Illicitam ergo usurpationem corrigit remissentis et pœnitentis affectus. Quod si non correxerit, manebit ad pœnam usurpatoris, quod datum est, vel ejus qui illicitè dedit, vel ejus qui illicitè accepit: non tamen pro non dato habetur. Neque ullo modo per devotum militem, quod à privatis usurpatum est, signum regale violabitur. Si enim aliqui furtim et extraordinariè, non in monetis publicis aurum vel argentum sed æs percutiendo signaverint; cum fuerit deprehensum, nonne illis punitis aut indulgentiâ liberatis, cognitum regale signum thesauris regalibus cogetur inferri.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. vii. c. liii. Nequaquam dubitarem habere eos baptismum, qui ubicunque, et à quibuscunque illud verbis evangelicis consecratum, sine suâ simulatione, et cum aliquâ fide accepissent: quanquam eis ad salutem spiritualem non prodesset, si caritate caruissent, quâ catholicæ insererentur Ecclesiæ.

was plainly of the same opinion; he thought that Christ gave a commission to his Apostles to baptise, but yet not such an one as peremptorily annulled and evacuated all baptisms that were performed by any other. "Our Saviour," says he,<sup>1</sup> "gave commandment in whose name the nations should be baptised: but he did not determine without exception, by whom they should be baptised. He said not to his disciples, this shall ye do, and no other shall do it. For whoever baptises in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, fulfils the work of the Apostles." Then he alleges that saying of St. John the Apostle in the Gospel, "Master we saw one casting out devils in thy name, and we forbad him, because he followeth not with us." To which Christ replied, "Forbid him not, for he that is not against you is for you." Upon which he 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. And upon this ground he allows the baptism of schismatics, and such heretics also as baptised in the faith of the Trinity, to be valid, though they were not every way legally authorised and qualified, as the true ministers of the Church, to perform it: of which more hereafter in its proper place.

SECT. 17.—Of the Baptism of Women, whether they had any Authority to baptise.

The next question is concerning the baptism of women, whether they had any authority, or were ever allowed in any case to baptise in the Church? as to ordinary cases, it is agreed on all hands, that they were absolutely forbidden to meddle with any ecclesiastical office, and baptism in particular. This was the controversy between the Church, and several ancient heresies, whether women might be priests,

---

<sup>1</sup> Optat. cont. Parmen. lib. v. p. 90. In quo baptizarentur gentes, à Salvatore mandatum est: per quem baptizentur, nullâ exceptione discretum est. Non dixit Apostolis, 'vos facite, alii non faciant.' Quisquis in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti baptizaverit, Apostolorum opus implevit.—Ergo nomen est quod sanctificat, non opus.

and baptise as well as men. The Marcionites affirmed it to be lawful ; so did the Collyridians, and the Pepuzians, and Cataphrygians, which were a branch of the Montanists. But the Catholics with great vehemence always opposed this, as an illegal and unchristian practice, as I have had occasion to shew more at large in another work, where I discourse of the office of the deaconesses in the ancient Church, to which I refer the reader.<sup>1</sup> The Lutherans and the Romanists, who defend the baptism of women in cases of extreme necessity, do not deny this, but say their adversaries do them wrong to charge them with the practice of the Marcionites and Montanists, which they utterly disavow. Therefore the stress of the question lies in this, whether the ancient Church allowed women to baptise in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity, as she did laymen ? and here, I think, with submission to better judgments, she did not: for Tertullian, in the very same place where he grants it may lawfully be done by men, forbids it absolutely to be done by women ; and he goes upon this principle, that men were called to the sacerdotal office, but not women ; and therefore when any exigency required, the one might perform it, but not the other. He calls it petulancy in women to usurp the power of baptising.<sup>2</sup> And whereas some defended it by the example of Tecla, and urged the authority of that ancient writing, which was called the Acts of Paul and Tecla, and was supposed to be written by the Apostle himself: he gives them to understand that it was no such thing, but that it was written by a presbyter in Asia under the name of St. Paul ; and that the presbyter was convict of the matter, and confessed the thing, that he did it out of love to St. Paul ; but he was deposed notwithstanding for his

<sup>1</sup> Origin. Eccles. lib. ii. c. 22. s. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Bapt.

c. 17. *Petu'antia autem mulierum, quæ usurpavit docere, utique non etiam tingendi jus sibi pariet; nisi si quæ nova bestia evenerit similis pristinæ; ut quemadmodum illa baptismum auferebat, ita aliqua per se eum conferat. Quod si quæ Pauli perperam scripta legunt, exemplum Teclæ ad licentiam mulierum docendi, tingendique, defendunt: sciant in Asiâ presbyterum, qui eam scripturam construxit, quasi titulo Pauli de suo cumulans, convictum atque confessum, id se amore Pauli fecisse, loco decessisse. Quam enim fidei proximum videretur, ut is docendi et tinguendi daret fœminæ potestatem, qui ne discere quidem constanter mulieri permisit!*

forgery. For it was utterly improbable, that the Apostle should grant women a power to teach and baptise, who did not so much as allow them to ask questions for learning's sake in a public assembly. In another place, he says,<sup>1</sup> "It was not permitted to women to speak in the Church; but neither might they teach, nor baptise, nor offer the oblation, nor assume to themselves any office belonging to men, much less those that appertained to the priests only." Whence it seems pretty plain, that he did not allow the same power and authority to women to baptise in cases of necessity, as he did to men, since he makes an exception in the one case, but none in the other. And so in the fourth Council of Carthage,<sup>2</sup> women are absolutely forbidden to baptise, without any exception. For though Gratian and Peter Lombard add the words, "*Nisi necessitate cogente, except necessity require,*" to the ancient body of that canon; yet this is either an interpretation of their own, or else a plain fraud; for there is no such reading now in any tome of the councils; and as Vossius observes,<sup>3</sup> it is otherwise cited by Walfridus Strabo,<sup>4</sup> some ages before them; which is an argument, that the former is the genuine reading, and that the canon originally had no such exception. Nor does St. Jerom, nor St. Austin, nor Gelasius, nor Isidore, grant any authority to women to baptise, as they do to men. Whence it may be inferred from their silence, that they did not think their cases to be parallel. And it may be concluded further, that the practice and rules of the modern Greek Church, and Romanists, and Lutherans, which allow midwives, or any other women to baptise in cases of necessity, whatever other grounds they may have to go upon, are not to be justified from the rules and canons of the ancient Church, since there are no such to authorise the practice.

SECT. 18.—Whether the usurped Baptism of Women was esteemed valid.

But it will be demanded further,—whether if women usurp-

---

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Veland. Virg. c. 9. Non permittitur mulieri in ecclesiâ loqui: sed nec docere, nec tingere, nec offerre, nec ullius virillis muneris, nedum sacerdotalis officii sortem sibi vindicare.      <sup>2</sup> Con. Carth. iv. can. 100. Mulier baptizare non presumat.

<sup>3</sup> Voss. de Bapt. Disp. xi. s. 15. p. 148.

<sup>4</sup> Strabo de Offic. cap. 26.



ed the authority of baptising, either in ordinary cases, as the heretical priestesses did; or in extraordinary cases of necessity, as perhaps some might do in the Catholic Church, though against law; was their baptism repeated as null and void, or received as valid by the Church? this question consisting of several parts, I cannot give the same distinct and positive answer to each part of it. But I think there is no doubt to be made, but that, first, all such Churches as rejected the baptism of heretical men, must needs be supposed to have rejected the baptism of heretical women, whether in ordinary or extraordinary cases. Therefore Tertullian, Cyprian, and Firmilian<sup>1</sup> are plain in the case, that all such baptisms are invalid. I think it, also, probable, that they, who received the baptism of heretical men out of the Church as valid, and the baptism of Catholic laymen in the Church, as not only valid, but authorised too, did yet reject the baptism of women in both cases, because they are so peremptory in prohibiting women universally to meddle with the ministerial offices, and this always without exception of any cases whatsoever. But as I remember no ancient author that has spoken directly and closely to this part of the question; and there are some reasons to incline a man to believe St. Austin to have been of a different opinion; so I leave this to the judgment of others, and further inquiry.

SECT. 19.—Whether Heretical and Schismatical Priests, and Degraded Clergymen had any legal Authority to baptise.

The next thing in debate is, concerning baptism administered by heretical and schismatical bishops, priests, and deacons, and such of the catholic clergy as are legally degraded or deposed by the authority of the Church, for transgressing the rules of their function. The particular stating and examination of this matter is a thing of great weight and moment; because it is such a practical case as the Church has always been much more concerned in, than in that of the baptism of mere laymen: and the whole Church of England, and all the Churches of the Reformation have the very essence

---

<sup>1</sup> Firmil. Ep. lxxv. ap. Cypr. p. 223.

and being of their baptism and Christianity depending on it. For they all received their baptism from the heretical and schismatical Church of Rome: according therefore as heretical and schismatical baptism is determined to be valid or not valid, such must be the fate of these Churches, either to have received true and valid baptism, or else to want yet all of them to be rebaptised. Now that I may speak the sense of the ancient Church upon this grand point with clearness and distinction, it will be necessary to treat separately of these four questions: 1. Whether heretics and schismatics have any legal authority from the Church to baptise? 2. Whether supposing them to have no legal authority, their baptism be notwithstanding true and valid baptism? 3. what privileges are conferred by such baptism, what are its defects, and how those deficiencies were supplied upon men's returning to the unity of the Holy Catholic Church? 4. Whether heretics, and schismatics, and degraded clergymen act in that capacity as clergymen or laymen? The distinct consideration of these several questions will be of great use; for nothing has more embroiled the Church, or confounded men in this dispute, than the not distinguishing authorised baptism from that which is merely valid; and the privileges and perfections of the one from the deficiencies and imperfections of the other. It was the not attending to these things distinctly, that led Cyprian and all his associates into the error of rebaptisation; they thought no baptism could be valid, unless both the administrator was an authorised person, and his baptism could also exhibit all those spiritual graces, which are ordinarily the effects of catholic baptism; but both these things were wanting in the baptism of heretics, viz. both authority and spiritual graces; and therefore they concluded their baptism to be invalid. It is the same want of attending to the distinction between unauthorised baptism and invalid baptism, which leads many into a mistake at this day. They always confound these two things together, which yet are of very different consideration from each other; for all the baptisms of heretics, schismatics, and degraded ministers are unauthorised; and yet it will not be safe to conclude immediately that they are therefore absolutely invalid, otherwise the Catholic Church and the Church of

England were in an ill case, as will appear by the sequel of this discourse.

For, first of all, it was agreed on all hands, that heretics and schismatics and degraded clergymen had not any legal authority from the Church to baptise. This was not only asserted by Cyprian and his followers, who maintained the invalidity of such baptisms, but also by St. Austin, and all the rest that stood up for the validity of them against the necessity of rebaptising. And they went upon this ground, that they who deserted and opposed the Church, where thenceforth destitute of her lawful call, and therefore acted not only without her authority, but against her authority in all their ministrations. They were so far from having the Church's authority to baptise in such cases, that they incurred her severest censures and anathemas for doing it, although their baptisms were received as valid under such an irregular, and unlawful administration. Nothing can be plainer than that canon of the second Council of Carthage to this purpose, which says,<sup>1</sup> "that if a presbyter, who is under the censure of excommunication of his own bishop, would have any redress, he must apply himself to the neighbouring bishops, and have his cause heard by them, in order to be reconciled to his bishop. But if he refuses to do this, and proudly withdrawing himself from the communion of his bishop, he sets up a separate and schismatical meeting to offer sacrifice to God, let him be anathema and lose his place." If such a schismatical presbyter makes himself an anathema for ministering the sacrament in a separate meeting, however valid in themselves his sacraments may be, yet certainly he acts against the authority of the Church, and all his ministrations are sinful and unlawful in such a separation. This is what we have heard Ignatius declare before,<sup>2</sup> "that it is not lawful either to baptise or celebrate the eucharist without the

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Carthag. ii. can. 8. Si quis presbyter à præposito suo excommunicatus vel correptus fuerit, debet utique apud vicinos episcopos conqueri, ut ab ipsis ejus causa possit audiri, ac per ipsos suo episcopo reconciliari. Quod nisi fecerit, sed superbiâ, quod absit, inflatus, secernendum se ab episcopi sui communione duxerit, ac separatim cum aliquibus schisma faciens, sacrificium Deo obtulerit, anathema habeatur ac locum amittat.

<sup>2</sup> Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrn. n. 8. Cited before, sect. 3.

bishop, but what he allows is well-pleasing to God." Now, what should make it sinful and displeasing to God, for a presbyter to baptise without his bishop, but only that in so doing he acts without and against the authority of his bishop, and in opposition to him, whom God has made the chief governor of the Church? This is also what we have heard St. Jerom say before,<sup>1</sup> "that neither presbyters nor deacons have any right to baptise without the order or authority of their bishop, because he is the chief minister of the Church." But enough has been said already upon this point, in speaking of the bishop's original power, and of the power of presbyters and deacons, as only derivative from them, to shew that none can have any lawful authority or regular power to baptise, but only as they act in subordination to them, according to the standing laws and rules of the Catholic Church. Only here we must observe a distinction which St. Austin makes about the word power, which either signifies that regular authority and power of administering baptism in a lawful way, which we have been speaking of; or else, such a power as may be in men to give a baptism that shall stand valid and firm, though they were not regularly qualified to perform it, but did it by contradiction to known rules, and in manifest usurpation. In which sense he allows heretics, and schismatics, and contumacious or degraded bishops and priests to have still a power to baptise: but then this was not the true regular authorised baptism of the Church, but an usurped power, and invasion of an office which regularly belonged to others. So that there was no dispute among the Ancients upon this point; for they all agreed in this, that taking power only for regular power and just and lawful authority, heretics and schismatics and degraded priests had not lawful authority to baptise; but what they did was done, properly speaking, by an unauthorised, criminal, anti-episcopal usurpation, because contrary to the known rules and orders of the true governing part of the Catholic Church.

---

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucifer. c. iv. See before, sect. 3.

SECT. 20.—Whether the Baptism of Heretics and Schismatics was valid.

But now, notwithstanding their agreement upon this point, that the baptism of heretics and schismatics was unauthorised and unlawful, they were divided upon the next question, —about the validity of such baptisms. Tertullian, though he allowed the lawfulness and validity of the baptism of laymen in cases of necessity, yet he utterly rejected the baptism of heretics, simply and universally, as altogether null and void: for he says,<sup>1</sup> “ There is but one baptism delivered to us, either in the Gospel of Christ, or the writings of the Apostles ; because there is but one Lord, and one baptism, and one Church in Heaven. Upon which account it is proper to consider, what is to be observed in relation to heretics. For the thing is only given in command to us. But heretics have no part or fellowship in our discipline, their very breach of communion testifies them to be foreigners: therefore I ought not to acknowledge that in them, which is only commanded to me ; because we and they have not the same God, nor the same Christ, and consequently not one and the same baptism: which seeing they have not rightfully, they have it not at all. That which is not cannot come into any account ; nor can they be said to receive that which they have not.” He says also, he wrote a book in Greek particularly to this purpose. And he touches upon it in his Book of Prescriptions against heretics,<sup>2</sup> where he says, “ No man can be edified by him, by whom he is destroyed. No man can be illuminated by him, of whom he is led into darkness.” And in another Book he

---

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Bapt. c. xv. Unus omnino baptismus est nobis, tam ex Domini Evangelio, quàm ex Apostoli Literis ; quoniam unus Dominus, et unum baptisma, et una ecclesia in cœlis. Sed circa hereticos sanè quid custodiendum sit, dignè quis retractet. Ad nos enim editum est. Hæretici autem nullum habent consortium nostræ disciplinæ ; quos extraneos utique testatur ipsa ademptio communicationis. Non debeo in illis cognoscere, quod mihi est præceptum ; quia non idem Deus est nobis et illis ; nec unus Christus, id est, idem : ideòque nec baptismus unus, quia non idem : quem cum ritè non habeant, sine dubio non habent : nec capit numerari, quod non habetur : ita nec possunt accipere, quia non habent. Sed de isto pleniùs jam nobis in Græco digestum est.

<sup>2</sup> Tertul. de Præscrip. c. xii. Nemo inde strui potest, unde destruitur. Nemo ab eo illuminatur, à quo contenebratur.

tells us more expressly,<sup>1</sup> “ that heretics were received again by baptism, in the same manner as heathens were.” Some think Tertullian here speaks of the school of Montanus, because he wrote his Book *De Pudicitia* when he was a Montanist: but his other books were written by him whilst he was a Catholic; and therefore I rather think he spake the sense of the Church of Carthage, and perhaps the whole African Church, in those days. For Agrippinus, bishop of Carthage, with a synod of the provinces of Africa and Numidia, not long after confirmed the same thing, as we learn from Cyprian’s *Epistles*:<sup>2</sup> and the opinion of Cyprian,<sup>3</sup> and the several Councils of Carthage in his time<sup>4</sup> are so well known, that I need not insist upon them. Firmilian also, bishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, joined with Cyprian, and wrote a long *Epistle* to him in defence of the same opinion,<sup>5</sup> where he also mentions the decree of synod of Iconium to the same purpose. Dionysius also, bishop of Alexandria, maintained the same doctrine,<sup>6</sup> and in one of his *Epistles* he alleges the decrees of the Councils of Iconium and Synada for confirmation of it. On the other hand, Stephen, bishop of Rome, and the Churches under him, stood up in defence of the contrary opinion. They asserted, that all who were baptised in the name of the Holy Trinity, were to be received only with imposition of hands, without rebaptising, whatever heresies or schisms they came over from to the Catholic Church: for so Firmilian, in his *Epistle* to Cyprian,<sup>7</sup> delivers their opinion with exactness and candour. I know indeed a great many learned persons, and among them Vossius, Blondel, and bishop Pearson,<sup>8</sup> are of opinion, that Stephen, bishop of Rome, in oppo-

<sup>1</sup> Tertul. de Pudicit. c. xix. Apud nos ut ethnico par, immò et super ethnico hæreticus etiam per baptismum veritatis utroque homine purgatus admittitur.

<sup>2</sup> Cypr. Ep. lxxi. ad Quint. p. 196. Ep. lxxiii. ad Jubaianum. p. 199.

<sup>3</sup> Cypr. Ep. 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, &c.

<sup>4</sup> Con. Carthag. ap. Cypr. p. 229. It. Ep. lxx. ad Januar.

<sup>5</sup> Firmil. Ep. lxxv. ap. Cypr. p. 221.

<sup>6</sup> Dionys. ap. Euseb. lib. vii. c. 7.

<sup>7</sup> Firmil. Ep. lxxv. p. 221. Non putant quærendum esse, quis sit ille qui baptizaverit, eò quòd qui baptizatus sit, gratiam consequi poterit invocata Trinitate nominum Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti.

<sup>8</sup> Pearson. Annal. Cypr. an. 256. n. 3. p. 54.

sition to Cyprian's doctrine, fell inconsiderately into the contrary extreme, and asserted, that all persons baptised by heretics, whether in the name of the Trinity or otherwise, were to be received without distinction. But a great many things are said by the learned Pagi<sup>1</sup> to clear Stephen of this imputation, and, I think, with justice and reason: for this one passage of Firmillian, which yet has escaped the observation of learned men on both sides, does abundantly vindicate him from the charge; for it shews plainly, he was not for receiving the baptism of all heretics whatsoever, but such only as kept to the form of the Church, and baptised in the name of the Holy Trinity. And if there be any expressions in Stephen's letter to Cyprian, which seem to import more, they are candidly to be interpreted with this restriction and limitation. Which I observe for the sake of some late ingenious writers, who, depending upon the venerable authority of Bishop Pearson, have unwarily slid themselves, and led others into the same mistaken opinion about Stephen, bishop of Rome: whereas Vincentius Lirinensis<sup>2</sup> fully vindicates his doctrine from the charge of novelty, and reckons it the true ancient Catholic opinion; nor do I know any ancient writer that has passed any harder censure on him for it, except such as were professed abettors of Cyprian's opinions, however they might dislike his fierce and immoderate temper.

Thus, then, the controversy stood at first, about the rebaptisation of heretics and schismatics. In the next age the dispute was resumed again, and the doctrine of Stephen, with a little variation, was generally received, whilst the doctrine of Cyprian was condemned in the Donatists, who pretended to be followers of his opinion. Now a distinction was made between heretics and schismatics, and then again between the several sorts of heretics: for some baptised in the name of the Trinity, according to the form of the Church, and others did not; and of those who baptised in the name of the Trinity, some were heterodox, as to the

---

<sup>1</sup> Pagi Critic. in Baron. an. 256. n. 4.  
æd. Hæres. c. ix.

<sup>2</sup> Vincent. Commonitor.

true faith of the Trinity; others were orthodox in that point, but heretical in other opinions. And according to these distinctions a difference was made in the reception of their baptisms. The baptism of schismatics was generally received as valid, without any distinction; the baptism of such heretics as did not baptise in the name of the Trinity, and the form of the Church, was as generally rejected; but about the baptism of those, who gave baptism in the name of the Trinity, and yet did not believe the true faith of the Trinity, as the Arians and some such others, there was still some question remaining: for Athanasius, and Optatus, and some few others, thought it was not only necessary that men should be baptised in the name of the Trinity, but also in the true faith of the Trinity; and therefore they rejected the baptism of the Arians, because, though they observed the form of baptising in the name of the Trinity, as it was used in the Church, yet they did not baptise into the true faith of the Trinity, because they denied the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost; and therefore they thought their baptism was not good, and ought to be repeated. But the generality of the Church were of another mind, and therefore they received the baptism of the Arians also, because they gave baptism in the name of the Trinity, though their faith was not right about it. This was the true state of this matter in the fourth century, when upon occasion of the schism of the Donatists it came exactly to be considered. And of the truth of all this the reader may satisfy himself from the testimonies I shall lay before him.

The first decree, that was made in this matter, was in the great Council of Arles, Anno 314, at which, St. Austin says,<sup>1</sup> near two hundred of the western bishops were present, though few of their subscriptions are now remaining. In this Council the dispute about heretical baptisms was thus determined, according to the new edition of Sirmund;<sup>2</sup> “ We make this decree concerning the Africans,

<sup>1</sup> Aug. adv. Parmen. lib. i. e. v.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Arelat. i. can. viii. De Afris, qui propriâ suâ lege utuntur, ut rebaptizent, placuit, si ad ecclesiam aliqui de hac hæresi venerint, interrogent eos nostræ fidei sacerdotes



who have been used to rebaptise according to a peculiar law of their own ; if any one return from his heresy to the Church, let the Catholic priests question him about the Creed ; and if they perceive that he was baptised in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, only imposition of hands shall be given him, that he may receive the Holy Ghost. But if upon examination he answers not the Trinity, that is, (that he was not baptised in the name of the Trinity,) let him be rebaptised." All that is here required is only that a man be baptised in the name of the Trinity, or at most in the faith of the Trinity, to make heretical baptism valid. And no more is required in the great Council of Nice, which has two canons to this purpose ; the first<sup>1</sup> of which orders the Novatian schismatics to be admitted upon their return, even to the same degrees among the clergy, which they enjoyed before, without any other ceremony than imposition of hands. But the other<sup>2</sup> requires the Paulianists, or Samosatene heretics to be rebaptised. Hence it became a general rule, that schismatics were to be admitted universally without rebaptising : but heretics with some exception ; for they who were in the condition and capacity of the Samosatene heretics were to be rebaptised. But the question may be, upon what account the Paulianists are ordered to be rebaptised more than other heretics ? Was it because they did not baptise in the name of the Trinity, or because they rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, though they kept to the form of the Church ? Athanasius seems to have been of opinion, that it was upon the latter account ; for he rejects the baptism of the Arians, though they baptised in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost ; because though they used the same form of baptism as was used in the Church, yet they did not believe, as the Church believed of the Divinity of the Son and Holy Ghost. This I take to be the meaning of that famous passage in

symbolum. Et, si perviderint in Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto eos baptizatos, manus eis tantum imponatur, ut accipiant Spiritum Sanctum. Quod si interrogati non responderint hanc Trinitatem, baptizentur.

The old editions read this canon otherwise : De Arianis, qui propria sua lege utuntur, ut rebaptizentur, placuit, &c. And so it is alleged in Gratian de Consecrat. dist. iv. c. <sup>1</sup> Con. Nic. can. viii. <sup>2</sup> Ibid. can. xix

his Third Oration against the Arians,<sup>1</sup> where he says, “ they did not baptise men into the faith of the Father and Son, but a creator and a creature, a being made and the maker of it.” By which he did not mean, as some mistake him, that the Arians had changed the form of baptism, which they never did till the time of Eunomius; but that though they baptised in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, yet they did not understand by those names what the Church understood, but believed the Son and Holy Ghost to be mere creatures; and therefore he thought their baptism to be of no effect, because though they baptised in the form of the Church, yet not into the faith of the Holy Trinity. And he concludes the same of the Manichees, and Montanists, and Samosatensians, who, he thinks, used the Catholic form of words, but rejected the true sense and meaning of them. Whence it is plain Athanasius was one of those who neither universally received nor universally rejected heretical baptisms; but such as were given in the Catholic form of words, and in the true faith of the Trinity, those only he admitted, refusing all others as invalid, where either the form or the faith was wanting.

Optatus<sup>2</sup> was of the same opinion, that the baptism of schismatics was to be received as valid, without any distinction, because they were baptised both in the name and the faith of the Trinity; and therefore he tells the Donatists, they never made any scruple about their baptism, nor ever pretended to wash them over again; for as long as the faith was the same, the baptism was the same,<sup>3</sup> and the Donatists were rather to be blamed for rebaptising those who had been baptised in the faith of the Trinity before. But as to the heretics he made a distinction; for some bap-

<sup>1</sup> Athan. Orat. iii. adv. Arian. tom. i. p. 413. Ὅτι γὰρ εἰς τὸν Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν εὐδόξουν οἱ Ἀρειανῶν, ἀλλ' εἰς κτιστὴν καὶ κτίσμα, καὶ εἰς ποίημα καὶ ποιητὴν.

<sup>2</sup> Optat. cont. Parmen. lib. v. p. 85. Quia quicquid in Trinitate factum fuerit, bene est: inde est, quod simpliciter à vobis venientes excipimus, cum dicit, non habet necessitatem iterum lavandi.

<sup>3</sup> Optat. Ibid. p. 86. Si datis alterum baptisma, date alteram fidem: si datis alteram fidem, date alterum Christum: si datis alterum Christum, date alterum Deum.

tised neither in the name, nor the faith of the Trinity; and the baptism of such heretics he calls sacrilegious and profane,<sup>1</sup> and will not allow it to be the same with the one baptism of the Church. The reasons of making such distinctions he assigns in the next words when he says,<sup>2</sup> “There are three things concur in baptism, 1. The name of the Trinity. 2. The faith of the receiver. 3. The administrator or baptiser. But these three are not all of equal weight and necessity. The Trinity has the principal place in the action, without which baptism cannot be performed: after this comes the faith of the believer; and then the person of the administrator, but that is not of equal authority with the two former.” Whence he concludes, “that baptism administered in the name and in the faith of the Trinity, whatever the quality of the administrator might be, was not to be repeated.

St. Basil delivers his opinion of these baptisms much after the same manner. He thinks that as to the Novatians, and such other schismatics as did not err in faith, the custom of the Church in every country was to be complied with, whether it was to baptise, or not to baptise them again. But as to the Pepuzians or Montanists he thinks much otherwise,<sup>3</sup> and wonders how the great Dionysius could pass them over. For the Ancients decreed, that that baptism only should be received, which did not recede from the faith. Upon which account, he says, they distinguished betwixt heresies, and schisms, and *παρασυναγωγὰι*, *unlawful assemblies*. Heresies denoted such as departed from the faith; schisms, such as contended only about questions of ecclesiastical discipline: and unlawful assemblies were such as were held by presbyters or bishops that were refractory, and would not submit to

---

<sup>1</sup> Opat. cont. Parmen. lib. v. p. 86. Per quod unum est, ab hæreticorum profanis et sacrilegis baptismatibus separatur. <sup>2</sup> Ibid. In hoc sacramento baptismatis celebrando, tres esse species constat, quas et vos nec augere, nec minuere, nec prætermittere poteritis. Prima species est in Trinitate, secunda in credente, tertia in operante. Sed non pari libramine ponderandæ sunt singulæ. Duas enim video necessarias, et unam quasi necessariam. Principalem locum Trinitas possidet, sine quâ res ipsa non potest geri: hanc sequitur fides credentis: jam persona operantis vicina est, quæ simili autoritate esse non potest, &c. <sup>3</sup> Basil. Ep. Canon. i. ad Amphiloeh. can. i.

the laws or rules of the Church ; but when they were censured for their crimes, and suspended from officiating, would yet, notwithstanding the canons, pretend to govern or minister as before, and draw people after them out of the Catholic Church. Now, he says, the Ancients thought the baptism of heretics, such as the Manichees, Valentinians, Marcionites, and Pepuzians, was to be wholly disannulled, because they were dissenters about the faith of God: but the baptism of schismatics, as being yet of the Church, was to be received ; and such as were baptised in unlawful assemblies, being corrected by true repentance and conversion, were to be admitted again into the Church ; as those clergy also, who went off with their refractory leaders, were to be restored to their station again upon their true repentance. Hence he concludes, that the Pepuzians were to be rejected as heretics, because they blasphemed the Holy Ghost, attributing his title to Montanus and Priscilla, and did not baptise in the name of the Holy Ghost, but in the name of Father, Son, and Montanus, or Priscilla. And though Dionysius had allowed their baptism, yet we were not to follow him in that mistaken practice. As to the Novatians, he says, Cyprian and Firmilian rejected their baptisms, together with that of the Encratitæ, Hydroparastatæ ; and Apotaetici, being they were broken off from the Church by their separation, and so neither had the Spirit themselves, nor could they give it to others, but were mere laymen, who had no power either to baptise or ordain ; and therefore they ordered all such as were baptised by them, to be rebaptised, as persons baptised only by laymen. This was the practice of Cyprian and Firmilian: but forasmuch as many Churches in Asia received the baptism of such by way of dispensation, his advice is, to permit it to be received, “ ἕτω δεκτόν,” only upon their return they must receive the unction of chrism or confirmation. Whence it is plain, St. Basil was not so rigid as Cyprian in the baptism of schismatics ; but for heretics, who made a breach upon the faith, he rejected their baptism universally without exception.

But the more general and prevailing interpretation of the Nicene Canon was, that the baptism of all heretics and schismatics, who did not reject the catholic form of baptising in

the name of the Trinity, was to be received, however they might be heterodox in their faith and opinions. For they supposed the Paulianists were therefore to be rebaptised, because they used another form of baptism. This was certainly the sense of the Council of Laodicea, and the second General Council of Constantinople, and the second Council of Arles and Trullo ; as also of St. Austin, St. Jerom, Genadius, Ursinus Afer, Siricius, Leo, Innocentius, the author under the name of Justin Martyr, and the generality of the ancient writers.

The Council of Laodicea has two canons to this purpose ; in the former of which, all such as had been baptised by the Novatians, the Photinians, and Quartadeciman Heretics, are ordered to be received to a participation of the holy mysteries,<sup>1</sup> only first anathematising their heresies, learning the Catholic Creed, and being anointed with the holy chrism. Here is no mention of a new baptism, but only confirmation upon their return to the Church. But in the next canon, such as return from the heresy of the Cataphrygians or Montanists, though they had been ordained among their clergy, and dignified with the title of *Maximi*, are appointed both to be catechised and baptised by the bishops and presbyters of the Church.<sup>2</sup> Now, what should be the reason of making such a difference between the baptism of the Photinians and the Montanists, since the Photinians were certainly as erroneous in their opinions about the Trinity, as the Montanists could be, but only this, that the Photinians, though they did not believe the Divinity of Christ, yet they still kept to the words and form of the Catholic baptism. But the Montanists, some think, changed the form ; for they did not baptise in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but in the name of the Father, Son, and Maximilla, or Montanus, as Theophylact<sup>3</sup>, and the learned Suicerus,<sup>4</sup> and others have observed from him : or else by their errors they destroyed the very essence of baptism.<sup>5</sup>

The like difference was made by the second General

<sup>1</sup> Con. Laodic. can. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. can. viiii.

<sup>3</sup> Theophyl.

Com. in Luc. xxiv. Basil. Ep. Canon. i. can. i.

<sup>4</sup> Suicer. Thesaur.

Ecl. tom. i. p. 635.

<sup>5</sup> See this matter fully discussed by the learned Author of the late curious History of Montanism, Artic. xiii. p. 168.

Council of Constantinople, anno 381, between the baptism of the Arians and Macedonians on the one hand, and that of the Eunomians, Montanists, and Sabellians on the other. The Arians and Macedonians are joined with the Sabbatians, and Novatians, and Quartadecimans, and Apollinarians; all which are to be received only by consignation or unction of the holy chrism, wherewith they are to be anointed on the forehead, eyes, nose, mouth, and ears, with this form of words, "the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit." But for the Eunomians, Montanists, and Sabellians, and such other heretics, they are to be received in the same manner as heathens;<sup>1</sup> which was by going through all the stations of the catechumens, in order as they are there mentioned, being the first day made Christians at large, the second day catechumens, the third day exorcised, then catechised and trained up to the discipline of the Church, and at last baptised. Now here it is to be observed, that the Arians and Eunomians are but branches of the same heresy, and yet the one are ordered to be rebaptised and the other not: the reason of which was evidently this, that the one observed the same form of baptising as was used in the Church, but the other had introduced a new form of their own inventing. For it is particularly noted of Eunomius, that he made a great many innovations in this matter: he baptised but with one immersion, as is noted in this canon; and Socrates says,<sup>2</sup> that was not in the name of the Trinity, but in the death of Christ. Epiphanius also observes<sup>3</sup> how they rejected the form of the Trinity, and baptised in the name of the Uncreated God, and the name of the Created God, and the name of the Sanctifying Spirit, created by the Created Son. And Gregory Nyssen, who wrote against Eunomius,<sup>4</sup> brings a like charge against him. So that there was a plain reason for the Council's ordering the Eunomians to be rebaptised, whilst they decreed otherwise about the Arians; for the Arians, properly so called, had made no such innovation, which was peculiar to the followers of Eunomius.

<sup>1</sup> Con. Constant. i. can. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Socrat lib. v. c. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Epiphan. Hær. lxxvi. Anomæor. p. 706.

<sup>4</sup> Nyssen. adv. Eunom. lib. xi.

The second Council of Arles made two decrees about heretics with the like distinction. In one canon the Photinians or Paulianists<sup>1</sup> are ordered "to be rebaptised, according to the decrees of the Fathers;" meaning, no doubt, the decree of the Nicene Fathers made in that behalf. But the Bonosiaci, though they maintained the same errors, yet because they baptised in the name of the Trinity, as the Arians did, are ordered in the next canon<sup>2</sup> to be received only with chrism and imposition of hands, as sufficient without a new baptism.

The Council of Trullo treads in the steps of the Councils of Nice and Constantinople, as to the rebaptisation of the Paulianists,<sup>3</sup> the Eunomians, the Montanists, and the Sabellians; to which they add the Manichees, Valentinians, and Marcionites, and all such like heretics. But the Arians, Macedonians, Quartadeimans, Novatians, Apollinarians, and, as they add, the Nestorians, might be received only by chrism, without a new baptism.

St. Austin delivers his sense of the Nicene Canon about the Paulianists after the same manner: he tells us, in his opinion, the reason why the Council appointed them to be rebaptised was,<sup>4</sup> "because they did not observe the form or rule of baptism, which many other heretics, when they left the Church, carried along with them, and continued still to observe it." "So that," as he says in another place,<sup>5</sup> "One might easier find heretics that did not baptise at all, than such as did not baptise in that form of evangelical words, of which the Creed consists, without which it was

<sup>1</sup> Con. Arelat. ii. can. xvi. Photinianos sive Paulianistas, secundum Patrum statuta, baptizari oportet.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. can. xvii. Bonosiacos autem ex eodem errore venientes, quos, sicut Arianos, baptizari in Trinitate manifestum est, dum interrogati fidem nostram ex toto corde confessi fuerint, chrismate et manus impositione in Ecclesiâ recipi sufficit.

<sup>3</sup> Con. Trull. can. 95. al. 96. <sup>4</sup> Aug. de Hæres. c. xliiv. Istos sanè Paulianos baptizandos esse in Ecclesiâ Catholicâ Niceno Concilio constitutum est. Unde credendum est eos regulam baptismatis non tenere, quam secum multi hæretici, cum de Catholicâ discederent, abstulerunt, camque custodiunt.

<sup>5</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. vi. c. 25. Quis nescit non esse baptismum Christi, si verba evangelica, quibus symbolum constat, illic defuerint? Sed faciliùs inveniuntur hæretici, qui omnino non baptizant, quàm qui illis verbis non baptizant.

not the baptism of Christ." Forasmuch then as they baptised generally in this form, their baptism was admitted as a complete sacrament, though their faith was erroneous. And he makes no scruple to say,<sup>1</sup> "that even the baptism of Marcion himself would be true baptism, if it were ministered in that form of evangelical words, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, though his belief under those words was not the true faith of the Catholic Church, but corrupted with false and fabulous doctrines." He also assigns the grounds and reasons of this practice, why the Catholic Church did not repeat their baptism:<sup>2</sup> "Because the baptism given by heretics was not, properly speaking, their baptism, but the baptism of Christ; which they, that once had, could never lose by going out of the Church, and consequently were not to be admitted into the Church again by rebaptisation, but repentance. The Church corrected the errors of their understanding,<sup>3</sup> upon their return, but did not violate the sacrament of God." And he challenges the Donatists<sup>4</sup> to shew him any instance of any man that was ever rebaptised by the Catholics, after he had been once baptised in the name of the Trinity, as the Donatists did. Which shews, that this was the peculiar practice of the Donatists, and not of the Catholic Church.

St. Jerom argues upon the same foot against Hilary, the deacon, whom he styles *Deucalion Orbis, the rebaptiser of the world*, because he was for rebaptising all those that had been baptised by the Arian heretics. Hilary it seems had gone one step further than his master Lucifer, and the rest of the Luciferians; for they allowed the baptism of the Arians,

<sup>1</sup> Aug de Bapt. lib. iii. c. 15. Quamobrem si evangelicis verbis, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti, Marcion baptismum consecrabat, integrum erat sacramentum, quamvis ejus fides sub eisdem verbis aliud opinantis, quam catholica veritas docet, non esset integra, sed fabulosis falsitatibus inquinata.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. lib. iii. c. 11. Catholica verò propterea non debet iterare baptismum, qui apud hæreticos datus est, ne judicare videatur ipsorum esse quod Christi est; aut eos non habere, quod intus cum acceperint, amittere utique foras exeundo non possunt, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Id. de Unico Baptismo cont. Petilian. c. iii. Si de ipsâ Trinitatis unitate dissentientem hæreticum invenio, et tamen evangelicâ et ecclesiasticâ regulâ baptizatum; intellectum hominis corrigo, non Dei violo sacramentum.

<sup>4</sup> Aug. adv. Fulgent. c. vii. Da mihi aliquem sanctorum post Trinitatem rebaptizare, quod facis.



though they did not allow their orders, nor grant them in any sense to be Christians, but said they were of the synagogue of Satan. Yet they received such as were baptised by the Arians,<sup>1</sup> not by giving them a new baptism, but only by admitting them to a state of repentance; so they allowed the baptism of those whom they did not allow to be priests, nor so much as Christian laymen. But Hilary here deserted his leaders, and carried the matter one degree further; he said the Arian priests were not only to be deposed but their laies also to be rebaptised;<sup>2</sup> against whom St. Jerom urges not only the contrary concessions and practice of his master Lucifer, but also the testimony, of Scripture,<sup>3</sup> proving from the Revelations, that such as were baptised by heretics might be received, upon their repentance, without rebaptising: for the Nicolaitans were heretics, and yet here was no command given, that they who were baptised by them should be baptised again. Then he proves the same from the constant practice of the Roman Church, where Hilary himself was baptised, who could be no Christian if his own doctrine were true; for he was baptised in a Church which had always received baptism from heretics. Nay, he himself,<sup>4</sup> whilst he was deacon of that Church, had received the baptism of the Manichees and Ebionites: but as soon as Arius arose, he was all on a sudden displeased with himself, and opened a new baptistery against the Church. He that was born in the bosom of the Church, he that was nourished with the milk of her breasts, lift up his sword against her, calling her harlot; and yet that harlot must be his mother, else he could not prove himself a Christian. Finally, he concludes both against Hilary and his master Lucifer, from the authority of the Council of Nice, which received all heretics, except the Samosatians, and not only admitted the baptism of the Novatians,

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucif. c. i. *Orthodox.* Si Ariani, ut dicis, Gentiles sunt, et Arianorum conventicula castra sunt Diaboli; quomodo in castris Diaboli baptizatum recipis? *Lucif.* Recipio, sed poenitentem. Aio laicum ab Arianis venientem recipi debere poenitentem, clericum verò non debere. It. c. v. *Orthod.* Eadem ratione à nobis episcopum recipi, quàm laicum à vobis recipitur.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. c. viii. Disseras quid adversum Hilarium dicendum sit, qui nec baptizatos quidem recipiat ab Arianis.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. c. viii. De Apocalypsi quoque approbemus Hæreticis sine baptizmate debere poenitentiam concedi. Nunquid dixit, Rebaptizentur, qui in Nicolaitarum fidem baptizati sunt?

<sup>4</sup> Hieron. *ibid.* cap. ix.

but allowed their clergy to continue their station in the Church.

In like manner Gennadius tells us,<sup>1</sup> “all such as were baptised by heretics in the name or confession of the Trinity were received as truly baptised, when they came over to the Church. And then if they consented to profess the true faith, they were confirmed by imposition of hands, and so admitted to the participation of the eucharist.”

The same author mentions a book of one Ursinus Afer,<sup>2</sup> written on purpose against those who were for rebaptising all heretics, wherein he proved, “that such as were either baptised in the name of Christ, or in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, were not to be rebaptised, though they understood the words in an heterodox sense: but when they made confession of the Trinity, the bishop’s confirmation by imposition of hands was sufficient for their salvation.”

About this time lived the author of the Questions and Responses, which go under the name of Justin Martyr. Among other questions he proposes this for one;<sup>3</sup> “If the baptism administered by heretics be adulterated and vain, why then do not the orthodox rebaptise an heretic when he comes over to the Catholic faith, but allow his adulterated baptism, as well as that which is true?” To which he answers, “that when an heretic comes over to the Catholic faith, the fault of his heterodoxy is corrected by the change of his opinion; and the faultiness of his baptism by the unc-

<sup>1</sup> Gennad. de Eccles. Dogm. c. lii. Si qui apud illos hæreticos baptizati sunt, qui in Sanctæ Trinitatis confessione baptizant, et veniunt ad nos, recipiantur quidem ut baptizati. Et si consentiunt credere, vel acquiescunt confiteri, purgati jam fidei integritate, confirmentur manûs impositione, &c.

<sup>2</sup> Gennad. de Scriptor. Eccl. c. xxvii. Ursinus Monachus scripsit adversus eos, qui rebaptizandos hæreticos decernunt, docens nec legitimum nec Deo dignum rebaptizari illos, qui in nomine vel simpliciter Christi, vel in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti, quamvis pravo sensu, baptizentur: iis autem post sanctæ Trinitatis et Christi simplicem confessionem, sufficere ad salutem manûs impositionem catholici sacerdotis.

<sup>3</sup> Justin. Quæst. xiv. ad Orthodox. Ἐι ἐψευσμένον τυγχάνει ἐ ματαιον τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν αἰρετικῶν διδόμενον βάπτισμα, διὰ τί οἱ ὀρθόδοξοι τὸν προσφένοντα τῇ ὀρθοδοξίᾳ αἰρετικὸν ἢ βαπτίζουσι, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἐν ἀληθείᾳ τῷ νόθῳ ἔωσι βαπτίσματι.

Respons. ibid. Τῶ αἰρετικῷ ἐπὶ τὴν ὀρθοδοξίαν ἐρχομένῳ τὸ σφάλμα διορθῆται, τῆς μὲν κακοδοξίας, τῇ μεταδίσει τῆ φρονήματος· τῷ δὲ βαπτίσματος τῇ ἐπιχρίσει τῷ ἁγίῳ μύρῳ.

tion of the holy chrism." Here we see, he does not deny but that the baptism of heretics is very faulty; nay, adulterated, spurious, and vain, as to any spiritual effects, whilst they continue heretics; and yet when they come over to the Catholic Church, their baptism is not to be repeated, as simply null and invalid, but to be corrected, amended, and completed in its deficiencies by the ministry of confirmation, which the Greeks call chrism or the holy unction. And thus we are to understand the word "*μάταιος ραιν*," as it is used by Ignatius, and the author of the Constitutions, and other Greek writers, when they speak of the baptism of heretics and schismatics, not as denoting simply the nullity and invalidity of it, but the sinfulness of the action in giving baptism out of the Church, and the inefficacy of it as to salvation, or any other spiritual effects till men return from their heresies and schisms to the unity of the Church again.

Pope Leo denies the spiritual efficacy of heretical baptism, as much as any man; and yet he was utterly against rebaptising: for he gives this direction to Nicetius, bishop of Aquileia,<sup>1</sup> "that such as received baptism from heretics; having not been baptised before, were to be received only by invocation of the Holy Spirit and imposition of hands, and that because they had before only received the form of baptism, without the sanctifying power of it." He gives a like resolution to the question of Rusticus Narbonensis:<sup>2</sup> "those that know they have been baptised in the form of the Church, but know not what faith they were of that baptised them, are not to be rebaptised; but by imposition of hands, and invocation of the Holy Spirit, whose grace they could not have from heretics, are to be united to the communion of Catholics." And this he learned from

---

<sup>1</sup> Leo. Ep. lxxvii. al. lxxix. ad Nicet. c. 7. Illi qui baptismum ab hæreticis acceperunt, eùm baptizati antea non fuissent. solâ invocatione Spiritûs Sancti per impositionem manuum confirmandi sunt, quia formam tantùm baptismi sine sanctificationis virtute sumpsere.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. Ep. xcii. ad Rustic. c. 16. Qui se baptizatos sciunt, sed ejus fidei fuerint, qui se baptizavere, se nescire profitentur, quolibet modo formam baptismatis acceperint, rebaptizandi non sunt: sed per manûs impositionem, invocatâ virtute Spiritûs Sancti, quam ab hæreticis accipere non potuerunt, Catholicis copulandi sunt. II Ep. xxxvii. ad Leon. Raven. c. 2.

the practice of his predecessors, Innocentius, and Siricius; whereof the one says,<sup>1</sup> "It was their custom to receive into the communion of Catholics, as well Arians as Novatians, and other heretics, only by invocation of the seven graces of the Spirit, with imposition of the bishop's hands, as it had been decreed in council:"—meaning the decree, which the Council of Nice, or the Council of Arles had made to this purpose. And this, he says, was then observed both in the Eastern and Western Churches. His other predecessor, Innocentius, affirms the same,<sup>2</sup> "that the baptism of the Arians was allowed as valid; and when they were converted they were received by penance and imposition of hands, which was the means of procuring for them the sanctification of the Holy Spirit." And so for the Novatians and Donatists he determines,<sup>3</sup> "that those, who came over from them, should be received only by imposition of hands; because though they were baptised by heretics, yet they were baptised in the name of Christ."

In another place he explains the reason, why the Council of Nice allowed the baptism of the Novatians, but not the Paulianists:<sup>4</sup> "because the Paulianists did not baptise in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, which the Novatians did, who, in the point of the divine power of the Trinity, always maintained the orthodox faith." Such, therefore, as came over from heresies of the like kind with

<sup>1</sup> Siric. Ep. i. ad Himerium Tarracon. c. i. Arianos nos cum Novatianis aliisque hæreticis, sicut est in synodo constitutum, per invocationem solam septiformis Spiritûs, episcopalis manûs impositione, catholicorum conventui sociamus. Quod etiam totus Oriens Occidensque custodit.

<sup>2</sup> Innocent. Ep. 18. ad Alexand. Antioch. c. iii. Arianos cæterasque hujusmodi pestes, quia eorum laicos conversos ad dominum sub imagine pœnitentiæ ac Sancti Spiritûs sanctificatione per manûs impositionem suscipimus, non videtur clericos eorum cum sacerdotii cujuspiam suscipi debere dignitate; quoniam his solùm baptisma ratum esse permittimus, quod utique in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritûs Sancti perficitur.

<sup>3</sup> Id. Ep. i. ad Victricium. c. 8. Ut venientes à Novatianis vel Montensibus, per manûs tantum impositionem suscipiantur: quia quamvis ab hæreticis, tamen in Christi nomine sunt baptizati.

<sup>4</sup> Innocent. Ep. xxii. ad Episcopos Macedon. c. 5. Id circò distinctum esse ipsis duabus hæresibus ratio manifesta declarat: quia Paulianistæ in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti minime baptizant: et Novatiani iisdem tremendis venerandisque nominibus baptizant, &c.

the Novatians, it was the custom of the Church of Rome to receive with imposition of hands to lay-communion,<sup>1</sup> but not to allow them orders, he says; which was a matter of discipline, in which the Church used a liberty to extend or relax her censures, as she thought proper in her own wisdom and discretion. It were easy to add many other testimonies of the like nature; but I suppose these are abundantly sufficient both to evince and explain the general sense of the Church upon this head, that they allowed as valid the baptism of all heretics that baptised in the name of the Trinity; though some few required they should be baptised in the true faith, as well as the true form, to make their baptism effectual.

SECT. 21.—What Defects there are in the Eaptism of Heretics and Schismatics, and how those Defects are supplied.

But now though the baptism of heretics and schismatics, and degraded or excommunicated clerks was reputed valid, so as it needed not to be repeated; yet it was not esteemed so perfect to all intents and purposes as the regular and authorised baptism of the Church, because both on the part of the receiver, and on the part of the giver there were some deficiencies in it. We must therefore inquire, in the next place, what the Ancients supposed such baptism could give? Then, what were its deficiencies, and what it could not give? and, how those deficiencies were supplied? For the resolution of these questions, St. Austin, who has considered this matter most exactly, often inculcates a known distinction between the external or visible sacrament, and the invisible or spiritual grace; the former of which is common both to good and bad men in the Church;<sup>2</sup> but the latter is peculiar only to those that are good. Now he supposes such as are baptised by heretics and schismatics,

---

<sup>1</sup> Innocent. Ep. xxii. c. 4. *Nostræ lex ecclesia est, venientibus ab hæreticis, qui tamen illic baptizati sunt, per manus impositionem laicam tantum tribuere communionem, nec ex his aliquem in clericatus honorem vel exiguum subrogare.*

<sup>2</sup> Aug. cont. Liter. Petilian. lib. ii. c. 104. *Discerne visibile sanctum sacramentum, quod esse et in bonis et in malis potest, illis ad præmium, istis ad judicium, ab invisibili unctione charitatis, quæ propria bonorum est.*

to be much in the same state as bad men in the Church; they receive the outward visible sacrament, but not the invisible, internal, and sanctifying grace of the Spirit. So that it cannot be said, that they received nothing at all; for they receive as much, almost, as wicked men in the Church; of whom it may be truly said, that they have received the sacrament of baptism, and need not upon any occasion to be rebaptised again: and further, that they 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. Their baptism makes them something more than mere heathens, who need baptism before they can come into the Church: it gives them a title to be members of the visible Church at large, though they are not true members of the invisible and spiritual Church, because they are not yet sanctified by the Spirit of Christ: it qualifies them for pardon upon their repentance, whenever they return from their vicious practices, and takes away those bars and obstacles that hindered the descent of the Spirit at their first admission; nay, though they turn heretics or schismatics, or become lapsers, or excommunicate, or even apostates, they need not a new baptism, but 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 received the outward form of baptism, or the visible sacrament in the Church, though 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 Magus was a true baptism, though he was an unworthy, and therefore an unprofitable receiver of it: and as the sacrament of the eucharist is a true sacrament, though many men eat it not to their soul's health, but to their own damnation, because they are unworthy receivers of it.

Now as the case was with the wicked men, who thus

received baptism in the Church, that they gained hereby some privileges, but not all, nor the chief of those that belonged to it: so the Ancients supposed the case of those to be, who were baptised in an uncharitable opposition and contempt of authority, by heretics, or schismatics, or excommunicate and degraded clergymen: their baptism, if done in due form, intituled them to some privileges, but not all that might be expected from it in the Church: it was the visible sacrament of baptism, and therefore made them something more than heathens, and qualified them for some, if not all, of the forementioned privileges; so that upon their repentance and return to the Church, they needed not to be received as mere heathens, by having their baptism repeated again: but then it wanted the internal and invisible grace, particularly the grace of unity and charity, which completes all other graces, and which heretics and schismatics were not supposed qualified to give, nor they, who desired baptism at their hands, qualified to receive, till they returned with repentance and charity to the unity of the Church again and then the Church by imposition of hands, and invocation 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 I take to be the true state of this matter, as generally delivered by such of the Ancients as defended the validity of heretical baptism. For as to those who pleaded against it, and stood up for rebaptisation, they argued upon a quite contrary and mistaken notion, that the visible sacrament and the invisible grace must necessarily be united together to make a true sacrament; and that neither could the Spirit operate without the water, nor the water without the Spirit. Which was the chief argument used by Nemesianus à Tubunis, in the famous Council of Carthage, for rebaptisation under Cyprian: to which St. Austin returns a very satisfactory answer, upon Cyprian's own principles, only by distinguishing a double notion of the Spirit.<sup>1</sup> “ For

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. vi. c. 12. Nam et Simon ille Magus natus erat ex aquâ et Spiritu, et tamen non intravit in regnum cœlorum. Sic fieri potest

if the presence of the Spirit be necessary to every true baptism, it must be only in such a sense as Simon Magus or any other wicked wretch, who is baptised in the Church, may be said to be born again of water and of the Spirit, who yet shall never enter into the kingdom of Heaven, and the case of heretics may be such, *i. e.* to be born of water and the Spirit without salvation. But if by the Spirit be meant only the spirit of true conversion, then all those, who renounce the world in words and not in deeds, are not born of the Spirit, but of water alone, who yet in Cyprian's opinion, are truly baptised in the Church. For one of these two things must needs be granted: either those, who fallaciously renounce the world, are born of the Spirit, though to their destruction, not salvation; and then heretics may be so too: or else if that saying of the Book of Wisdom, 'The Holy Spirit of discipline will not dwell with an hypocrite,' be taken to signify, that they who fallaciously renounce the world, are not born of the Spirit; then a man may be born of water alone and not of the Spirit. And Nemesianus disputed to no purpose, when he said, "that the Spirit cannot operate without the water, nor the water without the Spirit." It is plain from this discourse of St. Austin, that the great deficiency of heretical baptism was, that either it did not minister the Spirit at all, or else at least not to such a degree, as was effectual to sanctification and salvation. And this deficiency was therefore necessary to be supplied upon their return to the Catholic Church. There was but one case, he thinks, in which heretical baptism could avail any man to salvation, and that was, when it was such a case of necessity as that a man could not have baptism from any other,<sup>1</sup> and then the

---

ut hæreticis etiam contingat. Aut si non nascitur ex Spiritu nisi qui veraci conversione mutatur, omnes qui sæculo verbis et non factis renunciant, non utique de Spiritu, sed ex aquâ solâ nascuntur, qui tamen et intûs teste Cypriano sunt. Necessè est enim ut unum de duobus concedatur; aut illi qui fallaciter sæculo renunciant, nascuntur de spiritu, quamvis ad perniciem, non ad salutem, atque ita possunt et hæretici: aut si illud quod scriptum est: Sanctus Spiritus disciplinæ effugiet fictum, etiam ad hoc valet, ut fallaciter sæculo renunciantes, non nascantur de Spiritu, potest quis baptizari aquâ, et non nasci de Spiritu. Et frustra Nemesianus ait, neque spiritus sine aquâ operari potest, neque aqua sine Spiritu.

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. vii. c. 52. Illi qui sic sunt in magnâ domo tanquam



man, in heart, was still united to the Catholic Church. But in all other cases their baptism was unprofitably received; and to make it otherwise it was necessary for men to forsake their heresy or schism, and join themselves to the Catholic Church. Even as they, who were in the Church by the communion of the sacraments, but out of it by the diversity of their morals, were obliged to reform their lives, in order to make their baptism profitable, which before was of little advantage to them. Therefore St. Austin says, he had no dispute with Cyprian upon this point; he agreed entirely with him thus far,<sup>1</sup> “that heretics could not grant remission of sins: this was the deficiency of their baptism, which both in the giver and receiver was only to destruction, because they misused so great a gift of God. But then the same deficiency was many times in the baptism of those, who were baptised in the Church, because they were baptised in enmity and hatred of their brethren, and in that state could not have forgiveness of sins: yet this deficiency was not supplied by a new baptism, but by repentance and true conversion, whereby that pardon was obtained, which they had not merited, nor were qualified to receive before.”

Nor was this the singular opinion of St. Austin about the deficiency of heretical baptism, but the general sense of the Church: for which reason they appointed that imposition of hands should be given to such as returned to the Church in order to obtain the grace of the Holy Ghost for them by prayer, which they wanted before, as having received baptism from those, who had no power to give the

---

*vasa in contumeliam—neque omnino utiliter habent baptismum, neque ab eis utiliter accipitur, nisi fortè accipiendi necessitas urgeat, et accipientis animus ab unitatis vinculo non recedat: tamen habent, quanquam inutiliter habeant, et accipitur ab eis, etiam cum inutile est accipientibus: quod ut fiat utile, ab hæresi vel schismate recedendum est, et illi domui cohærendum, &c.*

<sup>1</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. v. c. 22. Proinde consentimus Cypriano, hæreticos remissionem dare non posse; baptismum autem dare posse, quod quidem illis et dantibus et accipientibus valeat ad perniciem, tanquam tanto munere Dei malè utentibus.—Quanto magis fieri non potest, ut eis peccata dimittantur, qui fratres oderunt, et in ipso odio baptizantur: quibus tamen postea correctis non rursus baptismus datur, sed ipsa venia, quam tunc accipere non meruerunt, in verâ conversione præstatur.

Holy Ghost. For thus Innocent, bishop of Rome, who was cotemporary with St. Austin, says of the baptism of the Arians,<sup>1</sup> "That their ministration was defective in this, that they could not give the Holy Ghost; and therefore such as were baptised by them were imperfect, and were to be received with imposition of hands, that they might thereby obtain the grace of the Holy Ghost." Pope Leo says,<sup>2</sup> "They had only the form of baptism, without the grace of sanctification; and therefore when they came over to the Catholic Church, though the form of baptism was not to be repeated, yet what was wanting in it was to be supplied, that by imposition of the bishop's hands they might receive the grace of the Holy Ghost." And that this was the true and only method of supplying the defects of heretical baptism, is evident from all the passages that have been alleged in the last section, which speak of the use of the sacred unction, which was joined with imposition of hands and prayer, to inaplore the grace of remission of sins, and the other gifts of the Holy Spirit, which were wanting before. To all which I shall only add these two observations further, to shew the necessity of supplying the defects of heretical and schismatical baptism by confirmation, or imposition of hands and prayer, upon men's reconciliation and returning to the Catholic Church.

The first is, that imposition of hands or confirmation was thought so necessary in this case, that though it was ordinarily only the office of the bishop to perform it, yet in cases of extreme necessity, when one, who had been baptised by heretics, was in danger of death, and could not come to the bishop, a presbyter in that exigency, was authorised to give him that solemn imposition of hands used

---

<sup>1</sup> Innocent. Ep. xviii. ad Alexand. Antiochen. c. lii. Nec Spiritum Sanctum eos habere ex illo baptisate, illisque mysteriis arbitramur: quoniam cum à catholicâ fide eorum auctores desciscerent, perfectionem Spiritus, quam acceperant, amisissent.—Horum laicos imperfectos, ut dixi, ad Sancti Spiritus percipiendam gratiam cum pœnitentiæ imagine recipimus. <sup>2</sup> Leo Ep. lxxix. ad Nicet. c. vii. et Ep. xcii. ad Rustic. c. xvi. Cited in the last section. It Ep. xxxvii. ad Leon. Raven. c. ii. Si ab hæreticis baptizatum quœpiam constiterit, erga hunc nullatenus sacramentum regenerationis iteretur: sed hec tantùm, quod ibi deficit, conferatur, ut per episcopalem manûs impositionem virtutem Sancti Spiritus consequatur.

in the prayer of confirmation, and invocation of the Holy Spirit, rather than he should die without it. This is evident from the first Council of Orange,<sup>1</sup> which made this decree, "That if any heretics, at the point of death, desire to be received as Catholics, in the absence of the bishop, the presbyters shall give them the consignation of chrism and the benediction."<sup>2</sup> And so in the Council of Epone a like order was made,<sup>3</sup> "That if any heretics, who lay desperately sick upon their beds, desired suddenly to be converted, in that case, for the salvation of their souls, which was heartily desired, a presbyter is permitted to give them the consolation of chrism:" which those that were in health were to go to the bishop for at their conversion. Here we may take notice, that this confirmation, or solemn invocation of the Holy Spirit, was thought more necessary for such as were baptised by heretics and schismatics, upon their return to the Church, than for those that were baptised in the Church: for many of those who were baptised in the Church, in country-towns and villages, died, as St. Jerom observes,<sup>3</sup> before the bishop could come to give them confirmation; and yet no such rule was made in that case, for presbyters to confirm them: the reason of which was, that they had received the grace of the Holy Spirit in their baptism, which heretics had not, and therefore there was no such absolute necessity of confirming them in order to die in peace and safety: but heretics could not die securely without it; and therefore the Church, in compassion to dying heretics, authorised even presbyters in cases of extreme necessity to give them confirmation, which

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Arausi. can. i. c. 2. Hæreticos in mortis discrimine positos, si Catholici esse desiderent, si desit episcopus, à presbyteris cum chrismate et benedictione consignari placet.

<sup>2</sup> Con. Epaunens. can. xvi. Presbytero, propter salutem animarum, quam in cunctis optamus desperatis et in lecto decumbentibus hæreticis, si conversionem subitam petant, chrismate subvenire permittimus. Quod etiam omnes conversuri, si sani sunt, ab episcopo noverint expetendum.

<sup>3</sup> Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucif. cap. iv. Id factum reperimus ad honorem potiùs sacerdotii, quàm ad legis necessitatem. Alioquin si episcopi tantùm imprecatione Spiritus Sanctus defluit: lugendi sunt qui in villulis aut in castellis, aut in remotioribus locis per presbyteros et diaconos baptizati, ante dormierunt, quàm ab episcopis inviserent. He says a little before, Spiritum Sanctum nos asserimus in vero baptismate tribui.

in other cases was the ordinary office of the episcopal function.

The other observation I would make in relation to this matter is, that imposition of hands was thought so necessary for heretics upon their return, that even those, who had received it before in their heretical baptism, received it again, when they were reconciled to the Church. The reason of which was, because heretics and schismatics, during their separation, were supposed neither qualified to give nor receive the Holy Ghost, either by baptism, or imposition of hands, or the consignation of chrism: for some heretics ministered all these, and yet imposition of hands was given them again when they returned to the Church. This is plain in the case of the Donatists. They not only retained baptism, but also the unction of chrism and imposition of hands, as the Church did. For so both St. Austin<sup>1</sup> and Optatus testify of them. And yet they could not give the Holy Spirit by any of them. Therefore when they came over to the Church, though neither the outward form of baptism nor chrism was repeated upon them, yet imposition of hands was repeated, because that was no more than a prayer to implore the gift of the Holy Ghost to descend upon them, which might be repeated as often as there was occasion for it. Optatus says expressly,<sup>2</sup> "That neither the baptism nor the unction of the Donatists was repeated: but imposition of hands was repeated, because this was necessary as a prayer to implore the divine blessing, and convey the invisible unction of the Holy Spirit to them, which they were not in a capacity to receive before." Therefore St. Austin says,<sup>3</sup> "Imposition of hands was not like baptism, a thing that might not be repeated: for it was

<sup>1</sup> Aug. cont. Literas Petilian. lib. ii. c. 104. In hoc unguento sacramentum chrismatis vultis interpretari, quod quidem in genere visibilium signaculorum sacro sanctum est, sicut ipse baptismus: sed potest esse et in hominibus pessimis, in operibus carnis vitam consumentibus, et regnum cœlorum non possessuris.

<sup>2</sup> Optat. cont. Parmen. lib. vii. p. 109. Quod à vobis unctum est, tale servamus, quale accepimus, &c.

<sup>3</sup> Aug. de Bapt. lib. iii. c. 16. Manûs autem impositio non sicut baptismus repeti non potest. Quid enim aliud est, nisi oratio super hominem?

Alcim. Avitus Ep. xxiv. ad Stephan. Manûs impositionem personæ, de quâ scribitis, adhibete; quam constat, si reverà in supradicti schismatis professione versata est, cum ministerio baptismatis etiam chrismate consignatam.

no more than praying over a man for a blessing. Which may be done whenever there is occasion for it." And therefore it was thought necessary to be done when heretics came over to the Church, to supply the defects of their baptism, which did not minister with the outward visible form the invisible grace of the Holy Spirit before.

I have said thus much upon this head, to shew those, who are baptised in heresy or schism, what was the true ancient method of reconciliation, and the way to die securely in the peace and communion of the Church. And if all persons concerned would observe this method, there would be no need of disputes about rebaptisation in the Church. For it appears, that the unauthorised baptism of heretics and schismatics may be reputed valid, and without rebaptising have its defects supplied by imposition of hands in confirmation.

SECT. 22.—Whether the Baptism of Heretics and Schismatics be any more than the Baptism of Unauthorised Laymen.

There remains one question more to be resolved concerning heretics and schismatics and degraded clergymen; whether in that capacity, as they were unauthorised in all their ministrations, they were reputed to be of the body of the clergy, or of the laity, or in a middle rank betwixt both? And whether the baptisms administered by them in such a state, were of any greater account than the baptisms of unauthorised laymen? This question is much of the same nature with that other,—whether an heretic be a Christian? Which is not to be resolved without a nice distinction. For if by a Christian be meant one that is not a mere heathen, but one that has received baptism so firm and valid, as that if the man turns heretic, or schismatic, or apostate or becomes excommunicate, his baptism notwithstanding will remain so indelible and inviolable, as that he shall never need a second baptism to be admitted into the Church again: in this sense the Ancients would make no scruple to affirm that heretics were Christians. But if by a Christian be meant one that is of the Catholic and orthodox faith, and in the bosom and unity of the Holy Catholic

Church; then they would make as little scruple to deny heretics to be Christians, but compare them to Jews and Pagans, as being enemies to true religion and destitute of the means of salvation as well as the other, as I have had occasion to shew in another discourse.<sup>1</sup>

Now the question, whether heretics be clergymen or laymen, priests or not priests, bishops or not bishops, is to be resolved much after the same manner. If by a bishop or priest be meant one that has received such an ordination from the Church to the office of bishop or priest, as that if the man turns heretic, or schismatic, 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 admit him, upon his repentance, to officiate in that station again, he shall not need a new ordination to qualify him for it: in this sense there are none among the Ancients but will allow heretics and schismatics to be bishops or priests, according to their respective orders. Some indeed were against their being allowed to officiate in those dignities, and were for depriving them wholly of those honours, when they returned to the Catholic 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. But none 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 allowed to be of the clergy, and upon this foot many Churches and Councils accepted them upon their return, as I have shewed elsewhere,<sup>2</sup> and permitted them to continue in their offices without reordination. 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 intend to deny the validity of their ordination, but supposed that to remain still so entire, as that if ever after the Church should recall them to those offices, she would

<sup>1</sup> Origin. *Eccles. lib. i. cap. iii. s. 4.*  
cap. vii. s. 7 and 8.

<sup>2</sup> Origin *Eccles. lib. iv.*

not do it by giving them a new ordination, any more than a new baptism. Which is largely insisted on by St. Austin against the Donatists;<sup>1</sup> and St. Jerom against the Luciferians;<sup>2</sup> both which sects pleaded for the invalidity of heretical ordinations, but were refuted upon this principle of the Catholic Church, that baptism and ordination, though sinfully given, if they be valid, are not to be wholly annulled, or afterward repeated. In this sense heretics and schismatics and degraded priests were allowed to be priests still, and their acts to be valid, though done irregularly, sinfully, and unlawfully, against the rule and authority of the Church, to their own destruction.

But then, on the other hand, if by priests be meant only presbyters acting by the just and lawful authority of their bishop, in due subordination to him, and in the unity of the Church, and according to the Catholic laws and rules thereof; so as when either they desert the communion of the Church, or are justly degraded for their crimes, they can no longer be said to act by her lawful authority, but in manifest contempt and opposition to her rules: and if by laymen are meant, all those who by the discipline and just censures of the Church are degraded from their clerical offices, and reduced to the state of lay-communion: in this sense the Ancients would not allow heretics and schismatics to be of the clergy, but censured them as men out of office; or, as anti-episcopal usurpers, who set up another altar against their bishop; and esteemed their acts as much unauthorised, sinful, and irregular, as those of any unauthorised laymen; nay and esteemed them in some sense laymen too, when once they were formally degraded, and reduced to the communion of laymen; which was making them laymen, as much as was in the Church's power to do it, by divesting them of their offices, and withdrawing all legal authority to execute such offices

---

<sup>1</sup> Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. ii. cap. xiii. Si visum est opus esse ut eadem officia gererent, quæ gerebant, non sunt rursus ordinati, sed sicut baptismus in eis, ita ordinatio mansit integra.—Ac cum expedire hoc judicatur ecclesiæ ut præpositi eorum venientes ad catholicam societatem, honores suos ibi non administrarent; non eis tamen ipsa ordinationis sacramenta detrahuntur, sed manent super eos.

<sup>2</sup> Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucifer.

from them, and so leaving them in an unauthorised state of anti-episcopal usurpation. The Church indeed did not pretend wholly to cancel or annul their ordination, or give them a new ordination, when she authorised them to officiate again: but she could and did, by her discipline and censures, deprive them of the execution of her sacred offices, and reduce them in all other respects to the quality of laymen, and then, if they acted in that state, it was not by her authority, but as usurpers and invaders. So that the answer to the question proposed, we see, depends entirely upon these distinctions: as they had an ordination that could not be wholly disannulled, they were in some measure intitled to the name and characters of clerks; but as they were divested of all lawful authority to execute any sacred office, they were in the state and capacity of laymen; and so, upon different accounts, as it were, in a sort of middle state betwixt both.

Upon the whole matter, the result of our inquiry concerning heretics and schismatics, and degraded clergymen is this: 1st, They all act in opposition to the Church's lawful authority, and therefore have not her lawful authority to baptise. 2dly, Notwithstanding this, their baptisms, if done in due form, are valid, and not to be repeated. Yet, 3dly, those baptisms have great deficiencies, particularly that they do not minister remission of sins, and other invisible graces of the Holy Spirit, except where it pleases God to supply them in extraordinary mercy, and in an extraordinary way, to infants or others, who are baptised by heretics in cases of necessity, for want of other lawful ministers: which deficiencies are to be supplied by imposition of hands, and invocation of the Holy Spirit, upon their repentance and return to the Catholic Church. And this whether heretics, acting in that capacity, be considered 4thly, either as clergymen, or laymen, or in a middle state betwixt both: for whatever capacity they act in, their baptisms are not properly the legal and authorised baptisms of the Church, and therefore have need of some subsequent authority to confirm them. This is the sum of the doctrine of the Ancients, concerning the baptism of heretics and their reception into the Church.



SECT. 23.—How the Church of England comes to have Authority to baptise, though she had her Baptism only from the Heretical Church of Rome.

If it be inquired now, how the reformed Church of England comes to have full and ample authority to baptise, which before was an heretical and schismatical Church, under the slavery of the Romish yoke? I answer, by shaking off that yoke, and reforming her errors, and returning to the unity of the Catholic Church. Which was the ancient method for schismatical and heretical bishops, and other clergy, to gain that lawful authority that empowered them to officiate legally, which they had not and could not have, whilst they continued in their errors, and out of the unity of the Holy Catholic Church. Thus the great Council of Nice decreed in the case of the Novatians,<sup>1</sup> “that upon their return to the Church they should continue in the same station and clerical degrees they were in before only receiving a reconciliatory imposition of hands, by way of absolution.” And by virtue of this they had now the full power and license of the Church to authorise them to officiate, which they certainly had not before. And this was the case of the Donatists in the time of St. Austin, as appears from the writings of that father, and several canons in the African Code, of which I have given a particular account in another place.<sup>2</sup> The same rule and method then which was used and allowed in the primitive Church, was that which authorised the English bishops and priests to officiate legally upon their reforming from their heretical and schismatical errors and corruptions, and returning to the strict and perfect unity of the Holy Catholic Church. And so those persons, who could only give valid baptism before, as heretics and schismatics may do by a kind of usurpation, were now qualified authoritatively to give it every way legal, perfect, and authentic.

But some will be ready to ask, Where was that Holy Catholic Church, to which our first reformers are supposed

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Nic. can. viii.  
and 8.

<sup>2</sup> Origin. Eccles. lib. iv. cap. vii. s. 7

to return? which is much such another question as that other, Where was your Church before Luther? to which I answer, it was where the Holy Catholic Faith and doctrine of the Creed and Scriptures was maintained, without the addition of the Romish errors and corruptions: and though there had been no visible professors of that faith and doctrine entirely pure, yet it had been sufficient for the first reformers to have returned to the profession of the faith itself; which, in effect, is returning to the unity of the Holy Catholic Church, the chief and principal part of whose unity is the sincere faith of the Creed and Scriptures. But we can shew also where there were visible professors of this faith in every age perhaps, who always opposed the corruptions of the Romish Church, and kept themselves free from her heretical stains and pollutions. And why might not our first reformers, by joining themselves to the faith and communion of those visible professors, be said to return to the unity of the Holy Catholic Church in the strictest and most perfect notion of the unity thereof? Some of those noble professors were the Waldenses or the Albigenses, and the Fratres Bohemi, whose history is so famous in latter ages. And many worthy writers have deserved excellently of the Church of God, who have endeavoured to preserve their memory, and writings, and confessions of faith, as standing monuments and lasting evidences of their religion; and also to clear their character of the black and odious imputations, which their adversaries have falsly and industriously thrown upon them. Such are the learned labours of Archbishop Usher, and Sir Samuel Morland, and Dr. Allix among ourselves, and those of the learned Albertinus, and Joachim Hesterberg; but especially the great treasures and collections of Mr. Paul Perrin and Balthasar Lydius, with the golden history of the persecutions of the Church of Bohemia, in most of which we may find their doctrines and principles to be the same with those of the reformation. Here were vast numbers of catholic and visible professors, as the reader may easily judge by this one observation, which Dr. Crakanthorp long ago made out of Bzovius's Annals<sup>1</sup> that there were no

---

<sup>1</sup> Crakanthorp. Defens. Eccles. Angl. cont. Spalat. cap. xviii. p. 100.

less than an hundred and forty two thousand nine hundred and ninety of the Albigenses miserably slaughtered in one age, in the one kingdom of France, within the space of threescore years. And then," as he says, "who can enumerate, or, even but conceive in his mind, what myriads of myriads in all other parts of Europe, for the space of four hundred years and more from the time of Pope Hildebrand, were devoured with fire and sword, by the beast which is drunk with the blood of the saints? Or who can speak of these things without weeping? if there were so many martyrs, the whole product of the Church was certainly much greater: for the blood of the martyrs always makes an increase." So then, without further inquiry, there were numbers enough of catholic professors for the Church of England to join with at the Reformation from her former errors and heresies of Rome. And that nothing might seem to be wanting, these were episcopal Churches too, and great care was always taken to preserve episcopacy among them. Spondanus himself tells us,<sup>1</sup> the Albigenses were once so powerful in France, as to think of setting up one of their bishops as a general patriarch of their order, against the Pope, and that Bartholomæus of Carcasson was his substitute in the French dominions. And that they had bishops among them, is otherwise evident from the history of the persecutions of the Bohemian Church, supposed to be written by Comenius, a bishop of the Bohemians in the last age, who tells us a remarkable story, "How the Bohemians, being in some distress for want of bishops, sent three of their ministers, Matthias Kunwaldius, Thomas Prelaucius, and Elias Krzenovius, to the Waldenses, dispersed throughout Austria and Moravia, to have them ordained bishops; which was accordingly done by Stephen and another bishop of the Waldenses, with some presbyters joined with them: these three were ordained bishops by them and sent back to Bohemia again:<sup>2</sup> and from thence came the succession of catholic bishops in Bohemia, which continued to the final extirpation of them in the last age, by the ill success of the Bohemian war, and the prevalency of

<sup>1</sup> Spondan. An. 1223. n. vii.

<sup>2</sup> Histor. Persec. Eccles. Bohem. c. xx. p. 71. Quinimo tribus illis ministros creandi potestate collatâ, manuum impositione eos episcopos creant, et ad suos remittunt.

the popish faction." These are most undeniable proofs, that the Waldenses or Albigenses had always bishops among them; and they did not derive their authority from the Pope, but had it originally among themselves, handed down from the time of Constantine, as they themselves declared to the Bohemians,<sup>1</sup> when they ordained their ministers bishops in the forementioned congress. And this agrees exactly with the account, which even Rainerius, a Popish writer, but something more ingenuous than the common railers of that party, gives of them. "Among all the sects," says he, "that are; or ever were, there is not a more pernicious one to the Church of God, than that of the poor men of Lyons; and that for three reasons: 1. because it was more ancient; for some said it had continued from the time of Pope Sylvester,<sup>2</sup> and others from the time of the Apostles. 2. Because it was more universal; for there was no nation almost, where this sect had not some footing. 3. Because all other sects were accompanied with horrible blasphemies against God, which would make a man tremble; but this of the Leonists had a great shew of piety: they lived uprightly before men, and believed all things aright of God and all the articles contained in the Creed. Only they blasphemed and hated the Church of Rome." These were those ancient, numerous, and pious members of the Catholic Church, governed by a college of Catholic bishops, from the time of Constantine, and so from the time of the Apostles, with whom the Church of England had to join in communion at the time of her Reformation from the errors and heresies of Popery. Which being so I cannot but stand amazed at the attempt of Mr. Collier, and wonder at his design, in his late history of the Church of England, where he goes about industriously and partially to represent the black part of the character of the Albigenses,<sup>3</sup> from the calumnies and slanders of their adversaries, without suggesting the least tittle of what so many learned men have said,

<sup>1</sup> *Histor. Persec. Eccles. Bohem.* c. xx. p. 71. *Inveniunt illi episcopum eorum Stephanum: qui accito episcopo altero, et aliquot é ministris, originem suam usque à Constantini temporibus, doctrinæ item suæ articulos, et quid hactenùs horrendi per Italiam et Galliam passi essent, explicant.*

<sup>2</sup> *Rainer. cont. Waldenses.* c. iv. Cited by *Crakanthorp. Cont. Spalat.* c. xviii. p. 109. Et in *Bibl. Patr.* tom. iv. par. ii. p. 749. *Aliqui dicunt, quod duraverit hæc secta à tempore Sylvestri; aliqui à tempore Apostolorum, &c.*

<sup>3</sup> *Collier. Eccles. Hist.* lib. v. p. 388, &c.

or what may be said in their vindication. This was not acting fairly the part of an historian, much less the part of a friend to the Church of England, to rob her of the testimony and confession of so considerable a body of worthy patriots and martyrs, in whose communion, as I have shewed, she had so particular an interest in almost all the steps and measures of her Reformation. And now that I have said this, I cannot but note one thing more in this author, which looks not well in a Protestant writer; that is, his account of the Lutherans and Calvinists, in his late Supplement to the Historical Dictionary, both which are taken from the history of Maimburg their professed enemy. When yet he could not be ignorant what an excellent vindication of the Lutherans had been written against Maimbourg, by the noble and learned Seckendorf; to which he refers his reader upon some other occasions; which shews, that he was no stranger to it. But this only by the way. I now return to the history of the ancient Church.

SECT. 24.—Of the Baptism of Turks, Jews, and Infidels.

The last question is concerning the baptism of such as are wholly out of the Church, and in no sense Christians, such as Turks, Jews, and Infidels:—Whether baptism administered by any of these, in the form of the Church, be to be reputed valid as well as others? I had not mentioned this question, but only because the Church of Rome has carried the matter so far as to affirm it, contrary to the judgment and practice of all the ancient Church: for in her Ritual of Baptism she has this rubric or direction;<sup>1</sup> “that though the ordinary minister of baptism be only a priest or a deacon, yet, in case of necessity, it may be done not only by a layman or woman, that is a Catholic, but by a Jew, a Pagan, or an infidel.” And so Pope Nicholas, in the Canon Law,<sup>2</sup> and Eugenius in the Council of Florence magisterially determined.<sup>3</sup> But this is one of the novelties of Popery; for the Ancients

<sup>1</sup> Rituale Roman. Titul. de Ministro Baptismi. p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Nichol. Res-

pons. ad Consulta Bulgaror. c. 104. ap. Gratian. de Consecrat. dist. iv. c. 24.

<sup>3</sup> Eugen. Decret. ad Armenos. Con. tom. xiii. p. 535. In causâ necessitatis non solum sacerdos vel diaconus, sed etiam laicus vel mulier, imò etiam paganus et hæreticus baptizare potest, dummodò formam servet Ecclesia.

spake in another style. St. Jerom professes himself amazed to hear a Luciferian say,<sup>1</sup> “ a man might be made a Christian by one, who himself was in no sense a Christian ;” which the Luciferians were forced to assert upon their principles, who received the baptism of the Arians, and yet maintained that they were mere Pagans who administered it: which St. Jerom justly exposes as a strange paradox in Christianity, that Christian baptism might be given by men, who themselves were no Christians. And this shews the true state of the controversy between St. Jerom and the Luciferians: it was not, whether laymen might baptise in case of necessity? as some have imagined; for upon this point both sides were agreed: but it was, first, Whether the Arian priests were mere heathens? which the Luciferians affirmed, and St. Jerom denied. And then, secondly, Whether supposing them to be mere heathens, as the Luciferians would have it, their baptism was valid, and ought not to be repeated again? The Luciferians asserted it to be valid, notwithstanding the supposition of their being heathens: but St. Jerom refutes their assertion upon this principle, that none but a Christian could give Christian baptism: and therefore the Luciferians ought either to own, as the Catholics did, that the Arians were in some sense Christians, and not mere Pagans; or else to rebaptise those that were baptised by them, since Pagans could have no manner of power to give Christian baptism. Tertullian, and the Council of Eliberis were of the same opinion: for they only plead for the validity of such baptisms as were administered by Christians. And St. Austin says,<sup>2</sup> “ it was a very different question from that of lay-baptism, and that nothing ought to be determined in favour of it, without the authority of a General Council.” Nicephorus, among the Greeks,<sup>3</sup> declares positively, “ that no man can baptise others, who is not first baptised himself as a Christian.” And Pope Gregory III. is alleged by some for the same opinion. So that the determination of the Romish Church, for the validity of baptism administered by Jews and

---

<sup>1</sup> Hieron. Dial. adv. Lucifer. c. v. *Novam rem asseris, ut Christianus quisquam factus sit ab eo qui non fuit Christianus.* <sup>2</sup> Aug. cont. Parmen. lib. ii. c. 13. It. do Bapt. lib. vii. c. 53. <sup>3</sup> Niceph. Hist. lib. xi. c. 11.

Pagans, is wholly new, and utterly without precedent in the primitive Church. The author of the *Chronicon Alexandrinum* and *Ado Viennensis* indeed give an instance or two of persons, who were baptised by heathens, in mockery, upon the stage, who are also said to have been converted, and suffered martyrdom upon it: but these effects were owing to the miraculous grace of God, and not to any such baptism; and therefore these instances may serve to prove the power of martyrdom, which may save men without baptism; but are of no weight to justify the modern practice.

I have now gone through the several questions at first proposed, so far as relates to the judgment and practice of the primitive Church.

## CHAP. II.

### *The Practice of the Modern Greeks and Moscovites.*

#### SECT. 1.—The Practice of the modern Greek Church.

PROCEED we now to inquire into the sense and practice of the Church in latter ages. And here I shall say nothing more of the Western or Latin Church, because its practice is so generally known and uncontested. In the Greek Church there has been some dispute about this matter, and some seeming variation in the decrees of their Councils, though they have more generally agreed with the Latins so far, as to allow the baptism of laymen in cases of extreme necessity; which is now also their common practice. In the time of the patriarch Nicephorus, commonly called the confessor, who lived in the beginning of the Ninth Century, about fifty years before Photius, it was synodically determined to be lawful. For in Harmenopulus's *Epitome of the Canons*, and the *Collection of Synodical Decrees of the Greek Patriarchs*, published by Leunclavius in his *Jus Græco-Romanum*, there are two canons of Nicephorus to this purpose. In one of which it is said,<sup>1</sup> “ that if there happen to be infants found

<sup>1</sup> Ap. Leunclav. *Jus. Gr. Rom.* lib. iii. p. 196. *Χρή τὰ ἀβαπτιστά νήπια,*

in a place, where there is no priest, they ought to be baptised: and if in that case the father baptises his own child, or any other man, provided only that he be a Christian, it is no sin." In the other canon he says,<sup>1</sup> "in case of necessity a simple monk, that is, one who is no priest, may baptise. As also a deacon, and a laymen, if it be in a place where there is no priest." And thus matters seem to have stood also in the time of Photius, who, among all the objections that he raises against the Roman Church, in his famous Encyclical Epistle, never so much as touches upon this point; which probably he would have done, had there then been any difference between them. Yet some private writers, about this time, began to dispute the legality of lay-baptism, and call in question the Church's practice. Georgius Hamartolus, a chronographer not yet extant in print, about the year 840, made a bitter invective against it; for the knowledge of which we are beholden to the curious industry of Cotelierius,<sup>2</sup> who has published a fragment out of that writer relating to this subject. He tells us, that author, having occasion to mention the case of the Jew that was baptised in sand, makes this reflection on it: "Where now are those, who say, that laymen and women may baptise sometimes in cases of necessity; and that contend, through ignorance and prodigious and perversicacious impiety, that such baptism ought to be reputed as perfect and divine? who pay no regard to the doctrine and command of the Apostles, meaning the book which goes under the name of the Apostolical Constitutions, which says, 'we donot permit a layman to perform any sacerdotal office, as the oblation of the eucharist, or baptism, or imposition of hands, or the greater, or the lesser benediction. For no one takes to himself this honour but he that is called of God. For this dignity or authority is given by the imposition of hands of the bishop: but he that assumes this power, as an usurper and invader,

---

*ἐὰν εὐρεθῇ τις εἰς τόπον, μὴ ὄντος ἱερέως, βαπτισθῆναι. Εἰ βαπτίσει δὲ ὁ ἴδιος πατήρ, ἢ ὁιοσδήποτε ἀνθρώπος, μόνον ἵνα ἐπὶ χριστιανός, ἐκ ἔσιν ἁμαρτία.*

<sup>1</sup> Ap. Harmenopol. Epitom. Canon. sect. iv. tit. ii. p. 44. Κατὰ περὶ τασιν ἐξ μοναχός λιτός βαπτίζει, ὡσαύτως ἐξ δούκονος. ἐξ λαϊκός δὲ, ἐὰν εὐρεθῇ εἰς τόπον, μὴ ὄντος ἱερέως.

<sup>2</sup> Cotelier. Not. in Constit. Apost.

lib. iii. c. 9.



will incur the crime, and become liable to the punishment of Saul and Uzzias. Nor do we only prohibit laymen, but the rest of the clergy to confer baptism, as deacons, readers, singers, and sub-deacons, allowing it only to bishops and presbyters, who are to have the deacons attend upon them. And they, who presume to do otherwise, shall suffer the punishment of Corah and his company. It is therefore vain cavilling," says our author, "or rather fighting against God, to speak more truly, in such as confer the gifts and operations of the priesthood upon laymen and women, to the subversion of their hearers, who lend an ear to the vain and empty discourses of men who know not what the priesthood means, or what difference there is between a priest and a layman." This writer seems either not to have known the forementioned Decrees of Nicephorus, or else to contemn and insult them. For he sets himself wholly to oppose both the doctrine and practice authorised by them, and argues as much against the validity of baptism when ministered by deacons in cases of necessity, as by laymen. Yet notwithstanding his opposition, these canons continued in force among the Greeks for some ages after. For Harmenopulus, who lived in the middle of the Twelfth Century, and wrote his *Epitome of the Greek Canons* about the year 1150, has inserted them both into his collection: and they are the only canons that are mentioned upon this subject; which seems to argue, that they were then the standing rule of the Greek Church. Yet there were some, who made opposition to them in this age also: for Michael Glycas, who wrote his *Annals* about 1120, takes occasion to urge several arguments against the validity of lay-baptism in any cases of necessity whatsoever. But as Cotelerius has observed<sup>1</sup> his arguments are grounded upon several mistakes in matters of fact, which makes them weak and inconclusive: first,<sup>2</sup> he urges the example of Dionysius, bishop of Ascalon, who is said to have re-baptised a man, who had been baptised in sand instead of water by a layman. But here wanted an essential part of

---

<sup>1</sup> Coteler. Not. in Constit. Apost. lib. iii. c. ix. p. 243.

<sup>2</sup> Glycas *Annal.*

of baptism, viz. the element of water, which seems to have been the true reason why the party was rebaptised, if the whole story be not a fiction. In the second place he alleges the authority of the Apostolical Canons, prohibiting laymen to meddle with the priest's office, whatever cases of necessity may seem to require it. And yet the case of necessity is never so much as once mentioned in all the Apostolical Canons or Constitutions: only laymen are severely prohibited, in general, from thrusting themselves into the offices of the ecclesiastical function. Thirdly, He argues from the authority of Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, who, he says, rebaptised the children that had been baptised by Athanasius. But this is directly contrary to all the old historians, Socrates, Sozomen, and Ruffin, who say expressly that Alexander did not rebaptise them, but only added what was wanting, and what belonged to the episcopal office to perform, that is, imposition of the bishop's hands, with the unction or chrism of confirmation. And so the author of the Life of Athanasius, in Photius,<sup>1</sup> is to be understood, when he says, "that Alexander gave them the unction, and perfected them by the seal or consignation of Christ." Which Glycas mistook for the seal of baptism, instead of confirmation, being led into that error by some modern biographer, who understood not the truth of the story, nor the ancient language of the Church, in which the word, σφραγις, signifies not only *the seal* of baptism, but that of confirmation also. About an hundred years after Glycas lived one Theodorus Scutariota, who wrote some *Scholia* or annotations upon Nicetas Choniates's Thesaurus Orthodoxæ Fidei, where he also maintains the invalidity of lay-baptism, as Cotelerius informs us,<sup>2</sup> who had seen the manuscript: for the work itself was never yet made public. But all these were but private writers hitherto, and therefore signify little to oppose their own private opinions to the declared sense of the Church, as it was authentically delivered in the Canons of Nicephorus, made in a patriarchal Council, where 270 bishops were present,

<sup>1</sup> Phot. Cod. 258. Τότες ἐπιχρίσας, ἐὰν τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ σφραγιδος ἐτελείωσεν.

<sup>2</sup> Coteler. Not. in Const. Apost. lib. iii. c. 9.

if the Council of Constantinople, Anno 814, was the Council in which those Canons were made. That which seems to carry more weight with it, to bear down the aforesaid authority, is another decree made in the Council of Constantinople, under Lucas Chrysoberges, the patriarch, Anno 1166. Here the question was put by Manuel, archbishop of Heraclea, whether a man ought to be received as a Christian, who was baptised by one who pretended to be a priest, but was not so? For such a case had lately happened in his diocese.<sup>1</sup> In answer to this the synod decreed, that such ought to be rebaptised; because the administration of baptism is only committed to bishop and priests, according to the forty-sixth and forty-seventh canons of the Apostles. This Council cannot be denied to speak plainly against the validity of lay-baptism, and in favour of rebaptisation, 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. But whether they intended by this wholly to invalidate the baptism of deacons and laymen in extraordinary cases of absolute necessity, when neither a bishop nor presbyter can be had; as they have not expressed themselves particularly upon this point, so it is more than I can pretend positively, from their words, to determine. But if it was so, then I can say, it was plainly contrary to the decrees of the former Council under Nicephorus, which prevailed in practice both before and since this Council, and still does in the Greek Church to this day, however some learned persons, for want of a little better inquiry, have suffered themselves to be led into an error in thinking otherwise; for 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 baptise, rather than suffer a child to die without baptism. Nothing can be plainer than the answer which Jeremy, the late patriarch of Constantinople, gave to the divines of Tubing, Jacobus

---

<sup>1</sup> Con. Constantinopol. ap. Mat. Blastar. Syntagm. Canon. in Bevereg. Pandect. tom. ii. p. 42.

Andreas and Martin Crusius, in the last age, when they had sent him the Ausbourgh confession, and desired his sentiments about it. In the point of ministering baptism he thus expresses himself, according to Socolovius's translation.<sup>1</sup> "The instrumental cause of baptism is a priest; unless a sudden necessity require it to be otherwise; in which case baptism conferred by one that is not a priest is valid." Hottinger takes notice of the same answer, and gives us his words from the original, which are,<sup>2</sup> "That when a case of necessity happens, they esteem it lawful for laymen to baptise." And Hottinger observes further, that though the patriarch expressed his dissent from the Lutheran divines, in some other points, yet upon this head, and many others, there was a perfect agreement between them: for the Lutheran Churches, as we shall see more hereafter, are all for the validity of baptism, when administered in cases of necessity by laymen. As to the practice of the present Greek Church, we have further evidence from what Suicerus<sup>3</sup> has observed out of Metrophanes Critopulus, a late writer of that communion, who wrote the confession of the Oriental Church, where he thus expresses himself concerning baptism in such cases.<sup>4</sup> "When a pressing necessity requires, the infant is baptised immediately after its birth: and if a presbyter be not at hand, the midwife does it. If the child recover, this baptism is reckoned sufficient for him." Arcudius has the like remark<sup>5</sup> out of Gabriel Severus, archbishop of Philadelphia, in his Book of the Sacraments of the Church,<sup>6</sup> where he says,

<sup>1</sup> Jerem. Epist. ad Germanos ab. Socolov. Censur. Ecclesiæ Oriental. c. vii. p. 3. Instrumentalis causa sacerdos est; nisi quid aliud præceps necessitas exposcat: nam et tum ab alio quàm à sacerdote collatus baptismus vim suam retinet.

<sup>2</sup> Id ap Hottinger. Hist. Eccles. Sæcul. xvi. p. 58.

<sup>3</sup> Ἀνάγκης μὲν τοι προπεσέσης, ἐν τοῖς λαϊκοῖς βαπτίζειν ἔξεῖναι.

<sup>4</sup> Suicer. Thesaur. Eccles. tom. i. p. 632.

<sup>5</sup> Metrophan. Critopul. Confess. Eccles. Orient. c. vii. p. 87. Ἀνάγκης δὲ κατεπειγέσης, εὐθὺς, μετὰ τὴν γέννησιν βαπτίζεται τὸ γεννηθὲν. κἂν πρεσβύτερος μὴ πάρεσιν, ἢ μαῖα τῆτο ποιῆι.—Εἰ δὲ τὸ βρέφος ἀναρρώσῃ, ἀρκεσθήσεται τῷ τῷ βαπτίσματι.

<sup>6</sup> Arcud. de Concord. Eccles. Orient. et Occid. lib. i. c. ii. p. 34.

<sup>7</sup> Gabriel Sever. de Sacramentis, cap. de Baptismo. Μὴ παρόντος ἱερέως, δύναται βαπτίζειν ἐν λαϊκοῖς χριστιανός, ἂντε γυνὴ ἂντε ἄρρεν.

“That when a priest cannot be present, a lay-christian, man or woman, may baptise.” And the learned Dr. Smith, who has lately written of the present state of the Greek Church, gives us this account of their practice from one of their public confessions of faith, written in the vulgar Greek, and printed in the year 1662, where it is expressly said,<sup>1</sup> “That it is not lawful and proper for any one to baptise, but a lawful priest, except in time of necessity; and then a secular person, whether man or woman, may do it. So that what bishop Taylor, in his *Ductor Dubitantium*,<sup>2</sup> has alleged out of Simeon, archbishop of Thessalonica, declaring, “That no man baptises but he that is in holy orders,” is either to be understood in the same manner, with the limitation and exception of the time of necessity, or else to be rejected as false; since there are so many plain undeniable evidences of their practice to the contrary, that he must outface the sun at noonday, that will pretend to withstand them. This answer was given by Arcudius to this passage of Simeon,<sup>3</sup> long before bishop Taylor wrote, but they neither of them refer us to Simeon’s book whence it is taken: I suppose it to be his *Book of the Sacraments of the Church*, whence, Socolovius says, the patriarch Jeremy took his account of baptism: and if so, it is more than probable they were of the same mind in this matter. But till I can see the book itself, I will not be positive, but rest satisfied with the answer given by Arcudius as a just reply to this exception.

SECT. 2.—The Practice of the Moscovites.

The Moscovites commonly follow the practice of the Greeks, as having been first converted to Christianity by them, and still continuing to be of their communion and religion. Whence one might probably conclude, that their sentiments and practice, in this point, were agreeable

<sup>1</sup> Smith’s Account of the Greek Church, p. 110.  
Dubit. lib. iii. c. iv. rule xv. p. 638.  
Orient, et Occid. lib. i. c. xi. p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> Taylor Duct.

<sup>3</sup> Arcud, de Concord. Eccles.

to those of the Greek Church, though there were no further evidence for it. But their rules and canons give particular orders about this matter, as the learned Gerhard, who was acquainted with them, assures us; for he says, the first canon of John,<sup>1</sup> their metropolitan, who is commonly called their prophet, gives this direction, "that children, in case of necessity, should be baptised without a priest." The people indeed do not always observe this rule: for some authors tell us,<sup>2</sup> 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. But we are to judge of the sense and practice of a Church from the rules and canons made by its governors, and not by the practice 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 practice of the common people.

### CHAP. III.

#### *The Practice of the Churches of the Reformation.*

##### SECT. I.—The Practice of the Lutherans.

NEXT for the Churches of the Reformation. The Lutherans in all nations allow of the baptism of lay-persons, men and women, in cases of absolute necessity. We have heard before out of Hottinger, that the German divines of Tubing, who were Luther's disciples, and of the Ausburgh confession, agreed perfectly upon this head with the Greek Church. And it is further evident from the works of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Gerhard. Loc. Commun. tom. iv. de Baptismo. n. [xxxvii. p. 242. Primus canon Johannis Metropolitæ eorum, dicti prophetæ, pueros quoque jubet in necessitate absque sacerdote baptizari. p. 24. <sup>2</sup> Joh. Fabri de Relig. Moscov. p. 176. Huic muneri fungendo, quæcunque necessitas inciderit, nemo hominum sufficere putatur, nisi sacerdos extiterit.

most celebrated writers of that way both in Germany and Denmark. Some of their professors have particular dissertations upon this subject, where they both assert the grounds of their own Churches' practice, and reply to all the objections that are made to the contrary. It will be sufficient to refer the reader to two of them at present, Brochmand and Gerhard, whereof the one was professor of divinity at Copenhagen in Denmark, and the other at Jena in Saxony.

Brochmand, in his *Body of Divinity*,<sup>1</sup> lays down this assertion as the doctrine and rule of the Church: "that any person, who is a Christian, man or woman, may be the extraordinary minister of baptism, at least in the case of extreme necessity, when there is imminent danger of death, and a minister of the word cannot be had." He considers four of the principal objections to the contrary, and gives them these short answers.<sup>2</sup> Object. 1.—That the administration of the sacraments is part of the ecclesiastical ministry. Matt. xxviii. 19. Mar. xvi. 15. Object. 2.—That it is not permitted to a woman to teach in the Church, 1 Tim. ii. 12. To these two objections he returns the same answer, "that in case of extreme necessity every private person is permitted to teach and administer baptism." For he supposes those rules to relate only to the public and standing ministry in ordinary cases. To objection 3.—That no private person is authorised to administer the Lord's supper; he replies, "that there is not commonly the same extreme necessity in the one as the other, and that makes some disparity between baptism and the Lord's supper." To the last objection, that women's baptism was introduced first by Marcion, the heretic; he answers, "that the Marcionites granted a promiscuous liberty to any persons to baptise in any case, which their Churches did by no means approve or allow."

Gerhard is more copious upon this subject: first, he lays down their doctrine in this assertion,<sup>3</sup> "that though the

<sup>1</sup> Brochmand. *System. Theolog.* tom. ii. de Baptismo, cap. v. sect. 3. p. 418. *Extraordinarius baptismi administer, saltem in extremo necessitatis casu, ubi presentissima mors imminet, et verbi minister haberi non potest, quivis homo Christianus esse potest, sive sit mas sive fœmina.*

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* cap. vi. p. 432.

<sup>3</sup> Gerhard. *Loc. Commun. de Bapt.*

administration of baptism ordinarily belongs to the ministers of the Church; yet, in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity, when one of these two things must needs be, that either an infant must die without baptism, or else baptism must be conferred upon it by a private person; in such an exigency, they hold that baptism may be administered in a private house, by any Christian that is rightly instructed in the articles of religion, without distinction of sex." Then he proceeds to assign the grounds of this assertion, where he argues first upon the necessity of baptism, from the words of our Saviour, "Except a man be born again of water and Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and urges, "that this necessity is not in respect of God, who is not so tied to the sacrament, that he cannot regenerate without it; but in respect of us, upon whom there lies a necessity of observing the divine command, about administering baptism, wheresoever the substantial parts of it may be had, lest, as much as in us lies, we hinder an infant from the ordinary means of salvation. A public minister of the Church is not of the essence of the sacrament, but a matter of order, which is not so necessary as the sacrament itself; order being instituted for the sacrament, and not the sacrament for order: and therefore order is to give way to the sacrament, when necessity requires." Secondly, he argues from the parallel case of circumcision, which in its first institution was appointed to be done by the master of the family only, Gen. xvii. 11, 23. yet in extraordinary cases of necessity it might be done by others, even by women, as by Zippora, when Moses was so discomposed and disabled, that he could not perform it; and by other women in the time of the Maccabees, 1 Mac. i. 63.—2 Mac. vi. 10. Thirdly, he argues further from the parallel case of absolution and teaching, which are the ordinary

---

n. 23. tom. iv. p. 229. Quamvis baptismi administratio ordinariè pertineat ad ecclesie ministros; extraordinariè tamen in extremo necessitatis casu, quando hoc immediatum disjunctum obtinet, aut infantulo absque baptismo moriendam, aut baptismus à privatâ personâ ei conferendus, in hoc inquam necessitatis casu, privatis in aedibus à quovis Christiano in articulis religionis rectè instituto, citra sexus respectum, baptismum administrari posse statuimus.



offices of the public ministers: "yet in extraordinary cases, as in the time of a siege, or a plague, or a persecution, when the Church is destitute of ordinary pastors, a private person may declare absolution out of the word of God, to a dying man, and he may instruct and comfort the sick, or others that are under any affliction. In like manner, private men, in cases of extreme necessity, may administer baptism; they being also a 'royal priesthood,' 1 Pet. ii. 9. and 'made kings and priests before God,' Rev. v. 10." I examine not now what weight and force there is in these arguments, but only barely relate them as I find them in our author, to shew what were the common principles and practices of the Lutheran Churches.

SECT. 2.—Of the Helvetic Churches.

Another eminent branch of the Reformation are the Helvetic Churches, the followers of Zuinglius, whose doctrine upon this point differs but little from the Lutherans. The opinion of Zuinglius himself was altogether the same; for in his Book about Baptism,<sup>1</sup> speaking of three several errors, that had crept in among the circumstances of baptism, he reckons this one of them, "that some thought baptism could not be conferred by any other but a priest only; whereas it might be given by any man in case of necessity, yea, by a woman also, if need required." But after the death of Zuinglius, in the General Confession of the Helvetic Churches, women were forbidden to baptise,<sup>2</sup> because the Apostle had commanded women not to meddle with ecclesiastical offices, of which baptism was one. But still no prohibition was laid upon men in cases of necessity, nor any order made for rebaptising those who were irregularly baptised by others.

---

<sup>1</sup> Zuingl. de Baptismo, tom. i. p. 96. Alter error circa personam circumstantiam versatur, quod baptismum à nemine alio, quàm à solo sacerdote conferri posse putarunt: cum interim quivis hominum hoc facere possit, imò fœmina quoque, si quando necessitas sic postulare videatur.

<sup>2</sup> Confess. Helvet. c. xx. p. 70. Docemus baptismum in ecclesiâ non administrari debere à mulierculis vel ab obstetricibus. Paulus enim removet mulierculas ab ecclesiasticis officiis. Baptismus autem pertinet ad officia ecclesiastica.

## SECT. 3.—Of the Calvinists, and French, and Dutch Churches.

Our next inquiry is into the sense and practice of the French and Dutch Churches, which in many things took their measures from the sentiments of Calvin. Now Calvin freely declares his mind against the lawfulness of lay-baptism in any case whatsoever. He thinks there can be no necessity sufficient to authorise private men or women to do the office of a public minister. He owns indeed that the contrary practice had generally prevailed, not only several ages before his own time, but, in a manner, from the first beginning of the Church,<sup>1</sup> “laymen always baptised in danger of death, if a minister could not be had in due time.” But he thinks the grounds they went upon were not justifiable. He does not peremptorily pronounce such baptisms absolutely null and void, but rather the contrary: for, as Archbishop Whitgift long ago observed,<sup>2</sup> against his adversary Cartwright, Calvin was of opinion, “that as among men, if an epistle be sent, so as the hand and seal be known, it skilleth not who or what manner of person carrieth it; even so it is sufficient for us to know the hand and seal of the Lord in his sacraments, by whomsoever they be delivered. Hereby is the error of the Donatists confuted who measured the virtue and worthiness of the sacrament, by the worthiness of the minister. Such be now adays our Anabaptists, which deny us to be rightly baptised, because we were baptised by wicked and idolatrous persons in the Pope’s Church; and therefore they furiously urge rebaptisation. Against whose folly we shall be sufficiently defended, if we think that we were baptised 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 ministered.” This was the judgment of Calvin.

---

<sup>1</sup> Calvin, Instit. lib. iv. c. xv. n. 20. Quod autem multis abhinc sæculis, adeoque ab ipso ferè ecclesiæ exordio, usu receptum fuit, ut in periculo mortis laici baptizarent, si minister in tempore non adesset, non video quam firmâ ratione defendi queat.

<sup>2</sup> Whitgift Defence of the Answ. to the Admonit. tract. ix. p. 518. ex Calvin. Institut. cap. xvii. sect. 16.

However Beza, his successor, declares positively, not only against the lawfulness, but the validity of baptism administered by private persons, especially by women; which he thinks, is no more to be regarded, than what any private man does of his own head in the name of a king or a commonwealth; or, than a counterfeit seal forged by a private man, and set to any instrument in imitation of the public. Yet he allows an essential part of baptism may be changed,<sup>1</sup> viz. the water, and any other liquor be used, rather than baptism should be deferred. Nay, and if Gerhard do not misrepresent him,<sup>2</sup> for I have not Beza's book which he quotes at hand, he scruples not to affirm, "that he should esteem the baptism of Satan in the ministry to be lawful." Which are pretty strange expressions to come from a man, who thought it a profanation of baptism, and a mere nullity, to have it administered in the most extreme necessity by any private Christian. How far the French Churches vindicate Beza in those two latter assertions, at present is not very material to inquire: but in the former, that is, in the doctrine of the invalidity and nullity of lay-baptism, it is certain they all join with him. At least from the time of the General Synod of Poitiers, 1560, they were all obliged to defend that doctrine by subscription. For in that Synod the question was put,<sup>3</sup> What was to be done in case a child had been baptised by a private person? And the answer was given, that the baptism shall be declared null, and the child shall be brought publicly into the Church, there to receive true baptism. This was also inserted into their book of discipline, to which they all swear and subscribe, Chap. xi. Art. 1. "That baptism administered by an unordained person is wholly void and null." The same resolution was given in many other National Synods, as the 1st and 2d of Rochel, 1571 and 1581, the Synod of Gap, 1603, and the Synod of Alenson, 1637. Where,

---

<sup>1</sup> Beza Ep. ii. ad Tillium.                      <sup>2</sup> Gerhard. Loc. Com. tom. iv. de Bapt. n. 23. Beza Quæst. 144. Ipsius Satanae baptismum in ministerio non dubitanter se velle dicere legitimum asserit.                      <sup>3</sup> Vid. Quick. Synodicon Gall. Reform. Synod of Poitiers. cap. vi. art. xi.

though the King had sent them a letter, requiring them to reverse their decree, and allow of the baptism of women and others, according as is done in the Romish Church; yet they utterly refused to allow of any such baptism, as a thing formally contrary to their belief. This then is indisputably the practice of the French Church. But the observation a learned person makes upon it, is not very accurate: "that we may reasonably suppose, that all the other Reformed Churches, who observe the same discipline, are of the same opinion." For this is all supposition without proof. For no other Church, that I know of, observes the same discipline with the French, which is peculiar to the French Church; and it is incongruous then to suppose that all the other reformed Churches observe the same discipline, when perhaps there is not one that does so. Neither are they all of the same opinion as to the particular case before us. For the Lutherans, as I have showed, are all of the opposite side, and manage the contrary part of the question, particularly against the followers of Calvin. Zuinglius also agreed with Luther, and the Helvetic Churches did not very much depart from his opinions. The Palatines also, as I shall presently shew, thought, that baptism, administered by laymen in a grand dissipation of the Church, was not to be repeated. And I believe neither the Waldenses, nor the Fratres Bohemi have any different sentiments from the Lutherans upon this point, though I have not yet had opportunity to make an exact inquiry into their opinions. How then can it be supposed that all the Reformed Churches beyond seas are of the same opinion with the French Church? I hope my ingenuous friend, when he sees this, will find it necessary, and becoming his wonted ingenuity, to retract his unguarded expression. To say, in a word, all that I know of this matter, the Dutch Church, though she does not observe the French discipline any more than any other of the Reformed Churches, joins, I think, with the French Church in this particular, that the baptism of laymen is altogether null and void, and ought to be repeated. For though I have not any of her public acts or declarations to this purpose, yet I find the general current of her writers, the Arminians excepted, to run this way; and I suppose

they speak the sense of their Church without any hesitation. So Rivet, Riissenius, Amesius, Vorstius, and others, with which I think it not necessary, in a plain case, to trouble the Reader. But then the Dutch Church is far from being all the Churches of the Reformation: the Zuinglians are a considerable body; the Lutherans are much more so; being spread far and wide through many great and populous nations: and some of them are episcopal Churches too, which allow this liberty in cases extraordinary to laymen. Whereas by some, the Dutch and French Churches are reckoned of no account, but unchurched, because they want episcopacy, and consequently true ordinations and Christian sacraments in their opinion: and then what signifies their testimony in such a case, if, as soon as they have delivered their evidence about Christian baptism, they shall be cashiered, and positively declared to be no Christians? But I proceed to the remaining parts of the Reformation.

SECT. 4.—Of the Palatine Churches.

The Churches of the Palatinate commonly follow the doctrine of the Calvinists, but 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. Which was a case that actually happened in the Palatinate by the wars in the last age, and gave occasion to Dr. Alting, professor of divinity at Heidelberg, to handle this question among his Problems. The question he puts in these terms, whether that baptism be lawful, which is administered privately by private persons, men or women? to this he returns answer in two distinct propositions: First, "that baptism administered privately by private persons, men or women, ought not to be esteemed lawful baptism." For which he assigns the common reasons that are usually alleged in this case. "1. Because it proceeds from a false opinion of the absolute necessity of baptism to salvation, as if an infant could not be saved without it. 2. Because baptism is not to be administered privately, but publicly in the sight of the whole Church, as being a part of the public ministry, and to avoid the magical ceremonies and super-

stitutions of the Papists. 3. Because baptism belongs not to private men, but to those, who are called to the ministry of the word. Which two things are joined together by Christ in the words of institution, Matt. xxviii. 19.—4. Because women are expressly and by name excluded from all ministry of the word and sacraments, 1 Cor. xiv. 34. 1 Tim. ii. 12.” But notwithstanding the illegality of such baptism, he concludes in a second proposition against the repetition of it in case of a dissipation of the Church.<sup>1</sup> “Baptism,” says he, “administered by private men in a grand dispersion of the Church, is not to be reiterated. We do not say it is legitimate or lawful; for we have shewed before, that it is faulty upon several accounts: but we say it is not to be repeated with this twofold condition or limitation: 1. That it be administered according to Christ’s institution, which is, that the infant be baptised in water, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. 2. That this be done in a dissipation of the Church, such as we now see every where throughout the Palatinate: for in such a state of the Church God pardons many things, which in a well ordered Church it would not be right and proper to admit of. Circumcision, no doubt, was administered with many faults and corruptions, whilst religion itself was so much corrupted among the people of Israel; and yet we never read that it was reiterated, when the people were called to the pure worship of God again. So, in like manner, in the last age, the baptism of the Papists was vitiated and defiled with many superstitions; but yet it was never repeated by the reformed Churches, when they separated themselves from the communion of the Papacy.” Thus far we have seen the judgment of the several Churches of the Reformation beyond seas.

---

<sup>1</sup> Alling. Theol. Problem. Par. 2. Quæst. xvi. p. 326. *Baptismus in dissipatione ecclesiæ administratus à privatis viris non est repetendus.*—*Eum non dicimus licitum aut legitimum esse; est enim trifariam vitiosus, ut ostendimus: sed non esse iterandum, cum hâc duplici conditione sive limitatione. 1. Si administratus sit juxta institutionem Christi, infante aquâ asperso in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritûs Sancti. 2. Si id factum in dissipatione ecclesiæ; qualis nunc passim cernitur in Palatinatu. Siquidem illo ecclesiæ statu multa Deus condonat, quæ nullo modo admittere fas esset in ecclesiâ benè ordinatâ.*—*Ita superiore sæculo baptismus Papistarum fœdatus et vitiatu fuit multis superstitionibus, nec tamen repetitus in Ecclesiis Reformatis, cum secessio fieret à communione Papatûs.*

## SECT. 5.—The Practice of the Church of England.

I come, in the last place, to consider the practice of the Church of England. Where we may observe some difference between the directions given in the Liturgy, as it stood in the time of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth, and those of the Liturgy in the time of King James, which received some alteration after the conference at Hampton Court. In the old Liturgy, the rubric of private baptism ran in these words,<sup>1</sup> “First let them that be present call upon God for his Grace, and say the Lord’s Prayer, if the time will suffer: and then one of them shall name the child and dip him in the water, or pour water upon him, saying these words, I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” This rubric was couched in such general terms, without restraining private baptism to a minister, that hence it is certain in fact, occasion was taken frequently both by laymen and women to baptise children privately, without a public minister: whence arose two questions among the learned men of those days: 1. Whether such baptisms were legally performed, and according to the intent and rules of the Church? And, 2. If they were illegal and against rule, whether they were also wholly null and invalid, and, as such, to be repeated again? Upon the first point learned men were a little divided; some were of opinion, that the words of the Rubric did no ways authorise lay persons, men or women, to baptise in private; but by private baptism only meant baptism administered in a private house, not publicly in a Church, and this to be given only by the minister, and not by any private person. This was the sense of Archbishop Whitgift, as is evident both from his answer to the Admonition, and his Defence of it against Cartwright. His words are these;<sup>2</sup> “The Book of Common-Prayer doth call it private baptism, in respect of the place, which is a private house, and not in respect of the minister. For even in necessity the curate may be sent for, or some other minister that may sooner

<sup>1</sup> Hamon l’Estrange Alliance of Div. Offices. c. viii. p. 223.

<sup>2</sup> Whitgift Defen. of the Ausw. to the Admon. Tract. ix. p. 504.

be come by." See also the Conference at Hampton-Court. Others think the Church, though she did not approve of this kind of baptism, yet intended to permit and tolerate it for a time, till men's prejudices and wrong notions, settled in them by long custom, might gently wear off without any prejudice to the Reformation. So Archbishop Abbot gives his opinion of this rubric: "As Moses," says he,<sup>1</sup> "for a time suffered the Israelites, for the hardness of their hearts, to give a bill of divorce in lesser causes; so for the weakness of men, and hardness of some, laymen were suffered to baptise. Which I take to have been the true reason, why any mention was made of private baptism, by those who first abolished superstition, and compiled the Common-Prayer-Book in this kingdom: not that they thought baptism given by a layman was altogether legitimate and right; but they were not willing to deter the ignorant and unlearned people from the true religion at the first dawning of the Reformation, by pressing too severely upon them, a thing which was so directly contrary to the opinion which they had for many years imbibed. But a toleration and permission does not conclude that to be right and just, which is only tolerated for a time." This difference in men's opinions continued to the time of the Hampton-Court-Conference: for there the several disputants expressed their minds variously upon it. Archbishop Whitgift was still of the same mind,<sup>2</sup> "that the administration of baptism by women and lay-persons was not allowed in the practice of the Church, but inquired of by bishops in their visitations, and censured; neither do the words in the book infer any such meaning." But the King excepted to this, and urged the words of the Book, that

---

<sup>1</sup> Abbot. Prælect. ii. de Baptismo. p. 97. Præ infirmitate hominum, aut durtiâ aliquorum, laicos mysteriis inbuere passi sunt. Quod pro certo existimo in causâ fuisse, eum in regno olim nostro, qui abolitâ superstitione, preces nostras et liturgiam in certam formam librumque redegerunt, privati baptismi mentionem subintulerunt; non quod baptismum datum per laicos, potissimum autem per fœminas, legitimum esse arbitrati fuissent; sed ne primis Evangelii revocandi auspiciis, indoctam et insciam multitudinem à verâ pietate deterrent, illud ingerendo, quod imbibitæ per multos annos opinionii expressè ad eò adversaretur.—Sed toleratio et permissio, fas et justum esse, quod ad tempus toleratur, non concludit.

<sup>2</sup> Conferen. at Hampton-Court, p. 14.



they could not but intend a permission and suffering of women and private persons to baptise. The bishop of Worcester, Babington, said, "that the words were doubtful, and might be pressed to that meaning; but yet it seemed by the contrary practice of our Church, censuring women in this case, that the compilers of the Book did not so intend them, and yet propounded them ambiguously, because otherwise, perhaps, the Book would not have then passed in Parliament." Whereunto Bancroft, the bishop of London, replied, "that those learned and reverend men, who framed the Book of Common-Prayer, intended not by ambiguous terms to deceive any, but did indeed by those words intend a permission of private persons to baptise in case of necessity, whereof their letters were witnesses;" some parts whereof he then read, and withal declared, "that the same was agreable to the practice of the primitive Church."

Bilson,<sup>1</sup> the bishop of Winchester, spake also very learnedly and earnestly in that point, affirming, "that the denying of private persons in cases of necessity to baptise, were to cross all antiquity, seeing that it had been the ancient and common practice of the Church, when ministers at such times could not be got; and that it was also a rule agreed upon by divines, that the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament." To which his majesty answered, "though he be not of the essence of the sacrament, yet he is of the essence of the right and lawful ministry of the sacrament;" taking for his ground, the commission of Christ to his disciples, Matt. xxviii. 20. "Go, preach and baptise."

Dr. Willet, who wrote his Controversies whilst the old rubric was in force, was also of Archbishop Whitgift's opinion,<sup>2</sup> "that neither laymen of what calling soever, nor yet midwives, or any other women, ought to be suffered in a well-reformed Church to baptise infants; neither are they authorised so to do amongst us."

This difference there was then in men's opinions concerning the sense of the rubric of our Church, as it then stood: but yet they all agreed upon the second point, that whether such baptisms were according to rule or against rule, per-

---

<sup>1</sup> Conferen. at Hampton Court, p. 18.  
p. 490.

<sup>2</sup> Willet Synopsis Papismi.

mited or not permitted, yet they were not absolutely null and void, or as such to be repeated by a lawful minister in order to obtain salvation. Archbishop Whitgift pleads as strongly as any man for the validity of such baptisms, though he did not believe them to be done according to any rule, or so much as permission of the Church. In one place<sup>1</sup> he argues thus against Cartwright, who disliked as well deacons' as women's baptising: "We read in the eighth of the Acts, that Philip, a deacon, did baptise: we read also that Moses's wife did circumcise. But where doth this Church of England allow any woman to baptise, or deacon to celebrate the Lord's Supper? and if it did; the dignity of the sacraments do not depend upon the man, be he a minister or not minister, be he good or evil. Let every one take heed that they do not usurp that authority whereunto they be not called." In another place<sup>2</sup> speaking again of Zipporah's circumcision, he says, "Moses at this time was extremely sick, and therefore could not execute that office himself." And in the Geneva Bible there is this note: "that it was extraordinary, for Moses was sore sick, and God even then required it. Zipporah therefore did circumcise in a point of extremity, and not wilfully or of purpose: and that circumcision was a true circumcision, though it were not done ordinarily: even so baptism is true baptism, though it be sometimes ministered by such as are not ordinary ministers." A little after<sup>3</sup> he pleads the universal practice of all Churches, ancient and modern: "although," says he, "divers, both old and new, do not allow that laymen should be suffered to baptise; yet there is none of them, such only excepted as err in rebaptisation, that think the being of the sacrament so to depend upon the minister, that it is no sacrament, if it be not celebrated by a minister." Here he alleges Tertullian, Ambrose, Jerom, Austin, Zuinglius, and Calvin himself. And then concludes, that if his adversary's doctrine were true, there had need be some general rebaptisation throughout all Christendom, as well of men as of children, for certain it is, that that sacrament

---

<sup>1</sup> Whitgift Defen. of the Answer to the Admonit. Tract. ix. p. 515.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 517.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 518.

hath been ministered to many, by such as be in no degree of the ministry. He urges further<sup>1</sup> the famous example of Athanasius, and the Jew that was baptised in sand instead of water, by a layman. This latter was rebaptised, but not the former. "This argueth," says he, "that the Church then made no doubt in respect of the persons that ministered this baptism, but only because there lacked water.— And certainly if the being of the sacrament depended upon man in any respect, we were but in a miserable case: for we should be always in doubt, whether we were rightly baptised or no. But it is most true, that the force and strength of the sacrament is not in the man, be he minister or not minister, be he good or evil, but in God himself, in his Spirit, in his free and effectual operation. This I speak not to bring confusion into the Church; for, as I said before, let men take heed that they usurp not an office, whereunto they be not called, for God will call them to an account for so doing, but to teach a truth, to take a yoke of doubtfulness from men's consciences, and to resist an error not much differing from Donatism and Anabaptism." He finally illustrates this matter from the example of preaching:<sup>2</sup> "He that speaketh the words of Scripture, and doth interpret them, preacheth, though he be not thereunto called: and it is the true word of God he preacheth, if he truly interpret; but he intrudeth himself into a vocation whereunto he is not called, and therefore offendeth God: but that doth derogate nothing from the word preached. The same reason is of the administration of the sacraments: for, as the word of God is the word God, by whomsoever it be preached, minister or other, so is the sacrament of baptism true baptism by whomsoever it be celebrated: the usurper of the office hath to answer for this intrusion, but the sacrament is not thereby defiled." And a little after,<sup>3</sup> "I go not about to prove that women may baptise, only I withstand this error, that the substance and being of the sacraments dependeth upon the man in any respect. I say, that baptism ministered by

---

<sup>1</sup> Whitgift Defen. of the Answer to the Admonit. Tract. xi. p. 519.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 520.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 521.

women is true baptism, though it be not lawful for women to baptise; as the baptism also ministered by heretics is true baptism, though they be usurpers of the office. And I further say, that if the baptism administered by heretical ministers, which be no members of the Church, be notwithstanding good and effectual, I see no cause why it should not be so rather, if it be ministered by laymen which are members and parts of the Church." Mr. Hooker had occasion to answer Cartwright upon the same subject, and he does it almost as copiously as the archbishop, but I shall only transcribe one passage, wherewith he concludes his discourse upon it. "Last of all," says he,<sup>1</sup> "whereas general and full consent of the Godly-learned in all ages doth make for validity of baptism, yea, albeit administered in private, and even by women: which kind of baptism, in case of necessity, divers Reformed Churches do both allow and defend; some others, which do not defend, tolerate; few, in comparison, and they without any just cause, do utterly disannul and annihilate: surely, howsoever through defect on either side, the sacrament may be without fruit, as well in some cases to him that receiveth, as to him which giveth it, yet no disability of either party can so far make it frustrate and without effect, as to deprive it of the very nature of true baptism, having all things else which the ordinance of Christ requireth." Whereupon we may consequently infer, that the administration of this sacrament by private persons, be it lawful or unlawful, appeareth not as yet to be merely void. Archbishop Abbot, in his Theological Lecture before the University of Oxford, largely maintains the same opinion,<sup>2</sup> that such baptisms, though irregularly given, are not to be repeated. His reasons are, 1st, Because the person of the minister is not of the essence or being of the sacrament, but only of the well-being. The form of the sacrament is baptising in water in the name of the Trinity.

<sup>1</sup> Hooker *Eccles. Polit. lib. v. n. lxxii. p. 246.*

<sup>2</sup> Abbot. *Prælect. ii. de Bapt. p. 99.* Ministrantis personam non de esse sacramenti, sed de bene esse judicârunt.—Pietè igitur fit, si minister tangat solus; at fit etiam si tangat alius.

Therefore it is most agreeable to the rules of piety, to have it done only by a minister; but yet it is done, though it be done by another. 2d. He argues from the axiom of the law, which is, "*Multa fieri non debent, quæ tamen facta valent; many things ought not to be done, which yet are valid when they are done.*" As the marriage of children against the consent of their parents, which is a thing that ought not to be done, but yet is valid when it is done. 3d. He argues from the general and perpetual consent and practice of the Church. 4th. From the sense and practice of the Church of England, which, for a time, tolerated such baptisms, and left this direction in the old rubric of private baptism, "Let them not doubt, that the child, so baptised, is lawfully and sufficiently baptised, and ought not to be baptised again." 5th. Lastly, from the inconveniences, that would attend the contrary practice among the whole congregation of Christians. For if none, but a priest every way qualified without exception, might in any case baptise, how great a part of faithful and pious Christians would want the seal of their Christianity? Or, who could be certain, that he himself was baptised in every respect as he ought to be? For one that was never ordained may take upon him the person of a priest. Or, perhaps, one may take holy orders, who never was baptised. Or, if he was baptised and ordained, he may be consecrated by a bishop who was no lawful bishop, nor had any power to give imposition of hands to others. These and such like doubts both may, and often do happen, as reason and experience testify. Whence he concludes upon the whole matter, "that baptism is valid, though given by a layman or woman, having the perpetual consent of the Church, and not being repugnant to the truth of the divine oracles." This writer read his lectures in Oxford in the year 1597. And about five or six years after there was a treatise published in the name of the whole University of Oxford, wherein the same doctrine is defended. This was the answer to the Millenary Petition. The title is, "The Answer of the University of Oxford to a Petition of some Ministers of the Church of England, desiring Reformation of certain Ceremonies." Oxon. 1603—4to. At

Cambridge the same assertion was maintained by Whitaker, as Dr. Forbes alleges him,<sup>2</sup> who dislikes his opinion. And if Archbishop Abbot was a competent judge of the books then written, there were few or none of the Church of England in those days that determined otherwise. Many were inclined to censure lay-baptism as irregular and unlawful, but they all agreed in this, that it was valid, and not to be repeated as a mere nullity, when once it was done. "The present times," says he,<sup>3</sup> "as far as I can judge, have not departed from the determination of their fore-fathers, but keep it as a *depositum* handed down from them." Cartwright indeed, and his followers, who affected the French discipline more than they did the English, went generally the other way, and declared openly not only against the lawfulness, but the validity of lay-baptisms in any case whatsoever. And therefore they continually declaimed against the old rubric of private baptism, and importunately called for an alteration. This, among other things, brought on the Conference at Hampton-Court, the result of which was, that the rubric should be made a little more plain by inserting the words "lawful minister," instead of the general term, "one of them that be present," as it was ambiguously worded before. This determined the question about the lawfulness of lay-baptism so far, as that now it could not well be thought to be permitted or enjoined by the Church. But as to the other question, about the validity of lay-baptisms when done, the divines of the Church determined still the same way that they had done before. For though some alteration was made in the rubric, and the words "lawful minister" inserted: yet they thought still no intimation was given, that private baptisms, by any other beside a lawful minister, should be esteemed absolutely null and invalid; nor any provision made in that case that they should be repeated. Isaac Casaubon, who wrote by the order of King James, and in defence of him against Cardinal Perron, some years after the conference at Hampton-Court,

<sup>1</sup> Whitaker. de Baptismo. Q. iii. c. 1.  
Theol. lib. x. c. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Forbes. Instruct. Histor.

<sup>3</sup> Abbot. Prælect. de Bapt. ii. p. 104. *Nostra etiam tempora, quantum ego novi, ab eorum determinatione non discesserunt, sed tanquam depositum apud nos, et traditum custodiunt.*

speaks thus in the name of the Church of England ;<sup>1</sup> “ what was heretofore said by Tertullian concerning the primitive Church, that baptism was administered by bishops, priests, and deacons; and that laymen also, in cases of extreme necessity, might do it; the very same is now observed in the Church of England, so far as concerns bishops, presbyters, and deacons, without tying them strictly to any rigid observation of time or place: and for the baptism of lay-persons, men or women, though she forbid it to be done by her laws, yet when it is done in due form, she does not altogether disallow or reject it, pronouncing it to be baptism, though not lawfully administered.”

King James asserted the same in the Hampton Court conference: for though he so expounded the necessity of baptism, as that it was only necessary to be had, where it might be lawfully had, that is, ministered by lawful ministers, by whom alone, and by no private person, he thought it might in any case be administered; yet he said,<sup>2</sup> he utterly disliked all rebaptisation, although either women or laics had baptised.

And indeed he shewed his dislike upon some particular occasions: for when one Mr. Crompton had written a book called, *St. Austin's Religion*, wherein he had asserted,<sup>3</sup> “ that for a layman, and much more for a woman, to baptise, in case of necessity, was in St. Austin's opinion, a pardonable sin; though pardonable, yet a sin, and the usurping of another's office;” Dr. Featly tells us,<sup>4</sup> King James, in part, disliked that which Mr. Crompton had delivered. And when he defended himself, by saying, “ that in the conference at Hampton-Court, women's baptising was utterly condemn-

<sup>1</sup> Casaubon. Respon. ad Epist. Perron. p. 33. Lond. 1612. Quod igitur de nascente olim Ecclesiâ dixit Tertullianus, baptizare episcopum, presbyterum, diaconum: postremò etiam laicis jus esse, in extremæ videlicèt necessitatis casu; hoc ipsum in Ecclesiâ Anglicanâ, quod ad episcopos, presbyteros et diaconos hodiè que servatur, sine ullâ vel loci vel temporis rigidâ et penitùs inviolabili observatione: laicorum verò baptismum, aut fœminarum, ut fieri legibus suis vetat, sic factum ex legitimâ formulâ quodammodo non improbat, baptismum esse pronuncians, etsi non legitimè administratum.

<sup>2</sup> Conference at Hampton-Court, p. 18.

<sup>3</sup> Crompton's Relig.

of St. Austin. p. 95.

<sup>4</sup> Featly's Cygnea Cantio, p. 21.

ed; and whereas before women were allowed to baptise in case of necessity, the new rubric restrained baptism to the lawful minister:" the King excepted to this answer, and told him, "That in all the several impressions of the book of Common-prayer, there was nothing said of a woman's baptising, neither to warrant it to be done, nor to condemn it when it was done. Neither doth St. Austin simply condemn a layman or woman baptising in case of necessity, as a sin, but saith, either it is no fault, or a pardonable one." And this, he said, was the sum of the resolution at Hampton-Court in this point, howsoever some had mistaken it. By which it plainly appears, what was the judgment of King James concerning the sense and practice of the English Church, that though she had given no authority to lay-persons to baptise, yet neither did she absolutely condemn it, when it was done, or by any public act order it to be repeated. This was the King's judgment, delivered upon this occasion a few weeks before his death.

In the reign of King Charles the First, one Ambrose Fisher wrote a defence of the Liturgy of the Church of England, Lond. 1630, wherein he maintains the same assertion, "that though laymen were prohibited to baptise; yet when it was done, their baptism was valid and not to be repeated."

Dr. Forbes indeed, the learned Scotch professor, set himself to oppose this in a particular dissertation among his *Historical Theological Instructions*,<sup>1</sup> where the reader may find the whole strength of the contrary side. But he goes upon such principles as cannot possibly be maintained by any English divine, nor were ever maintained by any ancient writer; for he argues as much against the lawfulness and validity of baptism administered by deacons, as by laymen; when yet nothing can be plainer than the power and authority, which the Church gives them in the office and form of their ordination; for there they are told, "that it appertaineth to the office of a deacon in the Church, in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Forbes. *Instruct. Hist.* lib. x. c. xiv.



absence of the priest, to baptise infants," and accordingly when the bishop says, "take thou authority to execute the office of a deacon in the Church of God committed unto thee," it must be understood, that, among other things, the power and authority of baptising is conferred upon them. But now, if the baptism of deacons be invalid, as Dr. Forbes asserts, if none but a priest can administer it, nor grant absolution and pardon of sins, which belongs to that sacrament; then the Church of England has been hitherto mistaken in conferring orders upon deacons, and investing them with authority to baptise. But if the Church has power to authorise deacons to baptise, then their baptism is not only valid, but authorised and authentic too. And that learned person, and all others, who invalidate the baptism of deacons, upon this principle, that they want sacerdotal powers, are under a great mistake, to oppose a practice so firmly established in the constitution of the Church of England. However it be, it is certain, there is a manifest opposition betwixt him and the Church upon this head; and therefore he cannot be supposed to speak the sense of our Church, when he invalidates the baptism of deacons. Nor does he produce any rule of the Church to invalidate the baptism of laymen, but proceeds upon other grounds, which have been considered in the foregoing parts of this discourse.

Bishop Taylor also argues for the invalidity of laymen's baptism in any case whatsoever:<sup>1</sup> but he does not pretend the Church has given any order to rebaptise such as are unlawfully baptised by laymen. Nor do I know any author, till of late, that has pleaded the authority of the Church for rebaptisation in such cases; but the sense which was given by Casaubon and King James has generally passed for the sense of the Church of England. And indeed if the Church had intended more, it had been easy, when she altered her rubric, forbidding any but a lawful minister to baptise, to have inserted a further order and decree, to rebaptise all such as were otherwise baptised; as the French Church did, both in her Canons and Book of Discipline, because she thought all baptisms, that were not given by a lawful minis-

---

<sup>1</sup> Taylor *Ductor Dubitant*, lib. iii. c. 4. rule xv. p. 638.

ter, to be absolutely null and void. Which the Church of England having never yet done, it may be presumed it was not her sense to make her discipline so rigorous, as that of the French Church, in requiring rebaptisation. At least Casaubon and King James, who were very capable of knowing her sense, so understood it, and we do not find many that have been inclined to contradict them. So that, upon the whole, it must be concluded, for any thing that yet appears to the contrary, that what Casaubon said in the name of King James is the present sense of the Church of England: she forbids lay-men or women, by her laws, to baptise; but if it be done in due form, though she does not approve of it, yet she does not wholly disannul it, or order it to be repeated, as absolutely null and void. And whether any alteration is proper to be made in this affair, is none of my province to determine: I have performed, as far as I could, the part of a faithful historian, to correct the errors of some, and inform the judgment of others, and leave the rest to be determined in a lawful assembly.

---

AN  
APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

*Some Remarks on the Historical Part of Mr. Lawrence's Writings, touching the invalidity of Lay-Baptism, his Preliminary Discourse of the various Opinions of the Fathers concerning Rebaptisation and Invalid Baptisms, and his Discourse of Sacerdotal Powers.*

WHEN I had almost finished the foregoing discourse, I had occasion to look into these writings, as containing some historical matters relating to the present subject. I was the more tempted to inspect them, because the author pretends to write with great accuracy, even to a mathematical exactness. I will not concern myself, at present, with his reasonings, but only his history, in which he will pardon me if I friendly shew him and the world some few of his mistakes, which are neither according to the rules of history, nor the exactness of a mathematical method and way of writing. In his discourse of Sacerdotal Powers, Chap. v. p. 120. he has these words: "After the Council of Nice, the major proposition, that those, whom a laic baptiseth, are to be rebaptised, was looked upon to be so true, that it was the undoubted principle whereby the Orthodox confuted the Luciferians; for thus they argued: those, whom a laic baptiseth, are to be rebaptised; but those, whom an Arian priest baptiseth, are not to be rebaptised: therefore an Arian priest is not a laic. This argument so confounded Hilary, the Deacon, that he was forced to deny the major,

which his Master Lucifer had granted before, viz. That those, whom a laic baptiseth, are to be rebaptised; and which St. Jerom affirms by the authority of the Nicene Council. *Hieron. Dial. adver, Lucif.* St. Chrysostom archbishop of Constantinople, Anno 398, is express for the invalidity of lay-baptism; and that in cases of necessity it can be no more administered by a laic, than the eucharist. *Chrys. lib. iii. de Sacerd. c. 5.* But all these are things, says he, which can be administered by no other man living, but by those sacred hands alone, the hands, I say, of the priest. These are instances for which I am beholden to the learned and Rev. Mr. William Reeves's notes on the 2d vol. of the Apol. of Justin Martyr, p. 263. 264." Thus far our author.

In which paragraph there are abundance of mistakes, of several kinds. The first and least is his misquoting Mr. Reeves's notes on Justin Martyr, instead of Vincentius Lirinensis. Secondly, he makes Mr. Reeves say, what he really does not, that Hilary, the deacon, was forced to deny the major (proposition in the argument) which his master Lucifer had granted before, viz. That those, whom a laic baptiseth, are to be rebaptised; and that St. Jerom affirms this by the authority of the Nicene Council: whereas Mr. Reeves says expressly, that Hilary, the deacon, did not deny the major proposition, but the assumption, which his master Lucifer had granted; which was, that those, whom an Arian priest baptiseth, are not to be rebaptised; and that it was this assumption, which St. Jerom confirmed by the authority of the Nicene Council. Mr. Lawrence did not here distinguish between a major and a minor proposition, but unluckily changes Mr. Reeves's terms, and puts major instead of assumption, which stands for a minor proposition only in all logics whatsoever. We are not likely to find, I am afraid, great exactness in history, when it is to be fetched from ancient Greek and Latin authors, by a person, who could make so unhappy a mistake only in transcribing an English author. Let us next examine, Thirdly, what errors he commits in point of ancient history, by virtue of this mistake: he makes Lucifer hereby a witness for the invalidity of laymen's baptism, by making him say,

that those, whom a laic baptiseth, are to be rebaptised: which proposition, when he produces Lucifer's plain testimony for it, shall have my assent, and not before. Fourthly, he makes St. Jerom affirm universally the same thing: and yet it is as plain as words can make it, that St. Jerom allowed laymen to give baptism in cases of necessity, as I have proved before from that very dialogue against the Luciferians, upon which he grounds the contrary assertion. Fifthly, he makes St. Jerom assert that pretended proposition upon the authority of the Nicene Council: and yet neither is there any such Canon in the Nicene Council, nor did ever St. Jerom assert there was, but only a Canon about allowing some heretical bishops and priests to enjoy the honour of their places, and not to be degraded to laymen, upon their return to the unity of the Catholic Church. Sixthly, he says, St. Chrysostom is express for the invalidity of lay-baptism; and that in cases of necessity it can be no more administered by a laic, than the eucharist. But St. Chrysostom neither expressly mentions the case of necessity, nor lay-baptism, nor the invalidity of it; but only says, "Baptism is not administered by any but the hands of a priest:" which, if it were to be taken in the strictest sense, to exclude all others, besides priests, in cases of extreme necessity, would exclude deacons as well as laymen; unless this author will say, that deacons are priests, or shew, that St. Chrysostom thought them to be so, which I am sure he did not, and yet he allowed them to baptise in cases of necessity, when a priest could not be had, as I have fully proved before, against Dr. Forbes, in answer to this very objection. But if such men as Dr. Forbes, and Mr. Reeves, who was this author's guide, were under some mistake in this matter, I do not wonder a less skilful writer should readily follow them: but for his other mistakes they are so gross and palpable, that I think he is bound in justice, both to Mr. Reeves and the world, ingenuously to acknowledge his misrepresentation, and correct his errors, as he has modestly promised to do, when any one modestly better informs him.

The next thing I shall take notice of is, his treatment of

St. Basil, in whose mouth he puts an argument and makes him contradict himself upon it. He says, p. 119. St. Basil thus argues: "Those, whom a laic baptiseth, are to be rebaptised: but those, whom an heretic or schismatic baptiseth, a laic baptiseth: therefore such are to be rebaptised. This argument he made use of to prove, that heretical and schismatical baptisms were null and void; and he reckoned them so, because he thought them of the same nature as lay-baptisms in those days. His major proposition, that those, whom a laic baptiseth, are to be rebaptised, was not denied; he had no opposers to defend such baptisms. All the opposition he met with was, that they denied his minor, that those, whom an heretic or schismatic baptiseth, a laic baptiseth.—And therefore though they did not deny but lay-baptism was null and void; yet they affirmed heretical and schismatical baptisms to be good, because they were not lay-baptisms; and to this St. Basil consented." Basil. Canon. Ep. ad Amphiloeh. can. 1.

But did St. Basil consent, that heretics and schismatics were laymen and not laymen at the same time? Did he consent that their baptism was null and void, and yet good too notwithstanding? Either St. Basil was very weak so to contradict himself, or else our author was very weak to father such a contradiction upon him. But perhaps he had it from Mr. Reeves, to whom he professes himself beholden for all these instances. No, indeed, it is an improvement upon Mr. Reeves, I think; but if otherwise, Mr. Reeves must answer for himself. In the mean time I will answer our author. St. Basil does not bring that as his own argument, but only relates it as the argument of St. Cyprian and Firmilian: but our author does not distinguish between a man's acting the part of an historian, and that of a logician: he might as well say, all the arguments I have related in this book are my own, because I have related so many men's arguments and opinions upon the present subject. If he had looked into St. Basil himself, he might have seen this. But was not St. Basil of opinion, that lay-baptisms and heretical baptisms were null and void? Yes. But he did not then say they were good and valid too: but only he was so modest, as not to condemn or break communion with those Churches, who differed

both in opinion and practice from him. And therefore, because there were other Churches in Asia, who allowed of the baptism of schismatics as valid, he advises those, who were members of those Churches, to comply with the custom and practice of their respective Churches: “*ἔγω δεκτόν. Let it be received.*” But he does not say the same of heretics, but thinks every Church ought to repeat their baptism. For he makes a great distinction between the baptism of heretics and schismatics; and so our author should have distinguished, if he would rightly have represented St. Basil’s opinion. For though, in his own private judgment, he was for rebaptising both of them, yet he makes some allowance for schismatics, who kept the faith, which he does not for heretics, who destroyed it. And therefore admits of a compliance in other Churches, in the one case, which he does by no means allow in the other. I have produced the passage at large in the first chapter, sect. 20. To which the reader may have recourse.

I come next to his preliminary discourse of the various opinions of the Fathers concerning rebaptisation and invalid baptisms. Here I observe in general, that he delivers ancient history often very magisterially, without referring his reader to any particular places in his authors, whereby to judge of the truth of his assertions. Thus he says, p. 2. that the Stephanians, among other arguments which they mustered up for the validity of heretical baptisms, used this for one: “that all catechumens, who died unbaptised, were not therefore damned; much less those who had received baptism, though from heretics or schismatics.” I do not dispute his assertion about the catechumens, but desire him only to inform the world, in what writing of the Stephanians, as he calls them, he finds this maintained, that, they who had received baptism from heretics or schismatics, were in a state of salvation. And when he alleges his author, we shall be better able to judge of the truth of the assertion.

Pag. 10. He tells us, Athanasius, in the fourth century, rejected the baptism of heretics: By which he would insinuate, that Athanasius was of Cyprian’s opinion, and rejected the baptism of all heretics in general. But he refers his reader to no place, and he is left to look for it in two or three

large volumes of Athanasius's works: yet I suppose he means his third oration against the Arians, tom. i. p. 413. where he disputes against the Arians' baptism, and rejects it as invalid, because they rejected the fundamental doctrine of the Trinity, though they kept to the form of baptising used in the Church. But this is not simply to reject the baptism of heretics; for he allowed the baptism of all others, as I have shewed in the foregoing discourse. Chap. i. sect. 20.

In the same page he brings the testimony of Pacianus, without referring the reader to any place where to find it, and it is scarce worth his while to inquire after it: for it is alleged to no manner of purpose; for what if Pacianus says, "that baptism purifies from sins, and unction brings down the Holy Spirit; and both the one and the other are applied by the hand and the mouth of the bishop?" What does this testimony testify concerning rebaptisation or invalid baptism? Either it signifies nothing at all, or else it signifies more than our author would have it signify, that no baptism is valid, no more than confirmation, that is not applied by the hand and mouth of a bishop: for this would destroy all sacerdotal powers, and make the baptism of priests invalid, as well as that of deacons and laymen.

Page 11. In the next place he produces Optatus, but still keeps his reader in the dark, and leaves him to read over seven books against Parmenian, to find a single passage in that author, who seems to think, he says, "that we ought to rebaptise those, who were baptised by heretics:" but does not make the same determination concerning those who were baptised by schismatics. But, if our author had dealt kindly by his reader, he should have referred him to the fifth book of Optatus, p. 85, where he might have found, without any trouble, that it was not the baptism of all heretics that he rejected, but only such as did not baptise into the faith of the Holy Trinity: for Optatus was of the same opinion with Athanasius, and says, if men were baptised in the faith of the Trinity, their baptism was not repeated, when they came over to the Catholic Church. I have produced the passage at large above, and need not here repeat it.

His reflections on the Council of Eliberis, which follow



immediately after are just enough: that it was a particular Council; and that it authorised only some laymen to baptise, but not all; and those not anti-episcopal, but in subjection to their bishops.

P. 12. But his next reflections on the first Council of Arles, are not so just and accurate. For he diminishes the authority of this Council by following the faulty subscriptions, which make but thirty-three bishops to have been present at it. Whereas it was a plenary Council of the whole Western Church, as St. Austin calls it, consisting of two hundred bishops, as Baronius, Schelstrate, Pagi, and most other learned critics, except Valesius, readily allow.

P. 13. He says further, “that the ancient heretics and schismatics, whose baptisms that Council allowed, had commonly received ordination from the hands of some catholic bishop or other; whence he concludes, that those baptisms were not anti-episcopal: which are both mistaken assertions; for many of the heresies and schisms of those times had a long succession of false bishops of their own, who were not ordained by catholic bishops, as the Novatians, Quartadecimans, and several others, who certainly did not act by any authority of the Catholic Church, whilst they were out of the Holy Catholic Church, and in manifest opposition to it. And though they had all been ordained by catholic bishops, yet they were no longer authorised to minister by the Catholic Church, than they continued in the Church: but as soon as they fell into heresies and schisms, they were anti-episcopal, properly speaking, till they returned to the centre of unity in the Church again. If this author thinks otherwise, let him speak his mind plainly and roundly upon it. In the mean time I will venture to assert, that anti-episcopal baptisms were, in some sense, the subject of that Council, forasmuch as heretical and schismatical baptisms were the subject of it.

Pag. 13. He says, “after the Council of Nice, it was a prevailing principle, that those, whom a laic baptised, were to be rebaptised; and that even Lucifer himself granted this

proposition to be true." But I have already accounted with this author for his many and great mistakes about this matter, and therefore shall not here repeat them.

Pag. 16. He alleges the eighth canon of the second Council of Carthage, in these words: "If a priest, excommunicated by his own bishop, undertake to offer up the sacrifices in private, and to set up altar against altar, thereby making a schism, he ought to be anathematised; because there is but one Church, one faith, and one baptism. His remark upon this canon is, that this one baptism cannot be supposed to be out of this one Church, and therefore is only in it." But this remark is made with great faintness and ambiguity. Why did he not speak plainly, and say, all such baptisms are utterly void, null, and invalid, and as such to be repeated again? But perhaps he was sensible, this was too plain against the mind of the Council, which did not intend to declare such baptisms absolutely invalid and void; but only unlawfully given by persons, who had no authority to give them in such a capacity, whilst they continued in such a schismatical opposition to their bishop, though they had otherwise received a lawful ordination from him. Which may convince our author, if he will be convinced, that all unauthorised and unlawful baptisms are not presently invalid: for a priest's baptism, if it be given in such circumstances as the Council supposes, is unauthorised and unlawful, as well as that of a laymen, and yet not to be repeated, when the party so baptised returns to the Church again. And it may convince him further, that these terms, unauthorised-baptism, invalid-baptism, and lay-baptism, are terms of different import, though they are usually confounded together and made equivalent by our author, which is the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος*, or *the reigning error*, that runs through his whole book. For,

Pag. 24. He repeats this again, "that the Church has not in any general Council made any determination about unauthorised and anti-episcopal baptisms:" As if either the baptisms of heretics, or schismatics, or excommunicated priests were not unauthorised, or the Councils of Nice, or

Arles, or Carthage, last mentioned, had made no decree about them.

Pag. 26. He says, "his province is only confined to lay, i. e. unauthorised-baptism, such as is performed by persons, who never were authorised for that purpose.—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." Here he again confounds lay-baptisms and unauthorised-baptisms together. As if all lay-baptisms were simply unauthorised, when they sometimes had the authority of bishops and canons to authorise them in certain cases. Or, as if there could be no unauthorised-baptisms but mere lay-baptisms; when yet it is so plain, that the baptism of excommunicated priests are unauthorised, as well as those of mere laymen. And how can it be said, with truth, that no Council can be produced for the validity of lay-baptism, or unauthorised-baptism, when he himself owns, that the Council of Eliberis authorised the one, and so many Councils confirmed the validity of the other.

Pag. 28. He alleges Tertullian in these words: "Baptism is reserved to the bishop: heretics are not able to give it, because they have it not; and therefore it is, that we have a rule to rebaptise them." These few words are tacked together from two or three different places of Tertullian, and therefore he would have done well to have pointed out the distinct books and chapters to his readers: which I have done to his hand in the foregoing discourse: the places are, *Tertul. de Bapt. c. xv. and xvii. and De Pudicitia. c. xix.* Where he talks of a rule indeed to baptise heretics again; but that rule was not what our author says it was, "the law and practice of the Church," but "the *præceptum Domini in Evangelio, the law of Christ and the Apostles,*" as Tertullian himself words it, which is the rule, upon which he founded rebaptisation of heretics, however our author came to mistake it. In the book *De Pudicitia*, I own he speaks of the practice of rebaptising heretics as heathens; but the rule, by which he justifies this practice, is not the rule of the Church, but the rule of Christ. Yet our author here could

easily discern, when it was for his turn, that Tertullian talked of a rule, and that that rule must needs be the law and rule of the Church distinct from the law of Christ. But when Tertullian speaks of laymen's having a licence to baptise in cases of necessity, then, in our author's opinion, he vents strange odd notions, his own private opinions, and not the Church's custom and allowance: though any unprejudiced person, that will compare the places together, will find, that he makes the one the practice of the Church as well as the other, and founds them both equally upon the law of Christ, or the rule of the Gospel, which our author mistook for a canon of the Church.

Pag. 29. He says, "the Council of Eliberis, in the fourth century, made a rule for the allowance of lay-baptism:" and yet a little before p. 26. we heard him say, that lay-baptism was the same as unauthorised-baptism, and that there was not so much as a provincial Council to be produced in its behalf, till the corrupt ones of Rome.

In the same page he insists again upon the testimonies of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and the Catholics disputing with the Luciferians in the same century, as more than a balance against Tertullian's private opinion. But why did he not think the Council of Eliberis more than a balance against them? who, if they were indeed against the opinion of Tertullian, a private person, they were also as much against the public opinion of the Council of Eliberis. But, in truth, the greater part of these pretended testimonies are neither against Tertullian, nor the Council of Eliberis; as I have particularly noted of St. Chrysostom and St. Jerom, more than once in the foregoing dissertation. But because our author talks so frequently and so much of the Catholics, in the plural, disputing with the Luciferians in the fourth century, I desire him to acquaint us, what authors he has read against the Luciferians, besides St. Jerom, and I will be one of those, that will give him my thanks for his information.

But his main testimony is still behind, and yet it is so little to the purpose, that I had once almost a mind to have overlooked it. He tells us, pag. 29. that Ignatius, the glorious martyr, who lived in the days of the Apostles, in

his Epistle to the Smyrneans, says, " Let that sacrament be judged effectual and firm, which is dispensed by the bishop, or him to whom the bishop has committed it. It is not lawful, without the bishop, either to baptise or celebrate the offices ; but what he approves of, according to the good pleasure of God, that is firm and safe, and so we do every thing securely." Our author thinks this exactly agreeable to the doctrine of St. Cyprian, and so he would deduce the rebaptisation of heretics and schismatics from the Apostles. But does Ignatius any where say, that heretical and schismatical baptisms were simply invalid and to be repeated ? He says, indeed, it is unlawful, and not safe to baptise in opposition to the bishop's authority and order. And so I believe any man will say, that has a due respect for the authority of the episcopal function. But does it hence follow, that all baptisms are absolutely invalid and void, that a schismatical presbyter gives in opposition to his bishop ? It is unsafe, doubtless, either for minister or people, the baptiser or the baptised, to be concerned in such baptisms : they cannot with a safe conscience, and without sin, if schism be a sin, be either agent or patient in such administrations ; because they are acting in contempt and defiance of that lawful authority which God has appointed in his Church. But the way to correct these errors is not to disannul the sacrament by repeating it again, but to repent of the unlawful manner of giving or receiving it, in opposition to lawful authority and the established rules of the Church. But our author, as I observed, always confounds unauthorised-baptism and invalid-baptism together ; and if an act be sinful, irregular, or illegal in the administrator, he presently concludes it must be null and void in the receiver. Which is his great mistake in his whole book, and particularly in interpreting this passage of Ignatius.

I shall but make one remark more upon our author's Preliminary Discourse, which is, in relation to his opinion of the invalidity of heretical and schismatical baptisms, which he thus expresses, page 27, and 28. " To return once more to the dispute in St. Cyprian's time, and the decrees then and since made about it, I cannot dissemble my

thoughts, that the arguments and determinations against his doctrine and practice, have nothing of that reason and solidity which an inquisitive person might justly expect in them: and that, on the contrary, St. Cyprian and his colleagues defend their assertion, that the baptisms of heretics and schismatics are invalid, with so much judgment and cogency of argument, founded upon the topic of such heretics and schismatics being destitute of holy orders while they were out of the Church of Christ, that I wonder how it could possibly have come to pass, that their doctrine should be afterwards exploded; especially when I consider, that what they taught and practised herein, was confirmed by numerous Councils in those earlier days, wherein truth was more prevalent than afterwards; and Tertullian long before affirmed the same thing. "Nay," he says, "Ignatius maintained the very same doctrine with Cyprian; and he thinks, nothing could have given credit and reputation to the contrary opinion, but the monstrous increase of heresy and schism afterwards, which, together with many other causes concurring, brought into the Church of Rome and the rest of the Western Churches, whom she had subjected to her vassalage, abundance of damnable doctrines and practices, insomuch that at last there was but little of solid and substantial religion to be found in the Churches of her communion."

Now let us put these things together, and view them narrowly, and see what will be the consequence. The baptisms of heretics and schismatics are invalid: the baptisms of the Church of Rome are the baptisms of heretics and schismatics; or, in his words, the baptisms of a Church that is overrun with abundance of damnable doctrines and practices, and has but little of solid or substantial religion to be found in her communion: therefore the baptisms of the Church of Rome are invalid. Now if the baptisms of the Church of Rome be invalid, upon this principle, that the baptisms of heretics and schismatics are invalid; what then becomes of the validity of the baptisms of the Church of England, and all the other Churches of the Reformation? Had they not all their baptism from that heretical Church of Rome, which, upon our author's principles, could not give

valid baptism, much less the power of baptising to others? Is not this as plain as any demonstration in Euclid, or any one syllable of an argument in our author's book, that if the baptism of heretics and schismatics be invalid; and the Church of Rome be an heretical or schismatical Church, and the Church of England have her baptisms originally from that Church and no other; that then the consequence must be, that all the baptisms of the Church of England are invalid, and that there is no true baptism administered by her priests any more than by any others. For they are all but pretended priests, as having received their baptism and ordination originally from heretics and schismatics, who had no power to minister any other sacraments or orders but such as are invalid. I believe our author did not see the consequence of this argument, which unbaptises all the Church of England at once, and himself among the rest, though he has been twice baptised or washed already. I know indeed, he declares, p. 31. "That it is not his design to meddle with the Cyprianic dispute in his discourse; his business is not to inquire, whether those, who were once duly authorised, and afterwards fall into heresy or schism, and thereby separate themselves, or are excluded from the Church, can administer valid sacraments and ordinations during this their separation: no, he will not do so much as touch upon this at all, because he does not think his case affected by it." But he has already touched upon it, and freely declared his opinion about it: and I have shewed him, what he did not think, that his case is wonderfully affected by it; and not only his case but the case of all the Church of England, and all the Churches of the Reformation; which are all unbaptised, and there is neither a priest, nor a Christian among them, if the principle he advances stand good, that the baptism of heretics and schismatics is utterly invalid: and he must seek for a priest of another kind to baptise him a third time with valid baptism, which he cannot have in the Church of England, nor the Church of Rome, nor the Churches of the Reformation, who all derive their invalid baptism from one and the same original: he must travel then as far as Constantinople for a priest of the

Greek Church to do it: and when he comes there, he will, perhaps, find the same difficulties in that Church, as his principle makes in the rest of the European Churches nearer at hand. For in that Church, there may be some question, whether there be not some heretical or schismatical doctrines maintained? She has some of the Romish errors; and to use an expression of his, p. 30. "Too much of her leaven still remaining in her;" and "One of her very great and peculiar corruptions," as our author styles it, "in the matter of lay-baptism and midwives-baptism," is still espoused by that whole Church, as I have proved unanswerably against my learned friend in the second chapter of the foregoing dissertation. To what Church then this gentleman will apply himself for valid baptism, I am at a loss to consider; and more at a loss to think, by whom all the rest of Christendom are to be rebaptised. But perhaps he will call this a tragical representation; as indeed it is, but it is a true one: he will complain, it may be, that I drive his principle further than he intended, and charge it with consequences, which he never thought of. I would charitably hope so indeed: but then I must say further, it is proper to shew him the dangerous consequences of his opinion, in order to convince him of the unreasonableness and absurdity of it. But perhaps he will say, he neither believes heretical and schismatical baptism to be invalid, nor the Church of Rome to be that heretical and schismatical Church, which I have represented from his character and picture of her. The reader will best judge of these things from his own words before recited. But if he denies these to be his opinions, I, for my part, will believe him; only beseeching him to express his mind a little more intelligibly upon such points for the future. And then I would ask him one question more: if the baptism of heretics and schismatics be valid, upon what foot it is so? Is it because they have an equal authority and commission to baptise, as well as catholic priests? If so, whence is their authority and commission derived? Is it from the catholic bishops of the Church? But sure they never intend to authorise heretics and schismatics to baptise, or perform any other ecclesiastical offices, which belong to the function



of the catholic clergy. Or if they ordain men to these offices, who, as soon as they are ordained, turn heretics and schismatics, and bid defiance to the Church, and set up separate meetings and conventicles to perform those offices, in direct opposition to the Church and all her orders; can it enter into any man's head to think, that they do all these things by the authority of the bishops of the Church, who first gave them ordination, when they are done so manifestly in contempt of all authority, and perhaps with a professed design to affront authority, and act independently of themselves, without any regard to the just rules of catholic communion? No, certainly, they forfeit all legal authority to perform such offices, at least, after the Church pronounces a formal sentence and censure upon them. Now then the question will be, whether any such offices, and particularly baptism, thus performed in contempt of authority, can be said to be valid or not? That it is not authoritatively performed is very plain: but does the thing done remain valid, or is it therefore absolutely null and void, because the heretical and schismatical priest had not the authority of the bishops of the orthodox Church to perform it? If it be valid, then there may be a valid baptism, where the administrator is not legally authorised to perform it. If it be simply invalid, and absolutely null and void, because administered by an heretical or schismatical priest, then all the difficulties return upon us that I have mentioned before, since our baptisms originally descend from the heretical and schismatical Church of Rome; which, if our author thinks fit to deny to be an heretical or schismatical Church, I will undertake to shew it upon the general principles of the Reformation. When these things are duly considered, they may, perhaps, have their proper influence upon this writer: at least I cannot but think, that venerable body, who are competent judges in this matter, will make no new decree, that will either reflect upon the general practice of the Church, or make it so extremely difficult to defend the baptisms of the Church of England, as it needs must be upon the principles of this author, who asserts the nullity of heretical baptisms, as well as those of laymen, though the Church of

England has no rule for rebaptising either; and by her constant practice, which, in difficult cases, is the best interpreter of rules, has allowed the validity of both of them, as has been fully made out in the foregoing discourse. I shall add no more but the handsome rebuke, which St. Jerom gave Hilary, the deacon, the *Deucalion Orbis*, as he styles him, who was for rebaptising all that had been baptised by heretics, when they came over to the unity of the Catholic Church: *Si hæretici baptismum non habent, et ideo rebaptizandi ab Ecclesiâ sunt, quia in Ecclesiâ non fuerunt: ipse quoque Hilarius non est Christianus; in eâ quippe Ecclesiâ baptizatus est, quæ semper ab hæreticis baptismum recepit.* Hieron. Dial. contra Lucifer. cap. ix.

Our author, I am told, understands Latin, and therefore I will leave him to translate this, and make the application.

END OF PART I.







BW150 .B61 v.3  
Origines ecclesiasticae, or, The

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 00056 1052