

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 5.
lxiii. 1.

with both your arms a sentence which now is no Gospel unto you, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice"⁶¹?"

[5.] To acknowledge Christ's institution the ground of both sacraments, I suppose no Christian man will refuse: for it giveth them their very nature, it appointeth the matter whereof they consist, the form of their administration it teacheth, and it blesseth them with that grace whereby to us they are both pledges and instruments of life. Nevertheless seeing Christ's institution containeth, besides that which maketh complete the essence or nature, other things that only are parts as it were of the furniture of sacraments, the difference between these two must unfold that which the general terms of indefinite speech would confound. If the place appointed for baptism be a part of Christ's institution, it is but his institution as Sacrifice, baptism his institution as Mercy, in this case. He which requireth both mercy and sacrifice rejecteth his own institution of sacrifice, where the offering of sacrifice would hinder mercy from being shewed. External circumstances even in the holiest and highest actions are but the "lesser things of the law"⁶², whereunto those actions themselves being compared are "the greater;" and therefore as the greater are of such importance that they *must be done*, so in that extremity before supposed if our account of the lesser which are *not to be omitted*, should cause omission of that which is more to be accounted of, were not this our strict obedience to Christ's institution touching "mint and cummin," a disobedience to his institution concerning love? But sith no institution of Christ hath so strictly tied baptism to public assemblies as it hath done all men unto baptism, away with these merciless and bloody sentences, let them never be found standing in the books and writings of a Christian man, they savour not of Christ nor of his most gracious and meek Spirit, but under colour of exact obedience they nourish cruelty and hardness of heart.

LXII. To leave private baptism therefore and to come unto baptism by women, which they say⁶³ is no more a

⁶¹ Matt. ix. 13.

⁶² Matt. xxiii. 23.

⁶³ T. C. lib. i. p. 144. [114.] "On this point, whether he be a minister or no, dependeth not only

"the dignity but also the being of

"the sacrament. So that I take the

"baptism of women to be no more

"the holy Sacrament of Baptism

"than any other daily or ordinary

Whether
baptism by
women be

sacrament, than any other ordinary washing or bathing of man's body; the reason whereupon they ground their opinion herein is such, as making baptism by women void, because women are no ministers in the Church of God, must needs generally annihilate the baptism of all unto whom their conceit shall apply this exception, whether it be in regard of sex, of quality, of insufficiency, or whatsoever. For if want of calling do frustrate baptism, they that baptize without calling do nothing, be they women or men.

[2.] To make women teachers in the house of God were a gross absurdity, seeing the Apostle hath said, "I permit not a woman to teach"⁶⁴; and again, "Let your women in churches be silent"⁶⁵. Those extraordinary gifts of speaking with tongues and prophesying, which God at that time did not only bestow upon men, but on women also, made it the harder to hold them confined with private bounds. Whereupon the Apostle's ordinance was necessary against women's public admission to teach. And because when law hath begun some one thing or other well, it giveth good occasion either to draw by judicious exposition out of the very law itself, or to annex to the law by authority and jurisdiction things of like conveniency, therefore Clement extendeth this apostolic constitution to baptism⁶⁶. "For," saith he, "if we have denied

"washing of the child." [That which gave occasion to the writers of the Admonition to insert baptism by women in their list of things found in the Prayer Book contrary to God's word, (ap. Whitg. Def. 503.) was the rubric which on this matter stood as follows in Queen Elizabeth's time: "They (the pastors and curates) shall warn the people, that without great cause and necessity, they baptize not children at home in their houses:" which was altered at the Hampton Court conference in 1603-4 to "they procure not their children to be baptized at home." Again, the old rubric directed, "Let them that be present call upon God for His grace, and say the Lord's Prayer, if the time will suffice. And then one of them shall name the child, and dip him in the water, or pour water upon him," &c. This was

altered to, "let the Minister of the parish, (or... any other lawful minister...) call upon God, &c. "And then... the minister shall pour water upon it," &c. See Barlow's account of the Conference at Hampton Court, in the Phoenix, 1. 139, &c. ed. 1707; Strype, Whitg. ii. 494; iii. 402; Wheatly on the Common Prayer, p. 370-372, Oxf. 1810. Whitgift (Def. 793.) questions both the construction of the old rubric, and the practice in his time.]

⁶⁴ 1 Tim. ii. 12.

⁶⁵ 1 Cor. xiv. 34.

⁶⁶ Clem. Const. Apostol. lib. iii. cap. 9. [Περὶ δὲ τοῦ γυναικας βαπτίζειν, γνωρίζομεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι κίνδυνος οὐ μικρὸς ταῖς τοῦτο ἐπιχειρούσαις διὰ τὸ οὐ συμβουλευόμεν' ἐπισφαλές γάρ' ἂν μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ παράνομον καὶ ἀσεβές... εἰ δὲ ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσι διδάσκων αὐταῖς οὐκ ἐπετρέψαμεν,

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 2.
true baptism,
good and ef-
fectual to
them that
receive it.

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 3.

"them leave to teach, how should any man dispense with nature and make them ministers of holy things, seeing this unskilfulness is a part of the Grecians' impiety, which for the service of women goddesses have women priests?"

I somewhat marvel that men which would not willingly be thought to speak or write but with good conscience, dare hereupon openly avouch Clement for a witness⁶⁷, "That as when the Church began not only to decline but to fall away from the sincerity of religion it borrowed a number of other profanations of the heathens, so it borrowed this, and would needs have women priests as the heathens had, and that this was one occasion of bringing baptism by women into the Church of God." Is it not plain in their own eyes that first by an evidence which forbiddeth women to be ministers of baptism, they endeavour to shew how women were admitted unto that function in the wane and declination of Christian piety; secondly, that by an evidence rejecting the heathens, and condemning them of impiety, they would prove such affection towards heathens as ordereth the affairs of the Church by the pattern of their example; and thirdly, that out of an evidence which nameth the heathens as being in some part a reason why the Church had no women priests, they gather the heathens to have been one of the first occasions why it had? So that throughout every branch of this testimony their issue is *yea*, and their evidence directly *no*.

[3.] But to women's baptism in private by occasion of urgent necessity, the reasons that only concern ordinary baptism in public are no just prejudice, neither can we by force thereof disprove the practice of those churches which (necessity requiring) allow baptism in private to be administered by women. We may not from laws that prohibit any thing with restraint conclude absolute and unlimited prohibitions. Although we deny not but they which utterly forbid such baptism may have perhaps wherewith to justify their orders against it. For even things lawful⁶⁸ are well prohibited,

πὼς ἱερατεῦσαι ταύταις παρὰ φύσιν
τις συγχωρήσει; τοῦτο γὰρ τῆς τῶν
Ἑλλήνων ἀθεότητος τὸ ἀγνόημα,
θηλείας θεαῖς ἱερείας χειροτονεῖν,
ἀλλ' οὐ τῆς Χριστοῦ διατάξεως.]

⁶⁷ T. C. lib. i. p. 144. [113.]

⁶⁸ Licita prohibentur, ne si per-
mitterentur eorum occasione perve-
niatur ad illicita. L. neque tamen.
Just. de Asuth. Tut. l. Officium. D.

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 4.

when there is fear lest they make the way to unlawful more easy. And it may be the liberty of baptism by women at such times doth sometimes embolden the rasher sort to do it where no such necessity is⁶⁹.

[4.] But whether of permission besides law, or in presumption against law, they do it, is it thereby altogether frustrate, void, and as though it were never given?

They which have not at the first their right baptism must of necessity be rebaptized, because the law of Christ tieth all men to receive baptism. Iteration of baptism once given hath been always thought a manifest contempt of that ancient apostolic aphorism, "One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism⁷⁰," baptism not only one inasmuch as it hath every where the same substance and offereth unto all men the same grace, but one also for that it ought not to be received by any one man above once. We serve that Lord which is but one, because no other can be joined with him: we embrace that Faith which is but one, because it admitteth no innovation: that Baptism we receive which is but one, because it cannot be

de rei Vind. [The places referred to apparently are, Just. Inst. i. 21. De Autoritate Tutorum, §. 1. "Neque tamen hereditatem adire," &c. et Dig. vi. i. 9. But the connection of these places with the subject matter of the text is not clear. The references perhaps have strayed from their proper place. In Digest. i. 18. 6. t. i. p. 46, ed. Lugd. 1552, the following gloss occurs, "Prætextu liciti, non debet comitti illicitum."]

⁶⁹ [Bishop Cooper, quoted by the author of "M. Some laid out in his colours," p. 66, says, "As touching the baptism by midwives, I can assure you that the Church of England, or any that I know of in place of government thereof, doth not maintain either the baptism of midwives as a thing tolerable in the Church, or else the condemnation of those children that depart this world unbaptized, but doth account them both erroneous, and not according to the word of God. For in the convocation the matter was debated amongst us, wherein some of

"those persons were present, to whom the drawing of the book was permitted: who protested that neither the order of the book did allow any such thing, neither that it was any part of their meaning to approve the same. But for so much as baptizing by women hath been aforetime commonly used, and now also of rashness by some is done, the book only taketh order and provideth, that if the child be baptized by the midwife rebaptizing be not admitted." Bridges, Defence, p. 576. "Concerning 'permitting the administration of baptism (in this light of the Gospel) to women,' (be it spoken with the reverence of our brethren) it is most untrue. When as it is not only given customarily in the open charge of every visitation, whether any such thing be done by them, as in the time of the popish darkness was used: but also if any such thing have happened, and be found out, the parties that so have done are openly punished for the same."]
⁷⁰ Ephes. iv. 5.

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 5.

received often. For how should we practise iteration of baptism, and yet teach that we are by baptism born anew, that by baptism we are admitted into the heavenly society of saints, that those things be really and effectually done by baptism which are no more possible to be often done than a man can naturally be often born⁷¹, or civilly be often adopted into any one's stock and family? This also is the cause why they that present us unto baptism are entitled for ever after our parents in God, and the reason why there we receive new names in token that by baptism we are made new creatures. As Christ hath therefore died and risen from the dead but once, so the sacrament which both extinguisheth in him our former sin and beginneth in us a new condition of life, is by one only actual administration for ever available, according to that in the Nicene Creed, "I believe one baptism for remission of sins."

[5.] And because second baptism was ever abhorred⁷² in the Church of God as a kind of incestuous birth, they that iterate baptism are driven under some pretence or other to make the former baptism void. Tertullian the first that proposed to the Church⁷³, Agrippinus⁷⁴ the first in the Church

⁷¹ "Una est nativitas de terra, alia de cœlo; una de carne, alia de Spiritu; una de æternitate, alia de mortalitate; una de masculo et fœmina, alia de Deo et Ecclesia. Sed ipsæ dum singulares sunt. Quo modo enim uterus non potest repeti, sic nec baptismus iterari." Prosp. Senten. 331. [S. Aug. in Joann. c. 3. Tract. xi. 6.] "Eja fratres lacteum genitalis fontis ad laticem convolate, ut semper vobis aqua sufficiat, hoc ante omnia scientes, quia hanc nec effundere licet nec rursum haurire." Zeno. Invit. ad Font. [i. p. 117. t. iii. Biblioth. Patr. Colon.]

⁷² August. de Bapt. cont. Don. lib. ii. cap. 14. [t. ix. 107. A.] "Quid sit perniciosius, utrum omnino non baptizari, an rebaptizari, judicare difficile est. Video quidem quid amplius homines detestentur atque horreant."

⁷³ Tert. de Bapt. [c. 15. "Circa

"hæreticos sane quid custodiendum sit, digne quis retractet: ad nos enim editum est. Hæretici autem nullum habent consortium nostræ disciplinæ, quos extraneos utique testatur ipsa ademptio communionis. Non debeo in illis cognoscere quod mihi est præceptum, quia non idem Deus est nobis et illis, nec unus Christus, id est idem. Ideoque nec baptismus unus, quia non idem. Quem quum rite non habeant, sine dubio non habent."

⁷⁴ Cypr. Epist. 71. [t. ii. p. 196.] "Sciamus, remissam peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesia dari posse, nec posse adversarios Christi quicquam sibi circa gratiam ejus vindicare. Quod quidem et Agrippinus, bonæ memoriæ vir, cum cæteris cœpiscopis suis, qui illo tempore in provincia Africa et Numidia Ecclesiam Domini gubernabant, statuit, et librato consilii communis examine firmavit."

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 6.

that accepted, and against the use of the Church Novatian the first that publicly began to practise rebaptization, did it therefore upon these two grounds, a true persuasion that baptism is necessary, and a false that the baptism which others administered was no baptism. Novatianus' conceit was that none can administer true baptism but the true Church of Jesus Christ, that he and his followers alone were the Church, and for the rest he accounted them wicked and profane persons, such as by baptism could cleanse no man, unless they first did purify themselves, and reform the faults wherewith he charged them. At which time St. Cyprian⁷⁵ with the greatest part of African bishops, because they likewise thought that none but only the true Church of God can baptize, and were of nothing more certainly persuaded than that heretics are as rotten branches cut off from the life and body of the true Church, gathered hereby that the Church of God both may with good consideration and ought to reverse that baptism which is given by heretics. These held and practised their own opinion, yet with great protestations often made that they neither loved a whit the less, nor thought in any respect the worse of them that were of a contrary mind. In requital of which ingenuous moderation the rest that withstood them did it in peaceable sort with very good regard had of them as of men in error but not in heresy.

[6.] The bishop of Rome against their novelties upheld as beseemed him the ancient and true apostolic customs⁷⁶, till they which unadvisedly before had erred became in a manner all reconciled friends unto truth⁷⁷, and saw that heresy in the ministers of baptism could no way evacuate the force thereof; such heresy alone excepted⁷⁸, as by reason of

⁷⁵ Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 2, 3. Cypr. Epist. 70—76.

⁷⁶ [Ὁ γὰρ Στέφανος μὴ δέειν τι νεώτερον παρὰ τὴν κρατήσανσαν ἀρχὴν παρὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπικαινοτομίαν οὐκ ὀνείδισεν, ἐπὶ τοῖς διηγανέτεσι. Euseb. E. H. vii. 3.]

⁷⁷ "Illi ipsi episcopi qui rebaptizandos hæreticos cum Cypriano statuerant ad antiquam consuetudinem revoluti novum emisere decretum." Hieron. cont. Lucifer.

[ad fin.] Vide et August. contr. Crescon. lib. iii. cap. ii, iii. [t. ix. 435—437.] et Epist. 48. [t. ii. 245—249.]

⁷⁸ "Dixisti fieri non posse ut in falso baptismo inquinatus abluat, immundus emundet, supplantator erigat, perditus liberet, reus veniam tribuat, damnatus absolvat. Bene hæc omnia poterunt ad solos hæreticos pertinere, qui [quia] falsaverunt symbolum, dum alter

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 6.

unsoundness in the highest articles of Christian faith, presumed to change, and by changing to maim the substance, the form of baptism. In which respect the Church did neither simply disannul, nor absolutely ratify baptism by heretics. For the baptism which Novatianists gave stood firm, whereas they whom Samosatzenians had baptized were rebaptized⁷⁹. It was likewise ordered in the council of Arles⁸⁰, that if any Arian did reconcile himself to the Church they should admit him without new baptism, unless by examination they found him not baptized in the name of the Trinity.

Dionysius bishop of Alexandria maketh report⁸¹ how there lived under him a man of good reputation and of very ancient continuance in that church, who being present at the rites of baptism, and observing with better consideration than ever before what was there done, came and with weeping sub-

"dixerit duos Deos cum Deus unus
"sit, alter Patrem vult in Persona
"Filii cognosci, alter carnem sub-
"ducens Filio Dei per quam Deo
"reconciliatus est mundus: et cæ-
"teri hujusmodi, qui a sacramentis
"catholicis alieninoscuntur." Optat.
lib. i. [c. 10. p. 12. Paris, 1679.]

⁷⁹ Synod. Nicæn. can. 19. [περί
τῶν Παυλιανιστῶν, εἴτα προσφυγόν-
των τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὅρος ἐκτε-
θεῖται ἀναβαπτίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐξά-
παντος. Item can. 8: περί τῶν ὀνο-
μαζόντων μὲν ἑαυτοὺς Καθαροὺς ποτε,
προσερχομένων δὲ τῇ καθολικῇ καὶ
ἀποστολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἔδοξε τῇ ἀγίᾳ
καὶ μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ, ὥστε χειροθετου-
μένους αὐτοὺς μὲν οὕτως ἐν τῷ
κλήρῳ. Ap. Routh, Script. Eccle-
siast. Opusc. p. 366, 359.]

⁸⁰ Synod. i. Arelat. can. 8. ["De
"Afris, quod propria lege utuntur,
"ut rebaptizent; placuit ut si ad
"Ecclesiam aliquis de hæresi vene-
"rit, interrogent eum symbolum;
"et si perviderint eum in Patre et
"Filio et Spiritu sancto esse bapti-
"zatum, manus ei tantum impona-
"tur, ut accipiat Spiritum sanctum.
"Quod si interrogatus non respon-
"derit hanc Trinitatem, baptizetur." Routh, Rel. Sac. iv. 91.]

⁸¹ Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. vii.
cap. 9. [Quoted also by T. C. iii.

135, to shew that the presumed in-
validity of baptism in any case does
not imply a necessity of rebaptiza-
tion. "Ὅντως, ἀδελφε, συμβουλὴν
δέομαι, καὶ γνώμην αἰτῶ παρὰ σοῦ,
τοιοῦτου τινὸς μοι προσελθόντος πρᾶ-
γματος, δεδῶκε μὴ ἄρα σφάλλωμαι.
τῶν γὰρ συναγομένων ἀδελφῶν πίστος
νομιζόμενος ἀρχαῖος καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐμῆς
χειροτονίας... τοῖς ὑπέγνων βαπτίζο-
μένοις παρατυχῶν, καὶ τῶν ἐπερω-
τήσεων καὶ ἀποκρίσεων ἐπακούσας,
προσῆλθέ μοι κλαίων καὶ καταθρηνῶν
ἑαυτὸν, καὶ πίπτων πρὸ τῶν πόδων
μου· ἐξομολογούμενος μὲν καὶ ἐξομ-
νύμενος τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ παρὰ τοῖς
αἱρετικοῖς βεβάπτιστο, μὴ τοιοῦτον
εἶναι, μηδὲ ὅλως ἔχειν τινα πρὸς τοῦτο
κοινωνίαν· ἀσεβείας γὰρ ἐκείνο καὶ
βλασφημιῶν πεπληρωσθαι· λέγων δὲ
πάνυ τὴν ψυχὴν νῦν κατανέυχθαι·
... καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δεόμενος τῆς εὐκρί-
νεστάτης ταύτης καθάρσεως καὶ παρα-
δοχῆς καὶ χάριτος τυχεῖν· ὅπερ ἐγὼ
μὲν οὐκ ἐτόλμησα ποιῆσαι, φήσας
αὐτάρκη τὴν πολυχρονίαν αὐτῷ κοι-
νωνίαν εἰς τοῦτο γεγονέναι· θαρσύν-
δὲ ἐκέλευον, καὶ μετὰ βεβαίας πίστεως
καὶ ἀγαθῆς συνειδήσεως τῇ μεταχῇ
τῶν ἁγίων προσιέναι· ὃ δὲ οὔτε πεν-
θῶν παύεται, πέφρικέ τε τῇ τραπέζῃ
προσιέναι, καὶ μόλις παρακαλούμενος
συνεστάναι ταῖς προσευχαῖς ἀνέχεται.]

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 7.

mission craved of his bishop not to deny him baptism, the
due of all which profess Christ, seeing it had been so long
sithence his evil hap to be deceived by the fraud of heretics,
and at their hands (which till now he never thoroughly and
duly weighed) to take a baptism full fraught with blas-
phemous impieties, a baptism in nothing like unto that which
the true Church of Christ useth. The bishop greatly moved
thereat, yet durst not adventure to rebaptize, but did the best
he could to put him in good comfort, using much persuasion
with him not to trouble himself with things which were past
and gone, nor after so long continuance in the fellowship of
God's people to call now in question his first entrance. The
poor man that saw himself in this sort answered but not
satisfied, spent afterwards his life in continual perplexity,
whereof the bishop remained fearful to give release: perhaps
too fearful, if the baptism were such as his own declaration
importeth. For that the substance whereof was rotten at the
very first, is never by tract of time able to recover soundness.
And where true baptism was not before given, the case of
rebaptization is clear.

[7.] But by this it appeareth that baptism is not void in
regard of heresy, and therefore much less through any *other*
moral defect in the minister thereof. Under which second
pretence Donatists notwithstanding took upon them to make
frustrate the Church's baptism, and themselves to rebaptize
their own fry. For whereas some forty years after the mar-
tyrdom of blessed Cyprian the emperor Dioclesian began
to⁸² persecute the Church of Christ, and for the speedier
abolishment of their religion to burn up their sacred books,
there were in the Church itself *Traditors* content to deliver
up the books of God by composition, to the end their own
lives might be spared. Which men growing thereby odious
to the rest whose constancy was greater, it fortuned that
after, when one Cæcilian was ordained bishop in the church
of Carthage, whom others endeavoured in vain to defeat by
excepting against him as a *Traditor*, they whose accusations
could not prevail, desperately joined themselves in one, and
made a bishop of their own crew, accounting from that day

⁸² Circa an. 300.

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 8.

forward their faction the only true and sincere Church. The first bishop on that part was Majorinus, whose successor, Donatus being the first that wrote in defence of their schism, the birds that were hatched before by others have their names from him.

[8.] Arians and Donatists began both about one time. Which heresies according to the different strength of their own sinews, wrought as hope of success led them, the one with the choicest wits, the other with the multitude so far, that after long and troublesome experience the perfectest view men could take of both was hardly able to induce any certain determinate resolution, whether error may do more by the curious subtilty of sharp discourse, or else by the mere appearance of zeal and devout affection, the latter of which two aids gave Donatists beyond all men's expectation as great a sway as ever any schism or heresy had within that reach of the Christian world where it bred and grew: the rather perhaps because the Church which neither greatly feared them, and besides had necessary cause to bend itself against others that aimed directly at a far higher mark, the Deity of Christ, was contented to let Donatists have their forth by the space of threescore years and above, even from ten years before Constantine till the time that Optatus bishop of Milevis published his books against Parmenian⁸³.

During which term and the space of that schism's continuance afterwards, they had, besides many other secular and worldly means to help them forward, these special advantages. First, the very occasion of their breach with the Church of God, a just hatred and dislike of *Traditors*, seemed plausible; they easily persuaded their hearers that such men could not be holy as held communion and fellowship with them that betray religion. Again, when to dazzle the eyes of the simple, and to prove that it can be no church which is not holy, they had in show and sound of words the glorious pretence of the creed apostolic, "I believe the Holy Catholic Church," we need not think it any strange thing that with the multitude they gained credit. And avouching that such as are not of the true Church can administer no

⁸³ Circa an. 370.

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 10.

true baptism, they had for this point whole volumes of St. Cyprian's own writing, together with the judgment of divers African synods whose sentence was the same with his. Whereupon the Fathers were likewise in defence of their just cause very greatly prejudiced, both for that they could not enforce the duty of men's communion with a church confessed to be in many things blameworthy, unless they should oftentimes seem to speak as half-defenders of the faults themselves, or at the least not so vehement accusers thereof as their adversaries; and to withstand iteration of baptism, the other branch of the Donatists' heresy, was impossible without manifest and professed rejection of Cyprian, whom the world universally did in his lifetime admire as the greatest amongst prelates, and now honour as not the lowest in the kingdom of heaven. So true we find it by experience of all ages in the Church of God, that the teacher's error is the people's trial, harder and heavier by so much to bear, as he is in worth and regard greater that mispersuadeth them. Although there was odds between Cyprian's cause and theirs, he differing from others of sounder understanding in that point, but not dividing himself from the body of the Church by schism as did the Donatists. For which cause, saith Vincentius⁸⁴, "Of one and the same opinion we judge (which may seem strange) the authors catholic, and the followers heretical; we acquit the masters, and condemn the scholars; they are heirs of heaven which have written those books, the defenders whereof are trodden down to the pit of hell."

[10.] The invectives of catholic writers therefore against them are sharp; the words of imperial edicts by Honorius and Theodosius⁸⁵ made to bridle them very bitter, the

⁸⁴ Vincent. Lirin. adver. Hæres. cap. 11. ["O rerum mira conversio! auctores ejusdem opinionis catholici, consecratores vero hæretici judicantur: absolvuntur magistri, condemnantur discipuli: conscriptores librorum filii regni erunt, assertores vero gehenna suscipiet." In Bibl. Pat. Colon. t. v. p. 2. pag. 239.]

⁸⁵ Vide C. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 6. l. "Adversarios," et l. "Nullus," circa an. 405. [t. vi. 196, Lyons,

1665, is a decree of Honorius, beginning with "Adversarios catholicæ fidei extirpare hujus decreti auctoritate prospeximus." Then enlarging on the guilt of rebaptizing, and its immoral effects, he enacts forfeiture of all property as the penalty: to be restored however to the children if catholic. The endowments of places where such baptism had been permitted are also confiscated. In p. 200, occurs the other law, one of Honorius and the

BOOK V.
Ch. ix. 11.

punishments severe in revenge of their folly. Howbeit for fear (as we may conjecture) lest much should be derogated from the baptism of the Church, and baptism by Donatists be more esteemed of than was meet, if on the one side that which heretics had done ill should stand as good, on the other side that be reversed which the Catholic Church had well and religiously done, divers better minded than advised men thought it fittest to meet with this inconvenience by rebaptizing Donatists as well as they rebaptized Catholics. For stay whereof the same emperors saw it meet to give their law a double edge⁸⁶, whereby it might equally on both sides cut off not only heretics which rebaptized whom they could pervert, but also Catholic and Christian priests which did the like unto such as before had taken baptism at the hands of heretics, and were afterwards reconciled to the Church of God. Donatists were therefore in process of time, though with much ado, wearied and at the length worn out by the constancy of that truth which teacheth, that evil ministers of good things are as torches, a light to others, a waste to none but themselves only, and that the foulness of their hands can neither any whit impair the virtue nor stain the glory of the mysteries of Christ.

[11.] Now that which was done amiss by virtuous and good men, as Cyprian carried aside with hatred against heresy, and was secondly followed by Donatists, whom envy and rancour covered with show of godliness made obstinate to cancel whatsoever the Church did in the sacrament of baptism, hath of later days in another respect far different from both the former, been brought freshly again into practice. For the Anabaptist rebaptizeth, because in his estimation the baptism of the Church is frustrate, for that we give it unto infants which have not faith, whereas according unto Christ's institu-

younger Theodosius, re-enacting the penalty. The emperors use such expressions as these: "iterati baptismatis polluunt sacrilegio;" "federalibus sacrilegiis;" "piaculare crimen," &c.] C. "Ne Sanct. Baptis." circa an. 413. [Cod. Justin. lib. i. tit. 6. 2. "Siquis rebaptizare quempiam de ministris

("Godefrois, mysteriis) catholicæ sectæ fuerit detectus, una cum eo qui piaculare crimen commisit, si tamen criminis per ætatem capax sit, cui persuasum sit, statuti prius oris supplicio percellatur." Thus the passage stands in the latter part of the law of Honorius and Theodosius, just quoted.]

BOOK V.
Ch. ix. 12, 13.

tion, as they conceive it, true baptism should always presuppose actual belief in receivers, and is otherwise no baptism.

[12.] Of these three errors there is not any but hath been able at the least to allege in defence of itself many fair probabilities. Notwithstanding, sith the Church of God hath hitherto always constantly maintained, that to rebaptize them which are known to have received true baptism is unlawful; that if baptism seriously be administered in the same element and with the same form of words which Christ's institution teacheth, there is no other defect in the world that can make it frustrate, or deprive it of the nature of a true sacrament; and lastly, that baptism is only then to be readministered, when the first delivery thereof is void in regard of the fore-alleged imperfections and no other; shall we now in the case of baptism, which having both for matter and form the substance of Christ's institution, is by a fourth sort of men voided for the only defect of ecclesiastical authority in the minister, think it enough that they blow away the force thereof with the bare strength of their very breath by saying, "We take such baptism to be no more the Sacrament of Baptism, than any other ordinary bathing to be a sacrament?"

[13.] It behoveth generally all sorts of men to keep themselves within the limits of their own vocation⁸⁷. And seeing God from whom men's several degrees and pre-eminences do proceed, hath appointed them in his Church, at whose hands his pleasure is that we should receive both baptism and all other public medicinable helps of soul, perhaps thereby the more to settle our hearts in the love of our ghostly superiors, they have small cause to hope that with him their voluntary services will be accepted who thrust themselves into functions either above their capacity or besides their place, and over boldly intermeddle with duties whereof no charge was ever given them. They that in any thing exceed the compass of their own order do as much as in them lieth to dissolve that order which is the harmony of God's Church.

Suppose therefore that in these and the like considerations the law did utterly prohibit baptism to be administered by

⁸⁷ Numb. xvi. 10; Levit. x. 1; 1 Sam. xiii. 11; 2 Sam. vi. 6; 2 Chron. xxvi. 16; Heb. v. 4.

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 13.

any other than persons thereunto solemnly consecrated, what necessity soever happen. Are not many things firm⁸⁸ being done, although in part done otherwise than positive rigour and strictness did require? Nature as much as is possible inclineth unto validities and preservations. Dissolutions and nullities of things done, are not only not favoured, but hated when either urged without cause, or extended beyond their reach.

If therefore at any time it come to pass, that in teaching publicly, or privately in delivering this blessed Sacrament of regeneration, some unsanctified hand contrary to Christ's supposed ordinance do intrude itself, to execute that whereunto the laws of God and his Church have deputed others, which of these two opinions seemeth more agreeable with equity, ours that disallow what is done amiss, yet make not the force of the word and sacraments, much less their nature and very substance to depend on the minister's authority and calling, or else theirs⁸⁹ which defeat, disannul, and annihilate both, in respect of that one only personal defect, there being not any law of God which saith that if the minister be incompetent his word shall be no word, his baptism no baptism? He which teacheth and is not sent loseth the reward, but yet retaineth the name of a teacher; his usurped actions have in him the same nature which they have in others, although they yield him not the same comfort. And if these two cases be peers, the case of doctrine and the case of baptism both alike, sith no defect in their vocation that teach the truth is able to take away the benefit thereof from

⁸⁸ 9. q. 2. c. "Lugdunensis." [Decr. Gratian. pars ii. caus. ix. qu. 2. p. 860. ed. Lugd. 1572. In which the ordination of an intruding bishop is held good, and persons so ordained are declared admissible to sacred offices with certain precautions.] c. "ex literis." Decretal. [Gregor.] de Matrim. contrac. [lib. iv. tit. 16. cap. 2. col. 1400; where is a similar decision with regard to a marriage contracted after espousals with another person, the espousals being first renounced on both sides.] Damas. Burch. [Brocarda Damasi.] Reg. 109. "Prohibita

"feri si fiant non tenent. In prohibitionibus autem circa res favorabiles contrarium obtinet." [ap. Tract. Illustr. Jurisc. t. xviii. p. 511. Venet. 1584.]

⁸⁹ T. C. lib. i. p. 144. [114.] "As St. Paul saith, that a man cannot preach which is not sent; (Rom. x. 15.) no not although he speak the words of the Scripture and interpret them: So I cannot see how a man can baptize unless he be sent to that end, although he pour water and rehearse the words which are to be rehearsed in the ministry of baptism."

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 14.

him which heareth, wherefore should the want of a lawful calling in them that baptize make baptism to me vain?

[14.] They⁹⁰ grant that the matter and the form in sacraments are the only parts of substance, and that if these two be retained, albeit other things besides be used which are inconvenient, the sacrament notwithstanding is administered but not sincerely. Why persist they not in this opinion? When by these fair speeches they have put us in hope of agreement, wherefore sup they up their words again, interlacing such frivolous interpretations and glosses as disgrace their sentence? What should move them, having named the *matter* and the *form* of the sacrament, to give us presently warning, that they mean by the *form* of the sacrament the *institution*, which exposition darkeneth whatsoever was before plain? For whereas in common understanding that *form*, which added to the element doth make a sacrament, and is of the outward substance thereof, containeth only the words of usual application, they set it down (lest common dictionaries should deceive us) that the *form* doth signify in their language the *institution*, which institution in truth comprehendeth both form and matter. Such are their fumbling shifts to enclose the minister's vocation within the compass of some essential part of the sacrament.

A thing that can never stand with sound and sincere construction. For what if the minister be "no circumstance but a subordinate efficient cause" in the work of baptism⁹¹? What if the minister's vocation be a matter⁹² "of perpetual necessity and not a ceremony variable as times and occasions require?" What if his calling be "a principal part of the institution of Christ?" Doth it therefore follow that the minister's authority is⁹³ "of the substance of the sacrament," and as incident into the nature thereof as

⁹⁰ T. C. lib. i. p. 165. [131.] "If either the matter of the sacrament, or the form of it, which is the institution, (which things are only substantial parts,) were wanting, there should then have been no sacrament at all ministered. But they being retained and yet other things used which are not convenient, the sacrament is ministered, but not sincerely."

⁹¹ T. C. lib. iii. p. 117, [and 138.]

⁹² T. C. lib. iii. 127. ["This is a matter of doctrine, and a matter of faith: . . . this is none of the variable ceremonies, which alter by the diversity of times, of countries, and of persons."] ⁹³ T. C. lib. [i. 114. and] iii. 135. "The minister is of the substance of the Sacrament, considering that it is a principal part of Christ's Institution."

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 15.

the matter and the form itself, yea more incident? For whereas in case of necessity the greatest amongst them⁹⁴ professeth the change of the element of water lawful, and others which like not so well this opinion could be better content that voluntarily the Words of Christ's institution were altered, and men baptized in the Name of Christ without either mention made of the Father or of the Holy Ghost, nevertheless in denying that baptism administered by private persons ought to be reckoned of as a sacrament they both agree.

[15.] It may therefore please them both to consider that Baptism is an action in part moral, in part ecclesiastical, and in part mystical: moral, as being a duty which men perform towards God; ecclesiastical, in that it belongeth unto God's Church as a public duty; finally mystical, if we respect what God doth thereby intend to work.

The greatest moral perfection of baptism consisteth in men's devout obedience to the law of God, which law requireth both the outward act or thing done, and also that religious affection which God doth so much regard, that without it whatsoever we do is hateful in his sight, who therefore is said to respect *adverbs* more than *verbs*⁹⁵, because the end of his

⁹⁴ Beza, Epist. 2. [t. iii. 196. ed. 1582.] "Desit aqua et tamen baptismus alicujus differri cum edificatione non possit nec debeat, ego certe quovis alio liquore non minus rite quam aqua baptizari." T. C. lib. iii. p. 138. "Shew me why the breach of the institution in the form should make the sacrament unavailable, and not the breach of this part [which concerneth the minister]?" T. C. ibid. "Howsoever some learned and godly, give some liberty in the change of the elements of the holy Sacrament, yet I do not see how that can stand." Idem, p. 137. "I would rather judge him baptized which is baptized into the name of Christ without adding the Father and the Holy Ghost when the element of water is added, than when the other words being duly kept, some other liquor is used."

⁹⁵ [Camden (Ann. pars i. p. 368. A. D. 1584.) in his summary of

Parry's confession, mentions that he was deterred for a while from practising on the Queen's life by the scruples of his spiritual advisers. "Creightonus etiam Scotus Jesuita, docendo mala non perperanda ut inde bonum proveniret, Deum magis *Adverbis*, quam *Nominibus*, delectari, magisque quod bene ac legitime factum, quam quod bonum, ei placere; nec unius exitio multas animas redimendas sine expresso Dei mandato." The paper referred to may be found in Holinshed, iii. 1388. It is a letter of Creighton's to Walsingham. "He, Parry, alleged the utility of the deed for delivering of so many Catholics out of misery, and restitution of the Catholic religion. I answered, that the Scripture answered thereto, Non sunt facienda mala, ut veniant bona. So that for no good, how great that ever it be, may be wrought any evil, how little that ever it be. He replied, that it was not evil to

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 15.

law in appointing what we shall do is our own perfection, which perfection consisteth chiefly in the virtuous disposition of the mind, and approveth itself to him not by *doing* but by *doing well*. Wherein appeareth also the difference between human and divine laws, the one of which two are content with *opus operatum*, the other require *opus operantis*, the one do but claim the deed, the other especially the mind. So that according to laws which principally respect the heart of men, works of religion being not religiously performed, cannot morally be perfect.

Baptism as an ecclesiastical work is for the manner of performance ordered by divers ecclesiastical laws, providing that as the sacrament itself is a gift of no mean worth, so the ministry thereof might in all circumstances appear to be a function of no small regard.

All that belongeth to the mystical perfection of baptism outwardly, is the element, the word, and the serious application of both unto him which receiveth both; whereunto if we add that secret reference which this action hath to life and remission of sins by virtue of Christ's own compact solemnly made with his Church, to accomplish fully the Sacrament of Baptism, there is not any thing more required.

Now put the question whether baptism administered to infants without any spiritual calling be unto them both a true sacrament and an effectual instrument of grace, or else an act of no more account than the ordinary washings are? The sum of all that can be said to defeat such baptism is, that those things which have no being can work nothing, and that baptism without the power of ordination is as judgment without sufficient jurisdiction, void, frustrate, and of no effect⁹⁶.

"take away so great evil and induce so great good. I answered, that all good is not to be done, but that only, 'quod bene et legitime fieri potest.' And therefore, 'dixi Deum magis amare adverbium quam nomina. Quia in actionibus magis ei placent bene ac legitime, quam bonum. Ita ut nullum bonum liceat facere, nisi bene et legitime fieri possit. Quod in hoc casu fieri non potest.'" [T. C. iii. 128. "It is all one as if he should say, that if there be

"no magistrate at hand, or none that will do his duty in executing justice against a murderer, that then a private man may take upon him to hang the murderer." 239. "As a private man, killing a murderer, hath himself murdered, and executed no justice, because he had no calling thereunto; even so those, which without all calling have taken in hand to baptize, have made a profane washing, and made no sacrament of the Lord."]

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 16.

But to this we answer, that the fruit of baptism dependeth only upon the covenant which God hath made; that God by covenant requireth in the elder sort Faith and Baptism, in children the Sacrament of Baptism alone, whereunto he hath also given them right by special privilege of birth within the bosom of the holy Church; that infants therefore, which have received baptism complete as touching the mystical perfection thereof, are by virtue of his own covenant and promise cleansed from all sin, forasmuch as all other laws concerning that which in baptism is either moral or ecclesiastical do bind the Church which giveth baptism, and not the infant which receiveth it of the Church. So that if any thing be therein amiss, the harm which groweth by violation of holy ordinances must altogether rest where the bonds of such ordinances hold.

[16.] For that in actions of this nature it fareth not as in jurisdictions may somewhat appear by the very opinion which men have of them. The nullity of that which a judge doth by way of authority without authority, is known to all men, and agreed upon with full consent of the whole world, every man receiveth it as a general edict of nature; whereas the nullity of baptism in regard of the like defect is only a few men's new, ungrounded, and as yet unapproved imagination. Which difference of generality in men's persuasions on the one side, and their paucity whose conceit leadeth them the other way, hath risen from a difference easy to observe in the things themselves. The exercise of unauthorized jurisdiction is a grievance unto them that are under it, whereas they that without authority presume to baptize, offer nothing but that which to all men is good and acceptable. Sacraments are food, and the ministers thereof as parents or as nurses, at whose hands when there is necessity but no possibility of receiving it, if that which they are not present to do in right of their office be of pity and compassion done by others, shall this be thought to turn celestial bread into gravel, or the medicine of souls into poison? Jurisdiction is a yoke which law hath imposed on the necks of men in such sort that they must endure it for the good of others, how contrary soever it be to their own particular appetites and inclinations; jurisdiction bridled men against their wills, that which a judge doth prevaieth by virtue of his very power, and therefore not

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 17.

without great reason, except the law have given him authority, whatsoever he doth vanisheth. Baptism on the other side being a favour which it pleaseth God to bestow, a benefit of soul to us that receive it, and a grace which they that deliver are but as mere vessels either appointed by others or offered of their own accord to this service; of which two if they be the one it is but their own honour, their own offence to be the other; can it possibly stand with equity and right⁹⁷, that the faultiness of their presumption in giving baptism should be able to prejudice us, who by taking baptism have no way offended?

[17.] I know there are many sentences found in the books and writings of the ancient Fathers to prove both ecclesiastical and also moral defects in the minister of baptism a bar to the heavenly benefit thereof. Which sentences we always so understand, as Augustine understood in a case of like nature the words of Cyprian⁹⁸. When infants baptized were after their parents' revolt carried by them in arms to the stews of idols, those wretched creatures as St. Cyprian thought were not only their own ruin but their children's also; "Their children," whom this their apostasy profaned, "did lose what Christian baptism had given them being newly born." "They lost," saith St. Augustine, "the grace of baptism, if we consider to what their parents' impiety did tend; although the mercy of God preserved them, and will also in that dreadful day of account give them favourable audience pleading in their own behalf, 'The harm of other men's perfidiousness it lay not in us to avoid.'" After the same manner whatsoever we read written if it sound to the prejudice of baptism through

⁹⁷ "Factum alterius alii nocere non debet." Ulp. l. De Pupillo. sect. "Si plurium." [Dig. xxxix. 1, 5. p. 558.] Item, Alphen. l. "Paterfamilias." de Hered. Instituend. [Dig. xxviii. v. 44. 402.] "Maleficia teneant auctores suos non alios." l. "Sancimus," 22. C. de Pen. [Cod. Just. ix. 47. 22. p. 305.]

⁹⁸ August. Epist. 23. [al. 98. §. 3. t. ii. 264.] Cypr. de Laps. t. i. 125. "Infantes quoque parentum manibus impositi vel attricati, amiserunt parvuli, quod in primo statim

"nativitatis exordio fuerant consecuti." Aug. "Amiserunt, dixit, quantum attinuit ad illorum scelus, a quibus amittere coacti sunt. Amiserunt in eorum mente ac voluntate, qui in illos tantum facinus commiserunt. Nam si in seipsis amisissent, remansissent utique divina sententia sine ulla dubitatione damnandi. Quod si sanctus Cyprianus arbitraretur, non eorum defensionem continuo subjiceret, dicens, Nonne illi, cum judicii dies venerit, dicent, Nos nihil fecimus?"

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 18.

any either moral or ecclesiastical defect therein, we construe it, as equity and reason teacheth, with restraint to the offender only, which doth, as far as concerneth himself and them which wittingly concur with him, make the sacrament of God fruitless.

[18.] St. Augustine's *doubtfulness*⁹⁹, whether baptism by a layman may stand or ought to be readministered, should not be mentioned by them which presume to define peremptorily of that wherein he was content to profess himself unresolved. Albeit in very truth his opinion is plain enough, but the manner of delivering his judgment being modest, they make of a virtue an imbecility, and impute his calmness of speech to an irresolution of mind. His disputation in that place is against Parmenian, which held, that a Bishop or a Priest if they fall into any heresy do thereby lose the power which they had before to baptize, and that therefore baptism by heretics is merely void. For answer whereof he first denieth that heresy can more deprive men of power to baptize others than it is of force to take from them their own baptism¹; and in the second place he farther addeth that if heretics did lose the power which before was given them by ordination, and did therefore unlawfully usurp as often as they took upon them to give the Sacrament of Baptism, it followeth not that baptism by them administered without authority is no baptism. For then what should we think of baptism by laymen to whom authority was never given²? "I doubt," saith St. Augustine, "whether

⁹⁹ T. C. lib. iii. p. 136. "Augustine standeth in doubt whether baptism by a layman be available or no." [Cont. Lit. Parm. lib. ii. c. 13.] [t. ix. 44.] "Where by all likelihood he was out of doubt, that that which was ministered by a woman, whose unaptness herein is double to that of a layman, was of no effect."

¹ ["Nulla ostenditur causa cur ille qui ipsum baptismum amittere non potest, jus dandi potest amittere. Utrumque enim sacramentum est; et quadam consecratione utrumque homini datur, illud cum baptizatur, istud cum ordinatur: ideoque in Catholica utrumque non licet iterari. Nam si

"quando ex ipsa parte venientes etiam prepositi pro bono pacis correcto schismatis errore suscepti sunt, . . . non eis in populo manus imponitur, ne non homini sed ipsi sacramento fiat injuria."]
² ["Quamquam etsi laicus per eunti dederit necessitate compulsus, quod cum ipse acciperet, quomodo dandum esset addidit, nescio an pie quisquam dixerit esse repetendum. Nulla enim cogente necessitate si fiat, alieni munus usurpatio est: si autem necessitas urgeat, aut nullum aut veniale delictum est. Sed et si nulla necessitate usurpetur, et a quolibet cuilibet detur, quod datum fuerit non dici potest non

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 19.

"any man which carrieth a virtuous and godly mind will affirm that the baptism which laymen do in case of necessity administer should be iterated. For to do it unnecessarily is to execute another man's office; necessity urging, to do it is then either no fault at all" (much less so grievous a crime that it should deserve to be termed by the name of sacrilege³) "or if any, a very pardonable fault. But suppose it even of very purpose usurped and given unto any man by every man that listeth, yet that which is given cannot possibly be denied to have been given, how truly soever we may say it hath not been given lawfully. Unlawful usurpation a penitent affection must redress. If not, the thing that was given shall remain to the hurt and detriment of him which unlawfully either administered or received the same, yet so, that in this respect it ought not to be reputed as if it had not at all been given." Whereby we may plainly perceive that St. Augustine was not himself uncertain what to think, but doubtful whether any well-minded man in the whole world could think otherwise than he did.

[19.] Their argument taken from a stolen seal⁴ may return to the place out of which they had it, for it helpeth their cause nothing. That which men give or grant to others must appear to have proceeded of their own accord. This being manifest, their gifts and grants are thereby made effectual both to bar themselves from revocation, and to assecure the right they

"datum, quamvis recte dici possit illicite datum. Illicitam autem usurpationem corrigit reminiscens et poenitentis affectus. Quod si non correxerit, manebit ad poenam usurpatoris quod datum est, vel ejus qui illicite dedit, vel ejus qui illicite accepit: non tamen pro non dato habebitur." Cartwright does not seem to have been aware of the force of the common idiom "nescio an:" otherwise he could hardly have missed the true construction; "Augustine standeth in doubt, whether a man could rightly as a Christian say that lay baptism is invalid in case of necessity."

³ T. C. lib. iii. p. 116. "The sacrilege of private persons, women especially, in administering

"the holy sacrament of baptism."]
⁴ T. C. lib. iii. p. 139. "As by the seal which the prince hath set apart to seal his grants with, when it is stolen and set to by him that hath no authority, there groweth no assurance to the party that hath it: So if it were possible to be the seal of God which a woman should set to, yet for that she hath stolen it and put it to not only without but contrary to the commandment of God, I see not how any can take any assurance by reason thereof." [This image was also, as it may seem, borrowed from St. Augustine, *ibid.* p. 45. "Neque unquam per devotum militem, quod a privatis usurpatum est signum regale violabitur." &c.]

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 20,
21.

have given. Wherein for further prevention of mischiefs that otherwise might grow by the malice, treachery, and fraud of men, it is both equal and meet that the strength of men's deeds and the instruments which declare the same should strictly depend upon divers solemnities, whereof there cannot be the like reason in things that pass between God and us, because sith we need not doubt lest the treasures of his heavenly grace should without his consent be passed by forged conveyances, nor lest he should deny at any time his own acts, and seek to revoke what hath been consented unto before, as there is no such fear of danger through deceit and falsehood in this case, so neither hath the circumstance of men's persons that weight in baptism which for good and just considerations in the custody of seals of office it ought to have. The grace of baptism cometh by donation from God alone. That God hath committed the ministry of baptism unto special men, it is for order's sake in his Church, and not to the end that their authority might give being, or add force to the sacrament itself. That infants have right to the sacrament of baptism we all acknowledge. Charge them we cannot as guileful and wrongful possessors of that whereunto they have right by the manifest will of the donor, and are not parties unto any defect or disorder in the manner of receiving the same. And if any such disorder be, we have sufficiently before declared that "*delictum cum capite semper ambulat*," men's own faults are their own harms.

[20.] Wherefore to countervail this and the like mischosen resemblances with that which more truly and plainly agreeth, the ordinance of God concerning their vocation that minister baptism wherein the mystery of our regeneration is wrought, hath thereunto the same analogy which laws of wedlock have to our first nativity and birth. So that if nature do effect procreation notwithstanding the wicked violation and breach even of nature's law made that the entrance of all mankind into this present world might be without blemish, may we not justly presume that grace doth accomplish the other, although there be faultiness in them that transgress the order which our Lord Jesus Christ hath established in his Church?

[21.] Some light may be borrowed from circumcision for explication what is true in this question of baptism. Seeing

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 21.

then that even they which condemn Sephora the wife of Moses for taking upon her to circumcise her son⁵, a thing necessary at that time for her to do, and as I think very hard to reprove in her, considering how Moses, because himself had not done it sooner, was therefore stricken by the hand of God, neither could in that extremity perform the office; whereupon, for the stay of God's indignation, there was no choice, but the action must needs fall into her hands; whose fact therein whether we interpret as some have done, that being a Midianite, and as yet not so thoroughly acquainted with the exercise of Jewish rites, it much discontented her, to see herself through her husband's oversight, in a matter of his own religion, brought unto these perplexities and straits, that either she must now endure him perishing before her eyes, or else wound the flesh of her own child, which she could not do but with some indignation shewed, in that she fumingly both threw down the foreskin at his feet, and upbraided him with the cruelty of his religion: or if we better like to follow their more judicious exposition which are not inclinable to think that Moses was matched like Socrates, nor that circumcision could now in

⁵ Exod. iv. 24. T. C. lib. i. p. 144. [113.] "I say that the unlawfulness of that fact doth appear sufficiently, in that she did it before her husband Moses, which was a prophet of the Lord, to whom that office of circumcision did appertain. Besides that she did cut off the foreskin of the infant not of mind to obey the commandment of God, or for the salvation of the child, but in a choler only, to the end that her husband might be eased and have release: which mind appeareth in her both by her words, and by casting away in anger the foreskin which she had cut off. And if it be said that the event declared that the act pleased God, because that Moses forthwith waxed better, and was recovered of his sickness, I have shewed before that if we measure things by the event, we shall oftentimes justify the wicked, and take the righteousness of the righteous from them." [Ap. Whigg. Def. 517: who answers,

"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.' Sephora 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 be not ordinary ministers." T. C. rejoins, iii. 126: "That the Lord required circumcision, if there were no ordinary minister for it, doth not appear. For as it was an order of God that the male child should be circumcised the eighth day, so was it also his order that he should be circumcised by a minister." In this he contradicts his master, Calvin, from whom most of his other arguments are derived. Inst. iv. 15, 22.]

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 21.

Eleazar be strange unto her, having had Gersom her elder son before circumcised, nor that any occasion of choler could rise from a spectacle of such misery as doth⁶ naturally move compassion and not wrath, nor that Sephora was so impious as in the visible presence of God's deserved anger to storm at the ordinance and law of God, nor that the words of the history itself can enforce any such affection, but do only declare how after the act performed she *touched* the feet of Moses saying⁷, "Sponsus tu mihi es sanguinum," "Thou art unto me an husband of blood," which might be very well the one done and the other spoken even out of the flowing abundance of commiseration and love, to signify with hands laid under his feet that her tender affection towards him had caused her thus to forget womanhood, to lay all motherly affection aside, and to redeem her husband out of the hands of death with effusion of blood; the sequel thereof, take it which way you will, is a plain argument, that God was satisfied with that she did, as may appear by his own testimony declaring how there followed in the person of Moses present release of his grievous punishment upon her speedy discharge of that duty which by him neglected had offended God, even as

⁶ "Mala passis non irascimur sed
"compatimur." Boet. de Consol.

⁷ Where the usual translation hath, Exod. iv. 25; "She cut away the foreskin of her son, and cast it at his feet, and said, Thou art indeed a bloody husband unto me. So he departed from him. Then she said, O bloody husband, because of the circumcision:" the words as they lie in the original are rather to be thus interpreted, "And she cut off the foreskin of her son. Which being done, she touched his feet (the feet of Moses) and said, 'Thou art to me an husband of blood,' (in the plural number, thereby signifying effusion of blood). And the Lord withdrew from him at the very time when she said, 'A husband of blood,' in regard of circumcision." [See the Targum of Onkelos in loco: which instead of "cast it at his feet" has *כִּי בָח לְקַדְּשׁוֹתָּהּ* "obtulit coram eo." And her words

are rendered, "propter sanguinem circumcisionis hujus detur" [datur?] "nobis sponsus meus." And afterwards, "Nisi propter sanguinem circumcisionis hujus, condemnatus erat ad mortem sponsus meus." To this construction Mede (l. 53.) objects that *סָוֶן* "sponsus" could hardly be applied so long after marriage: which is answered by a remark of Tirinus in Pol. Synops. that it may mean, "ego te morti destinatum redemi sanguine filii, atque ita jam secundo te mihi sponsum coemo:" nam nuptiae solebant olim coemptione fieri, tum apud Hebraeos, tum apud Romanos." Compare Pococke, ad Port. Mos. Not. Miscell. p. 51: who seems to think the place best illustrated by the double meaning of the root *סָוֶן* in Arabic: viz. 1. Affinitatem contrahere, and 2. Circumcidere."]

BOOK V.
Ch. lxii. 22.

after execution of justice by the hands of Phineas⁸ the plague was immediately taken away, which former impunity of sin had caused; in which so manifest and plain cases not to make that a reason of the event which God himself hath set down as a reason, were falsely to accuse whom he doth justify, and without any cause to traduce what we should allow; yet seeing they which will have it a breach of the law of God for her to circumcise in that necessity, are not able to deny but circumcision being in that very manner performed was to the innocent child which received it true circumcision, why should that defect whereby circumcision was so little weakened be to baptism a deadly wound?

[22.] These premises therefore remaining as hitherto they have been laid, because the commandment of our Saviour Christ which committeth jointly to public ministers both doctrine and baptism⁹ doth no more by linking them together import that the nature of the sacrament dependeth on the minister's authority and power to preach the word than the force and virtue of the word doth on license to give the sacrament; and considering that the work of external ministry in baptism is only a preeminence of honour, which they that take to themselves and are not thereunto called as Aaron was, do but themselves in their own persons by means of such usurpation incur the just blame of disobedience to the law of God; farther also inasmuch as it standeth with no reason that errors grounded on a wrong interpretation of other men's deeds should make frustrate whatsoever is mis-

⁸ Psalm cvi. 30.

⁹ T. C. lib. iii. p. 142. "Seeing they only are bidden in the Scripture to administer the sacraments which are bidden to preach the word, and that the public ministers have only this charge of the word; and seeing that the administration of both these are so linked together that the denial of license to do one is a denial to do the other, as of the contrary part license to one is license to the other; considering also that to minister the sacraments is an honour in the Church which none can take unto him but he which is called unto it as was

"Aaron: and further, forasmuch as the baptizing by private persons and by women especially condemneth the dangerous error of the condemnation of young children which die without baptism; last of all seeing we have the consent of the godly learned of all times against the baptism by women, and of the reformed churches now against the baptism by private men; we conclude that the administration of this sacrament by private persons and especially by women is merely both unlawful and void."

BOOK V.
Ch. lxiii. r.

conceived, and that baptism by women should cease to be baptism as oft as any man will thereby gather that children which die unbaptized are damned, which opinion if the act of baptism administered in such manner did enforce, it might be sufficient cause of disliking the same, but none of defeating or making it altogether void; last of all 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 defects on either side the sacrament may be without fruit, as well in some cases to him which receiveth as to him which giveth it, yet no disability of either part 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.

Interrogatories in baptism touching faith, and the purpose of a Christian life.

LXIII. All that are of the race of Christ, the Scripture nameth them "children of the promise"¹⁰ which God hath made. The promise of eternal life is the seed of the Church of God. And because there is no attainment of life but through the only begotten Son of God, nor by him otherwise than being such as the Creed apostolic describeth, it followeth that the articles thereof are principles necessary for all men to subscribe unto whom by baptism the Church receiveth into Christ's school.

All points of Christian doctrine are either demonstrable conclusions or demonstrative principles. Conclusions have strong and invincible proofs as well in the school of Jesus Christ as elsewhere. And principles be grounds which require no proof in any kind of science, because it sufficeth if either their certainty be evident in itself, or evident by the light of some higher knowledge, and in itself such as no man's knowledge is ever able to overthrow. Now the principles whereupon we do build our souls have their evidence

¹⁰ [Galat. iv. 28.]