

BOOK V. with both your arms a sentence which now is no Gospel unto  
Ch. lxi. 5. you, "I will have mercy and not sacrifice<sup>1</sup>?"  
lxiii. 1.

[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<sup>2</sup>," 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.

Whether  
baptism by  
women

LXII. To leave private baptism therefore and to come unto baptism by women, which they say<sup>3</sup> is no more a

<sup>1</sup> Matt. ix. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Matt. xxiii. 23.

<sup>3</sup> 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

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<sup>1</sup>;" and again, "Let your women in churches be silent<sup>2</sup>." 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 baptism<sup>3</sup>. "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, i. 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.]

<sup>1</sup> 1 Tim. ii. 12.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. xiv. 34.

<sup>3</sup> Clem. Const. Apostol. lib. iii. cap. 9. [Περὶ δὲ τοῦ γυναικας βαπτίζειν, γνωρίζομεν ὑμῖν, ὅτι κίνδυνος οὐ μικρὸς ταῖς τοῦτο ἐπιχειρούσαις διὸ οὐ συμβουλεύομεν ἐπισφαλές γάρ· μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ παράνομον καὶ ἀσεβές· . . . εἰ δὲ ἐν τοῖς προλαβοῦσι διδάσκειν αὐταῖς οὐκ ἐπετρέψαμεν,

BOOK V.  
Ch. lxiii. 2.  
be true baptism, good and effectual to them that receive it.

“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 witness<sup>1</sup>, “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 lawful<sup>2</sup> are well prohibited,

*πὼς ἱερατεῦσαι ταύταις παρὰ φύσιν τις συγχωρήσει; τούτο γὰρ τῆς τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀθεότητος τὸ ἀγνόημα, θηλείαις θεαῖς ἱερείας χειροτονεῖν, ἀλλ’ οὐ τῆς Χριστοῦ διατάξεως.]*

<sup>1</sup> T. C. lib. i. p. 144. [113.]

<sup>2</sup> Licita prohibentur, ne si per-

*mitterentur eorum occasione perveniant ad illicita. L. neque tamen. Just. de Asuth. (A, but Bodl. MS. “Auth.,” the appearance of “s” being due to the intrusion of a stroke from the line above. Tut. l. Officium. D. de rei Vind. [The places referred*

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 is<sup>1</sup>.

[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 Baptism<sup>2</sup>,” 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

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 committi illicitum.”]

<sup>1</sup> [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 conversation 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 aforesaid 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.”]

<sup>2</sup> Ephes. iv. 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 born<sup>1</sup>, 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 abhorred<sup>2</sup> 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 Church<sup>3</sup>, Agrippinus<sup>4</sup> the first in the Church

<sup>1</sup> "Una est nativitas de terra, alia de coelo; una de carne, alia de Spiritu; una de aeternitate, alia de mortalitate; una de masculo et foemina, alia de Deo et Ecclesia. Sed ipsae duae singulares sunt. Quomodo enim uterus non potest repeti, sic nec baptismus iterari." Prosp. (of Aquitaine + c. 463.) Senten. 331. [S. Aug. in Joann. c. 3. Tract. xi. 6.] "Eja fratres lacteum genitalis fontis ad laticem convolvate, ut semper vobis aqua sufficiat, hoc ante omnia scientes, quia hanc nec effundere licet nec rursus haurire." Zeno. (of Verona + c. 380.) Invit. ad Font. [i. p. 117. t. iii. Biblioth. Patr. Colon.]

<sup>2</sup> August. de Bapt. cont. Don. lib. ii. cap. 14. [t. ix. 107. A.] "Quid sit perniciosius, utrum omnino non baptizari, an rebaptizari, judicari difficile est. Video quidem quid amplius homines detestentur atque horreant."]

<sup>3</sup> Tert. de Bapt. [c. 15.] "Circa haereticos sane quid custodiendum sit, digne quis retractet: ad nos enim editum est. Haeretici autem nullum habent consortium nostrae disciplinae, quos extraneos utique testatur ipsa ademptio communicationis. Non debeo in illis cognoscere quod mihi est praecipuum, 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."

<sup>4</sup> 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, bonae memoriae vir, cum caeteris coepiscopis suis, qui illo tempore in provincia Africa et Numidia Ecclesiam Domini gubernabant, statuit, et librato consilii communis examine firmavit."]

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 his 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. Cyprian<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>2</sup> 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 beseeemed him the ancient and true apostolic customs<sup>3</sup>, till they which unadvisedly before had erred became in a manner all reconciled friends unto truth<sup>4</sup>, and saw that heresy in the ministers of baptism could no way evacuate the force thereof; such heresy alone excepted<sup>5</sup>, as by reason of

<sup>1</sup> Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 2, 3. Cypr. Epist. 70-76.

<sup>2</sup> [ingenious, A. 1616; cf. p. 605] 1887.

<sup>3</sup> ["Ο γε Στέφανος μὴ δέιν τι νεώτερον παρὰ τὴν κρατήσασαν ἀρχὴν παραδοσὶν ἐπικαινοτομεῖν οἰόμενος, ἐπὶ τούτῳ διηγανᾶκται. Euseb. E. H. vii. 3.]

<sup>4</sup> "Illi ipsi episcopi qui rebaptizandos haereticos 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.]

<sup>5</sup> "Dixisti fieri non posse ut in falso baptisate inquinatus abluat, immundus emundet, supplantator erigat, perditus liberet, reus veniam tribuat, damnatus absolvat. Bene haec omnia poterunt ad solos haereticos pertinere, qui [quia] falsaverunt symbolum, dum alter dixerit duos Deos cum Deus unus sit, alter Patrem vult in Persona

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 Samosatensians had baptized were rebaptized<sup>1</sup>. It was likewise ordered in the council of Arles<sup>2</sup>, 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 report<sup>3</sup> 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 submission craved of his bishop not to deny him baptism, the

"Filius cognosci, alter carnem subducens Filio Dei per quam Deo reconciliatus est mundus: et cæteri hujusmodi, qui a sacramentis catholicis alieni noscuntur." Optat. lib. i. [c. 10. p. 12. Paris. 1679.]

<sup>1</sup> Synod. Nicæn. can. 19. [περὶ τῶν Παυλιανιστῶν (Παυλιανιστῶν), εἴτα προσφυγόντων τῇ καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ὅρος ἐκτεθεῖται ἀναβαπτίζεσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐξάπαντος. Item can. 8: περὶ τῶν ὀνομαζόντων μὲν ἑαυτοὺς Καθαροὺς ποτε, προσερχομένων δὲ τῇ καθολικῇ καὶ ἀποστολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἔδοξε τῇ ἀγίᾳ καὶ μεγάλῃ συνόδῳ, ὥστε χειροθετοῦμένους αὐτοὺς μὲναι οὕτως ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ. Ap. Routh, Script. Ecclesiast. Opusc. p. 366, 359. (= p. 382, 375, ed. 1840.)]

<sup>2</sup> Synod. i. Arelat. can. 8. ["De Afris, quod propria lege sua utuntur, ut rebaptizent; placuit ut si ad Ecclesiam aliquis de hæresi venerit, interrogent eum symbolum; et si perviderint eum in Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto esse baptizatum, manus ei tantum imponatur, ut accipiat Spiritum sanctum. Quod si interrogatus non responderit hanc Trinitatem, baptizetur." Routh, Rel. Sac. iv. 91. (p. 308, ed. 1846.)]

<sup>3</sup> Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. vii. cap. 9. [Quoted also by T. C. iii.

135, to shew that the presumed invalidity of baptism in any case does not imply a necessity of rebaptization. Ὅντως, ἀδελφε, συμβουλής δέομαι, καὶ γνώμην αἰτῶ παρὰ σοῦ, τοιοῦτου τινός μοι προσελθόντος πράγματος, δεδίως μὴ ἄρα σφάλλωμαι. τῶν γὰρ συναγομένων ἀδελφῶν πίστος νομιζόμενος ἀρχαῖος καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἐμῆς χειροτονίας . . . τοῖς ὑπόγονοις βαπτίζομένοις παρατυχῶν, καὶ τῶν ἐπερωτήσεων καὶ ἀποκρίσεων ἐπακούσας, προσῆλθέ μοι κλαίων καὶ καταβρηνῶν ἑαυτὸν, καὶ πίπτων πρὸ τῶν πόδων μου ἔξομολογούμενος μὲν καὶ ἐξομνύμενος τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ παρὰ τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς βεβάπτιστο, μὴ τοιοῦτον εἶναι, μηδὲ ὅλως ἔχειν τινὰ πρὸς τοῦτο κοινωνίαν ἀσεβείας γὰρ ἐκείνο καὶ βλασφημιῶν πεπληρῶσθαι λέγων δὲ πάνυ τι τὴν ψυχὴν νῦν κατανεύχθαι . . . καὶ διὰ τοῦτο δέομενος τῆς εὐκρινεστάτης ταύτης καθάρσεως καὶ παραδοχῆς καὶ χάριτος τυχεῖν ὅπερ ἐγὼ μὲν οὐκ ἐτόλμησα ποιῆσαι, φήσας αἰτάρκη τὴν πολυχρονίαν αὐτῷ κοινωνίαν εἰς τοῦτο γεγομένην θαρσεῖν δὲ ἐκέλευον, καὶ μετὰ βεβαίας πίστεως καὶ ἀγαθῆς συνειδήσεως τῇ μετοχῇ τῶν ἁγίων προσιέναι ὃ δὲ οὔτε πενήθῶν παύεται, πέφρικέ τε τῇ τραπέζῃ προσιέναι, καὶ μάλιστα παρακαλούμενος συνεστάναι ταῖς προσευχαῖς ἀνέχεται.]

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 throughly and duly weighed) to take a baptism full fraught with blasphemous 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 martyrdom of blessed Cyprian the emperor Diocletian began to<sup>1</sup> 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 fortun'd 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 forward their faction the only true and sincere Church. The

<sup>1</sup> Circa ann. 300.

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 subtlety of sharp discourse, or else by the mere appearance of zeal and devout affection, the later 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<sup>1</sup> 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 Parmenian<sup>2</sup>.

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 true baptism, they had for this point whole volumes of St.

<sup>1</sup> So Bodl. MS. and A. *theirs*. substituted *course*.) 1887. 1616, 1622. Gauden (1662, 1676, &c.)

<sup>2</sup> Circa an. 370.

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 mis-persuadeth 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 Vincentius<sup>1</sup>, "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 Theodosius<sup>2</sup> made to bridle them very bitter, the punish-

<sup>1</sup> Vincent. Lirin. adver. Hæres. cap. 11. ["O rerum mira conversio! auctores ejusdem opinionis catholici, consecratos 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.]

<sup>2</sup> 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 younger Theodosius, re-enacting the penalty. The emperors use such expressions as these: "iterati baptismatis polluunt sacrilegio:" "feralibus sacrilegiis;" "piaculare crimen," &c.]