

THE NEW  
SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA  
OF  
RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

EMBRACING

BIBLICAL, HISTORICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY  
AND BIBLICAL, THEOLOGICAL, AND ECCLESIASTICAL  
BIOGRAPHY FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES  
TO THE PRESENT DAY

Based on the Third Edition of the *Realencyklopädie*  
Founded by J. J. Herzog, and Edited by Albert Hauck

PREPARED BY MORE THAN SIX HUNDRED SCHOLARS AND SPECIALISTS  
UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF

SAMUEL MACAULEY JACKSON, D.D., LL.D.  
(*Editor-in-Chief*)

WITH THE ASSISTANCE OF

CHARLES COLEBROOK SHERMAN  
AND  
GEORGE WILLIAM GILMORE, M.A.  
(*Associate Editors*)

AND THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENT EDITORS

CLARENCE AUGUSTINE BECKWITH, D.D.  
(*Department of Systematic Theology*)

HENRY KING CARROLL, LL.D.  
(*Department of Minor Denominations*)

JOHN THOMAS CREAGH, D.D.  
(*Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders*)  
(VOL. I.)

JAMES FRANCIS DRISCOLL, D.D.  
(*Department of Liturgics and Religious Orders*)  
(VOLS. II. TO XII.)

JAMES FREDERIC M-CURDY, PH.D., LL.D.  
(*Department of the Old Testament*)

HENRY SYLVESTER NASH, D.D.  
(*Department of the New Testament*)

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., LL.D.  
(*Department of Church History*)

FRANK HORACE VIZETELLY, F.S.A.  
(*Department of Pronunciation and Typography*)

---

Complete in Twelve Volumes

---

FUNK AND WAGNALLS COMPANY  
NEW YORK AND LONDON

JAN 6 1909  
Divinity School  
(Burr fund)  
(I II)

COPYRIGHT, 1908, BY  
FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY

---

Registered at Stationers' Hall, London, England

---

[Printed in the United States of America]  
Published May, 1908

tially influenced by this tendency. The Anglican Prayer-book requires children who have been privately baptized to be brought to their parish church as soon as possible thereafter for a solemn ceremony of formal "reception into the Church."

**7. Sponsors:** The institution of godfathers and godmothers is not coeval with infant baptism, but originated in the custom of requiring an adult pagan unknown to the bishop to be accompanied, when he came to seek baptism, by a Christian who could vouch for him, and who was also bound to watch over his preparation and instruction. It is worth noting that in the Eleusinian mysteries the candidate to be initiated had a similar sponsor, known as *mystagogos*. The date of the Christian function is unknown. Since Tertullian is the first witness for sponsors at infant baptism (*De baptismo*, xviii), the custom must have been established before his time; and its existence may possibly be inferred from Justin (*I Apol.*, lxi, 2). But the duties attached in modern times to the office of sponsor are rather those which would be connected with infant baptism. The sponsor was obliged to represent the child, since the oldest baptismal formularies, drawn up for adults, were used without change for infants, who could not answer questions, make the renunciation, or recite the profession of faith. This is clearly brought out in the oldest Egyptian baptismal ritual, where the parents are regarded as the most natural sponsors. Augustine takes the same view (*Epist.*, xcvi, 6); but he also contemplates the bringing of children of slaves by their masters and of orphans or foundlings by other benevolent persons. Attempts have been made to prove that the sponsorship of parents continued the usual custom down to the eighth century, and that an innovation is represented by the Synod of Mainz (813); but it is usually the case that such synodal decisions have a long previous history and raise to the rank of laws things already established as customs. Thus the seventh Roman *Ordo* speaks simply of godfathers and godmothers, and mentions the parents only in connection with the oblation, and then in addition to the sponsors. Cæsar of Arles speaks clearly of the spiritual relationship into which the sponsors enter with the child in a way which, taken in connection with Augustinian ideas, would soon tend to exclude the parents from this office. Another consequence of the notion of spiritual affinity was the prohibition of marriage between sponsors, which appears as early as the Code of Justinian (V, iv, 26). The Trullan Council (canon liii) absolutely forbids marriage between a child's godfather and its mother. By the thirteenth century this view had extended so far as to prohibit marriages between the baptizer and the baptized or the latter's parents, between the sponsors themselves, between them or their children and the baptized person, or even between a godfather's widow and the godson or his natural parent. The Council of Trent diminished these restrictions, so that, according to the *Catechismus Romanus* (II, ii, 21), marriage is now forbidden only between baptizer or sponsor and the baptized person, and between the sponsors and parents.

The close relation between sponsors and child

was considered to lay a grave responsibility upon the former. Having renounced the devil and professed the faith on the child's behalf, they were bound to see that these vows were carried out. This is emphasized in the instructions of Cæsar of Arles and in those issued for the Frankish mission, where Charlemagne insisted that the sponsors should know the creed and the Lord's Prayer thoroughly. This insistence tended to diminish, though Thomas Aquinas still presupposed the instruction of children by their godparents (*Summa*, III, lxxi, 4); but the *Catechismus Romanus* complains that "nothing more than the bare name of this function remains," and attempts to enforce its duties.

Originally there was but one sponsor, but with the admission of parents to the office this principle was broken through. A tendency to increase the number as much as possible is attested by synodal decrees of the early Middle Ages, which place the proper number at two, three, or four. The Council of Trent allows only one sponsor of the same sex as the candidate, or at most two of different sexes. According to Roman Catholic law, a sponsor must have been baptized and preferably confirmed; the *Rituale Romanum* excludes infidels and heretics, those laboring under excommunication or interdict, notorious criminals, the insane, and those ignorant of the rudiments of the faith; monks and nuns, since their separation from the world makes it difficult for them to perform the duties, are not supposed to undertake them.

The institution of sponsors was retained, with infant baptism, by the Evangelical Churches at the Reformation. Though parents were still excluded, the notion of spiritual affinity was dropped, and any baptized Christian is now, though it was not usual at first, permitted to take the office without regard to his creed—a latitude which would be illogical if the function carried with it the duty of religious instruction, as it does not at present. Some among those who recognize that it is practically an empty form are in favor of abolishing it altogether, while others would have it reformed and made once more a living reality. [The Anglican baptismal office (which contemplates two godfathers and one godmother for a boy, and vice versa) contains a solemn charge to them as to their duties, including spiritual instruction and bringing the child to confirmation at the proper time.]

(P. DREWS.)

**IV. Discussion of Controverted Points.—1. The Argument against the Necessity of Immersion:** In the view of those who do not practise immersion, baptism is a "washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," in which the "dipping of the person into the water is not necessary;" but it may be "rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person" (*Westminster Shorter Catechism*, Q. xciv, and *Confession*, xxviii, 3). "We must bear in mind," said Walafrid Strabo a thousand years ago (*De rebus eccl.*, xxvi, *MPL*, cxiv, 959), "that many have been baptized not only by immersion but by affusion, and may yet be so baptized if necessary." "Whether the person who

is baptized," says John Calvin ("Institutes," IV, xv, 19 end), "be wholly immersed, or whether thrice or once, or whether water be only poured or sprinkled upon him, is of no importance." "The mode of applying water as a purifying medium," says Charles Hodge (*Systematic Theology*, iii, 526), "is unessential."

This is the position occupied also by Thomas Aquinas, *Summa*, III, lxxvi, 7; *Catechismus ex decreto Concilii Tridentini*, Leipsic ed., 1853, p. 136 (Eng. transl. by J. Donovan, London, 1833, p. 155); Dominicus a Soto, *Distinc.*, III, i, 7; Durandus, *In sententias*, IV, iii, 4; William Lyndwood, *Provincialis*, iii, 25; Giovanni Perrone, *Prælectiones theologicae*, vi, 10; C. Pesch, *Prælectiones theologicae*, vol. vi, Freiburg, 1900, pp. 150-151; T. M. J. Goussset, *Théologie dogmatique*, vol. ii, Paris, 1850, p. 412; H. von Hurter, *Theologia dogmatica compendium*, vol. iii, p. 210, § 324; P. Minges, *Compendium theologiae dogmaticæ specialis*, part ii, Munich, 1901, p. 45; J. Dalponte, *Compendium theologiae dogmaticæ specialis*, Trent, 1890, VII, i, 814, p. 565; R. Owen, *Dogmatic Theology*, London, 1887, p. 405; Darwell Stone, *Holy Baptism*, Oxford, 1899, pp. 135 sqq.; H. E. Jacobs, *Summary of Christian Doctrine*, Philadelphia, 1905, p. 329 sqq.; H. L. J. Heppel, *Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformirten Kirche*, Elberfeld, 1861, p. 441; B. de Moor, *Commentarius in J. Marckii compendium theologiae*, 7 parts, Leyden, 1761-78, XXX, ix, vol. v, p. 413; J. J. van Oosterzee, *Christian Dogmatics*, New York, 1874, p. 749; H. Bavinck, *Gerreformeerde Dogmatiek*, vol. iv, Kampen, 1901, p. 273; A. Grébillat, *Exposé de théologie systématique*, vol. iv, Neuchâtel, 1890, p. 493; R. L. Dabney, *Syllabus and Notes*, p. 764; E. D. Morris, *Theology of the Westminster Symbols*, Cincinnati, 1901, pp. 678 sqq.; R. V. Foster, *Systematic Theology*, Nashville, 1898, pp. 749 sqq.; W. B. Pope, *Compendium of Christian Theology*, vol. iii, London, 1879, p. 322; Miner Raymond, *Systematic Theology*, vol. iii, Cincinnati, 1877, p. 359; John Miley, *Systematic Theology*, vol. ii, New York, 1894, p. 397; N. Burwash, *Manual of Christian Theology*, vol. ii, London, 1900, p. 359; H. C. Sheldon, *System of Christian Doctrine*, Cincinnati, 1903, pp. 520 sqq.; J. W. Etter, *Doctrine of Christian Baptism*, Dayton, Ohio, 1888, p. 121; J. Weaver, *Christian Theology*, Dayton, Ohio, 1900, p. 250.

It is important to keep in mind the exact point which is in debate. This is not whether the Greek word which was adopted to designate this sacrament, and which has passed into English as "to baptize," means "to immerse." Nor is it whether the early Christians, or even the apostles, baptized by immersion. It is whether so slender a circumstance as the mode of applying the water can be so of the essence of baptism that nothing can be baptism except an immersion.

The contention that immersion alone can be baptism is usually based on the presumption that baptism was originally administered by immersion. It does not appear, however, that, granting the fact, the inference from it is stringent. Its assumption throws baptism out of analogy with all other Christian usages, with the sister sacrament of the

Lord's Supper, and with itself in other particulars. Probably no one immersion, even if it were the validity of the Lord's Supper depends upon painfully conforming in the mode of its celebration to all the circumstantial details of its first celebration. The Lord's Supper was instituted at an evening meal, as a part of a household feast which was itself the culminating act of an annual festival, from which it derived deep significance; in a private gathering, of men alone, who received the elements in a reclining posture. No one seeks to reproduce any of these things in the manner of

its celebration. Even the use of unleavened bread, which might be thought a more intimate circumstance, is treated as a matter of indifference by a large part of Christendom. If primitive baptism were by immersion, it will scarcely be doubted that it was administered to completely nude recipients. The Jews, in their parallel rite of proselyte baptism, insisted upon this to such an extent that "a ring on the finger, a band confining the hair, or anything that in the least degree broke the continuity of contact with the water, was held to invalidate the act" (C. Taylor, *The Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, Cambridge, 1886, pp. 51, 52). The allusions of the early Fathers imply a like nudity in their method of celebrating the Christian rite (Bingham, *Origines*, XI, xi, 1; *DCA*, i, 160). Few would demand that this usage should be imitated. In the midst of so much freedom in the circumstantial details of Christian ordinances, it is not obvious that the mode of applying the water must be treated as of the essence of the sacrament.

Nor is it easy to be sure what the mode of applying the water employed by the apostles was; or whether indeed it was uniform. No apostolic record in the New Testament. In the record the New Testament gives of acts of baptism, the mode in which the water was applied is never described.

It is never even implied with a clearness which would render differences of interpretation impossible. Nor does what we may think the most natural suggestion seem in all instances to be to the same effect. If we are inclined to fancy the phrase "to baptize in water" (Gk. *baptizein en hydati*, Matt. iii, 11; John i, 26, 31, 33) suggestive of immersion, we can not fail soon to recall that it may just as well mean "with water" and that it is varied, even in parallel passages, to the simple dative of cause, manner, means, or instrument (Mark i, 8; Luke iii, 16; Acts i, 5; xi, 16). If "baptizing in the river Jordan" (Matt. iii, 6; Mark i, 5), varied even to what some unidiomatically render "baptizing into Jordan" (Mark i, 9), strikes us as intimating immersion, we are bound to bear in mind that both phrases may just as well be translated "at Jordan" (Thayer's *Lexicon*, s.v. *ἐν*, I, 1, c; cf. esp. Luke xiii, 4, and F. Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Eng. transl., London, 1898, p. 122); just as we are bound to bear in mind of those passages which, in our English Bible, speak of going "down into the water" to be baptized and coming "up out of the water" after baptism (Mark i, 10; Acts viii, 38, 39), that they may just as well be rendered going "down [to] the water" and "coming up from the water"; and just as we are bound to bear in mind in the presence of all such passages that there are other manners of baptizing besides immersion, which require for their accomplishment going into and coming out of the water. If we read of a locality being selected for baptizing "because there was much water," or, possibly better, "because there were many waters," that is, numerous pools, or springs, or rivulets there (John iii, 23), we read also of the

administration of baptism in circumstances in which there is no likelihood that "much water" was available—for example, in a private house (Acts x, 47, where the water almost seems to have been something to be brought and expended in the act; cf. Acts ix, 18; xxii, 16), or even in the noisome jail at Philippi (Acts xvi, 33). Candor would seem to compel the admission that not only is there no stress laid in the New Testament on the mode of applying the water in baptism, but that all the allusions to baptism in the New Testament can find ready explanation on the assumption of any of the modes of administration which have been widely practised in the Churches.

In these circumstances it is not strange that appeal should be made to subsidiary lines of investigation, in the hope that by their means at least a probable judgment may be reached as to the mode in which baptism was administered in apostolic times. Of these, most frequent appeal has been made to these three: the philology of the term employed in the New Testament to designate baptism; the archeology of the rite as practised in the Churches; the inherent symbolism of the sacrament. It must be confessed that the results of this threefold appeal are less decisive than could have been wished.

It is of course true that the term "to baptize" goes back to a root which bears the sense of "deep" (cf. W. W. Skeat, *Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, Oxford, 1882, p. 733, no. 89). Its immediate primitive, the Greek verb *baptein*, from which it is formed by adding the termination *-izein*, which gives it a repetitive or intensive meaning (cf. Jelf's *Greek Grammar*, i, 331, § 330), naturally, therefore, has the sense "to dip," while "baptize" itself would primarily

3. Philo- mean "to dip repeatedly" or "to logical Con-dip effectively." Even the primitive siderations. verb, *baptein*, of course, acquired secondary senses founded on its fundamental implication of "dipping," but ultimately leaving it out of sight. Thus, as iron is tempered by dipping, when applied to iron *baptein* came to mean "to temper"; as garments are dyed by dipping, *baptein* came to mean, when applied to garments, "to dye"; and it soon passed on to mean simply, without any implication of the mode by which it is accomplished, "to temper," "to dye," "to steep," "to imbue," and the like. When, for example, the Greek bully threatened his fellow that he would "dye [*baptein*] him with the dye of Sardis"—a place famous for its red dye—he meant precisely what the English bully means when he threatens his fellow "to give him a bloody coxcomb," and was as far as possible from implying that the effect would be produced by a process of dipping. So when we read in the common Greek version of Dan. iv, 30 (35); v, 21, that Nebuchadnezzar was "wet [*baptein*] with the dew of heaven," there is no implication whatever of the mode of the application of the dew to his person. The derivative, *baptizein*, of course, lent itself even more kindly to the development of these secondary senses, because, as an intensive form, it naturally emphasized the effect. Accordingly

it is rarely used more literally than of the sinking of ships by storm or by war, with the implication, of course, of their destruction; or of the bathing of persons (Eubulus, *Nausicaa*, 1), with the implication, of course, of their cleansing. It passes freely over into such metaphorical usages as when a drunkard is spoken of as baptized with wine, a profligate as baptized with debt, a city as baptized with sleep, a hapless youth as baptized with questions, or as when the prophet (Isa. xxi, 4, LXX) is made to say he is baptized with iniquity; the English equivalent in such cases being something like "overwhelmed," "steeped," or the like. Such a term obviously lay close at hand for application to the Jewish ceremonial lustrations, in which, not the mode, but the effect of the application of the water receives the stress. In the Greek Old Testament it has not yet, indeed, obtained the position of the technical designation of these lustrations. But the beginnings of such a usage are already traceable there (Ecclus. xxxi, 30 [xxxiv, 25]; Judith xii, 7; cf. II Kings v, 14); and by the time the New Testament was written it seems to have supplanted the term commonly employed in the Greek Old Testament [*louesthai*] for this purpose (cf. Cremer, s.v., and J. A. Robinson, in *JTS*, Jan., 1906, vii, 26, 187-189). At least that term occurs in the New Testament only once of a ceremonial lustration, and then only in connection with *baptizein* as explaining its effects, while *baptizein* occurs quite naturally in this sense (Mark vii, 4; Luke xi, 38; Heb. ix, 10) and is the term adopted, probably from such a preceding use, to designate the symbolical washing proclaimed by John the Baptist, and the Christian rite which is called "baptism." In these circumstances it seems very rash to assume that the word was applied to the Christian rite in its primitive meaning of "to dip"; or indeed that any implication of that primitive meaning still clings to it in this application. The presumption is very strong that even in its preliminary use of the Jewish lustrations, it had already "lost its earlier significance of 'dipping,' or 'immersing'" and "acquired the new religious significance of 'ceremonial cleansing by water'" (J. A. Robinson, ut sup.; cf. *EB*, i, 473; *DB*, i, 238). In any event the stress of the word in its application to the Christian rite is not upon the mode in which the water is applied in it, but to its effect as a symbolical cleansing. The etymology of the word, in short, throws no clear light on the mode of applying the water in baptism in the usage of the apostles.

Nor does archeology lend much more aid. It is, indeed, true that the present divergences in the practise of the Churches are the result of growth, and that behind them lies what without much straining may be called a universal usage of at least theoretical immersion. And it is true that the earliest clear intimation which has come down to us of the manner in which Christians baptized, belonging probably to about the middle of the second century (found in the seventh chapter of the *Didache*), contemplates normal baptism as by immersion. But it is equally true that throughout the whole patristic period no one ever doubted the entire validity of baptism administered in other modes of

applying the water. The Didache makes provision for baptism by affusion whenever water in sufficient quantity for immersion is not at hand

**4. Archeological Considerations.** (cf. A. Harnack, *Lehre der zwölf Apostel*, Leipsic, 1884, pp. 23-24; F. X. Funk, *Doctrina duodecim apostolorum*, Tübingen, 1887, p.3); and Cyprian (*Epist.*, lxxv [lxix], 12-14; *ANF*, v, 401) argues

the whole case out with respect to the baptism of the sick by affusion. No contrary voice is ever raised; but in various ways a full body of testimony is borne to the unhesitating acceptance, throughout the early Church, of baptism by affusion as equally valid with that by immersion. And despite the consentient testimony of the literature of the period to immersion as normal baptism, the entire testimony of the monuments is to the opposite effect (cf. C. F. Rogers, *Baptism and Christian Archaeology*, in the Oxford *Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*, IV, v; also *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct., 1896, pp. 601-644). This monumental evidence comes, it is true, from only a single section of the Church,—that which had its center at Rome; but it makes it clear that from the second century down to a comparatively late date baptism as actually administered, in that region at least, was not an immersion but an affusion, although ordinarily apparently affusion upon a nude recipient standing in shallow water. When we realize that this was the actual mode of baptism in the early Roman Church, we catch apparent allusions to it in the literature of other portions of the Church also, and begin to suspect it may have been prevalent elsewhere too. Indeed, we are deterred from confidently ascribing it to the Apostolic Church itself chiefly by the gulf of a century's width which separates the Apostolic Church from our earliest evidence, literary or monumental. This is not a century over which we may lightly leap. During its course the church usages for which we have both first and second century evidence changed greatly; and all the conditions for a development of new usages with respect to the mode of baptism were present in the circumstances of the times. Nor can we be helped over the gulf by the analogy of the Jewish proselyte baptism. For, in the first place, the points of departure of the two usages were different. The Jewish rite was rooted specifically in the bath preliminary to sacrifice; the Christian took hold through the command of our Lord and the baptism of John of the entire lustration system and tradition. And in the next place, the Jewish usage, just because a development of the presacrificial bath, owed its elaboration into a separate rite, to the cessation of the sacrifices, which threw the bath into an importance it could not have had in their presence; it is therefore too late in its origin to have served as a model for Christian baptism.

We are left, therefore, to the essential symbolism of the rite to indicate how it must needs be administered, and how, therefore, the apostles must have administered it. If, indeed, it could be established that the essential symbolism of the rite is burial and resurrection with Christ, an application of the water in such a manner as to suggest this might well be thought necessary to its proper

administration. There are many who take this view, and seek support for themselves in the connection instituted between baptism

**5. Considerations from Sym-bolism.** and dying and rising again with our Lord in Rom. vi, 3-5; Col. ii, 12. The Church Fathers from a comparatively early date (certainly from the fourth century—Cyril of Jerusalem,

Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom) were accustomed to speak familiarly of the Christian enacting in baptism the drama of redemption through death and burial and resurrection. But the Church Fathers never lost sight of the fact that the fundamental symbolism of the rite was cleansing; to them it was before all else the bath in which sins were washed away. And certainly the passages cited from the New Testament can scarcely be fairly adduced as implying that in its very mode of administration baptism signified for the Apostolic Church burial and resurrection with Christ. Their reference is not to the mode of baptism but to its effects. So little does Paul depend upon the very mode in which baptism is administered to suggest burial and resurrection with Christ, that he actually labors to make his readers connect their baptism with the death and resurrection of Christ by the aid of another mediating thought; viz., that their baptism was with respect to Christ's death for their sins. He repeats the heavy clause, "through baptism unto death" (Rom. vi, 4) in order to prevent them from missing a point which, if baptism in its very mode symbolized burial and resurrection with Christ, they could not in any event miss. This may not prove that baptism as known to Paul was not by immersion. But it seems to indicate that its symbolism to him was not burial and resurrection with Christ. And, indeed, it is hard on other grounds to maintain that this is the inherent symbolism of immersion as a religious rite. Few will maintain that this is the inherent symbolism of the Jewish lustrations. Few will maintain even that the baptism of John the Baptist, which most advocates of immersion as the only valid form of baptism will suppose to have been by immersion, was charged with this symbolism. It seems clear enough that baptism, the matter of which is nature's great detergent, has as its essential symbolism just cleansing. And this being so, there seems nothing in the essence of the sacrament to demand one mode of applying the water above another, within the limits of this symbolism. And we can not forget that our Lord Jesus himself said on a memorable occasion: "He that is bathed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit"; and that the Lord Jehovah declared through his prophet that he would "sprinkle clean water upon his people and they should be clean" from all their filthiness. From which we may perhaps infer that out of the circle of ideas of neither the Old Testament nor the New Testament would it be imaginable that a complete bath were necessary in order to symbolize a complete cleansing.

It would hardly appear probable that the mode of applying the water in baptism can enter into the very essence of the sacrament, when it is so difficult to obtain certainty as to what that mode was

in the hands of the apostles. Each of us may properly cherish an opinion of his own as to what that mode was. The opinion of the

**6. The Mode** writer of this article is that it was of Applying probably by pouring water on the head of the recipient, standing, or Unessentially perhaps, but apparently not invariably, in a greater or less depth of water. But he would not like to

insist that no mode of administering baptism but this is valid. Certainly the New Testament lays no stress on the mode of applying the water; and even were it established that it was rather by immersion that the apostles were accustomed to administer it, it is not apparent that no other modes of administering it are valid. It might even be granted that the term "baptism" means nothing but "immersion," and that it was applied to this rite because it meant "immersion," and just in order to describe it as a rite of "immersion"; and still it would not follow that the rite can be validly administered only by "immersion." As in the case of the sister sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in which the term "supper," in its English form and in the Greek of the Lord's time, means an evening meal and was given to this ordinance because it meant an evening meal and to signalize the fact that the feast at which it was instituted was an evening meal, so in the case of baptism, it may be altogether conceivable that the name of the ordinance is derived from a prominent external circumstance connected with its first administration, and yet as far as possible from forming an integral element of the sacrament itself. Whatever may have been the primitive meaning of the term which was adopted to designate it, and however the rite was customarily administered in the first days of its use, the thing is a washing with water for the sake of cleansing to symbolize the cleansing of the sinner by the blood of Jesus Christ. And the main matter is therefore not the mode of washing, but the fact of washing.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

**2. The Baptism of Infants:** A large section of Protestant Christendom, especially in the United States, dissents from the practise of infant baptism. It includes the various denominations of Baptists, Disciples of Christ, the Dunkers, Mennonites, Winebrennerians, and other Christian bodies. These Christians and their sympathizers in pedobaptist denominations, ground

**1. Arguments against Infant Baptism.** their dissent (1) upon the absence of a positive command of Christ, or of any account of apostolic procedure which expressly favors the practise; (2) they hold infant baptism to be a violation of the very idea of baptism, since baptism presupposes conversion and an intelligent profession of faith, which can not be expected from infants.

To these arguments it is replied in general that, while no positive command for baptizing infants is given by Christ or his apostles, the pages of the New Testament offer a strong probability that infants were baptized from the beginning; and the testimonies of Irenæus, Origen, and Tertullian con-

firm this impression. The argument in detail is as follows: (1) The general command to baptize all nations, naturally interpreted, includes the baptism of infants; and the men-

**2. Arguments in Reply.** tion of the baptism of whole households (Acts x, 48; xvi, 15, 33; I Cor. i, 16; xvi, 15) implies the presence

of children; at least their presence in some households is far more probable than their absence in all. If to these considerations be joined the reiterated assertion that the promise of the remission of sins and of the Holy Spirit was to the believers and their *children* (Acts ii, 38; cf. iii, 25), we have a strong probability, to say the least, that infants were baptized by the apostles. (2) Christ's treatment of children, whom he blessed and pronounced to be members of the kingdom of heaven (Matt. xviii, 3; xix, 14) shows that children are fit subjects for the kingdom of heaven; are they not then also fit recipients of the initiatory rite, which is baptism with water? All baptism is in idea an infant baptism, and requires to begin life anew in a truly childlike spirit, without which no one can enter the kingdom of God. (3) The analogy of circumcision, which began with adult Abraham and then extended to all his male children, favors the baptism of infants. Baptism is the initiatory rite of introduction into the Christian Church, and the sign and seal of the new covenant, as circumcision was the sign and seal of the old covenant (Rom. iv, 11). The blessing of the old covenant was to the seed as well as to the parents; and the blessing of the new covenant can not be less comprehensive. Infant baptism rests upon the organic relation of Christian parents and children (I Cor. vii, 14). It is a constant testimony to the living faith of the Church, which descends, not as an heirloom, but as a vital force, from parent to child.

No time can be assigned for the beginning of the practise of infant baptism. If it had been an innovation, it seems likely that it would

**3. Origin of Infant Baptism.** have provoked a violent protest. No traces of this can be found except in Tertullian, who, alone in the early Church, denies the expediency of infant baptism.

The requirement of repentance and faith, which the apostles made a condition of baptism, was to be expected when it is remembered that their exhortations were addressed to adults. This will always be the mode of procedure when the gospel is first preached to a people. Adult baptism always comes first in every missionary Church. Infant baptism, it is reasonable to assume, arose naturally from the very beginning, as Christianity took hold of family life and training.

The three earliest witnesses to the prevalence of infant baptism are Irenæus, Origen, and Tertullian. The testimony of Irenæus, though not unequivocal, leans strongly in favor of the apos-

**4. Patristic Testimony.** tolic usage. Born probably between 120 and 130, a disciple of Polycarp, one

of John's disciples, he was surely an excellent witness. He says, "Christ came to save through means of himself all who through him are born again [regenerated] to God, *infants*,