

Union Seminary Magazine.

Vol. X.

December-January, 1899.

No. 2.

I.—Literary.

AMERICA AT THE SUMMIT OF THE CENTURY.

The last century should always be the best, and its closing decade the greatest. This is pre-eminently true of the century fast drawing to a close.

God is not writing books now. The canon of scripture was complete when the aged St. John penned the last line of his gospel. God is not working miracles now. There is no longer any need for the display of the supernatural. But God is just as busy as ever. His name does not appear, but his presence is everywhere. His hand is unseen, but omnipotent, shaping the destiny of the world and fore-ordaining still whatsoever comes to pass. "The world is not made, but making," some one says. God is as alert as he was in the days of the old theophanies. Was he in the world in the days of Abraham, and Moses, and Elijah, and Paul? God is not less gloriously and triumphantly in the world in the last years of this imperial nineteenth century.

It has been a century of unsurpassed industrial improve-

tions of learned societies, or locked up in foreign tongues and available only to the savant and the linguist. Numerous books on the subject, charmingly written, and handsomely illustrated, and in our own language, are at the command of the general reader, and at a price within the limits of the most meagre purse. While it is by no means expected that the purchaser should essay the role and rank of "expert" in this department of learning, he should have such a fair and ready acquaintance with the subject, in its extent, nature and value, as will enable him, like a scribe instructed unto the kingdom of God, to bring forth out of his treasures things new and old." "But if any man be ignorant, let him be ignorant."

St. Albans, W. Va.

SOME REMARKS ON PHILIP SCHAFF'S ACCOUNT
OF THE MODE OF BAPTISM IN
THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

PROF. T. C. JOHNSON.

The Rev. Dr. Philip Schaff did great service in behalf of the Christian literature of America, and of the world. He edited, and was a large contributor to, commentaries, dictionaries, and encyclopædiæ. He wrote notes of travels, papers and books of devotion, and, above all, a great monumental historical work. He possessed literary skill of a high order. Though a German-Switzer by birth, he wielded the English language with extraordinary skill. Hence his works are widely read and exert a vast influence. He is a sort of modern Jerome; but like Jerome of old, the great influence which he has exerted has not been one of unmixed good.

His great literary skill and huge capacity for labor were not controlled by a correspondingly deep insight into his subject, by a profundity of thought, nor by logical powers of reasoning of the highest order. And, instead of making first hand investigations, he was too much given to reproduction of other men's views. For this reason, the intelligent reader never accepts an inference, or conclusion, of

Dr. Schaff's, until he has himself examined the evidence by which it is supported, and himself has ascertained the sufficiency of that evidence either taken alone or along with other which may be brought into connection with it.

But not all readers are intelligent; and many, consequently, are in danger of being misled by frequent passages in the works of Dr. Schaff.

We propose to examine, in this paper, one passage which may easily mislead the unthinking. Dr. Schaff says, on page 468 *et seq.* of his History of the Christian Church, volume I:

"The usual FORM of baptism was immersion. This is inferred from the original meaning of the Greek βαπτίζεω and βαπτισμός, (1) from the analogy of John's baptism in the Jordan; from the Apostle's comparison of the sacred rite with the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, with the escape of the ark from the flood, with a cleansing and refreshing both, and with burial and resurrection; finally from the general custom of the ancient church, which prevails in the east to this day. (2) But sprinkling, also, or

(1) Comp, the German *taufen* the English *dip*, Grim defines βαπτίζω (the frequentative of βάπτω), immerge, submerge; Liddell and Scott: "to dip in or under the water." But in the Septuagint and the New Testament it has also another meaning. Hence, Robinson defines it: "to wash, to lave, to cleanse by washing." See below.

(2) The Oriental and Orthodox Russian churches require even a *threefold* immersion, in the name of the Trinity, and deny the validity of any other. They look down on the Pope of Rome as an unbaptized heretic, and would not recognize the single immersion of the Baptists. The Longer Russian Catechism thus defines Baptism: "A sacrament in which a man who believes, having his body *thrice plunged* in water in the name of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, dies to the carnal life of sin, and is born again of the Holy Ghost to a life spiritual and holy." Mariot (in Smith and Cheatham I, 161,) says: "*Triple immersion*, that is, thrice dipping the head while standing in the water, was the all but universal rule of the church in early times." and quotes in proof Tertullian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Jerome, Leo I, etc. But he admits on page 168, sq., that *affusion* and *asperision* were exceptionally also used, especially in clinical baptism, the validity of which Cyprian defended, page 76 or 69 ad Magnum). This mode became the rule in the Western Church after the thirteenth century.

copious pouring rather, was practised at an early day with sick and dying persons, and probably with children and others, where total or partial immersion was impracticable. Some writers suppose that this was the case even in the first baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost; for Jerusalem was poorly supplied with water and private baths; the Kedron is a small creek and dry in summer; but there are a number of pools and cisterns there. Hellenistic usage allows to the relevant expressions sometimes the wider sense of washing, bathing, sprinkling, and ceremonial cleaning. (1) Unquestionably, immersion expresses the idea of baptism, as a purification and renovation of the whole man, more completely than pouring or sprinkling; but it is not in keeping with the genius of the Gospel to limit the operation of the Holy Spirit by the quantity or the quality of the water or the mode of its application. Water is absolutely necessary to baptism, as an appropriate symbol of the purifying and regenerating energy of the Holy Spirit; but whether the water be in large quantity or small, cold or warm, fresh or salt, from river, cistern or spring, is relatively immaterial, and cannot affect the validity of the ordinance.'

This is the whole account of the mode of baptism given by Dr. Schaff in his great History of the Christian Church. (We have been careful to present the foot notes as well as the statements in the body of the text). It is superficial,

(1) 2 Kings 5:14 (*Sept.*); Luke 11:38; Mark 7:4 (*βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων* etc.); Heb. 6:2 (*βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆ*) 9:10; (*διαφόροις βαπτισμοῦς*). Observe also the remarkable variation of reading in Mark 7:4 *εἰς* *μη βαπτισαυχη* (*except they bathe themselves*), and *βαπτισανται* (*sprinkle themselves*). Westcott and Hort adopt the latter in the text, the former in the margin. The Revision of 1881 reversed the order. The "*divers baptisms*" in Hebrews 9:10 (in the Revision: *Washings*) probably include all the ceremonial purifications of the Jews, whether by bathing (Lev. 11:25; 14:9; Num. 19:7), or washing (Num. 19:7; Mark 7:8), or sprinkling (Lev. 14:7; Num. 19:19). In the figurative phrase *βαπτίζεν ἐν πνεύματι* to be overwhelmed, plentifully endowed with the Holy Spirit (Matt. 3:11; Luke 3:16; Mark 1:8; John 1:33; Acts 1:5; 11:16), the idea of immersion is scarcely admissible since the Holy Spirit is *poured* out. (See my *Hist. of the Apost. Church*, p. 569).

hasty, incorrect and calculated to mislead every careless and poorly informed reader.

First, the inference from the "original meaning" of the Greek βαπτίζεῖν and βαπτισμὸς "is invalid; while, on the other hand, the historic use of these words, especially in the Hellenistic Greek, grounds a strong argument for baptism by affusion.

Let us observe, in the outset, that if the original meaning of βαπτίζεῖν were to dip* and that only; if, according to its etymology and its classic usage, it never meant anything else than to put under water and draw out again, that would not ground a strong inference that Christian baptism was by immersion; and for two reasons. (1) When a language becomes a vehicle of revealed religion, some words must change their meanings. It is a familiar fact that our missionaries to-day among peoples who have not been considerably affected by a knowledge of the one true religion, can find no words exactly fitted for the conveyance of many Christian conceptions, and that they are under necessity to change the meanings of certain words. For instance, how hard it is for our missionaries in China to convey to the Chinese mind the proper notion of God. The Chinese have no word in their language which suits exactly. The missionaries must tell the Chinese of the true God. They must tell about him in a language and with words that the Chinese understand; they must tell in the Chinaman's own tongue. So they take the word which comes nearest. They fill it with a new meaning; and put it to a new and lofty use. How silly would it be for the Chinese scholars of a thousand years hence to deduce the conception of the true God from the original meaning of the term adopted now by translators.

In like manner the New Testament, also, is full of terms which the inspired writers used with new meanings. We must ascertain their significance by learning from the New Testament itself what sense the Apostles intended them to bear.

*For convenience we shall use the word "dip" in this discussion of putting into or under the water and taking out again.

It will not do to try to get the Biblical conceptions largely from a study of the original meanings of these terms. For instance, it will not do to try to get the rich meaning of ἀγαπᾶω out of classic usage. The classic Greek world did not know anything about Christian brotherly love. They did not feel it. They did not try to express the action in speech. It will not do, again, to try to get much about the form of administration, and the significance, of the Lord's Supper from a study of the "original meaning" of the Greek δεῖπνον. They are not to be found in it.

Now, our Baptist brethren do not act as if they believed with us. They seem to approve of the course of the Chinese doctor of divinity who in the thirtieth century shall try to form the proper conception of the true God by going back to the *original* meaning of the word "God" used of necessity by our present translators, but in a new sense.

We condemn this course. We say, indeed, that it is fair to conclude that the Chinese word *God* which is used is chosen because it has some meaning or other which suited in part; but that our doctor will be able to get little good out of the study of the heathen Chinese use of the term. He is to ascertain the real meaning of the term as used by present translators, by a study of the connections in which *they* use it. And so we say of the words βαπτίζεν and βαπτισμός. Their meaning in the classic Greek is of next to no significance in this debate. When a man becomes a child of God he undergoes a great change; and when a language is impressed to convey the Gospel of our blessed Lord it also is metamorphosed. We must study the words as thus newly used to ascertain their meanings as applied to their new and high purposes. We care little for their old significations.

(2) Even where the occasion of change would not seem to have been so urgent, words which primarily denoted a specific form or mode have, in the course of time, lost all reference to their primary, etymological and historical import. A very scholarly and able contemporary writer asserts that nothing is more common in living language than such a change in the meaning of words. He says: "To *manufacture*, for instance, originally meant *to make* 'by the

hand’; but now a very large proportion of *manufactured articles* are no longer ‘*hand made*,’ but on the contrary, and in contradistinction, are made by machinery. Originally it was vessels *only with ‘sails’ that ‘sailed,*’ but now we constantly read and speak of the *sailing* of steamboats, although in many cases they have actually no ‘*sail*’ at all, and they cannot *sail* in the primary acceptation of the term. Originally it was at the sound or ‘*blast*’ of the trumpet that heralds described the armorial ensigns of those who entered the tournament lists; it was thus (compare the German *blassen*) that they *blazoned*; their description was ‘*blazed*’ abroad over the whole assembled multitude. But now nothing in the world is done more quietly than the *blazoning* of coats of arms; and yet they continue to be *blazoned*. In fact, *coats of arms*, so called, are no longer ‘*coats*’ at all; just as the great majority of ‘*spinsters*’ no longer *spin*. There are, too, other *hypocrites* besides those who are found on the boards of a theatre, though a *hypocrite* originally was a *stage player who answered from under a mask*. So a *villain* was originally just a *villager*; a *pagan* was simply a *countryman*; a scandal was a stick in a trap. And to come back to the very word in dispute, the root verb from which it springs, though primarily meaning to *dip* [?] came also to mean to *dye*, in whatsoever way the dyeing was effected. And as a matter of philological fact, the word *baptize* itself is now by the great majority of people who use it all over the world, used to denote the performance of a purificatory rite, without the least atom of reference *in their use of it*, to its primary import of *immersion*. If the term is now employed in this way, is it inconceivable that it should have been *formerly* thus employed? If not, is it inconceivable that we should have to push back the reference of the ‘*formerly*’ to the very time of the New Testament?”*

Add to this Dr. Schaff’s concession, already quoted, that “Hellenistic usage allows to the relevant expressions sometimes the wider sense of washing, bathing, sprinkling and ceremonial cleansing. (II Kings, 5:14; Luke, 11:38; Mark, 7:4; Heb., 6:2; 9:10.) The ‘*divers baptisms*’ in Heb. 9:10

*See Morrison on Mark VII. 4.

probably include all the ceremonial purifications of the Jews, whether by bathing, or washing, or sprinkling.'") We see the inference from the original meaning of the words βαπτίζειν and βαπτισμός is worth next to nothing. Words may merge all reference to their primary meaning. These words have done so; and had done this, as the Hellenistic usage shows, prior to the day of Pentecost. Hence the original meaning of the Greek βαπτίζειν and βαπτισμός becomes of very small moment.⁽¹⁾

We repeat, then, that if the original meaning of were to dip, and that only; if, according to its etymology and usage in classic Greek, it never meant anything else than to put under the water and take out again, that would not ground a valid inference that Christian baptism was by immersion; this vaunted argument of our Baptist friends would fall to the ground as a weak and almost worthless thing. For we have seen that naturally, when the Scriptures are to be translated into a heathen or pagan language many of its words must be given a new meaning; we have seen that many words which once denoted a specific form or mode have merged all reference to it; and we have seen that these words, βαπτίζειν and βαπτισμός have actually changed their meaning and are used by a majority of Christians without any reference to their primary import, and that this change had taken place before the date at which our Baptist brethren think the Christian church was established.

(1) Dr. Broadus's effort to abrogate the force of this point would command some respect, were it not clear that βαπτίζειν and βαπτισμός have actually changed their meanings in Apostolic usage, as Dr. Schaff says (see quotations from him already given); *i. e.*, were he fighting a mere theory and not a fact. But it is to be remarked that he understates, perhaps unconsciously, and misstates the scope of the argument, and hence, perhaps also, cites few illustrations and those not the strongest. Moreover, when we have advanced beyond our present supposition as to the classic meaning of the word, which is a mere supposition, and have set forth its rich and varied usage in classic Greek, we shall find that it is not employed in "an entirely different sense in sacred from what it had in classical sense." And we shall find that all Dr. Broadus's war on our argument amounts, in his own pelucid terms, "to just nothing." See *Immersion Essential to Baptism*, p. 43, ff.

But the original meaning of βαπτίζεῖν was not to dip, *in the sense of putting into or under the water and taking out again.* The Rev. Dr. T. J. Conant was a scholar of recognized ability. He undertook researches on this subject at the request of the American (Baptist) Bible Union. He stated the results of his investigation as follows: "The word βαπτίζεῖν, during the whole existence of the Greek as a spoken language, had a perfectly defined and unvarying import. In its literal use, it meant, as has been shown,—to put entirely into or under a liquid, or other penetrable substance, generally water, so that the object was wholly covered by the enclosing element. By analogy it expressed *the coming into a new state of life or experience*, in which one was, as it were, inclosed and swallowed up, so that temporarily or permanently, he belonged wholly to it."* He says again, "The word, *immerse*, as well as its synonyms, *immerge*, etc., expresses the full import of the Greek word βαπτίζεῖν. The idea of emersion is not included in it. It means simply to put in or under water; without determining whether the object immersed sinks to the bottom, or floats in the liquid or is immediately taken out. This is determined not by the word itself, but by the design of the act, in each particular case. A living being put under water without intent to drown him, is of course to be immediately withdrawn from it; and this is to be understood, whenever the word is used with reference to such a case. But the Greek word is also used where a living being is put under the water for the purpose of drowning, and, of course, is left to perish in the immersing element."†

Concerning these statements let us notice: 1st. It is conceded that βαπτίζεῖν does not mean to dip, *i. e.* to put in or under and withdraw again, and claimed, that when taken in its literal import, it means, "*to immerse, or immerge, to put into or under water, 'without determining' whether the object immersed sinks to the bottom, or floats in the liquid, or is imme-*

*"The Meaning and Use of βαπτίζεῖν, Philologically and Historically investigated for the American Bible Union. By T. J. Conant, D. D.," p. 158. (Copied in Baird's Bible History of Baptism, p. 155.

†"The Meaning and Use of βαπτίζεῖν," p. 88.

diately taken out. In the words of another Baptist scholar, the "whole function" of βαπτίζεῖν "is fulfilled with the act of submersion." By baptism, the subject is, according to this conception, put under the water and left there. Hence, if our Baptist brethren argued truly from this "literal import" of the term; and if they acted in accord with the conclusion there reached, they would drown a vast number. In executing the last great commission: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," they would go and submerge them; and the weak, whether weak on account of sickness or age, would drown. The great commission makes no command, either directly or by implication, for the rescue of those put into jeopardy in this way. 2nd. According to this teaching the emblem—ritual baptism—seems quite inadequate as an emblem of that of which Immersionists say it is the emblem.

Dr. Carson says: "The immersing of the whole body is essential to baptism, not because nothing but immersion can be an emblem of purification, but because immersion is the thing commanded, and because that, without immersion there is no emblem of *death, burial and resurrection* which are in the emblem equally with purification.*

Now observe, that if Dr. Carson had had any Biblical grounds for holding that burial and *resurrection* must be in the emblem, then *he* might argue for immersion as he does; for he held that βαπτίζεῖν meant *to dip*, though he confessed: "I have *all* the lexicographers and commentators against me."⁽²⁾ But not so those who see, as every honest scholar must see now, that βαπτίζεῖν does not mean "*dip*" at all, though it may mean submerge. There is certainly nothing in *submergence* emblematical of *resurrection*. Nor can our Baptist friends read it in. This emblem has no resurrection in it, if "without immersion there is no emblem of death, burial and resurrection." Logically, Dr. Conant and those who agree with him must see in the rite of baptism no reference to resurrection. This utter lack of harmony between sign and thing signified is damning.

*Dr. Carson: *Baptism, its Modes and Subjects*; page 381.

(2) Dr. Carson: *Baptism, its Modes and Subjects*, page 55.

3rd. There is a word, and it occurs in the New Testament writings, which might have been used of the rite of baptism had it been *immersion*. But the inspired teachers did not use this word when speaking of the ordinance of Christian baptism. They do not seem to have been immersionists. Therefore, instead of using βάπτειν, *to dip*, when speaking of the rite of baptism, they used βαπτίζειν, which had several meanings as used in the Hellenistic Greek; but never meant "to dip." βάπτειν would have suited Immersionists. Listen to these uses of the word in the New Testament: "Send Lazarus, that he may dip (βάπτειν) the tip of his finger in water and cool my tongue."* "He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it; and when he had dipped the sop he gave it to Judas Iscariot."⁽²⁾ "And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood."⁽³⁾ This word would have suited the Immersionist exactly. It would have suited so well that Dr. Carson wishes to take its meaning and affirm it of βαπτίζειν, a word which the Apostles preferred though it did not mean *dip*—to put into the water and take out again, at all. Some protagonists of immersion say that the Apostles chose the word βαπτίζειν in preference to βάπτειν, on account of "its greater length, weight and dignity of form." This is a very poor reason. What would we think of men who claimed to be teachers, with a message of vast importance, if they should throw away a word whose meaning suited exactly, and choose instead a word of doubtful import, and not only so, but wanting in an essential feature to carry the meaning intended, because, forsooth, it was of "greater length, weight and dignity of form?" Sam Jones would call such men pompous old "windbags," and Sam Jones would be right so far. The Apostle Peter would more properly describe them as speaking "great swelling words of vanity." But poor Peter! he would hit himself. The burden of his preaching was sometimes: "Repent and be baptized," (βαπτισθήτω). (4)

*Luke 16:24. (2) John 13:26. (3) Revelations 19:13.

(4) Dr. Broadus tries to break the force of this point by showing that βαπτίζειν is sometimes equivalent to βάπτειν. The best proof he can find is Plutarch *Alex.* 67, where Plutarch represents

4th. The admissions of Dr. Conant about the meaning of βαπτίζεω include one of great importance. After giving what he regarded as its meaning in its literal import, he said: By analogy it expressed "the coming into a new state of life or existence." This is true and here, no doubt, is found the real reason for choosing this word to name the rite of initiation into the kingdom of God. The process which makes a man a child of God brings him into a "new state of life or existence." And the rite emblematical of the spiritual transaction should be called by a word expressing such a change.*

We see, now, that the meaning assigned to the word βαπτίζεω by the most competent Baptist scholars as its literal import makes the rite of baptism leave the subject under the water without a command, either expressed or implied, to take him out, we see that this fact shears immersion as an emblem of the feature of resurrection, "if without im-

the soldiers of Alexander as on one occasion dipping (baptizing) wine with cups from huge wine jars and mixing bowls. But apparently Dr. Broadus fails to notice that it is the wine that is said to have been baptized, dipped, not the cups, which word is in the instrumental dative. The thing that is baptised, what is done with it? We leave our Baptist Brethren to explain. Was it introduced into a new sphere? In Dr. Broadus' own happy words his effort here is "simply amusing." See *Immersion Essential to Baptism*, page 40.

*If we understand Dr. Broadus (see *Immersion Essential to Christian Baptism*, pp. 19, 20) he would thrust always into the derived meaning of βαπτίζεω, viz.: "The coming into a new state of life or existence," the idea of submersion. For example, when a man is said to be *baptized* with wine, that is, intoxicated, he would thrust in the idea of his submergence into wine. But if so the Greek would represent the man as *drowned* in wine. There had to be a complete severance of the secondary from the primal import before the phrase could become a convenient one to set forth the state of the intoxicated, who actually puts the wine in himself and thus was introduced to another kind of existence. We, with Dr. Broadus, hold that "we are not at liberty to assign to a word a new meaning quite different from its primary and established meaning until we find a passage which requires it." But we hold also that having found such a passage we must assign the word a "new meaning." We find some such passages in the New Testament. See the concessions of Schaff already quoted.

mersion there is no emblem of death, burial and resurrection," and so cuts across Baptist teaching. We see that the inspired writers refused to use a word *βάπτειν* which would have conveyed the idea of *dipping*, immersion in the sense in which our Baptist friends really hold it; and that they used another word; and that by reason of a secondary meaning which *it* had—one which it had "by analogy," viz.: "Coming into a new state of life or existence," it was likely to be seized upon and used to name the rite of initiation into the Church, no matter what the precise mode in which the rite is administered. We had also seen that *βαπτίζειν* is *one* of a class of words which has merged its reference to its primary import and that it had done so prior to the time of the Apostolic Age, in many cases, as Schaff even admits.

Let us now have the truth positively about it. We have found no juster statement of it than that given by Dr. Baird.* He says: "Its primary meaning, as used by them (Greeks), was,—to bring into the state of mersion. This meaning had no respect to the mode of action, whether by putting the subject under the fluid, pouring it over him, or in whatever manner. In other words, it expressed not *immersion*, but *mersion*—not the mode of inducing the state, but the state induced,—that of being imbosomed in the mersing element. From this primary signification was derived a secondary use of the word. Anything that is mersed is in the possession and control of the mersing element, the word was hence used to express the establishing of a complete possession and controlling influence. As we say that a man is drowned,—immersed,—overwhelmed, in business, in trouble, in drunkenness, or in sleep; having in these expressions no reference whatever to the mode in which the described condition was brought about; so the Greeks used the verb *βαπτίζω*. They spoke of men as baptized with grief, with passion, with business cares. An intoxicated person was 'baptized with wine,' etc. In such use of the word, the essential idea is that of the action of

*S. J. Baird: *The Great Baptizer*, p. 155.

a persuasive potency by which the subject is brought and held in a new state or condition."

Dr. Baird continues: "Now, here was the very word required to designate the Mosaic rites of purifying. Of dip-pings and immersions Israel had none; and, if these had been found in their ritual, the verbs, *βάπτειν*, to dip, and *καταδύω*, to plunge into, to immerse, and the nouns *βουφή* and *κατάδυσις*, a dipping, an immersion, were at hand and specific in meaning. But they did want words to express that potency by which the unclean were, in the words of Dr. Conant, introduced into "a new state of life,"—a state of ritual cleanness, typical of the spiritual newness of life in Christ Jesus, which God's people receive, by the baptism of the Spirit. To express the working of that change, they appropriated the word *βαπτίζω*, to baptize; that is to cleanse, to purify. Then, to give names to the rite by which that change was accomplished, they formed from it the two sacred words *βαπτισμός* and *βάπτισμα*, words wholly unknown to classic Greek literature. They are as to etymology and meaning identical. By grammarians, the termination *μος*, is said generally to indicate the act signified by the verb, while *μα* indicates its effect. But the rule is neither absolute nor universal, and the sacred writers do not maintain the distinction. By them baptism is used alike to signify the act of baptizing and the effect, the new state produced by it. In their writings the distinction seems to consist in the employment of *baptismos* generally, as designating divers kinds of baptismal rites; while *baptisma* is specifically applied to the baptism of John and Christ. It is found in no other writings of that or preceding ages. Outside of the Scriptures, *baptismos* occurs in the works of Josephus, who thus designates John's baptism (Antiquities of the Jews, XIII.)" *

So much for the Greek uses of the word
We have seen that in classic use it meant to bring into a state of mersion without indicating anything as to the mode in which the mersion was accomplished; that secondarily it

*Ibid, 156.

meant to bring into a changed condition without, again, indicating at all how the change was brought about.

Let us now examine such passages in Hellenistic Greek as are not immediately concerned with Christian baptism and yet serve to show the mode in which the changed conditions denoted by *baptismo* and *baptismos* are brought about.

1. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says: "According to which are offered both gifts and sacrifices that cannot, as touching the conscience, make the worshiper perfect, *being* only (with meats and drinks, and divers *baptismoi*) carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation." (1) He here distributes the whole Levitical system under two categories, one of which is "meats and drinks" and the other is "divers baptisms." The baptisms of which he speaks were baptisms of men and not of things, since they were "righteousness of the flesh (v. 10)" which could not purge the conscience (v. 9 and 14). He can refer only to the sprinklings and the self-performed washings of the Levitical ritual. There were no other rites in the Levitical system in which water was used, or to which the name baptism could be applied with any show of reason. Of these, the sprinklings were vastly more important and hence must have been chosen in contrasting the Levitical and Christian dispensations. But even if this were not granted, the self-performed washings were also by affusion, hence a rite or rites of which the mode was affusion is here called by the inspired author of the Hebrews, *baptisms*.

The student will remark that Dr. Schaff, in common with other scholars who maintain immersion, expressly admits that "divers baptisms" in this passage probably include "all the ceremonial purifications of the Jews, whether by bathing, or washing, or sprinkling." Take this admission which is necessitated by the facts in the case, in connection with another statement equally certain, that the Old Testament provides for no ritual purification of a man by immersion anywhere, and it is clear that so far we have affusion as the mode in which the changed condition referred to by *baptismos* is represented.*

(1) Hebrews 9: 9-10.

*Broadus passes this text in silence. See his book.

2. In the Septuagint we find βαπτίζεω for the first time in II Kings, 5: 10, 14. "Elisha sent a messenger unto him (Naaman) saying, Go wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again, unto thee, and thou shalt be clean. * * * * Then went he down and *dipped* himself seven times in the Jordan according to the saying of the man of God."

That dipped is an improper translation here may be argued from the instructions of Elisha, who told him to go and *rahatz*, wash by applying water to his person. "Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean, wash (*rahatz*) me and I shall be whiter than snow," cries the agonizing David. Here the Psalmist teaches that a sprinkling is a washing. The water used in accomplishing ritual cleanness in a Hebrew might be more or less, but it was always water applied. That affusion is a washing is taught Gen. 43:31 and Deut. 21:6 still more plainly; so also in Ex. 30:19; in connection with II Kings, 3:11. But Elisha had sent to Naaman, saying, Go and *wash* (*rahatz*).

Again, that dipped is an improper translation is to be inferred from the Hebrew word *Tabal*, which was here rendered in the Septuagint by βαπτίζεω. The fundamental meaning "appears to be contact by touch, a contact which may be of the slightest and most superficial kind, as when the priest was directed to dip the finger of his right hand in a few drops of oil held in the palm of his left (Lev. 14:15, 6), and when those who bore the ark dipped the soles of their feet in the brim of the Jordan and the water instantly fled away (Josh. 3:13, 15). Again, it is used to describe the staining or smearing of Joseph's coat with the blood of the kid (Gen. 28:31), "when the Septuagint translates it by μόλιω *to soil*, to stain, to smear. Moreover, the Chaldee equivalent of this word is used in Dan. 4:30 and 5:21, where the rendering into English is, "this body *was wet* with the dew of heaven." This variety of meaning gives ample scope for the inference that *tabal* here is used as synonymous with *rahatz*, which Elisha used in his order. This inference is confirmed to a certainty by the assertion that Naaman baptized, or had himself baptized (βαπτίζεω, *tabal*) seven times "according to the saying of the man of God."

The man of God had told him to *rahatz*, to wash himself by the application of water. Hence we infer that the mode in which Naaman baptized himself was by affusion.

This position might be confirmed by a great number of other arguments: For example, by one from the Jewish mode of purifying, which was never by immersion in case of persons; and especially by those from the Jewish mode of purifying lepers who had been healed; and by one from the relation which the Prophet Elisha sustained to the Sinaitic covenant.*

Thus it appears that there is hardly a possibility that "dipped" is the proper translation here.

3. In the Apocryphal book Ecclesiasticus, 34:25, the Septuagint says: "He that baptizeth himself after he toucheth a dead body, if he touch it again, what availeth his washings." Numbers 19:13-20 and 31:19-24, show how this was done. This case is perfectly clear. The dodge of the Immersionists here, that the reference is to self-performed washings, even if true, would not help them, as the self-performed washings were demonstrably by affusion also. But the self-washings were not purifications from the dead. The law is clear on this point. "The man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation, because he hath defiled the sanctuary of the Lord; *the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him ; he is unclean*". (Num. 19:20).

The writer of Ecclesiasticus had taught, therefore, years before the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the *sprinklings* of the Mosaic dispensation were *baptisms*.

*These and other arguments may be seen elaborated with great skill in "The Great Baptizer," pp. 167 ft.

[TO BE CONTINUED IN NEXT NUMBER.]

Union Seminary Magazine.

Vol. X.

February-March, 1899.

No. 3.

I.—Literary.

REPENTANCE AND ORIGINAL SIN.

The question is sometimes asked whether we must repent of original sin. It is sometimes asked triumphantly by controversialists who fancy that they disprove by it the reality of "original sin." The Christian heart, they argue, turns in instinctive repentance away from all sin: it is absurd, however, to talk of repenting of "original sin": the only sin that is recognizable as such, therefore, under the test of repentance, is our actual transgression. It is also, however, sometimes asked anxiously by earnest Christians, eager to perform their whole duty before the Lord. All sin, they reason, must be repented of that it may be forgiven: must I not then repent of the sin of our first father, which has been imputed to me, just as really and just as poignantly as I repent of my own actual transgressions, if I am to hope for forgiveness and reception into life? If not, am I not practically assuming the frivolous attitude of the young French woman, who, when asked by her Confessor; "What must we do to repent unto life," replied archly: "We must first of all sin, my Father?"

In approaching a question like this we must obviously begin by making sure that we are not using our terms confusedly. What do we mean by "Repentance?" And what do we mean by "Original Sin?" Clearly, if we use these terms in shifting senses we shall never arrive at a stable solution of the problem propounded. If Repentance means for

SOME REMARKS ON PHILLIP SCHAFF'S ACCOUNT
OF THE MODE OF BAPTISM IN
THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

PROF. T. C. JOHNSON.

[Continued.]

[During the latter part of the preceding paper we were engaged in an examination of such passages in Hellenistic Greek as are not immediately concerned with Christian Baptism and yet serve to show the mode in which the changed conditions denoted by *baptisma* and *baptismos* are brought about. We had proceeded to examine: 1, The use of one of these terms as employed in Hebrews 9:9, 10; 2, The use of the word *baptizo* in II Kings 5:10, 14; 3, The use of the same word in Ecclesiasticus 34:25. We point now to another passage in Hellenistic Greek in which the same word *baptizo* is used, viz:]

4. In Judith 12:7, this chaste widow is said to have baptized *at* (*ἐπι*) a fountain in (*ἐν*) the camp of Holofernus.

These washings were self-imposed washings of tradition. If they involved immersion they would not greatly concern us, seeing that they are the ordinances of men. But both the language and the circumstances are strongly against the idea of immersion. She baptized herself *at* a fountain. Would a rude and licentious soldiery allow a beautiful young woman to baptize herself in the fountain? Her washings at this fountain can have extended no further than to hands, forearms, feet and ankles.*

5. There is a passage in Josephus, Antiq. Bh. 4; Chapter iv. 6, which is literally translated as follows: "Any persons being defiled by a dead body, they put a little of these ashes (of a red heifer) and hyssop into spring water, and baptizing, sprinkled them on the third day and on the seventh." This passage has often been misunderstood because of incorrect translations. But in it Josephus unites with the writers of

*Dr. Broadus disposes of this point a little too easily, by saying that as Judith lives in a heathen tent and eats the food of the heathen, she "goes at midnight with her maid into a ravine and immerses herself." See p. 54, *Ibid.*

Hebrews and Ecclesiastes in calling leuitical purifyings, which were by affusion or sprinkling, *baptisms*.

6. In the New Testament, in Mark vii. 3, 4; Lu. xi. 38; John ii. 6; Hebrews ix. 9, 10, the Jewish ritual purifications are described by the term *baptize*. In every case it was by affusion. That this is true has been unanswerably argued as follows: "1. From the Levitical law which describes various washings and sprinklings, but not one immersion of a man's person for purification. 2. From well-known antique habits still prevalent in the East, which limited the washings to the hands and feet, and performed them by affusion. Compare 2 Kings iii. 11; Exod. xxx. 21. 3. From comparison of the two passages, Mark vii. 4, and Lu. xi. 38 with John ii. 6. These water-pots were too narrow and too small (holding about two bushels) to receive a person's body, and were such as were borne on the shoulders of female servants*. 4. From the great im-

*Dr. Broadus, in trying to meet this point, declares that the view of the passage which we maintain represents Mark as guilty of "a waste of words, a very empty tautology." One would suppose that the Jews would wash before eating after returning from the market, if they wash before eating even when they have *not* been to market." Sic Broadus (See p. 50).

But there is no tautology here: for in verse three, according to our conception, it is the hands that are diligently washed prior to eating; in verse four it is the persons that are affused. Let us suppose that the "six water-pots of stone containing two or three firkins apiece, which were set in the house in Cana 'after the manner of the purifying of the Jews' (John 2: 6), furnish us with a fair representation of the kind of vessels that were generally employed among the Jews to contain the water of baptism; and that the members of the family and their guests would, in passing into the house, lift the bunch of hyssop that would be lying conveniently, fixed on the extremity of a distant and appropriate handle, and would dip it into the appropriate element and sprinkle their persons. The water and the hyssop being untouched by the unclean, continued clean, and would be available for all." Morrison on Mark *in loco*. Such is our conception; and renders Broadus's objection to our view harmless.

It is to be further remarked that we have never seen one spark of evidence that the Jews generally had the water conveniences required by the immersionist conception. They affirm, but the evidence is all the other way.

probability that the Jews would immerse all over so often, or that they could. 5. From the fact that they are declared to have practiced, not only these baptisms of their persons, but of their utensils and massive couches—Numb. 19:17, 18. It is simply preposterous that these should have been immersed as often as ceremonially defiled.

Last, the Levitical law, which these Jews professed to observe with such strictness, rendered an immersion impossible anywhere but in a deep running stream, or living pool or a fountain. For if anything ceremonially unclean went into a vessel of standing water, no matter whether large or small, the water was thereby defiled, and the vessel and all other water put into that vessel and all persons who got into it. See Levit. xi. 32, 36.*

As for the Talmudic baptisms, of which Immersionists make so much, they are inventions of the scribes of post-biblical date. Not till the close of the fifth century do we come on a clear account of proselyte immersion. After that it is frequent.

Now, we see that so far from there being an argument for immersion as the mode of Christian baptism from the original meaning of βαπτίζειν, there is an argument of great strength from the historic uses of the term that baptism was by affusion. We have seen that if the original meaning had been to dip, and that only, there could have been no valid argument to immersion, since many words merge all reference to their original import in the course of time, especially when put to new and higher uses, and since this word had changed its meaning prior to the time of Apostolic teaching. We have seen that this word had a secondary meaning derived by analogy which made it just the word to name the rite which represents regeneration by the Holy Ghost; and finally, we have seen that the word was employed in Hellenistic Greek by writers of canonical books of Scripture, by a writer of one of the Apocryphal books, and by the Jewish historian Josephus to name the Levitical purificatory rites. As all the rites by which persons were purified were by affusion, we learn that by historic associa-

*Dabney's Theology, pp. 776-777.

tion the word βαπτίζεῖν would carry with it to Jewish Christians the idea of baptism by affusion and never that of immersion where the subject was a person.

Instead of inferring that immersion was the mode in the Apostolic age, therefore, Dr. Schaff should have inferred that affusion was the mode from the application of the word βαπτίζεῖν in Hellenistic Greek and especially in the Greek of the Old and New Testaments to the Levitical rites of purification.

Second. Dr. Schaff argues for immersion in the second place, "from the analogy of John's baptism in the Jordan."

Dr. Schaff does not conceive of the mode of John's baptism correctly, else he would infer that Christian baptism was by affusion. His argument is as follows: John baptized by immersion; the New Testament makes no difference, certainly as to mode, between John's baptism and Christian baptism, but on the contrary, represents them as alike; therefore, it is most natural to conclude that these baptisms were administered in the same way.

Now, we agree that the New Testament does make the impression that John's baptism and Christian baptism were administered in the same mode; and that if we can discover the mode of one we can infer with a high degree of certainty the mode of the other,—if we can discover the mode of John's baptism we can argue therefrom to the mode of baptism by the Apostles; but we do not agree that John's baptism was by immersion; we hold that he baptized by sprinkling or affusion, and that therefore we ought to conclude that Christian baptism was by sprinkling or affusion.

That John baptized by affusion may be shown from the fact that his baptism was no novelty to the Jews; from John's relation to the Sinaitic covenant; from the character in which he announced Christ; from the indecency of the rite of immersion as it must have been practiced by John, if practiced at all, and from the great numbers resorting to him for baptism.

1. John's baptism was no novelty. It was a rite with which the people were familiar. When the Pharisees sent certain men to John, "They asked him, and said unto him, Why baptisest thou, then, if thou be not that Christ, nor

Elias, neither that prophet." (John 1:25.) They have no question as to the form, nature, significance or divine authority of the rite. They inquire simply as to his authority to summon the nation to baptism, since he is neither "that Christ" nor "Elias," nor "that Prophet." They say by the clearest implication that they would consider it entirely proper for Elias or the Christ or that Prophet to baptize the people. But in the Old Testament Scriptures, which spoke of the coming of Elias, and the Christ, or that Prophet, the only baptisms or purifications of persons were by affusion,—pouring or sprinkling. Nor do we know of any historical evidence of performance of baptisms in any other mode among the Jews of this early day.

2. Again, if we consider John's relation to the Sinaitic covenant it becomes difficult to infer that his baptism could have been other than by affusion. Like Elijah of old John had come to warn and testify in behalf the broken Sinaitic covenant. He was the last great prophet of the Old Dispensation. In that dispensation the only baptisms of persons had been by affusion. It is most natural, therefore, to think that John's baptism was by affusion. John was a minister to the Levitical law, which was itself in all its requirements, a testimony to the covenant. That law knew nothing of the immersion of persons. Shall we suppose that John the minister of this law, the vindicator of the covenant, turned his back upon the forms sanctioned in the Old Testament and seized upon a form invented by the Scribes of his day? Such is the hard supposition into which *immersionism* would drive us; but there is no valid historical evidence that the Scribes of John's day had any such mode of baptism; and if they had, was John a friend and admirer of their traditions? Would he turn from the divine injunctions and replace them by one of their traditions without a word of attempted justification?

3. From the character in which he announced Christ. He announced Christ not in the character of humiliation and death, but in that of exaltation and royalty, as he appeared the covenant King of Israel at Sinai and as he is enthroned at the right hand of majesty on high, pouring out grace upon his people and the fire of justice on his

enemies. He said, "I indeed baptize you with water; * * * He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. Whose fan is his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." (Matt. iii. 11, 12. These words not only show the aspect in which John presented Christ, but teach also that his baptism meant not the burial of the Lord Jesus, but *the baptism of the Spirit dispensed by Him*. "I baptize you with water; * * * but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Immersion would have been utterly inharmonious with such a presentation of Christ and such a conception of the meaning of baptism.

4. From the indecency of the practice of immersion by John under his peculiar circumstances. He had neither waterproof suit nor "immersion robes." The Jews who were baptized by him had none; and their ordinary clothing was of such a sort that their immersion would have resulted in indecent exposure. A Jew of John's day wore two garments,—a sleeveless shirt reaching to the knee, and a second garment of the same shape reaching to the ankles. Over these he might wrap one or more shawls. There was little difference in the shape of the garments of men and women. In preparing for active exercise they drew up their skirts knee high and fastened them with a girdle at the loins. That with such clothing and such numbers as flocked about John, the immersionist theory would have resulted in wholesale indecent exposure, needs no arguing. Nor need we say that such indecency is out of keeping with both Old and New Testament religion.

Dr. Broadus tells us that he grew up accustomed to immersion all his life, and that the idea that immersion was indecent was to him "utterly novel," when he as a student at the University of Virginia first heard it. He says if you think immersion indecent, you have not been "well raised" in this respect. He says that if there may be indecent exposure in immersion so there may be also in a lady's alighting from a carriage; and that many people who talk of the indecency of immersion go sea-bathing still more exposed. Pp. 35-37, *Ibid*.

On this we remark: 1st. The Hottentot used to go throughout his life with a dress which Europeans consider

indecent. It was "*novel*" to the Hottentot, too, to hear that his dress was indecent. 2nd, Dr. Broadus will hardly say that there is as little liability to exposure in descending from a carriage as in receiving immersion. 3rd. There is a vast deal of indecent exposure at our seaside resorts. That does not make immersion decent. 4th. The people crowding on John's baptism were peculiarly ill-dressed for the reception of such a rite.

5th. From the great number which resorted to John for baptism.

The number of those baptized by John must have been enormous. Matthew says, "There went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan and were baptized of him." Mark gives similar testimony.

Now, between three and four millions of Israelites seem to have entered the promised land under Joshua (Num. 26:51, 62). There seem to have been at least seven millions of them there in the time of David. According to Josephus the population of his country in his own day numbered four millions. Make all allowances for the use of geographical terms in narrow senses and for Hebrew freedom to talk in obsolete terms, and yet grant that Matthew and Mark, inspired penmen, speak with truth and soberness, and John seems incompetent to do the work on the immersionist theory.

Dr. Baird has entered into calculations with the following result: "If we suppose John to have stood in the water three hours a day, during the six months of his ministry, and to have administered the rite at the rate of one per minute, during the entire time, the total results of such miraculous labors and endurance would have been about thirty-two thousand seven hundred and sixty persons baptized. * * * * Without the intervention of a miracle—and John did no miracles—even this was impossible."

This argument, though of only relative strength, can not be pooh-poohed. It supports the view that John's baptism was by affusion.

Thus we see that the facts, that John's baptism was recognized by his contemporary countrymen as a rite likely to be employed by Christ and his forerunner, that John

was the representative and vindicator of the Sinaitic covenant, that he presented Christ in his estate of exaltation, make it *certain* that John's baptism was by affusion, and that this position is further confirmed by the indecency of the immersionist supposition and the inability of John to do the work on their theory. John's baptism was by affusion, therefore.

But if John's baptism was by affusion, inasmuch as the New Testament makes the impression on the minds of immersionists as well as ourselves that John's baptism and Christian baptism were administered in the same mode, we conclude that Christian baptism was administered in the Apostolic age by affusion.

Third. Dr. Schaff argues in the *third place*, from the Apostle's comparison of the sacred rite with the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, with the escape of the ark from the flood, with a cleansing and refreshing bath, and with burial and resurrection.

This is a fourfold argument, each point of which either tells against the immersionist position, or is absolutely silent as to the mode.

Let us take them up in their order:

1. "From the Apostle's comparison of the sacred rite with the miraculous passage through the Red Sea."

His comparison is found in 1 Cor. 10; 1-2: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea."

Immersionists picture the Israelites as marching "through that long and fearful night with the double wall of water rolled up on each side, and the column of fleecy cloud stretching its enshrouding folds above them * * * It was in this * * * * that they were baptized into their allegiance to the great Law-giver and Leader."*

This picture is unhistorical. The Israelites were under the cloud, but that was prior to their entering the sea and marching through the sea. "The Angel of God which

*See Review of Dale's *Classic Baptism* in the *Baptist Quarterly*, 1869. Page 148.

went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them. And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these; so that the one came not near the other all night. And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea * * * and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea." Exodus 14: 19-12.

Thus it appears that the cloud passed *over* the children of Israel before Moses "stretched out his hand over the sea;" but was between Israel and the Egyptians during the march through the sea. The vision of the immersionist is dissipated by history.

Paul's teaching in this point is that the cloud and the sea did for Israel of old, in reference to Moses, that which baptism does for the Christian in reference to Christ. The passage through the sea and the guidance and protection of the cloud separated them unto Moses, put them under obligations to the Disciples of Moses just as Christian baptism separates the Christian to Christ. He has not in mind the mode of baptism, but its consequences, the change of heart which follows spiritual baptism, and the obedience of life. He goes on to say that with many of the Israelites "he was not well pleased, for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples to the intent that we "should not lust after evil things as they also lusted." (Vv. 5-6).

This passage is in the teeth of the Baptist claim. And the comparison of the Apostle throws no light whatever on the mode of Baptism. He was dealing with a weightier matter, viz: the consequences of baptism.

We may remark, in passing, that *we* do have a case of wholesale immersion at the time when the Israelites passed the Red Sea. Their pursuers were immersed, thoroughly. But our Immersionist friends will hardly say that the immersion of the Egyptians in this case was *baptism*.

2. From the Apostle's comparison of the sacred rite "with the escape of the ark from the flood."

This comparison is found in I Pet. 3: 19-20. "For Christ

hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit. By which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, where once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us."

Our Baptist friends seem to argue that since there was plenty of water in the region wherein Noah and his family were saved, they were saved by immersion, seeing they are said to have been saved by water. But it is to be observed, *first*, that the historical account in Genesis is silent as to any immersion of Noah and his family. The rest of the world is plainly declared to have been immersed. The salvation of Noah and his house consisted in their not being immersed in the same way. Yet Noah and his house were saved by a baptism typical of that which saves us (see v. 21 "doth now also save us"). As the waters of the deluge brought destruction to the old world, but life to Noah and his house, so the baptism of the spirit brings death to the old man, but life to the new man, through union with Christ, participation in the power of his resurrection.

It is the consequences of baptism at which Peter looks as well as Paul—the consequences which really follow spiritual baptism, and the obligations which really springs from water baptism.

The "water" of the deluge was a baptism to Noah and his house because it saved him from the fury and persecution of the world to the service of God, rendered it still more obligatory on Noah and his family to serve God. It was a water of separation, It did for Noah and his house, in type, at least, what is done for the christian by baptism administered by Christ.

While this passage, like that in the Corinthians, teaches nothing of the form, there is in historical association with it also an account of immersing of God's enemies, which immersion is not in scripture called a baptism. In each of these cases we see God's chosen baptized and yet not immersed, while his enemies are immersed and yet not baptized.

3. From a comparison of the sacred rite "with a cleansing and refreshing bath"

This comparison is found in Titus 3: 4-7. "After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared, not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we might be made heirs, according to the hope of eternal life."

The "washing" which Paul had in mind was never in a basin, as the immersionist supposes. It was not by immersion, but by the application of water to the person. We support this position by the following facts: (1) There is no historic evidence that the ancient Greeks, prior to the time of their adoption of Roman customs, used bath tubs in which they could stand, sit, or lie, as in a bath tub of to-day. They did have a vessel in which the bather might sit while water was poured over him. They had a laver (*λουτήν*, or *λουήριον*) beside which a man might stand and wash, having the water dipped out and poured over his person. (2) There is no historic evidence that the Hebrews did. And it is natural to suppose that Paul borrows his imagery from one of these sources. (3) In classic Greek *λούτρον* (the word here rendered washing) "does not mean a *laver*, but *water* for washing, and the *washing* accomplished by it; and that with intimate reference to its affusion on the person.* (4) The testimony of Hellenistic Greek is that it has the same meaning in it. "He that is baptized for the dead, and again toucheth the dead, what availeth his washing" (*λούτρῳ*) (Ecclesiasticus 34:25). Paul writes that Christ gave himself for the church, "that he might cleanse it, purifying it with *the washing* (*τῷ λούτρῳ*) of water." This cannot mean "purifying it with the laver," that is, with the bath tub, not washing; "or in the laver," since such a rendering cannot be given an instrumental dative.

To denote laver the Greeks, classic and Hellenistic, have the word *λουτήρ*.

*Baird: "The Great Baptizer, p. 327.

“Washing,” the translation given *λοῦτρον* by the authorized version, is correct as far as it goes, but somewhat defective. *λοῦτρον* is always washing by affusion. We might paraphrase our present scriptures as follows, therefore: “According to his mercy he saved us, by the affusional washing of regeneration, even by the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly.” Notice how this view of the meaning of *λούτρον*, as affusional washing, is confirmed by the relative clause “which he SHED ON us abundantly.”

Without more exhaustive consideration of this passage, which could only end in the confirmation of our view in its substantial, we can see that we have not only no teaching of immersion here, but strong if incidental confirmation of the view that baptism was by affusion.

4. From the Apostle's comparison of the sacred rite, “with burial and resurrection.”

The passages containing this comparison are Romans 6: 3, 4, “Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized unto Jesus Christ were baptized into his death. Therefore we were buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we should walk in newness of life,” and Col. 2: 12, “Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.”

These two passages contain the whole evidence that the form of baptism represents the burial of the Lord Jesus Christ. They therefore deserve consideration which otherwise they would not merit.

All admit that the subject of discussion in them is spiritual baptism and the conditions consequent thereon, and not ritual baptism at all. All admit that if the form is referred to at all, it is by mere allusion. Is there then this allusive reference to the form?

We answer, No: (1) The assumption of allusion to a supposed ritual baptism is wholly unnecessary to the exegesis of the passage. (2.) Such allusion is confusing to the Apostle's argument. (3.) The Apostle speaks not of immersion, but of burial; if there is an allusion to ritual baptism there is no allusion to immersion.

Taking up these several arguments against the Immersionist position in order :

(1.) The assumption of allusion to a supposed ritual baptism is wholly unnecessary to the exegesis of the passage. If there be no allusion to the rite of water baptism, at all, of course there is no allusion to the form.

In order to get at Paul's meaning in Romans 6 : 3-4, we must read the context. He says, (Vv. 1-11), "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that died to sin, (or for sin), live any longer therein? Or, (to put the matter more clearly) know ye not that as many as were baptized into Christ (Jesus) were baptized into his death? Therefore we were entombed with him through the baptism unto his death, that, like as Christ was raised from among the dead through the Father's glory, so we also may walk in newness of life. For if we have been engrafted together in the likeness of his death, then all the more also in the likeness of his resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that we might no longer serve sin. Now, if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him. * * * * * For in that he died, he died to sin (or for sin) once, but in that he liveth, he liveth to (or for God). Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin (or for sin), but living to God (or for God) in Jesus Christ!"

Paul meets in these words one of the most common and plausible, but ill-founded, objections to the doctrine of justification by faith, viz: "that it allows men to live in sin that grace may abound." It arises from ignorance of the doctrine in question, and of the nature and means of sanctification. It is so preposterous in the eyes of the enlightened believer that Paul deals with it rather by exclamations at its absurdity than with logical arguments. The main idea of this passage is that such is the nature of the believer's union with Christ that his living in sin is not merely an inconsistency, but a contradiction in terms, as much so as speaking of a live dead man or a good bad one. Union with Christ being the only source of holiness, cannot be the source of sin. In verse 1 the apostle presents

the objection. In verse 2 he declares it to be unfounded, and exclaims at its absurdity.* In verses 3-4 he exhibits the true nature and design of christianity as adapted and intended to produce newness of life. It is to be particularly remarked that he is talking of christianity in the heart of the believer (real christian). "Shall we who died for sin live any longer in it?" Or, if this is not clear, "know ye not that all we who were baptized *into Christ* Jesus were baptized into his death?" Here Paul does not say "baptized into the name of Christ" That sort of baptism—baptism into the name of Christ—ritual baptism—unites to the visible church; but baptism into Christ, real baptism, unites to the body of Christ, as Paul teaches in Gal. 3:27: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." It is the spiritual baptism, therefore, of which Paul speaks in Rom. 6:3. He says, "know ye not that all who were baptized *into Jesus Christ* were baptized into his death." "I said a moment ago," he seems to say, "how shall we who died to sin live in it?" Now we who were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death, into the benefits of his death. If we were baptized into *him*, our vicar, we were baptized into his death, a vicarious death and for us. He died for sin; we died in him, our vicar, for sin; and (v. 4) since he is our vicar in death it is that he may be in life. Therefore we were entombed with him by *the* baptism into his death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead * * * so also we should walk in newness of life." Notice that in verse 4 the baptism referred to is the baptism mentioned in verse 3. There is a reference only to *baptism* into Christ. There is not even a faint allusion to the ritual baptism by water.† The passage teaches nothing as to mode.

(2) If such an allusion be assumed, it is confusing to the Apostles' argument, as has been shown by Dr. Baird in the following passage:

"The burial of which the Apostle speaks is spiritual as well as the baptism. The two are in no sense identical;

*See Hodge in Commentary on *Pour in loco*.

†The student must study the rest of the passage for himself. Enough has been done to show that there is no need of an assumption of a reference to ritual baptism.

but the one is, by the Apostle, distinctly and sharply discriminated from the other. The baptism is the primary cause of which the burial is *one*, and but one, of the results. The baptism is the shedding upon us of the Holy Ghost of life in Christ Jesus. The burial is the putting away and obliterating the old man out of our lives. It follows that in any parallel figurative or ritual system, each one of these spiritual realities must have its own analogue, as distinctly defined and discriminated, each from the other, as are the realities which they are designed to represent. And in fact, such is the figurative system of the Scriptures, which represent one by the outpouring of water and the other by the burial of the dead. To interpret, therefore, a ritual *baptism* as symbolic of the spiritual *burial*, is as incongruous to the Scriptural conception, as would be the employment of the burial of the dead to represent the outpouring upon us of the spirit of life. And to understand the Apostle, by the expression, "buried by baptism," to mean directly the spiritual phenomenon which the phrase designates, and at the same time to convey an allusion to a ritual *baptism* as being a symbol of the *burial*, is an absurdity which does violence to the whole conception, to the destruction of its propriety and significance. For not only are the two thus sharply discriminated by Paul, but he attributes to each its own relations and predicates, and assigns to each its own place in the scheme of grace and in the argument which he states. To neglect, therefore, the distinction and confound them together, as is done by the Baptist interpretation, destroys the whole logical force and sequence of the argument, and dissolves the connection between the premises and conclusions (1)."

(3) The Apostle speaks not of immersion but burial, entombment. Hence if any one be still disposed to think that we have here an allusion to ritual baptism he has, yet, no ground for inferring that such baptism was by immersion.

συνετάφημεν, "We were buried." "We were entombed."
v. 4. This word has no reference to the rite of baptism, because the burial spoken of is not in water, but in a sep-

(1) Baird. The Great Baptizer. pp. 369, 370.

ulchre. *θάπτω* signifies, *to pay the last dues to a corpse*; and so at first to burn it, "then as the ashes were usually inurned and put under the ground, *to bury, inter, entomb*" Compare Liddell and Scott, *sub voce*. "Burial and baptism are totally diverse ideas and have nothing in common. In order to baptise the element of water must come into *contact* with the body baptized; but in a burial, the surrounding element of earth comes into no contact at all with the body buried. The corpse is carefully protected from the earth in which it is laid. Entombment, consequently, is not the emblem of baptism, but of death. Entombment would be even a more inappropriate term by which to describe the rite of baptism, than would "in-grafting," which follows as another emblem of the believer's union with Christ, and which has never been associated by commentators with the rite of baptism†."

It is thus made clear that in Rom. 6: 3, 4, there is naught to be learned of the form of water baptism.

The interpretation of this passage has given to the student the key to Col. 2:9-13. We need not deal with it further.

The unprejudiced mind cannot fail to see, we believe, that the comparisons which the Apostles make, of baptism, teach either nothing concerning the mode or teach that the rite was by affusion. The most of these comparisons were not of ritual baptism but of that of which ritual baptism is the symbol—*baptism with the Holy Spirit*.

†Shedd: Com. on Rom. *in loco*.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

Union Seminary Magazine.

Vol. X.

April-May, 1899.

No. 4.

I.—Literary.

MR. KIPLING'S VERSE.

It has rarely happened in the history of literature that a great writer has been equally great in poetry and in prose. Men who have talent only may do two things equally well; the man of genius is apt to do but one thing, but to do that one thing passing well. One of the unwritten reasons for denying that Bacon wrote Shakespeare's Plays is the difficulty of believing that the *Essays* and *Hamlet* were born of the same brain. Nevertheless, in the opinion of the world, Rudyard Kipling has accomplished the improbable, and, if popularity be an adequate test, has achieved not only supreme but equal excellence in story and in song.

It is at this late day perhaps a trite remark that Mr. Kipling has been happy in his command of subjects. He leads us into unknown lands and shows us men and deeds that are strange to us. His poetry—less, perhaps, than his prose, but still to a marked degree—borrows interest from its far-off background and setting.

Mandelay, with its "old Mulmein Pagoda" is as attractively novel to us in our clanging Western world as is Mowgli, the Jungle Man; and the "*Ballad of East and West*," that stirring tale of a time "when wolf and gray wolf meet," is only another "*Plain Tale from the Hills*," done in incomparably virile verse. Kipling's best work is popularly supposed to be in the noble *Recessional Hymn*,

to exact numbers in his visions of future things. And the theory of the composition of the book in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes puts the seventy prophetic weeks beyond reasonable explanation. It has been found, indeed, that the assignment of the book to that late age furnishes the sober student ten times more and greater difficulties, than its honest and truthful acceptance as the work of Daniel, one of the best and greatest men of all history.

SOME REMARKS ON PHILLIP SCHAFF'S ACCOUNT
OF THE MODE OF BAPTISM IN
THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

PROF. THOS. C. JOHNSON.

[*Concluded.*]

Dr. Schaff argues for immersion in the Apostolic Church, in the *fourth* place, "from the general custom of the ancient church, which prevails in the East to this day." In describing the form of baptism employed in the period 100 to 312, Dr. Schaff says that it was by immersion; and describes it as follows: "The immersion consisted in thrice dipping the head of the candidate who stood nude in the water. Single immersion seems to have been introduced by Eunomius about 360, but was condemned on pain of degradation, yet it reappeared afterward in Spain, and Pope Gregory I. declared both forms valid, the trine immersion as setting forth the Trinity, the single immersion the Unity of the Godhead. The Eastern Church, however, still adheres strictly to trine immersion. Baptism by *pouring* water from a shell or vessel or from a hand on the head of the candidate while he stood knee-deep or waist-deep in the water, occurs also and was probably considered equivalent to immersion. But baptism by *aspersio* or *sprinkling* was exceptional and applied only to infirm or sick persons; hence called *clinical* baptism. The validity

of this baptism was even doubted by many in the third century; and Cyprian wrote in its defence, taking the ground that the mode of application of water was a matter of minor importance provided that faith was present in the recipients and ministrant. According to ecclesiastical law, at least, it incapacitated for clerical office."*

Now, the argument is that the early church would not have practiced this mode so widely had they not had Apostolic example and teaching. The early church was prevalently immersionist; it would not have so generally practiced immersion had not this been the mode of the Apostolic Church. Hence, immersion *was* the mode of the Apostolic Church.

In reply, we freely admit that immersion was widely practiced between 150 A. D. and 250 A. D. But we observe :

(1) That this argument proves too much about baptism in the Apostolic Age. From Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Tertullian and Cyprian, a picture of baptism can be drawn that no honest Christian would be willing to call Apostolic as to mode. Not one of these writers gives the simple picture of the rite which is given by New Testament writers. Moreover, they represent the manner of its administration as changing. They present a picture of an ordinance in process of change, each one a picture of the thing as it was in his day.

As early as the end of the second and beginning of the third century in baptizing a candidate the following things were done: The candidate in a solemn vow renounced the service of the devil, professed that of Christ and confessed faith in the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost; the minister offered an appropriate prayer; the candidate was immersed three times in the triune name; after the application of the water a kiss of peace was given him and a mixture of milk and honey administered. "He was then anointed and marked on the forehead with the sign of the cross. Finally, the presiding minister, by laying on of hands, bestowed the benediction. Tertullian endeavors to explain some of these ceremonies. The flesh, he says, is

*Schaff: Hist. of Christian Church, vol. ii. pp. 248.

washed, that the soul may be freed from spots; the flesh is anointed that the soul may be consecrated; the flesh is marked (with the sign of the cross), that the soul may be guarded; the flesh is overshadowed by the imposition of hands, that the soul may be enlightened by the spirit.(1) From the writings of Cyprian it may be learned that in his time, perhaps before, exorcism of the devil was made a part of the rite of baptism. It was regularly made so by conciliar action in 256 A. D. Very early also the candidates were nude while being baptized.

Such was baptism in the early Church. Are we to conclude, therefore, that when Peter and his helpers baptized the multitude of believers on the day of Pentecost, that he put them through all these processes,—exorcised them, kissed them, gave them milk and honey, anointed them and marked them with the sign of the cross, layed hands on them and pronounced the benediction on them? And that they were naked while receiving baptism? To such a conclusion immersionist logic leads.

(2). This argument proves too much about the worship, the government and the theology of the Apostolic Church.

Worship began to suffer violation in the ancient church, 100-312. The elements used in the Lord's Supper were spoken of in terms of exaggeration and regarded with awe. They were sometimes looked upon as the very body and blood of our Lord. Communicants began to stand while receiving the supper, supposing that they thus honored God more than by sitting. Confession came to be looked on as meritorious and penance began to take the place of evangelical repentance. Men dragged the sign of the cross into worship.

The polity of the church was changed in the same period almost universally. Our Baptist brethren say that the polity of the Apostolic Church had been Congregationalist. We say it had been Presbyterian in the Apostolic age. But by 250 A. D., it was Episcopal generally—thoroughgoing Episcopal and the High Church type, too, in some quarters. All admit this.

(1) W. D. Killen; *History of Ancient Christianity*, pp. 480-481. Scribners. New York. 1869. Comp. Schaff, ii, p. 251.

The doctrines of the Church of 100 to 250 A. D., contain some things which we cannot find in the New Testament. When we read of "sins *cleansed* by repentance, or by alms and faith;" when we read of saints as saved by works of righteousness which they had done, we see that the Church had gotten off New Testament ground. The sacramentarianism of the Church was another mark of difference between it and the New Testament Church. Other defections from the true faith might be pointed out.

But the logic of the immersionist argument, which we are now considering, pushes them to take the position that inasmuch as the early Church held these views concerning the Lord's Supper, Confession, Penance, Church Government, &c., &c., that we ought to infer that the Apostolic Church also held them.

(3). The early church was, in the main, ignorant, with unusually strong inclinations toward the adulteration of the Gospel; and it is consequently worth very little as an instructor of our own age in regard to the life and teachings of Christ and the Apostles.

The two greatest teachers after the death of John and before 317, were Tertullian and Cyprian of North Africa. Tertullian was a brilliant and scholarly lawyer, but erratic and always more of a lawyer than a true theologian in his theological works. Cyprian was a civilian of high rank, and possessed some literary skill. He was busy during the ten or eleven years of his life after he became a Christian in the administration of his bishopric and in writing. His teachings spring, therefore, from many sources other than the Scriptures. The bishops and elders of the Church of this period were in the main pious and consecrated men, but poor teachers of the truth, for the simple reason that they had no large acquaintance with it. They were ignorant.

The Church of this age had also unusually strong tendencies toward the adulterations of the Gospel. It was essentially a missionary church on missionary ground, and all churches in foreign mission fields will mingle elements of old faiths with the new, unless they are exceptionally well guided. The ancient church, unlike the missionary Church of China, for example, had no guidance from

without; and the elements from which it was composed made it the breeder and nursery of departures. Its members were Jews or Gentiles. The Gentiles had been devotees of one or more of a multitude of religions. They were of the lower, middle classes for the most part, people with little or no education. In cases where scholars became Christians they were often sowers of error by reason of the false beliefs which they had not thrown off, but had brought with them into the Church.

If all the white people south of Mason's and Dixon's line were carried elsewhere, and our negroes left to develop their own civilization and churches uninfluenced from the outside, who can doubt that fifty years from now these negro churches would exhibit multitudinous gross and multi-form departures from the teaching now current in evangelical churches, white and black, in this territory today. What mongrel and monster rites would the visitor come upon in some communities, and what general departures!

So between the high plane of the Apostolic teaching and the teaching of the fathers of the subsequent age there, was a vast fall. The fathers are not competent to witness as to what happened in the Apostolic age. While they were truthful men in the main, and may be trusted where they speak of that of which they were competent to speak, they are not competent to speak of much. Moreover, they assumed so often to improve on the Apostolic customs and teaching, that they cannot be taken as intending to say that they did so and so *because* the Apostles did. When they immersed, who shall say that therein, they say, "We believe that Apostles immersed, or know that they immersed." What is to hinder our saying, "Maybe they declare: Whatever the Apostolic mode, *immersion* is better than pouring or sprinkling, therefore, *we immerse*?"

The view which has been expressed here about the incompetence of the Ancient Church, as distinguished from the Apostolic, to teach us about what occurred in the Apostolic age, is admitted by the majority of great Protestant historians, and held by almost all Protestant bodies save the Anglican church. The Baptists themselves hold it in spite of making this point when arguing for immersion.

It has been thus seen that this argument for immersion resolves itself into straw. It is true that the Ancient Church, 100-312, baptized commonly, or at least more commonly by immersion. But this, when taken alone, shows nothing about *baptism* in the Apostolic age, except that it may (or may not) have been by immersion. When the Biblical arguments are taken into consideration it can mean nothing but that the Church had abandoned the Biblical mode for one which has seemed to it better. As it threw away the Biblical polity for one monarchial in character, so it threw away the simple Biblical rite of baptism for one which in its own eyes was more imposing.

But it may be asked why it threw away the Biblical rite for immersion, if such is the case? We do not believe that this question is impossible of at least partial answer. But we would remind the student that men's motives for a given course of conduct are often most obscure. In many cases we know not the motives of the suicide. Nevertheless, we are able to say, Yesterday he was alive and apparently a happy man. This morning he was found dead by suicide. We know that he took his life. We don't know why. And the fact that we do not know why in no wise diminishes our certainty that he killed himself.

So of changes in the history of the Church. We know that there was no use of the cross in the Apostolic Church, *i. e.*, none such authorized by the Apostles. We know that in the Ancient Church, 100-312, there was a widespread use of the cross in worship. What were the reasons for its adoption in this manner? One historian suggests that its use in worship was borrowed from heathen worship. Another explains its adoption in another manner. Who certainly knows? Suppose all are ignorant. Its adoption was nevertheless a fact.

So though we cannot explain why the Church should have adopted immersion instead of affusion as the mode of baptism, if it appears on other grounds that baptism was by affusion in the Apostolic age and by immersion in 200 A. D., we know *there has been a change.*

But some reasons why the church of Tertullian's time, say, should have thought immersion the preferable mode are not wanting :

(1). The Church ran rapidly into sacramentalism, as we have shown. Sacramentalism in its early stages, among a simple people who have not yet developed scholastic leaders, calls for an abundant use of the material element to which is tied the invisible grace. It is supposed that there must be a free and large use of the symbol in order to a copious infusion of grace. Cyprian of Carthage actually combatted this idea in his day: "In the saving sacrament," says he, "the contagion of sin is not washed away just in the same way as is the filth of the skin and body in the ordinary ablution of the flesh, so that there should be need of saltpetre and other appliances, and a bath and a pool in which the poor body may be washed and cleansed * * * It is apparent that the sprinkling of water has like force with the saving washing, and that when this is done in the church, when the faith both of giver and receiver is entire, all holds good and is consummated and perfected by the power of the Lord, and the truth of faith." (1)

The implication is unmistakable here that in Cyprian's time many sacramentarians connected the efficacy of the rite with the quantity of water used and the energy of the washing. But Cyprian, an educated man, though a sacramentarian, held no such view. And we shall find that after the Church has become seven hundred years older it too can remain sacramentarian while letting go the conception that the amount of grace is proportioned to the amount of water.

We repeat then, that immersion suited sacramentalism in its early stages in the Christian Church. Many Christians believed that the more water used in baptism, the more grace given. We cited in proof of this a passage in Cyprian. The same inference may be drawn from other ancient writings, *e. g.*, from the gibes of Julian the Apostle against the Christian baptism of his day.

The student may strengthen this argument indefinitely for himself.*

(2) Work righteousness began to crop into the Church

(1) Epist. lxxvi. p. 321, quoted in Killen; Ancient Christianity, pp. 479, 480.

*[See here the "Didactic Term Apostolocism," Chap. vii.]

immediately on the death of the Apostles. Merit was discovered in everything that the believer did; and many things were invented for him to do that his merit might be increased.

Immersion as being a larger thing, involving more trouble and inconvenience, attended by greater risk to health, and withall exhibiting the candidate shivering and sputtering in greater apparent humility, suited the genius of the religion of work-righteousness well. And for this reason, in part, in all probability, it came into use.

(3). It appealed, when practiced at all, to the imagination and the pride. There are persons to-day who do not like to be received into the church simply by confession of their faith before the elders: they wish to make confession before the world. In some cases the motives may be correct; in others, however, it is due to egotism that the candidate desires to make a more public confession. So in the case of baptism; some persons to-day appear to desire immersion on account of their egotism. The candidate becomes the cynosure of all eyes for the time, while being immersed. Hence immersion is desired.

(4). It is probable that in an age of meagre historical knowledge the Church was influenced unduly, as our Baptist brethren are to-day, by the supposed original meaning of the term *βαπτίζεν*.

This may or may not be a sufficient explanation of the change in mode of baptism. But we remind the student, again, that if our explanation be thought insufficient, that does not disprove the fact of change.

The degraded ancient Church was trying to improve on God's plans in many particulars; that it baptized generally by immersion proves only and simply that in its eyes immersion was better than sprinkling; not that it was the mode of the Apostolic Church.

Even if it be held to create a presumption in favor of the view that immersion was the mode in Apostolic times, it cannot stand in the presence of those proofs already advanced in favor of the view that baptism in those times was by affusion, pouring or sprinkling.

We believe it has now been fairly and conclusively shown that not one of the vaunted Baptist arguments is worth

anything to support immersion ; and not only so, but that the facts on which they rely, rightly interpreted, point in the direction of affusion. The use of βαπτίζεν in Hellenistic Greek, of cleansing and purifying rites, of affusion, and never of immersion, of persons, but often of affusion or sprinkling of persons, grounds a strong inference that Christian baptism was by affusion ; the analogy of John's baptism would seem to teach affusion ; the comparisons which the Apostles make of baptism with the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, with the escape of the Ark from the Deluge, with a cleansing and refreshing bath, and with burial and resurrection, either teach nothing at all about the rite of *water baptism*, as not speaking of it, or imply affusion.

Their strongest argument would be the practice of the Church of the time of Tertullian, which was immersion, if the Church had not been given to substituting its own devices for God's ordinances. As it is, the practice of immersion 200 to 900 A. D. can do no more than the Roman Catholic Church's doctrine of Transubstantiation, which grew up between 150 and 1100 A. D. They simply point us back to the Scriptures to see whether they are true or not.

But in the first place, the case of those who hold to baptism by affusion either by pouring or sprinkling, is much stronger than it has hitherto appeared in our study. So far we have examined the grounds of the *immersionists*. We have seen that those grounds really support the doctrine of *baptism by affusion*, and support it strongly. But there are other arguments which add to the strength of our position. We have dealt with the arguments of the immersionists at such length that we must necessarily be brief in what remains ; but we must state compendiously at least four more arguments in favor of baptism by affusion—viz :

- (1). From its chief symbolic significance.
- (2). From the Jewish mode of purification taken in connection with the Scriptural identification of baptism with Jewish purification. (John iii : 25, 26).
- (3). From the Divine design of baptism as a rite for the Church in every clime and among all classes.
- (4). From a tabulation of New Testament passages referring to the rite of baptism.

(1). The chief symbolical significance of baptism is cleansing by the Holy Ghost.

The Baptists claim that baptism signifies and commemorates primarily Christ's burial and resurrection. But they can point to no other Scriptures than Rom. vi: 3-5; Col. ii: 12, and I. Cor. xv: 29. And we have seen that the first two of these passages contain no reference to the mode of baptism, and indeed speak only of spiritual baptism and not of water, or ritual baptism at all. As for I. Cor. xv: 29, "he would be a hardy man who would base any theory on a passage so obscure." It is probable that the Apostle refers here to the Levitical rule of Num. xix: 14-19. There is thus no authority for this element in the Baptist doctrine.

But that baptism signifies purification or cleansing by the Holy Ghost may be argued from the Levitical purifyings with which baptism was identified by New Testament writers, and is either expressly taught or necessarily implied in the following Scripture passages: Acts x: 47, 48, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Acts xxii: 16, "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Tit. iii: 5, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Heb. x: 22, "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

These Scriptures make it abundantly clear that baptism signifies cleansing by the Holy Ghost. Even Baptists hold that this is part of the significance of baptism. But they do not give it that place which it merits and which the Scriptures give it, owing to their desire to make baptism signify Christ's *burial*, about which the Scriptures are silent.

The Scriptures, then, make baptism signify cleansing by the Holy Ghost. The Scriptures also represent this cleansing Spirit as "descending," as "falling," or "poured."

This representation is universal in Scripture. There is not an instance to the contrary. Illustrations of this method of representation may be seen in Acts ii: 2-4: "And suddenly there came a sound *from heaven* as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting," &c. ii: 15-18: "For these are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will *pour out* my Spirit upon all flesh * * * And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will *pour out* in those days of my Spirit," &c.* ii: 33, "Therefore being by the right hand

*Dr. Broadus tries to obviate the force of this point as follows: "But what is the sense of maintaining that when two symbols or images represent the same thing they must therefore be the same image or symbol? What was predicted as a baptism is afterwards described as a pouring. Well, if I say a man is bathed in pleasure, and presently speak of him as drinking from the cup of pleasure, would any one argue that the action of bathing is the same as drinking from a cup? Peter quotes the prophet as using the image of pouring, while our Lord had used the image of baptism; therefore pouring and baptism are the same thing. Christ is called a lamb, and is also called a shepherd; therefore a lamb and a shepherd is the same thing." P. 57 *Ibid.*

1st. The sense in maintaining that the two symbols, *in this case*, are the same thing, appears in the fact that one of these passages records the manner of the fulfilment of the promise recorded in the other. Suppose the second is equally figurative with the first, yet it records a historic event in the spiritual world in such and such terms, and thus teaches that the spiritual baptism was by affusion. And it is an outstanding fact that the Apostles were wont to talk of a "*shedding forth*," a "*falling upon*" of the Holy Ghost, which was spiritual baptism, and granted the right to administer water baptism to those upon whom the Holy Ghost had thus fallen.

2d. It may be foolish to say that "a lamb and a shepherd is the same thing," because the Scriptures call Christ a lamb and also a shepherd. We quite agree that it is. Christ has many functions; he may be called by as many names corresponding thereto: That grounds no right of saying that the functions are identical. But Dr. Broadus seems confused; we are not here concerned with diverse functions of a being, but with one operation of a being to which two terms are applied. The operation is that of the Holy Spirit on the hearts of men whereby they are renewed and enabled to lead spiritual lives. This one operation is now called a

of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath *shed forth* this, which ye now see and hear." x: 44, 45, 48, "While Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost *fell on* all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was *poured out* the gift of the Holy Ghost. * * * And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord."

Now, there is perfect harmony in our conception. As the Holy Ghost is poured out upon, shed forth, falls on men and makes them the children of God, so we *affuse* with water, the great cleansing element in nature, in symbolism of the Holy Ghost's blessed work, those whom we believe to have received the Holy Ghost. We thus figure forth the work of God. Immersion not only takes no account of these Scriptural representations of the Divine method in regenerating us, it runs in the teeth of them. The Holy Ghost falls upon us, a cleansing agent of Almighty power. Christ sends him down upon us. Christ's minister, seeing that we have received the Holy Ghost, may well ask, Can any forbid water—the great cleansing element in nature—that we should not apply in symbol of the cleansing of the Holy Ghost? Analogy demands affusion. And it is to be remarked that Peter, in such a case, said, "Can any forbid water that these should not be *baptized*?" He used a word, βαπτίζεν, which in his day was applied to rites of purification of persons by sprinkling and never by immersion with Old Testament warrant. Peter, a loyal Jew, would wish to affuse in symbol of purification by the Holy Ghost, in the absence of instructions to the contrary.

It is thus seen that these texts, which teach that the grace of regeneration symbolized in baptism is shed forth, not only ground a strong argument from analogy that water should be sprinkled or poured in baptism, but con-

baptizing. and now a "pouring out," "shedding forth," &c. Suppose these words are figurative, yet if there be any justice in language, they must have a common meaning. The one interprets the other. There can be no dubiety about the meaning of "pouring out," "shedding forth." Hence the common meaning is clear.

tain other evidence, as seen in the case of Acts x: 44-48, that baptism was by affusion.

It might also be shown that baptism refers to our cleansing from guilt by expiation; that expiation is symbolized in Scripture as sprinkled or affused or put on; and that, therefore, again analogy demands that our baptism be by affusion, by the application of water to us.

(2). From the Jewish mode of purification taken in connection with the Scriptural identification of baptism with Jewish purifications, John iii: 25, 26, "There arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about *purifyings*; and they came unto John and said unto him, Rabbi, he that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, behold the same *baptizeth* and all men came unto him."

The question between "some of John's disciples and the Jews" is here put to John, viz: the meaning of Christ's baptizing. Baptizing is thus identified with *purifying*. The Levitical purifications were, of persons, all by sprinkling or affusion of some grade. Hence the inference is immediate and necessary: Christian baptism to-day should be by affusion. Baptism and the Jewish purifyings were enough alike in significance and mode to create the popular impression that they were identical.

(3). From the Divine design of baptism as a rite for the Church in every clime and among all classes. In many countries water is inconveniently scarce for immersionists. In extensive regions it is frozen up for half the year. Many persons are too frail to undergo the physical risk of immersion. This being true, it is highly improbable that a religion which places so little stress on forms which has rites so few and simple, should have one so burdensome, indecent and dangerous to multitudes to whom it is the Church's duty to carry the Gospel.

(4). Finally, we may place all the New Testament passages which refer to ritual baptism in three columns, one of which is headed, "*Cases which in the absence of other Scriptures might suggest immersion, but which admit of the affusion interpretation without straining*"; "*Cases which more naturally suggest some other mode than immersion,*" and "*Cases incompatible with immersion.*"

(a) There are Scripture passages which, in the absence of other texts, might suggest immersion. They are, however, easily interpreted in consistency with the view that affusion was the mode.

These are : Matt. iii: 6, 16 ; Mark i: 9 ; John iii: 22-23 ; Acts viii: 38-39. The passage which favors immersion most is Mark i: 9, "Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens rent asunder," &c. The conception of the affusionist may be roughly stated as follows : Jesus came from Nazareth unto the Jordan ; He was baptized (by affusion) while standing with his feet in the water (a natural position for a foot traveller in a warm climate when near water). And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw, etc.

This conception which the affusionist may frame of the transaction, is probable in every way, and it satisfies fully the demands of the text. But it is not necessary for the advocate of affusion to grant even that the Master stood in the water while being baptized. The prepositions *eis* and *ek*, here rendered *in*, or *into*, and *out of*, "are in innumerable instances used to express motion toward, *unto*, and from.—Acts xxvi: 14 ; xxvii: 34, 40." Some affusionists would say, that probably "Jesus only went to the water, was baptized and immediately on going up from it, saw the," etc.

For ourselves, we prefer to think that our Lord on occasion of his baptism actually stood in the water, though his so standing was a mere accident of the scene and due to the convenience and comfort of the ministrator and the candidate.

So much for the explanation of the advocate of affusion. The conception of the immersionist is strictly as follows if he construes it accurately : "Jesus came unto the Jordan, he was baptized by submergence ; when he came up after the submergence, he saw," etc. This view satisfies the language of the inspired writer not a whit better than our own conception, and moreover has not one tenth the antecedent probability of being true. For this is the strongest text for immersion, in our judgment, between the lids of the Bible.

If it be said that we have a reference here not to Christian baptism but the baptism of John,* then the student may treat Acts viii: 38-39 as we have treated Mark i: 9. Affusion satisfies that text too as well as immersion.

(b) There are texts which suggest other modes than immersion: Acts xviii: 8; Tit. III: 3; Heb. x: 22; taken in connection with Ezek. xxxvi: 25; Mark vii: 4, 8; Luke xi: 38-40; Heb. ix: 10. This has been developed in another connection.

(c) Texts which exclude immersion: Acts ii: 41; ix: 18; x: 47-48; xvi: 15, 32-33. The baptism of the three thousand in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost; the baptism of Paul,—“standing up, be baptized” bade Ananias, (Acts xxii: 16); and “standing up, he was baptized” (Acts ix: 18); the baptism of Cornelius; the baptism of the jailor at Philippi,—all exclude the idea of immersion. In every one of these cases baptism was administered on the spot, just where the convert received the Gospel. There is nothing said of rivers, abundant water. “Vast numbers, individuals and families were baptized wherever they happened to be at the moment—in their houses, or prisons, or gathering place.”

We have now seen that not one of the arguments for immersion is sound; but that the facts misinterpreted in the support of immersion really support the doctrine of baptism by affusion; and we have seen that the doctrine of affusion is further confirmed by analogy with the graces symbolized by the design of baptism to be the initiatory rite of a universal religion, by the identification of baptism with Jewish purification rites of which affusion was the mode, where persons were concerned; and by a candid and unstrained interpretation of all the several texts which refer to Christian ritual baptism.

THOS. C. JOHNSON.

*The student will recall that we have identified John's baptism and Christian baptism.