Principle on which its Validity is denied.

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,” and again, “Let your women in churches be silent.” 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 judgment exposition out of the very law itself, or to annex to the law by authority and jurisdiction things of like conueniency, therefore Clement extendeth this apostolic constitution to baptism. “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. Whig. 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, 4th 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...”]
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“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 1, “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 endeavours 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 ordereath 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 yes, 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 2 are well prohibited, not proved invalid because prohibited in public.

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 rashser sort to do it where no such necessity is 3.

[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 tiseth 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,” baptism not only inasmuch as it hath everywhere 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 Authoritate Taurum, § 1. “Ne- que tamen hereditatem adire,” &c. et Dig. vi. 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. 5. t. i. p. 45, ed. Lugd. 1552, the following gloss occurs, “Fra- textu licit, non debet committiri licitum.”

1 [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 con- vocation 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. 353. Concerning permitting the adminis- tration of baptism (in this light of the Gospel) to women, (be it spoken with the reverence of our brethren) it is most uncertain. When ‘as it is not only given customarily in the open charge of every visi- tation, 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.”]

2 Licta prohbitentur, ne si per- mitteretur eorum occasione perver- niatur 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. i. Officium. D. de rei Vind. [The places referred
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that accepted, and against the use of the Church Novatian the first that publicly began to practise rebaptism, 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 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 withhold them did it in peaceable sort with very good regard had of them as of men in error but not in heresy.

[5.] The bishop of Rome against their novelties upheld as beseemed him the ancient and true apostolical customs, till they which unadvisedly before had erred became in a manner all reconciled friends unto truth, and saw that heresy in the ministers of baptism could no way evacuate the force thereof; such heresy alone excepted, as by reason of 1 Euseb. lib. vii. cap. 2. 3. Cypr. Epist. 17. 19. 3 [Ingeniosus, A. 1616; cf. p. 605] 4 [ibid. p. 196. 5 Sciamus, remissam peccatorum non nisi in Ecclesia dari posse, nec posse adversarios Christi quosque sibi gratiam ejus vincere dicare. Quod quidem et Agrippinus, bona memoria vir, cujus memoriae causa, quod ipsum in Africa et Numidia Ecclesiam Domini gubernabant, statuit, et liberato consilio communis examinum firmissim. 6 Dixisti fieri non posse ut in falsi baptisma inquisitum ablatur, immanius emundat, supplicantor erigit, perditis libet, reus veniam tribuat, damnatum absolvat. Bene huc omnia poterunt ad sos heretics pertinent, qui [quia] falsaverunt symbolem, dum alter ducterit 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 re baptized. It was likewise ordered in the council of Arles, 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 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

"Filii cognoscit, alter carmen sub-" "ducem leoni per quam Deo ""reconciliatus est mundus : et ec-" "teri hujusmodi, qui a sacramentis ""catholicae aliquem noscuntur." Optat. "lib. i. [c. 10. p. 12. Paris. 1679.]"

1 Synod. Nicena. can. 19. [perc. "tis Papianistae (Papianistae)," eis triumplhatorum de catholico el-" "naturae, hoc est estea mundi sanctificationem aulou anabaptizant. Hic can. 8: per-" "tis accipientem qui in quoque sancto Katholeit o-" "nique accipiantur."

2 Synod. i. Arelat. can. 8. ["De ""Afri, quos propter lege turne un-""tur, ut rebaptizent ; placuit ut si ad ""Eclesiam alium de hereesi veni-""rit, interrogent eum symbolum ; ""et si perverditur eum in Patre et ""Filio et Spiritu sancto esse bapti-""tatum, manus et tantum impona-"

3 Quod si interrogatus non respon-""derit hanc Trinitatem, baptizetur."" Routh, Rel. Sac. iv. 91. (p. 308, ed. 1846.)]

4 Euseb. Eccles. Hist. lib. vii. cap. 9. [Quoted also by T. C. iii. 135, to show that the presumed invalidity of baptism in any case does not imply the necessity of rebaptism. ""In quo, deo, sancto, sancta, sanctissima, et in trinitate confiteantur.""]

5 "Due of all which profess Christ, seeing it had been so long sithen 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 track of time able to recover soundness. And where true baptism was not before giver, the case of rebaptism 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 persecute the Church of Christ, and for the speedier abolition of their religion to burn up their sacred books, there were in the Church itself Tractors content to deliver up the books of God by composition, to the end their own lives might be spared. Which men growing thereby obious to the rest whose constancy was greater, it fortuned that after, when one Cecilian was ordained bishop in the church of Carthage, whom others endeavoured in vain to defeat by excepting against him as a Tractor, they whose accusations could not prevail, desperately joined themselves in one, and made a bishop of their own order, accounting from that day 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 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 1 forth by the space of three-score years and above, even from ten years before Constantine till the time that Optatus bishop of Milevis published his books against Parmenian 2.

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 betrayed 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. 

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 see 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 1, “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 2 made to bridle them very bitter, the punish-

---

1 Vincent. Libr. adv. Hæres. cap. 11. (“O rerum mira conversione! auctores ejusdem opinionis catho-
lici, consecratores vero heretici
judicantur: absolvuntur magistri,
condemnantur discipuli: con-
scriptores librorum fili regni e-
runt, assertores vero genna
I. v. p. 2. pag. 239.)
2 Vide C. Theod. lib. xvi. tit. 6. l.
“Adversarios,” et 1. “Nullus,”
circa an. 405. [l. vii. 196, Lyons,
1665, is a decree of Honorius, be-

ginning with “Adversarios catho-
lici, he are 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 en-
dowments 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
e.xpressions as these: “iterati bap-
tismatis polluit sacrilego;” “fe-
ralibus sacrillegis;” “piaclature
clerici, &c.”

---

1 So Bodl. MS. and A. theirs. substituted course.) 1887.
1616, 1622. Gauden (1662, 1676, &c.) 2 Circa an. 370.