

[CLICK HERE FOR TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

HANDBOOK

ON

BAPTISM

OR

Testimonies of Learned Pedobaptists on the Act and Subjects of Baptism,
and of both Baptists and Pedobaptists on the
Design Thereof

BY

J. W. SHEPHERD

Author of "Queries and Answers," by David Lipscomb

WITH AN

INTRODUCTION

BY

J. A. HARDING

Formerly Professor of Classic and New Testament Greek in the Bible School, Nashville,
Tenn. and President of Potter Bible College, Bowling Green, Ky.

As certain also of your own poets have said."—Paul
"One of themselves, even a prophet of their own, said."—Paul

SECOND EDITION

To My Wife,

WHO, WITH THE GENTLENESS OF AFFECTION,

AND

THE PATIENCE OF LOVE, HAS BEEN

A FAITHFUL CO-WORKER WITH ME IN THE LORD,

I

MOST AFFECTIONATELY DEDICATE

THIS VOLUME.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

The first edition of this book was published in 1894; and since that time repeated efforts have been made by debaters who were hard pressed in discussion to prove that my quotations are unreliable, and in some instances with seeming success. Some years ago Daniel B. Turney, of Hutsonville, Ill., a noted Methodist debater, charged publicly in a debate that I had *not* quoted John Dawson's Greek-English Lexicon correctly. His opponent was unable to meet the charge, and Turney was so encouraged that he wrote me the following note: "I certify that Dawson's Greek Lexicon, London, 1822, defines 'baptizo' thus, 'Baptize, mergo, lavo,' and does not define it as stated in Shepherd's 'Handbook on Baptism,' page 27." This I grant; but had his opponent been as well informed as he should have been, he would have referred to the "Biographical Sketches of Authors Quoted" and there learned that I quoted the definition from the *new edition* of said lexicon, published in London *without date* on title-page. In all instances I give the *edition, place, and date* of publication (when the date is stated on the title-page by the publisher), so that the user of the book can easily determine whether the one making the attack is quoting from the same edition I used. I am not responsible for changes made by authors in different editions of their works. I emphasize this so that those who use my book may be prepared to meet such charges. *Demand of him who charges me with misquoting and perverting authors to produce the same edition from which I quote, and accept nothing else.* If this is done, I do not fear the consequences.

Recently I received the following note from A. O. Colley: "Pardon me for consuming your time, but I want some information as to your 'Handbook on Baptism.' In my debate with a Methodist preacher I quoted Wesley's statement concerning the importance of infant baptism, as given in your book (page 304), from 'Doctrinal Tracts,' page 251. He denounced it as false and you as a falsifier." The "Doctrinal Tracts" were formerly published in the "Discipline;" but as the "Discipline" undergoes a

revision once in four years, the General Conference of 1812 ordered them to be left out and published in a separate volume. Several new tracts are included in this "separate volume," "and Mr. Wesley's 'Short Treatise on Baptism' is substituted in the place of the extract from Mr. Edwards on that subject." A number of editions of this volume have been issued. The one before me when "Handbook on Baptism" was prepared bore date of 1836. As I write, there is a copy of it lying on my desk, dated 1845, which contains the language *verbatim* as I quoted from Wesley. The same article on baptism I found in "The Works of John Wesley," Volume VI., page 16, in the Wesley Hall library, Vanderbilt University. Wesley's tract on baptism has been left out of the recent editions of "Doctrinal Tracts" and another article has been substituted for it. That the language is Wesley's no one who is familiar with his writings will deny, and one who denies it will "never fail with persons of knowledge to betray the cause he would defend; and though, with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as a statement of fact, sometimes better, yet a candid mind will disdain to take the help of a falsehood, even in support of the truth."

So far as known, all typographical errors have been corrected. One error that has been the cause of much adverse criticism was the omission of "*the*" before "*conditions*" in the quotation from Dr. Hackett on page 364. In commenting on "*wash away thy sins*" (Acts 22:16), Dr. Hackett says: "This clause states a result of the baptism in language derived from the nature of that ordinance. It answers to *for the remission of sins* in [Acts] 2:38—i. e. submit to the rite in order to be forgiven. In both passages baptism is represented as bearing this importance or efficacy." So far Dr. Hackett translates and speaks as a *scholar and exegete*; but in order to give some comfort to Baptists, whose theory had been ruined by his scholarship, he adds this *opinion*: "Because it is the sign of the repentance and faith, which are the conditions of salvation." It is true that there is not much comfort in this opinion, but drowning men catch at straws. Now, a translation is changing the words from one language into those of another that convey the same idea in the new language that they did in the old. Exegesis is developing the meaning of a passage from the words used and their relation to each other in that passage. This opinion of Dr. Hackett's is no part of either. There is not a word in either passage that suggests

the thought, and he did not give it as such, or it would have been expressed in his comments on Acts 2:38. But he gives the full translation and exegesis of the passage without saying a word about why God made it so. On "wash away thy sins," he says that "this clause states a result of the baptism in language derived from the nature of the ordinance," and that it "answers to '*for the remission of sins*' in 2:38—i. e. submit to the rite in order to be forgiven." According to this, the exegesis of one passage is the exegesis of the other. Dr. Hackett did not make the statement as a part of his translation and exegesis; and whoever contends that he did, misrepresents Hackett and imposes on his hearers or readers. It is simply an opinion based on other than the teaching of these passages. But it might be admitted that the opinion is correct and give no comfort to those who contend that baptism is not essential to salvation. If baptism is the *God-appointed sign* in which faith and repentance manifest themselves, then faith and repentance *prepare* the person for forgiveness, or form the character in him which the Lord is willing to forgive; and when he has been baptized as a *declarative sign* that he has believed and repented, then God remits, or washes away, his sins. Surely no one will claim that God forgives until the appointed conditions manifest themselves in the *appointed sign*. God does not so dishonor himself and his appointments as to require faith and repentance to manifest themselves in a sign, and yet bestow the blessing while the person *refuses* or *fails* to manifest the sign.

An appendix has been added which contains chapters on Ezek. 36:25 and Isa. 52:15. It also contains, besides much other valuable matter, tabulated tables of the words "dip," "pour," "sprinkle," and "wash," the Greek words from which they are translated, and the references to the passages in which the word occurs in the Authorized Version, or King James Version, with footnotes indicating the differences between that and the American Revised Version.

The "Biographical Sketches" have been revised, and in many instances rewritten, bringing them down to date.

The continual discussion of baptism is important so long as unscriptural views of it are not only entertained, but made the bitter root of discord among men. Truth ever gains and error loses by honorable discussion. The results of the discussion of

iv.

Preface to the Second Edition.

this subject have been prolific of good during the last century. The first edition of this book has been very popular with those engaged in the discussion, and I hope that this edition may become even more so. I send it forth with an earnest prayer to God that it may be helpful in preserving the scriptural *act, subject, and design* of baptism.

J. W. SHEPHERD.

Nashville, Tenn., September 17, 1912.

CLICK ON CHAPTER TITLE FOR CHAPTER

CONTENTS.

PART FIRST.

THE ACTION OF BAPTISM.

INTRODUCTION. 14

CHAPTER I.

TESTIMONY OF LEXICONS.—Bagster, Bass, Bloomfield, Bretschneider, Bullinger, Constantine, Cremer, Dawson, Donnegan, Dunbar, Ewing, Green, Greenfield, Grimm, Groves, Hedericus, Jones, Leigh, Liddell and Scott, Maltby, Morel, Parkhurst, Pickering, Robinson (Edward), Robson, Scapula, Schleusner, Schrevelius, Sophocles, Stephanus, Stockius, Thayer, Wright 25

CHAPTER II.

TESTIMONY OF ENCYCLOPEDIAS.—Americana, Blaikie's, Brande's, Britannica, Chambers', Concise, Edinburgh, English, Globe, International, London, Manifold, Metropolitana, New American, Penny, Perthensis, Popular, Rees', Schaff-Herzog, Students', Zell's 39

CHAPTER III.

TESTIMONY OF CHURCH HISTORIANS.—Alzog, Bingham, Bossuet, Bower, Conybeare and Howson, Cox (Homersham), Döllinger, Fisher, Gregory, Guericke, Kurtz, Lingard, Milman, Mosheim, Neander, Pressense, Proctor, Riddle (J. E.), Robertson (J. C.), Schaff, Smith (James), Smith (Philip), Stackhouse, Stanley, Waddington, Wall 48

CHAPTER IV.

TESTIMONY OF THE "FATHERS."—Apostolic Constitutions, Barnabas, Hook, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Coxe (A. C.), Gregory Thaumaturgus, Hippolytus, Bunsen, Hermas, Ire-

| | |
|--|----|
| naeus, Justin Martyr, Cox (Homersham), Hey, Beeves, Stuart, Teaching of the XII., Tertullian | 58 |
|--|----|

CHAPTER V.

| | |
|---|----|
| TESTIMONY OF THEOLOGICAL WRITERS.—Barclay, Barrow, Bates, Baxter, Bennett, Beyschlag, Beza, Bonet-Maury, Boston, Calvin, Campbell, Candlish, Coleman, Comber, Coxe (A. C.), Cunningham, Dens, Fisher, Frith, Gibbons, Godet, Goodwin (W. W.), Halley, Hanna, Harris, Holsten, Holtzmann, Jacob, Keane, Kenrick, Knapp, Langen, Limborch, Luther, Maurice, Melancthon, Milton, Moberly, Morison, Moule, O'Donnoghue, Paine, Pictet, Plummer, Poole's Continuator, Potter, Purver, Riddle, Stapferus, Stokes, Storr and Flatt, Stuart, Summers, Tomline, Trumbull, Turretin, Usher, Van Oosterzee, Venema, Wilson, Witsius, Whyte | 66 |
|---|----|

CHAPTER VI.

| | |
|---|----|
| JOHN'S BAPTISM.—1. <i>General Testimony</i> : Alford, Boys, Casaubon, Diodati, Ebrard, Ewald, Griffith, Grotius, Haydock, Keim, Kenrick, Lightfoot (John), MacEvilly, Meyer, Plumptre, Renan, Reuss, Rosenmüller, Strauss, Sutcliffe, Valpy, Weiss, Witsius | 83 |
| 2. <i>In Jordan</i> : Geikie, Hammond, Hausrath, Lange, Poole's Continuator, Weiss | 89 |
| 3. <i>In Ænon, "Because There Was Much Water There:"</i> Calvin, Doddridge, Grotius, Lampe, Lightfoot (John), Olshausen, Plummer, Whitby | 91 |
| 4. <i>At Bethabara</i> : Blunt, Edersheim, Geikie, Le Clerc, Wescott | 95 |
| 5. <i>The Baptism of Jesus</i> : Bloomfield, Blunt, Bossuet, Cajetan, Edersheim, Geikie, Keim, McCarthy, Meyer, Talmage, Whitby | 95 |

CHAPTER VII.

| | |
|---|-----|
| BAPTISM IN THE HOLY SPIRIT.—Blunt, Campbell, Carr, Casaubon, Christian Cyclopedia, Cook, Cyril, Hopkins, Lange, Lechler, Meyer, Neander, Norton, Pyle, Plumptre, Tillotson, Van Oosterzee | 100 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER VIII.

| | |
|---|--|
| BAPTISM IN SUFFERINGS.—Alford, Barnes, Bengel, Bloomfield, Brown (John), Campbell, Clarke (Adam), Diodati, Dod- | |
|---|--|

dridge, a Lapide, Lightfoot (John), Maldonatus, Morison, Poole's
Continuators, Scott (Thomas), Stuart, Sutcliffe, Trapp (John), Trapp
(Joseph), Trollope, Van Oosterzee, Watson, Whitby, Witsius, Wordsworth
..... 106

CHAPTER IX.

THE BAPTISM MENTIONED IN MARK VII. 4; LUKE XI. 88.—Beza, Döllinger, Green,
Grotius, Hammond, Maclear, Meyer, Milton, Plumptre, Trollope, Valpy,
Venema 113

CHAPTER X.

THE BAPTISMS MENTIONED IN ACTS OF APOSTLES.—1. *Baptism of the Three
Thousand*: Abbott, Cunningham, Halley, Plumptre, Schaff, Venema, Weiss
..... 117
2. *The Baptism of the Eunuch*: Abbott, Bloomfield, Blunt, Burkitt, Calvin, Cox
(Homersham), Doddridge, Lindsay, Plumptre, Poole's Continuators,
Thompson, Turretin 120
3. *The Baptism of Saul*: Lechler, Plumptre 123
4. *The Baptism of Cornelius*: Abbott, Bloomfield, Krummacher 124
5. *The Baptism of the Jailer*: Meyer 124

CHAPTER XI.

THE REFERENCES TO BAPTISM IN THE EPISTLES.—1. *Buried in Baptism* (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii
12): Aitken, Alford, Apostolic Constitutions, Bannerman, Barnes, Baur, Baxter,
Becon, Beet, Benecke, Bennett, Benson, Bingham, Bloomfield, Boys, Burkitt,
Burnett, Cajetan, Candlish, Cave, Chalmers, Chrysostom, Church of England,
Churton and Jones, Clarke (Adam), Clarke (Samuel), Colenso, Conybeare and
Howson, Cranmer, Cunningham, Cyril, Daille, Davenant, Diodati, Doddridge,
Döllinger, Dorner, Edwards, Estius, Ewald, Farrar, Faussett, Fell, Findlay, Frith,
Fowler, Gataker, Gifford, Godet, Goodwin (Thomas), Goulburn, Grotius, Hall,
Hammond, Haydock, Hey, Hill, Hoadly, Hole, Jaspis, Jowett, Keble, Knapp, Lange,
Lechler, Liddon, Lightfoot (J. B.), Locke, Luther, MacEvilly, Macknight, Manton,
Marshall, Martyr (Peter), Meyer, Moberly, Moule, Newcombe, Nicholson, Norris,
Olshausen, Ornsby, Piconio, Pictet, Poole's Pontinuators, Pope, Pusey, Pyle,
Plummer, Riddle (Matthew B.), Rosenmüller, Saurin, Schaff, Scott Seeker,
Stanhope, Stier, Sutcliffe, Taylor (Jeremy), Tholuck, Thorold,

| | |
|--|-----|
| Tillotson, Tomline, Trollope, Turretin, Tyndale, Valpy, Vincent, Wall, Webster and Wilkinson, Weiss, Wells Wescott, Wesley, Wheatley, Whitby, Whitefield, Wilson (Daniel), Witsius, Wolfius, Wordsworth, Wycliffe, Zwingli | 126 |
| 2. <i>Baptism of the Israelites</i> (1 Cor. x. 2): Alford, Burkitt, Edwards, Evans, Faussett, Gataker, Grotius, Kling, MacEvilly, Macknight, Meyer, Olshausen, Robertson (P. W.), Stuart, Turretin, Webster and Wilkinson, Whitby, Witsius | 169 |
| 3. <i>Baptized for the Dead</i> (1 Cor. xv. 29): Bloomfield, Chrysostom, Clarke (Samuel), Edwards, Lewin, Macknight | 175 |
| 4. <i>Washing of Regeneration</i> (Titus iii. 5): Faussett, Hopkins, Van Oosterzee | 178 |
| 5. <i>The Doctrine of Baptisms</i> (Heb. vi. 2): Davidson, Macknight | 179 |
| 6. <i>Divers Baptisms</i> (Heb. ix. 10): Gurney, Macknight | 179 |
| 7. <i>Baptism and the Flood</i> (I Peter iii. 21): Hammond, Leighton, Macknight, Sutcliffe | 181 |

CHAPTER XII.

| | |
|---|-----|
| REVIEWS.—Edinburgh, London, Monthly, Quarterly, Religious Review Of | 183 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER XIII.

| | |
|--|-----|
| THE PRACTICE OF THE GREEK CHURCH.—Benham, Bunsen, Coleman, Edinburgh Encyclopedia, Encyclopedia Americana, Riddle (J. E.), Schaff, Stackhouse, Stanley, Venema, Wall | 187 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER XIV.

| | |
|--|-----|
| HISTORY OF SPRINKLING.—Blunt, Bonet-Maury, Bossuet, Bunsen, Burnett, Candlish, Catholic Dictionary, Coleman, Cox (Homersham), Coxe (A. C.), Cunningham, Edinburgh Encyclopedia, Encyclopedia Metropolitan, Encyclopedia Perthensis, Fisher, Gibbons, Ghashtier, Hagenbach, Hefele, Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann, Hook, Johnson, Kenrick, Knapp, Kurtz, Lightfoot (John), McClintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, Mede, Milman, Neander, Rees' Encyclopedia, Riddle (J. E.), Schaff, Smith (Philip), Stanley, Stillingfleet, Stokes, Stuart, Taylor (Jeremy), Turretin, Van Oosterzee, Wall, Zell's Encyclopedia | 191 |
|--|-----|

Contents.

PART SECOND.

THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

JEWISH PROSELYTE BAPTISM.—Benham, Blunt, Encyclopedia Britannica, Fairbairn, Godet, Meyer, Pressense, Stuart, Weiss 217

CHAPTER II.

BAPTISM IN ROOM OF CIRCUMCISION. — Barclay, Beyschlag, Brooke, Coleridge, Godet, Halley, Hammond, Kenrick, Langen, Limborch, Milton, Mozley, Newman, Pressense, Stuart, Thayer 223

CHAPTER III.

IDENTITY OF THE COVENANTS.—Alexander (W. L.), Bonwetsch, Bonet-Maury, Ditzler, Holsten 231

CHAPTER IV.

NO SCRIPTURAL WARRANT FOR INFANT BAPTISM.—Alford, Bannerman, Barclay, Barlow, Baxter, Beet, Bennett, Beyschlag, Bledsoe, Boston, Bonwetsch, Browne (E. Harold), Bunsen, Burnett, Calvin, Döllinger, Dwight, Fisher, French, Godet, Hahn, Hanna, Hey, Holsten, Jacob, Jacobi, Kächler, Knapp, Langen, Limborch, Lutz, Meyer, Moule, Mozley, Newman, North British Review, O'Donnoghue, Paine, Prentiss, Pressense, Raymond, Schmidt, Stanley, Stapferus, Steitz, Stillingfleet, Stuart, Thayer, Tomline, Tulloch, Waterland, Wellford, Witsius 236

CHAPTER V.

INVITATION TO LITTLE CHILDREN.—Abbott, Burkitt, Milton, Olshausen, Poole's Continuator 255

CHAPTER VI.

THE COMMISSION (Matt, xxviii. 19).—Athanasius, Bannerman, Barnes, Barrow, Baxter, Bledsoe, Bloomfield, Boston, Burnett, Calvin, Candlish, Clarke (Adam), Doddridge, Dwight, Grimm, Kenrick, Leslie, Lutz, MacEvilly, Meyer, Olshausen, Parkhurst, Poole's Continuator, Ridgeley, Robinson, Scott (Thomas), Valpy, Watson, Webster and Wilkinson, Whitby 257

CHAPTER VII.

- "YOUR CHILDREN" (Acts ii. 39).—Abbott, Hammond, Limborch, Milton, Valpy
 270

CHAPTER VIII.

- HOUSEHOLD BAPTISMS.—1. *The House of Lydia*: Abbott, Beet, Blunt, Limborch,
 Lumby, Meyer, Olshausen, Pressense 272
2. *The House of the Jailer*: Abbott, Beyschlag, Blunt, Coleridge, Jacobi,
 Limborch, Pressense, Wilson 275
3. *The House of Stephanas*: Beet, Hammond, Macknight, Neander, Olshausen,
 Pressense 279

CHAPTER IX.

- 1 CORINTHIANS VII. 14.—Beyschlag, Edwards (T. C.), Farrar, Kling, Meyer,
 North British Review, Olshausen, Stanley 281

CHAPTER X.

- TESTIMONY OF THE "FATHERS."—1. *Cyprian*: Bledsoe 285
2. *Irenæus*: Bledsoe 287
3. *Justin Martyr*: Bledsoe, Blunt, Hagenbach, Knapp, Semisch 288
4. *Origen*: Bledsoe, Bunsen, Kennedy, Neander 291
5. *Tertullian*: Beet, Bledsoe, Cunningham, Neander 293

CHAPTER XI.

- TESTIMONY OF HISTORIANS.—Cunningham (William), Cave, Fisher, Guericke,
 Hagenbach, Mosheim, Neander, North British Review, Schaff 298

CHAPTER XII.

- ORIGIN OF INFANT BAPTISM.—Jacob, Jacobi, Kenrick, Neander, Wesley .. 302

PART THIRD.**THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM.**

CHAPTER I.

- JOHN'S BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS.—Armitage, Bickersteth, Bliss,
 Burkitt, Clarke (W. N.), Ewald, Godet, Hammond, Webster and Wilkinson,
 Willmarth 305

CHAPTER II.

BAPTIZED INTO THE NAME, ETC. (Matt. xxviii. 19).—Browne (E. Harold), Hill, Knapp, Scott, Stiffler, Storr and Flatt, Willmarth 309

CHAPTER III.

COMMISSION AS GIVEN BY MARK, xvi. 16.—Barnes, Barrow, Beet, Benson, Bickersteth, Burton, Burkitt, Clarke (Adam), Clarke (W. N.), Meyer, Moberly, Norris, Valpy, Whitby, Willmarth 314

CHAPTER IV.

BORN OF WATER (John iii. 5).—Alford, Apostolic Constitutions, Barnes, Barrow, Beet, Benson, Bloomfield, Blunt, Boys, Browne (E. Harold), Clarke (Adam), Clarke (Samuel), Comber, Cox (Homersham), Cyprian, Cyril, Dale, Dods, Dwight, Halley, Hooker, Hovey, Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Knapp, Lange, Leslie, Lightfoot (John), Macknight, Meyer, McLean, Moberly, Moule, Nicholson, Norris, Pope, Sadler, Schaff, Summers, Sutcliffe, Tertullian, Trollope, Wall, Webster and Wilkinson, Wescott, Wesley, Whitby, Willmarth, Wordsworth 320

CHAPTER V.

BAPTIZED FOR REMISSION OF SINS (Acts ii. 38).—Abbott, Alexander (J.A.), Armitage, Axtell, Benson, Bickersteth, Bloomfield, Bonet-Maury, Butcher, Bywater, Cameron, Clarke, Cranmer, Cyril, Dill, Diodati, Ditzler, Doddridge, D'Ooge, Du Veil, Flagg, Foster, Fullerton, Gale, Gloag, Godet, Goodell, Goodwin (W.W.), Hackett, Halley, Hammond, Harkness, Harman, Harper, Hogue, Hovey, Huntington, Lechler, Meyer, McLean, McClintock, Packard, Paine, Pope, Proctor (J. C.), Purves, Sadler, Sale, Schaff, Scott, Sitterly, Strong, Thayer, Turrentine, Tyler, Weiss, Willmarth 339

CHAPTER VI.

SALVATION OF CORNELIUS. —Beet, Cyprian 360

CHAPTER VII.

SAUL'S SALVATION.—Alexander (W. L.), Beet, Benson, Bloomfield, Burkitt, Clarke (Adam), Doddridge, Hackett, Hammond, Hovey, Jacobson, Meyer, Poole's Continuator, Sadler, Scott, Wesley, Willmarth, Wordsworth . 362

CHAPTER VIII.

BAPTIZED INTO THE DEATH OF CHRIST (Rom. vi. 3).—Alford, Bannerman, Beet, Blunt, Burton, Calvin, Clark, Davenant, Diodati, Gifford, Hodge, Jortin, Jowett, Knapp, Lange, Macknight, Moberly, Philippi, Poole's Continuator, Schaff, Scott (John), Scott (Thomas), Stier, Trollope, Vaughan, Waterland, Webster and Willmarth 368

CHAPTER IX.

PAUL NOT SENT TO BAPTIZE (1 Cor. i. 17).—Alford, Barnes, Beet, Burkitt, Calvin, Farrar, Halley, Poole's Continuator, Sadler, Tertullian, Webster and Willmarth, Woodford 379

CHAPTER X.

"WASHED" (1 Cor. vi. 11).—Beet, Burkitt, Burton, Clarke (Adam), Farrar, Kling, Has, Macknight, Meyer, Plummer, Pyle, Trollope, Valpy, Wells, Woodford 385

CHAPTER XI.

BAPTIZED UNTO MOSES (1 Cor. x. 2).—Beet, Browne (E. Harold), Has, Meyer, Moberly, Robertson (F. W.), Valpy, Wordsworth 389

CHAPTER XII.

BAPTIZED BY ONE SPIRIT (1 Cor. xii. 13).—Beet, Blunt, Hammond, Sadler, Valpy 393

CHAPTER XIII.

PUT ON CHRIST IN BAPTISM (Gal. iii. 27).—Beet, Blunt, Faussett, Hammond, Luther, Meyer, Sadler, Schaff, Willmarth 396

CHAPTER XIV.

CHURCH CLEANSED BY WASHING (Eph. v. 26, 27).—Alford, Bloomfield, Braune, Burkitt, Calvin, Clarke (Adam), Ellicott, Hammond, Knapp, Leslie, Meyer, Meyrick, Plummer, Poole's Continuator, Pyle, Riddle (Matthew B.), Sadler, Stuart, Thorold, Valpy 399

CHAPTER XV.

WASHING OF REGENERATION (Titus iii. 5).—Alford, Barnes, Beet, Bloomfield, Blunt, Burton, Calvin, Clarke (Adam),

Cyprian, Dykes, Fell, Hammond, Hovey, Huther, Jackson, Lechler, Macknight, Mede, Plummer, Poole's Pontinuators, Pyle, Sadler, Spence, Stuart, Summers, Waterland, Webster and Wilkinson, Whitby, Woodford, Wordsworth 404

CHAPTER XVI.

BODIES WASHED (Heb. x. 22).—Browne(E. Harold), Davidson, Doddridge, Farrar, Stuart 412

CHAPTER XVII.

BAPTISM SAVES (1 Peter iii. 21).—Barnes, Beet, Benson, Bloomfield, Burkitt, Burton, Calvin, Cook, Hovey, Kächler, Knapp, Macknight, Moberly, Pyle, Sadler, Sutcliffe, Watson, Willmarth 415

CHAPTER XVIII.

TESTIMONY OF THE "FATHERS."—Barnabas, Cyprian, Hermas, Hippolytus, Irenæus, Tertullian 424

CHAPTER XIX.

TESTIMONY OF THEOLOGIANS.—Baxter, Bickersteth, Bonet-Maury, Burnett, Calvin, Crap, Fuller, Gale, Hall (Robert), Hodge, Hooker, Jacob, Jones, Leslie, Limborch, McClintock, Moberly, Neander, O'Donnoghue, Pearson, Pope, Storr and Flatt, Tulloch, Wesley, Willmarth, 428

PART FOURTH.

Appendix 440

PART FIFTH.

Biographical Sketches of Authors Quoted 463
 Index to Authors Quoted 511
 Index to Appendix 517

INTRODUCTION.

WHY HAS THIS BOOK BEEN WRITTEN?—MR. SHEPHERD'S FACILITIES FOR DOING THE WORK WELL.

WHY should another book be written on the subject of baptism? Why should any one preach about it, or discuss it, ever again? Why not, as do many, ignore the questions arising out of it in our writing and preaching, and say, as do they, that the subject has been worn threadbare, that it is a matter of comparatively little importance, that more harm is done by discussing it than good, and that therefore it ought to be left alone? I reply: the questions concerning baptism are living, practical issues, which must be considered by every human being who intelligently endeavors to follow Christ. Men may talk as they will, but the facts remain. The duty to be baptized confronts every man who reads the Bible. He meets the subject near the beginning of Matthew, and it comes up again and again in many places—in commands, examples, exhortations, and in many incidental ways, as he goes on through the four Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles; and the last book (Revelation) with tremendous power enforces the necessity of keeping the commandments.

The mighty forerunner of the Lord, who came to make ready a people prepared for him, came baptizing, by the authority of Jehovah himself, those who accepted his teaching. What a wonderful preacher he was! A Spurgeon or Beecher, a Brooks or Talmage, a Moody or Jones enters a great city where there are many thousands of people anxious to go somewhere to learn something or to be entertained; and in an elegant and costly tabernacle, equipped with every appliance for the comfort and convenience of the multitudes, he addresses the thousands who throng about him, and we marvel at "the drawing power" of the famous man. But the achievements of these (14)

men are nothing when we compare them with the work of John the Baptist. Instead of going into the crowded centers of population, he lifted up his voice in the wilderness, and the wayfarers who passed by stopped in amazement and awe, fascinated by the strange boldness, the wondrous eloquence, the authority and power of the greatest speaker who had ever addressed an audience—a man who had been full of the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb, and than whom, at the day of his birth, a greater had not been born of woman. He did not need to seek the crowds, to hunt for an elegant audience room, to make arrangements for the comfort and convenience of his hearers. He was too great to need or care for these things; it was only needful for him to speak, and the fame of his eloquence and power drew the crowds. And it is said,* "Then went out unto him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan; and they were baptized of him in the river Jordan, confessing their sins." For days and weeks and months the great crowds flocked about him, and were convicted of sin and moved to repentance as men have rarely ever been since the world began. This is the beginning of the doctrine of baptism. There were divers baptisms (immersions) under the law, and various types of baptism, but no such thing as "the baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins" existed until the days of John.

One day, as John stood by the river in the midst of the great crowd, there came demanding baptism at his hands his kinsman, Jesus, the only man on earth who was greater than John. And when John hesitated and said, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" the Son of God answered, "Suffer it now; for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Then he suffered him. Jesus was baptized because it was *right*—because his Father wanted him to be. And the Father expressed his pleasure by sending upon him, immediately after his baptism, the Holy Spirit, and by saying, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

Jesus then became the greatest of preachers, and vast multitudes were baptized under his ministry. Shortly after his baptism it was said that "Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John." (John iv.

* All quotations of scripture in this Introduction are from the Revised Version.

1.) This work was continued by the Lord for about three years, till it was ended by his death on the cross—ended for a few weeks only, for it was soon to begin again, to be continued under the authority and supervision of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, till Christ should come again. For after his resurrection, just a few seconds before he ascended to his Father, he said to his apostles, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." These words are Christ's great commission to his apostles for the conversion and salvation of the world, the most important proclamation ever presented to the consideration of man; and it is a matter of infinite importance that it should be studied and understood. The apostles acted under this document in converting sinners and establishing churches. They began their work under it about eight or ten days after their Lord left them, on the first Pentecost after his ascension. It was on that day that the Holy Spirit descended on the apostles, and filled them with wisdom and power. Immediately after receiving him they preached to the great multitude which had been drawn together by the noise of his coming. Speaking as they were moved by the Holy Spirit, the apostles had wonderful favor and influence with the people, who when they heard the preaching" were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and the rest of the apostles, Brethren, what shall we do?" Peter, to whom Christ had committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven, answering, said unto them, "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For to you is the promise, and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call unto him." (Acts ii. 38, 39.) It is immediately added, "They then that received his word were baptized; and there were added to them in that day about three thousand souls." Thus the work was done under the commission, on

the day of the descent of the Spirit, in a great meeting conducted by the twelve apostles.

Shortly afterward the city of Samaria was converted (Acts viii.), and the Holy Spirit says of them, "When they believed Philip preaching good tidings concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both men and women." Philip, who conducted this "protracted meeting," was a man "full of the Spirit and of wisdom" (Acts vi. 3), and of course he did his work just as it should be done. Indeed, God was so well pleased with him and with his way of leading men to Christ, that a little later he sent an angel from heaven to him, to direct him to a man of Ethiopia, a eunuch of great authority under Candace, queen of the Ethiopians, to bring about his conversion. (Acts viii. 26.) Philip promptly arose and journeyed, as the angel told him to do, till he came to the place appointed; and, lo, the great man came riding by in a chariot. Then the Holy Spirit said to Philip, "Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." He did so, and when an opportunity was promptly given him, he preached Christ to the eunuch. As he drew near to the conclusion of his sermon they came to a certain water, and the eunuch said, "Behold, here is water: what doth hinder me to be baptized?" "And he commanded the chariot to stand still; and they both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him. And when they came up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip; and the eunuch saw him no more, for he went on his way rejoicing." Thus we see how a man full of the Holy Spirit, sent on a special mission by God through an angel, converted a sinner. Observe that the Spirit led him to the chariot, and immediately after the baptism the Spirit caught him away. The Spirit did not catch him away till the work was done. That was the kind of preacher the Spirit approved of in those days, and that is the kind of preacher he approves of now.

By the way, the Spirit seemed to hover about baptisms in a wonderful way in those days. When Jesus was baptized the Spirit descended in a bodily form and rested upon him. On the day of Pentecost for the second time the Spirit was seen, this time as a flaming

fire; and, after commanding the people to repent and be baptized. Peter added, "And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." And he then explained that this promise was to all that God should call to. himself. When, through an angel from God, a vision from heaven, and the direct command of the Spirit, Peter was sent to Cornelius and his house, after he preached to them, and after the miraculous outpouring of the Spirit upon them, "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ." (Acts x. 48.) This same Peter, after speaking of those in the ark having been saved through water, adds, "which also after a true likeness doth now save you, even baptism, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience toward God, through the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (1 Peter iii. 21.)

In the conversion of Lydia (Acts xvi. 13-15), it is said that the Lord opened her heart "to give heed unto the things which were spoken of Paul." "And when she was baptized, and her household," says Luke, "she besought us, saying, If ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord, come into my house, and abide there. And she constrained us." Notice that the Lord opened this woman's heart to do what a gospel preacher sent by the Lord told her to do, and she was baptized. And it is just se now. Whenever the Lord opens any one's heart to do what a gospel preacher sent by the Lord says do, such an one is always baptized. For gospel preachers sent of the Lord preach now as they did then, and people whose hearts God opens under their preaching do now as they did then.

In the same city of Philippi, some days later, Paul and Silas preached to the jailer at midnight; and the Lord also opened his heart to give heed to the things spoken by them: and they baptized him the same hour of the night and his household. These converts truly believed, and were ready to do at once what the word of the Lord required.

Not a great while after Paul preached at Corinth, and the Holy Spirit says of his work there: "And Crispus the ruler of the synagogue believed in the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." Thus Heaven-sent preachers conducted meetings in those days, and thus the Spirit re-

ported the result. Let us not forget that he had these records made for our guidance.

When Paul himself turned to the Lord, God sent a special messenger to him that he might receive his sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost. And when the messenger (Ananias) came, he put his hands on him and said, "Brother Saul, receive thy sight." And then, after telling him that he was to be a minister and a witness for Christ, he added, "And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on his name." (Compare Acts ix. 1-19 with xxii. 6-16.)

It is certain that in the light of these scriptures no human being who has a proper regard for the wisdom and goodness and power of Father, Son, and Spirit can be indifferent to the subject of baptism. I once heard an eminent minister say, in a ministers' meeting, "As for baptism, I care but little about it in any way." Perhaps many thought, when he thus spoke, "How sweetly spiritual he is! He soars far above earth and water and outward forms in his spiritual worship." But I thought, "What an infidel! What contempt he has for the wisdom and goodness of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost! "

We have seen that God sent John expressly to preach and baptize; that Christ was baptized because it was right, and that his Father expressed his approval in the most wonderful way; that Christ then began to preach, and (through his disciples) to baptize; that in his great commission, in the last words that he spoke on earth, he commanded his disciples to disciple the nations and baptize them; that on the day of the descent of the Spirit, under his ministry, about three thousand were added to the disciples; all that received the word were baptized that day. We have seen that again and again, when God sent angels to bring the preacher and the people to be converted together, the preacher commanded the people to be baptized, and they were; we have seen that again and again, when the Holy Spirit led the preacher to the people to be converted—as in the cases of Lydia, the jailer, and the eunuch—they were always at once baptized when they received the word; we have seen that when God from heaven sent Ananias to Paul, he at once commanded him to be bap-

tized, and Paul at once obeyed. I ask again, Can any man who honors God, who loves Christ, who trusts in the wisdom and goodness of the Holy Spirit, in the light of these scriptural facts, be indifferent to the subject of baptism? Certainly not. The man who speaks contemptuously of this institution, or who considers it a matter of indifference, is either ignorant or skeptical.

The chief questions pertaining to baptism that now agitate the religious world are these: Was Christ immersed in water, or was the water sprinkled or poured upon him? Is it necessary that we should be baptized in the same way that he was? Were infants baptized by his authority? How is baptism connected with remission of sins? Is it a condition precedent to forgiveness, or is it a sign of a forgiveness already received? It is believed that if any man is in doubt on these questions, or on any one of them, if he will carefully consider the following pages with the single desire to know the truth that he may walk in it, the doubt will be removed.

GREAT LIBRARIES CONSULTED BY MR. SHEPHERD IN PREPARING
THE BOOK.

Mr. J. W. Shepherd, the compiler of the materials and the editor of the book, has done his work in the most diligent and painstaking way. He has given us by far the fullest, the best arranged, and most valuable collection of learned testimonies on the action, subjects, and design of baptism ever published in a single volume. While collecting material for the work he had access to the following great libraries: In New Zealand, for two years, the Public Library of the city of Christchurch, and the Otago University Library of the city of Dunedin; in the city of Sydney, Australia, for two years, the Public, "University, St. Andrew's College, the Diocesan, and the Athenæum Libraries; in the city of Melbourne, Australia, the Public Library and the University Library; in the city of Edinburgh, Scotland, the Advocate's Library. This last is one of the five great libraries of Great Britain which receive a copy of every book published in the United Kingdom. It is one of the best institutions in the world for the use of one making such a collection. It was founded in 1680 (214 years ago), and had 265,000 volumes ten years ago. Doubtless it has 300,000

now. After having made out a list of the books that he desired to examine, Mr. Shepherd spent from three to four hours a day in this splendid institution for a month. He only had to hand the list to the librarian, who brought the books to him; thus he could do much in a little while. He also had access to Mitchell's Library, Glasgow, Scotland; Vanderbilt University Library and Howard Library, Nashville, Tenn. In addition to these public institutions, he visited *many* private libraries and book establishments, great and small. He speaks with evident gratitude and pleasure of the "very great kindness" of Messrs. Angus and Robertson, of Sydney, Australia, who for eighteen months gave him free access to their fine collection of new and secondhand theological works, allowing him to take any book to his study, and to keep it as long as he pleased. As he himself says, God seemed to guide him in his work, and to open up the way for the prosecution of it.

The orderly arrangement of the book is worthy of special mention. Everything is alphabetically arranged. You can turn with ease to any passage of scripture bearing on the subject, and find what is said about it. In this respect the book far surpasses any similar collection known to me.

Another very valuable feature of the work is the list of Biographical Sketches. It greatly adds to the value of a testimony to know by whom it is given, his nationality, religion, position and work in the world. This list is also alphabetically arranged. The preparation of these sketches cost an immense amount of labor, the facts in many instances being exceedingly difficult to obtain.

In addition to the points already noted, attention is called to the following facts about the book:

1. The testimony of Quakers and infidels is given because they are disinterested parties.
2. The book has NO RIVAL, for it includes Action, Subjects, and Design.
3. Much of the matter given has never appeared in print before, as it is contained in letters written to the editor.
4. The quotations are taken directly from the original works of the authors quoted.

5. Nearly five years were spent in gathering the material.

6. More than four hundred of the most learned men the world has produced, from the apostolic times to the present day, have been quoted.

7. Utmost care has been taken to give each quotation exactly as found in the author's own work, even to punctuation, Italics, etc.

8. The testimonies are all from disinterested parties, like the Quakers or infidels, or from "the party of the other part"—that is, Pedobaptists testify on the action and subjects of baptism, while both Baptists and Pedobaptists testify on the design.

9. The letters from living scholars which are given in this book are from men who rank among the leading writers and educators of the world. They are in answer to the following questions:

(1) "Is there precept for or example of infant baptism in the New Testament?"

(2) "What bearings have the Abrahamic covenant and circumcision on infant baptism? "

(3) "What is the meaning of *baptizo* in the New Testament?"

(4) "Please give me your translation of the preposition *eis* in Acts ii. 38, and your opinion, as a Greek scholar, as to the relation it sustains to the predicates of the verse and the phrase, 'remission of sins.'"

Mr. Shepherd says the letters in answer to (4) are given verbatim, with the exception of Professor Fullerton's (the omission from which is indicated in the report of it). But in answer to (1) just such parts of the letters are given as directly answer the question; for (excepting Professors Thayer, Holsten, Bonwetsch, Langen, and Kächler, whose letters are given in full) each writer, after having answered the question in the negative, made an effort to establish the practice on a scriptural basis by logical inference, analogy, silence of scripture, or in some such way. It is not claimed that the other writers who are quoted on the subject of infant baptism do not contend for its validity; for, with few exceptions, they do, and try to sustain themselves by inferential and analogical reasonings. This fact, however, makes their testimonies all the more valuable and conclusive, for it is evident they

would not admit so much against their practice did not their scholarship and honesty compel them to do so. Mr. Shepherd has not quoted scholars who agree with him as to the action, subjects, and design of baptism—men of his own "faith and order." He started out to give the testimonies and admissions of those on the other side. He certainly has done his work well. The collection is invaluable. Among those who properly love and reverence the word of God, who are able to appreciate the value of testimonies from candid and profoundly learned men, it only needs to be studied to do much towards bringing about unity of faith and practice in the subjects discussed. It is prayerfully commended to the public, in full confidence that it will be a standard work for many years to come, a powerful factor in dispelling the fogs and mists of tradition, and in hastening the consummation for which the Master prayed—"the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" among the lovers of the Lord.

J. A. HARDING.

NASHVILLE BIBLE SCHOOL, Nashville, Tenn., March 5, 1894.

HANDBOOK ON BAPTISM.

PART FIRST.

THE ACTION OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

TESTIMONY OF LEXICONS.

BAGSTER.—*Bapto*; to dip, to dye.

Baptizo: pr., to dip, immerse; to cleanse or purify by washing; to administer the rite of baptism, to baptize; met., with various references to the ideas associated with Christian baptism as an act of dedication—e. g., marked designation, devotion, trial, etc.; mid., to procure baptism for one's self, to undergo baptism.

Baptisma: pr., immersion, baptism, ordinance of baptism; met., baptism in the trial of suffering.

Baptismos: pr., an act of dipping or immersion; a baptism; an ablution.

BASS.—*Baptizo*: (1) to dip, immerse, or plunge in water; mid. and pas., to wash, bathe one's self (Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38); (2) to baptize, administer baptism, pass., to receive baptism; figuratively, to be immersed in sufferings or afflictions.

Baptisma: (1) the ordinance of baptism; (2) immersion in afflictions or sufferings (Matt. xx. 22, 23, etc.).

Baptismos: an ablution, immersion or washing in water.

BLOOMFIELD. — *Baptizo*: to immerse, or sink anything in water, or other liquid; said both of persons (also animals) and things, class. In N. T. it occurs only in the following senses: (1) from the adjunct of immersion, to wash or cleanse by washing; trans. mid. and aor. 1 pass. in mid. sense, to wash one's self, bathe; (2) to baptize, administer the rite of baptism, either that of John, or of Christ; and in pass. and mid., to be baptized, or cause one's self to be baptized, *i. e.*, gener., to receive baptism; which in the primitive church was, according to Oriental habits, usually, though not necessarily, performed by immersion.

Baptisma: (1) prop., something immersed in liquid, and thereby washed. In N. T. the rite of baptism, whether that of John or of Jesus Christ; (2) met., baptism into calamity, a being plunged into and overwhelmed by afflictions.

Baptismos: (1) the act of washing, or ablution, of vessels, etc. (Mark vii. 4, 8; Heb. ix. 10, comp. Lev. xi. 32); (2) specially and met. a religious rite, which directs immersion into, or washing with, water as the symbol of spiritual ablution and purification.

Bapto: to dip or immerse; by impl. to tinge or dye.

BRETSCHNEIDER. — *Baptizo*: properly, to dip repeatedly, to wash repeatedly; then (1) to wash, to cleanse simply; (2) to immerse into water, to submerge.

Baptisma: immersion, submersion, in N. T. only concerning the sacred submersion which the fathers call baptism.

Baptismos: (1) immersion, a washing done with water. Mark vii. 4, 8, Heb. ix. 10; (2) the sacred submersion which, the fathers call baptism.

Bapto: to dip in, to immerse.

BULLINGER.—*Baptizo*: (in form a frequentative or factitive of *bapto*, dip or dye); *baptizo*, to make a thing dipped or dyed. To immerse for a religious purpose.

Baptisma: an immersion or washing with water, (washing unto purification from sin), used in N. T. for the rite of baptism.

Baptismos: the washing. It denotes the act as a fact, as *baptisma* does the result of the act.

CONSTANTINE.—*Baptizo*: immerse, plunge, dip, bathe, dye, cleanse, moisten, wash, make clean.

Baptismos: that is the act of dipping, plunging, in which signification dyeing is used.

Bapto: dip, bathe, dye, plunge, wet with oil, heal moisten, color.

CREMER.—*Baptizo*: immerse, submerge. The peculiar N. T. and Christian use of the word to denote *immersion*, *submersion* for a religious purpose=baptize, John i. 25, *ti oun baptizeis*; may be pretty clearly traced back to Levitical washings.

Baptisma: baptism.

Baptismos: the washing, Mark vii. 4, 8.

Bapto: immerse. To make wet by immersion. LXX. =Tabal.—Then—to dye by dipping.

DAWSON.—*Baptizo*: to dip or immerse in water, to baptize; in the passive, to be baptized voluntarily; in the middle, to procure baptism for a person's self; also to dip a person's self, to bathe, to wash. From *bapto*, to dip.

Baptisma: baptism, an immersion or washing in water.

Baptismos: the same as the preceding.

Bapto: to dip in water, to plunge, to immerse.

DONNEGAN.—*Baptizo*: to immerse repeatedly into a liquid; to submerge, to sink, viz., *descend*, to soak thor-

oughly with wine; met., to dip in a vessel and draw, to overwhelm; pas., to be immersed.

Bapto: to dip, to plunge, *into water, or any liquid*, to submerge, to sink—to dye, to color; met., *said of a spear, dye, in blood*, to wash—to draw out water, *by dipping a vessel into it, in order to fill another vessel*, to temper metals by immersion in water; neut., to dip one's self=mid., *baptomai*, to bathe one's self.

DUNBAR.—*Baptize*: to dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink, overwhelm; to soak; pas., to be immersed; to be drenched with wine. *In N. T.*, to wash, perform ablution, cleanse, to baptize.

Baptisma: immersion, dipping, plunging; metaphor, misery, calamity, *i. e.*, with which one is overwhelmed, Matt. xx. 22, 23.

Baptismos: washing, baptism.

Bapto: to dip, plunge, immerse; to dye or stain; to temper *by dipping in water*; to wash, to draw up; to fill by drawing up. Mid., to bathe one's self.

EWING.—*Baptizo*: in its primary and radical sense, *I cover with water or some other fluid*, in whatever manner this is done, whether by *immersion or affusion, wholly or partially, permanently or for a moment*; and, in the passive voice, *I am covered with water or some other fluid*, in some manner or other. Hence the word is used in several different senses, referring either mediately or immediately to the primary idea. It is used to denote, (1) *I plunge or sink completely under water*; (2) *I cover partially with water, I wet*; (3) *I overwhelm or cover with water in that mode*; (4) *I drench or impregnate with liquor by affusion*; (5) *I oppress or overwhelm, in a metaphorical sense, by bringing affliction or distress upon*; (6) *I wash, in gen-*

eral, without specifying the mode; (7) *I wash for the special purpose of symbolical, ritual, or ceremonial purification*; (8) *I administer the ordinance of Christian baptism, I baptize*.

GREEN.—*Bapto*: to dip; to dye.

Baptizo; pr., to dip, immerse; to cleanse or purify by washing; to administer the rite of baptism, to baptize.

Baptisma; pr., immersion; baptism, ordinance of baptism, Matt. iii. 7; Rom. vi. 4, *et al.*; *met.*, baptism *in the trial of suffering*, Matt. xx. 22, 23; Mark x. 38, 39.

Baptismos: pr., an act of dipping or immersion; a baptism, Heb. vi. 2; an ablution, Mark vii. 4, 8; Heb. ix. 10.

GREENFIELD.—*Baptizo*; (fr. *bapto*) to immerse, immerge, submerge, sink; in N. T. to wash, perform ablution, cleanse, to immerse, baptize, administer the rite of baptism. *Met.*, to overwhelm *one with anything*, to bestow liberally, imbue largely; *pas.*, to be immersed in, or overwhelmed with miseries, oppressed with calamities.

Baptisma: pr., what is immersed; hence immersion, baptism, ordinance of baptism. *Met.*, misery, calamity.

Baptismos: immersion, baptism; a washing, ablution.

Bapto; to dip, plunge; to dye.

GRIMM.—*Baptizo*: I. (1) prop., *to dip repeatedly, to immerge, submerge*; (2) *to cleanse by dipping or submerging, to wash, to make clean with water*; in the mid. and the 1 aor. pass., *to wash one's self, bathe*; (3) *met. to overwhelm; to be overwhelmed with calamities* of those who must bear them. II. In the N. T. it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist,

afterward by Christ's command, received by Christians and adjusted to the contents and nature of their religion, viz., an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin, and administered to those who, impelled by a desire for salvation, sought admission to the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom.

Baptisma: a word peculiar to N. T. and eccl. writ., *immersion, submersion*; (1) used trop. of calamities and afflictions, with which one is quite overwhelmed; (2) of John's baptism, that purificatory rite by which men on confessing their sins were bound to a spiritual reformation, obtained the pardon of their past sins and became qualified for the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom soon to be set up; (3) of Christian baptism; this, according to the view of the apostles, is a rite of sacred immersion commanded by Christ.

Bapto: (a) *to dip, dip in, immerse*; (b) *to dip into dye, to dye, color*.

GROVES.—*Baptizo*: (fr. *bapto*, to dip) *to dip, immerse, immerge, plunge, to wash, cleanse, purify; to baptize; to depress, humble, overwhelm*.

Baptisma: *a washing, ablution; purification; baptism; the Christian doctrine; depth of affliction or distress*.

Baptismos: *immersion in water, washing; ceremonial purification*.

HERDERICUS.—*Baptizo*: *plunge, immerse, cover with water; (2) cleanse, bathe; (3) baptize in the sacred signification*.

Baptisma: *immersion, dipping; (2) baptism*.

Bapto: *plunge, immerse; (2) moisten in dye, dye; (3) bathe; (4) draw, fill by drawing; (5) perish, of a ship*.

JONES.—*Baptizo*: fr. *izo*, I plunge—plunge *in water*, dip, baptize, John iv. 2.—plunge *in sleep*, bury, overwhelm.

Baptismai: I am plunged—am baptized—I plunge myself, I plunge myself *in sin*, wallow in, plunge myself in sorrow, submit to, suffer, Matt. xx. 20.

Baptisma, atos, to; baptismos, on, o: immersion, baptize—plunging *in affliction*, Mark x. 38.

LEIGH.—*Baptize*: the native and proper signification of it is *to dip into water*, or *to plunge under water*, John iii. 22, 23; Matt. iii. 16; Acts viii. 38. ... The word baptize, though it be derived from *bapto tingo*, *to dip*, or *plunge* into the water, and signifieth primarily such a kind of washing as is used in bucks, where linen is *plunged* and *dipt*, yet it is taken more largely for any kind of washing, rinsing, or cleansing, even where there is no dipping at all; as Matt. iii. 11; xx. 22; Mark vii. 4; x. 38; Luke iii. 16; Acts i. 5; xi. 16; 1 Cor. x. 2.

Baptisma: dipping into water, or washing with water.

Bapto: *intingo*.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT.—*Baptizo*: (1) *to dip in* or *under water*; of ships, *to sink* or *disable* them; met., of the crowds who flocked into Jerusalem at the time of the siege; *to be drenched*; *soaked in wine*; *over head and ears* in debt; seeing that he was *being drowned with questions* or *getting into deep water*. (2) *to draw wine by dipping* the cup in the bowl. (3) *to baptize*; *to get one's self baptized*.

Baptisma: *baptism*, the usual form in N. T., both of John's and of Christian baptism.

Baptismos: *a dipping in water*, *ablution*.

Baptistes: *one that dips*; *a baptizer*.

Bapto: I. trans. (1) *to dip in water*, Latin, *immergere*.

(2) *to dip in dye.* (3) *to draw water by dipping* a vessel. II. intrans., the ship *dipped, sank.*

MALTBY.—*Baptizo: immergo, to plunge, to immerse.*
Bapto: mergo, (2) tingo, to dip, to dye.

MORELL.—*Baptizo: plunge, immerse, cover with water; (2) wash off, bathe; (3) baptize in the sacred signification.*

Baptisma: immersion, dipping; (2) baptism.

Baptismos: same as the above.

Bapto: plunge, immerse; (2) dip in dye, dye; (3) bathe; (4) draw, fill by drawing; (5) perish, of a ship.

PARKHURST.—*Baptizo: from bapto, to dip.*

(1) *To dip, immerse, or plunge* in water; but in the N. T. it occurs not strictly in this sense, unless so far as this is included in sense (2) and (3) below.

(2) *Baptizomai: mid. and pass., to wash one's self, be washed, wash, i. e., the hands by immersion or dipping* in water. Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38; comp. Mark vii. 3; Matt. xv. 2, and under *Putme*. The LXX. use *baptizomai*, mid., for *washing one's self by immersion*, answering to the Heb. *Tabal*, 2 K. v. 14, comp. ver. 10. Thus it is also applied in the apocryphal books, Judith xii. 7; Ecclus. xxxiv. 25.

(3) *To baptize, to immerse in or wash with water, in token of purification from sin, and from spiritual pollution.*

(4) *Figuratively, to be immersed or plunged* in a flood, or sea, as it were, of *grievous afflictions and sufferings*, Matt. xx. 22, 23; Mark x. 38, 39; Luke xii. 50.

Baptisma: (1) an immersion or washing with water, hence used in the N. T. for the baptism both of John the Baptist and of Christ.

(2) *Baptism or immersion in grievous and overwhelming afflictions and sufferings*, Matt. xx. 22, 23.

Baptismos: an immersion or washing in water, occ. Mark vii. 4, 8; Heb. ix. 10; vi. 2.

Bapto: to dip, plunge, immerse.

PICKERING.—*Bapto*: to dip, to dip under, to plunge; to steep, dye, or color; to wash; to draw up; to fill by drawing up; mid., to bathe one's self; pass., to sink or be lost, as a ship; to temper steel or iron by dipping it in water.

Baptizo: to dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink, overwhelm; to steep, to soak, to wet; mid., to wash one's self, or bathe.

Baptisma: that which is dipped or steeped; immersion, dipping, plunging; in N. T., the rite of baptism; also metaphorically, misery, calamity, i. e., with which one is overwhelmed, Matt. xx. 22, 23.

Baptismos: a washing, ablution; in N. T., baptism.

ROBINSON.—*Baptizo*: to immerse, to sink; trans., e. g., spoken of ships, galleys, etc. In N. T.—

(1) to wash, to cleanse by washing, trans., mid., and aor., pass., in middle sense, to wash one's self, to bathe, to perform ablutions.

(2) to baptize, to administer the rite of baptism, either that of John or of Christ; pass, and mid., to be baptized or to cause one's self to be baptized, i. e., genr., to receive baptism.

Met., and (1) in direct allusion to the sacred rite, to baptize in the Holy Ghost and in fire, i. e., to overwhelm, richly furnish with all spiritual gifts, or overwhelm with 'fire unquenchable,' etc.; (2) genr., but still in allusion to the rite, to baptize with calamities, i. e., to overwhelm with sufferings.

Baptisma: pr., something immersed; in N. T. *Baptism*.—

Metaph. *baptism into calamity, i. e., afflictions* with which one is oppressed or overwhelmed. *Bapto: to dip in, to immerse.*

ROBSON.—*Bapto: to dip in, immerse; to tinge, dye.*

Baptizo (*bapto*, a frequentative in form, but not in fact): *to immerse, sink; trans., e. g., spoken of ships, galleys, etc.; in N. T., (1) to wash one's self, bathe, perform ablutions, Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38.*

(2) *To baptize, administer the rite of baptism, either that of John or of Christ, pass, and mid., to be baptized, i. e., genr., to receive baptism:* in the primitive churches (where, according to Oriental habits, bathing was to them what washing is to us,) the rite appears to have been ordinarily, though not necessarily, performed by immersion.

Baptisma: pr., something immersed.

SCAPULA.—*Bapto: to dip, to immerse. Also to dye* (because it may be done by immersing.) *To put into, to saturate. At Luke xvi. 24, "that he may dip the tip of his finger in water." Also, to wash.*

Baptizo: to dip or immerse, as we immerse things for the purpose of dyeing or cleansing by means of water. Likewise, to dip, to submerge, to cover over in water. Also, to cleanse, to wash. Mark vii., Luke xi.

Baptizomai: to be dipped, to be submerged, and, metaphorically, to be covered over.

Baptismos and *baptisma: a dipping, washing, cleansing; the act itself of immersing; also, of washing or cleansing Mark vii.; also baptism, by the Christian writers.*

SCHLEUSNER.—*Baptizo: (1) properly, to immerse, to dip in, to dip into water, from bapto, and corresponds to the Hebrew Tabal 2 Kings v. 14 in the Alexandrian ver-*

sion, and to *Tabang* in a version of Psalm lxxviii. 5, by Symmachus, and to Psalm ix. 6, by an unknown translator. But in this sense it is never used in the New Testament, but frequently in Greek writings. Now, because not unfrequently anything is accustomed to be immersed and dipped into water that it may be washed, therefore (2) it signifies to cleanse, to wash, to purify with water. So it is used in the New Testament, Mark vii. 4: "And [when they come] from the marketplace, except they wash [baptize] themselves they eat not." Luke xi. 38: "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marveled that Jesus had not washed [baptized himself] before dinner."

Baptisma: (1) *properly, immersion, dipping into water, washing*. Hence it is applied to the sacred rite which by distinction is called baptism, in which those to be baptized formerly into water were immersed, that they might be bound to the true divine religion.

SCHREVELIUS. — *Baptizo*: to baptize, dip, immerse, wash, cleanse.

Baptisma: an object immersed; a washing, dipping, immersion.

Bapto: to dip, immerse, sink, wash, dye, stain, temper.

SOPHOCLES.—*Baptizo, iso (bapto)*: to dip, to immerse: to sink; (2) mid., *baptizomai, to perform ablution, to bathe*; (3) to plunge a knife; (4) *baptizo, mergo, mergito, tingo, or tinguo*, to baptize. There is no evidence that Luke and Paul and the other writers of the New Testament put upon this verb meanings not recognized by the Greeks.

Baptismos, ou, o: a plunging, immersion.

Bapto: to dip; (2) to dye. Classical.

STEPHANUS. —*Bapto*: plunge, immerse, likewise *dip* which is done by plunging. *To stain, to moisten*.

Baptizo: *plunge*, immerse, as we *dip* in the water either for the purpose of *moistening* or for cleansing. *Plunge*, that is, to submerge, cover with water. Cleanse, bathe. Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38.

Baptismos and Baptisma; plunging, bathing, or cleansing one's self. Mark vii. 4. Likewise *baptisma*, with the name preserved in the Christian Scriptures.

Baptistes: he who *plunges*, he who cleanses.

STOCKIUS.— *Baptizo*: generally and by force of the word it has the notion of *dipping in* and of *immersing*. (2) Specially, (a) properly it is *to immerse* and to dip into water; (b) tropically (I). By metalepsis it is *to wash, to cleanse*, because anything is accustomed to be dipped in and immersed in water, that it may be washed or cleansed, although also by sprinkling water the *washing* or *cleansing* may be done, and is accustomed to be done.

Baptisma: (1) generally and by force of its origin it denotes *immersion* or *dipping*. (2) Specially (a) properly it denotes the *immersion* or *dipping of a thing into water* that it may be cleansed or washed. Hence it is used to designate the first sacrament of the New Testament, which they call the sacrament of *initiation*, namely, baptism, in which those to be baptized were formerly immersed into water; however, now the water is at least sprinkled upon them, that they may be washed from the defilements of sin, may obtain the remission of it, and be received back into the covenant of grace as heirs of eternal life.

Baptismos: generally and by force of the word it denotes *immersion* and *dipping in*. (2) Specially (a) properly it denotes the *immersion and dipping of a thing into*

water that it may be washed. Hence it is applied to the *sacrament of baptism*, in which the one to be baptized formerly into water was immersed, that he might be cleansed from the defilements of sin and received into the covenant of grace.

THAYER.—*Baptizo*: I. (1) prop., *to dip repeatedly, to immerge, submerge*. (2) *To cleanse by dipping or submerging, to wash, to make clean with water*; in the mid. and the 1 aor. pass., *to wash one's self, bathe*. (8) Met., *to overwhelm, to be overcome with calamities*, of those who must bear them. II. In the N. T. it is used particularly of the rite of sacred ablution, first instituted by John the Baptist, afterwards by Christ's command received by Christians and adjusted to the contents and nature of their religion (see *baptisma*, 3), viz., an immersion in water, performed as a sign of the removal of sin, and administered to those who, impelled by a desire for salvation, sought admission to the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom.

Baptisma, tos, to, (baptizo): a word peculiar to the N. T. and eccl. writ., *immersion, submersion*, (1) used trop., of calamities and afflictions, with which one is quite overwhelmed; (2) of John's baptism, that purificatory rite by which men, on confessing their sins, were bound to a spiritual reformation, obtained the pardon of their past sins, and became qualified for the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom, soon to be set up; (3) of Christian baptism; this, according to the view of the apostles, is a rite of sacred immersion, commanded by Christ.

Bapto: (a) *to dip, dip in, immerse*, foil, by a gen. of the thing into which the object is dipped (because only a part of it is touched by the act of dipping); (b) *to dip into dye, to dye, color*.

WRIGHT.—*Baptizo*: I dip, immerse, plunge; saturate; baptize; humble, overwhelm.

Baptisma: Washing, ablution; purification; baptism; depth of affliction.

CHAPTER II.

TESTIMONY OF ENCYCLOPEDIAS.

AMERICANA. — Baptism (that is, *dipping, immersing*, from the Greek *baptizo*). ... In the time of the apostles, the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel, with the words which Christ had ordered, and to express more fully his change of character, generally adopted a new name. The immersion of the whole body was omitted only in the case of the sick, who could not leave their beds. In this case sprinkling was substituted, which was called *clinic baptism*.—*Art. Baptism, Vol. I., p. 557.*

BLAIKIE'S MODERN.—In the primitive church the person to be baptized was dipped in a river or in a vessel, with the words which Christ had ordered, generally adopting a new name to further express the change. Sprinkling, or, as it was termed, *clinic baptism*, was used only in the case of the sick who could not leave their beds. The Greek Church and Eastern schismatics retained the custom of immersion; but the Western Church adopted or allowed the mode of baptism by pouring, or sprinkling, since continued by most Protestants. This practice can be traced back certainly to the third century, before which its existence is disputed.—*Art. Baptism, Vol. I., p. 377.*

BRANDE'S.—Baptism was originally administered by

immersion, which act is thought by some to be necessary to the sacrament.—*Art. Baptism*, p. 130.

BRITANNICA.—The usual mode of performing the ceremony was by immersion. In the case of sick persons (*clinici*) the minister was allowed to baptize by pouring water upon the head or by sprinkling. In the early church "clinical" baptism, as it was called, was only permitted in cases of necessity, but the practice of baptism by sprinkling gradually came in in spite of the opposition of councils and hostile decrees. The Council of Ravenna, in 1311, was the first council of the church which legalized baptism by sprinkling, by leaving it to the choice of the officiating minister. The custom was to immerse three times, once at the name of each of the Persons in the Trinity, but latterly the threefold immersion was abolished, because it was thought to be against the unity of the Trinity.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. III., p. 351.

CHAMBERS'.—It is, however, indisputable that at a very early period the ordinary mode of baptism was by immersion, in order whereto baptisteries began to be erected in the third; perhaps in the second, century, and the sexes were usually baptized apart. But baptism was administered to sick persons by sprinkling; although doubts as to the complete efficacy of this clinical baptism were evidently prevalent in the time of Cyprian (middle of the third century). Baptism by sprinkling gradually became more prevalent; and a dispute concerning the mode of baptism became one of the irreconcilable differences between the Eastern and Western churches, the former generally adhering to the practice of immersion, whilst the latter adopted mere pouring of

water on the head, or sprinkling on the face. This practice, although generally adopted in the West from the thirteenth century, was not universal, for it was the ordinary practice in England before the reformation to immerse infants, and the fonts in the churches were made large enough for this purpose. It continued to be the practice even till the reign of Elizabeth; and the change which then took place is ascribed to the English divines who had sought refuge in Geneva and other places on the Continent during the reign of Mary.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. I., p. 723.

CONCISE.—Immersion was, there is no doubt, the first rule of the church. All early descriptions of baptism, as Tertullian's *De Baptismo*, use such words as going down, and plunging in the water.—*Art. Baptism*, p. 81.

EDINBURGH.—Baptism, in the apostolic age, was performed by immersion. Many writers of respectability maintain, that the Greek verb *bapto*, as well as its Hebrew synonym, sometimes denotes sprinkling; but the various passages to which they appeal, will lead every candid mind to a different conclusion. The circumstances recorded concerning the first administration of baptism are, likewise, incompatible with sprinkling. Had a small quantity of water been sufficient, the inspired historian would never have said that, John baptized in the river Jordan, and in Enon, because there was much water there. The administrators and the subjects of baptism are always described as descending into the water, and again ascending out of it. When Paul affirms that we are buried with Christ in baptism, and raised again, he not only alludes to immersion, but, upon any other supposition, there would be no propriety in

the metaphor which he employs. We are likewise said to be saved by *dia loutron*, the washing, or, by the bath, of regeneration; where there is a manifest reference to baptism performed by immersion.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. III., p. 245.

ENGLISH.— The manner in which it was performed appears to have been at first by complete immersion," as a sign of total baptism in the Holy Spirit, being entirely penetrated by his grace," says Neander; who adds, that it was only in case of sickness that sprinkling was allowed ("Hist. of the Christ. Rel.," Sec. IX.). John baptized in the Jordan; and in another place (John iii. 23) it is said that he baptized "in Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there." The Ethiopian eunuch went down into the water to receive baptism from Philip. The words *baptism*, and *to baptize*, are Greek terms, which imply, in their ordinary acceptation, washing or dipping.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. I., p. 886.

GLOBE. — Baptism (Gr. *baptize*, *bapto*, to dip, etc.). Washing the body with water, representing the removal of impurity and pollution in connection with religion was much in vogue among ancient nations.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. I., p. 272.

INTERNATIONAL.—It is, however, indisputable that in the primitive church the ordinary mode of baptism was by immersion, in order to which *baptisteries* began to be erected in the 3rd, perhaps in the 2nd century, and the sexes were usually baptized apart. But baptism was administered to sick persons by sprinkling; although doubts as to the complete efficacy of this *clinic* (sick) baptism were evidently prevalent in the time of Cyprian (mid-

dle of third century). Baptism by sprinkling gradually became more prevalent; but the dispute concerning the mode of baptism became one of the irreconcilable differences between the Eastern and Western churches, the former generally adhering to the practice of immersion, whilst the latter adopted mere pouring of water on the head, or sprinkling on the face, which practice has generally prevailed since the thirteenth century; but not universally, for it was the ordinary practice in England before the Reformation to immerse infants, and *the fonts* in the churches were made large enough for this purpose. This continued also to be the practice till the reign of Elizabeth; and the change which then took place is ascribed to the English divines who had sought refuge in Geneva, and other places on the Continent, during the reign of Mary. To this day the rubric of the Church of England requires, that if the godfathers and godmothers "shall certify that the child may well endure it," the officiating priest "shall dip it in the water discreetly and warily;" and it is only, "if they shall certify that the child is weak" that "it shall suffice to pour water upon it," which, however, or sprinkling, is now the ordinary practice.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. II., pp. 204, 205.

LONDON.—*Baptism*, derived from the Gr. *bapto* and *baptizo*. The primary meaning is to dip, to plunge, to immerge.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. III., p. 495.

MANIFOLD.—It is, however, indisputable that in the primitive church the ordinary mode of baptism, was by immersion, in order to which *baptisteries* began to be erected in the third, perhaps in the second century, and the sexes were usually baptized apart. But baptism was

administered to sick persons by sprinkling; although doubts as to the complete efficacy of this *clinic* (baptism on a bed) baptism were prevalent in the time of Cyprian (middle of third century). — *Art. Baptism*, Vol. IV., p. 4.

METROPOLITANA. — The word *baptism* is derived from the Greek *baptize*, and means literally dipping or immersion. — *Art. Baptism*, Vol. XV., p. 247.

NEW AMERICAN. — The form of baptism at first was, according to most historians, by immersion, but as Christianity advanced into colder climates, the more convenient mode of sprinkling was introduced. — *Art. Baptism*, Vol. II., p. 595.

PENNY. — The manner in which it was performed appears to have been at first by complete immersion. John baptized in the Jordan; and in another place (John iii. 23) it is said that he baptized in Emm, near to Salim, because there was much water there. The Ethiopian eunuch went down into the water to receive baptism from Philip. The words *baptism*, and *to baptize*, are Greek terms which imply, in their ordinary acceptation, *washing* or *dipping*. — *Art. Baptism*, Vol. III., p. 413.

PERTHENSIS. — In performing the ceremony, the usual custom (except in clinical cases, or where there was scarcity of water), was to immerse and dip the whole body. Thus St. Barnabas, describing a baptized person, says, "We go down into the water full of sin and filth, but we ascend bearing fruit in our hearts." And this practice was so general, that we find no exceptions made in respect either to the tenderness of infants, or the bashfulness of the other sex, unless in case of sickness or

other disability. But to prevent any indecency, men and women were baptized apart; and either the baptisteries were divided into two apartments, one for the men, the other for the women, as Bingham has observed; or the men were baptized at one time, and the women at another, as is shown by Vossius, from the *Ordo Romanus*, Gregory's *Sacramentarium*, etc. There was also an order of deaconesses, one part of whose business was to assist at the baptism of women. These precautions, however, rather indicate a scrupulous attention to delicacy, than imply any indecency in the circumstance of immersion itself. From the candidates' being immersed, there is no reason to infer that they were naked. The present Baptists never baptize naked, though they always immerse.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. III., p. 276.

POPULAR.—In the primitive church the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel, with the words which Christ had ordered, and to express more fully his change of character, generally adopted a new name. The immersion of the whole body was omitted only in the case of the sick who could not leave their beds. In this case sprinkling was substituted, which was called *clinic baptism*. The Greek Church, as well as the schismatics in the East, retained the custom of immersing the whole body; but the Western Church adopted in the thirteenth century, the mode of baptism by sprinkling, which has been continued by the Protestants, the Baptists only excepted. The introduction of this mode of baptism was owing to the great inconvenience which arose from the immersion of the whole body in the northern climates of Europe.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. I., p. 477,

REES'.—In the primitive times, this ceremony was performed by immersion, as it is to this day in the Oriental churches, according to the original signification of the word.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. III.

SCHAFF-HERZOG.—In the primitive church, baptism was by immersion, except in the case of the sick (clinic baptism), who were baptized by pouring or sprinkling. The latter were often regarded as not properly baptized, either because they had not completed their catechumenate, or the symbolism of the rite was not fully observed, or because of the small amount of water necessarily used. [The twelfth Canon of the Council of Neo-Caesarea (314-325) is: "Whoever has received clinic baptism (through his own fault) can not become a priest, because he professed his faith under pressure (fear of death), and not from deliberate choice, unless he greatly excel afterwards in zeal and faith, or there is a deficiency of other eligible men."—*Hefele Conciliengeschichte*, Vol. I., § 17, first ed.] In 816 the Council of Calcuith (Chelsea, in England) forbade the priests to pour water upon the infants' head, but ordered to immerse them [*Hefele*, Vol. IV., § 416]; the Council of Nemours (1284) limited sprinkling to cases of necessity; and Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theologica*, P. III., Ques. 66, *De Baptismo*, Art. VII.) says although it may be safer to baptize by immersion, yet sprinkling and pouring are also allowable. The Council of Ravenna (1311) was the first to allow a choice between sprinkling and immersion (11 Can. *Hefele*, Vol. VI., § 699); but at an earlier date, 1287, the canons of the Council of the Leige Bishop John prescribe the way in which the sprinkling of children should be performed. The practice first came into common use at the end of the thirteenth century and

was favored by the growing rarity of adult baptism.—*Art. Baptism, Vol. I., p. 201.*

STUDENTS'.—The ordinary mode of administering the sacrament in the early church was by immersion, the sick only being sprinkled.—*Art. Baptism, Vol. I., p. 272.*

ZELL'S.—In the time of the apostles, the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel, with the words which Christ had ordered, and to express more fully the change of character generally adopted a new name.—*Art. Baptism, Vol. I., p. 236.*

CHAPTER III.

TESTIMONY OF CHURCH HISTORIANS.

ALZOG.—This sacrament, which was conferred in the *baptistry*, was administered by a triple immersion of the body in the water, and by the solemn invocation of the three Persons of the blessed Trinity—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.—*Manual of Church Hist.*, Vol. I, Period I., Epoch L, Part II., Chap. V., § 88, p. 291.

BINGHAM.—The ancients thought that immersion, or burying under water, did more lively represent the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, as well as our own death unto sin and rising again to righteousness.— *Christian Antiquities*, Vol. III., Book XI., Chap. XI., § 1, p. 594.

BOSSUET.—The decision of Constance, in approbation of and for retaining communion under one kind, is one of those, wherein our adversaries think they have the most advantage. But in order to be convinced of the gravity and constancy of the church in this decree, we need but remember that the Council of Constance, when they passed it, had found the custom of communicating under one kind established, beyond contradiction, many ages before. The case was much the same with that of baptism by immersion, as clearly grounded on scripture as communion under both kinds could be, and which, nevertheless, had been changed into infusion with as

much ease and as little contradiction, as communion under one kind was established; so that the same reason stood for retaining one as the other. It is a fact most certainly avowed in the Reformation, although at present some will cavil at it, that baptism was instituted by immersing the whole body into water; that Jesus Christ received it so, and caused it to be so given by his apostles; that the scriptures know no other baptism than this; that antiquity so understood and practiced it; that the word itself implies it, to baptize being the same as to dip: this fact, I say, is unanimously acknowledged by all the divines of the Reformation, nay, by the Reformers themselves, and those even who best understood the Greek language and the ancient customs as well of the Jews as Christians; by Luther, by Melancthon, by Calvin, by Casaubon, by Grotius, by all the rest, and lately even by Jurieu, the most contradicting of all ministers. Nay, Luther has observed, that the German word signifying baptism was derived from thence, and this sacrament named Tauf, from profundity or depth, because the baptized were deeply plunged into water. If, then, any fact in the world can be deemed certain, it is this same: but is it not less certain, even by all these authors, that baptism without immersion is valid, and that the church is in the right to retain the custom. It is therefore plain, in a parallel fact, what ought to be our judgment as to the decree of communion under one kind, and that all which is opposed against it is nothing but chicane. And, indeed, if there was reason to maintain baptism without immersion, because, in rejecting it, it would follow, there had been no such thing as baptism for many ages, consequently, no such thing as a church, it being impossible for the church to subsist without the substance of the sacraments; no less impossible was it,

without the substance of the Supper. The same reason, then, subsisted for maintaining communion under one kind, as for maintaining baptism by infusion; and the church, in maintaining these two practices which tradition showed equally indifferent did nothing else but, according to custom, maintain against contentious spirits that authority, whereon the faith of the people did repose.—*History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*, Vol. II., Book XV., §§ 189,140, pp. 370, 371, 372.

BOWER.—Baptism by immersion was undoubtedly the apostolic practice, and was never dispensed with by the church, except in case of sickness, or where a sufficient quantity of water for immersion could not be procured. In both these cases, baptism by aspersion or sprinkling was allowed, but in no other.—*History of the Popes*, Vol. II., p. 110.

CONYBEARE AND HOWSON.—It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our northern climates) has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very important passages of scripture.—*Life and Epistles of Paul*, Vol. I., p. 518.

COX, HOMERSHAM.—The Jews baptized by immersion, and this undoubtedly was the form of the Christian institution originally.—*The First Century of Christianity*, p. 277.

DÖLLINGER. — At first Christian baptism commonly took place in the Jordan; of course, as the church spread more widely, in private houses also. Like that of St. John, it was by immersion of the whole person, which is the only meaning of the New Testament word. A mere pouring or sprinkling was never thought of. St. Paul made this immersion a symbol of burial with Christ, and the emerging a sign of resurrection with him to a new life. Baptism is a "bath." Of the Ethiopian's baptism it is said that both he and Philip went down into the water, and so the evangelist baptized him.—*The First Age of Christ, and of the Church*, Vol. II., p. 183.

FISHER.—The ordinary mode of baptism was immersion.—*History of the Christian Church*, p. 41.

GREGORY.—The initiatory rite of baptism was usually performed, by immersing the whole body in the baptismal font, and in the earlier periods of Christianity was permitted to all who acknowledged the truths of the gospel, and promised conformity to its laws.—*History of the Christian Church*, p. 34.

GUERICKE.—Baptism was originally performed by immersion in the name of the Trinity, (by Marcion, in the name of Jesus simply). In case of the administration to the sick, sprinkling was substituted for immersion.—*Church History*, § 39, p. 141.

KURTZ.—According to the showing of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, baptism was ordinarily administered by a thrice-repeated immersion in flowing water, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. If there be no flowing water at hand, any other kind, even

warm water, may be used, and in case of necessity sprinkling may be substituted for the thrice-repeated immersion. At a later time sprinkling was limited to the baptism of the sick, *baptismus clinicorum*. We hear nothing of a consecration of the water to its holy use, nor is there any mention of the renunciation and exorcism which became customary first in the third century through the use of a form of adjuration previously employed only in cases of possession. Upon immersion followed an anointing, *chrisma* (still unknown to the Didache), as a symbol of consecration to a spiritual priesthood (1 Pet. ii. 9); and then, in accordance with Acts viii. 16 f., the laying on of the hands, as the vehicle for the communication of the Holy Spirit. Soon the immersion came to be regarded as the negative part of the ordinance, the putting away of sin, and the anointing with the laying on of hands as the positive part, the communication of the Spirit.—*Church History*, Vol. I., § 35, 3, pp. 199, 200.

LINGARD.—The regular manner of administering it was by immersion.—*History of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, Vol. I., p. 291.

MILMAN.—The baptism was usually by immersion.—*History of Christianity*, Vol. III., Book IV., Chap. II., p. 428.

MOSHEIM. — The sacrament of *baptism* was administered in this century, without the public assemblies, in places appointed and prepared for that purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font.—*Ecclesiastical History*, Century I., Part II., Chap. IV., § 8, p. 28.

The sacrament of baptism was administered publicly twice every year, at the festivals of Easter and Pentecost or Whitsuntide, either by the bishop, or, in consequence of his authorization and appointment, by the presbyters. The persons that were to be baptized, after they had repeated the Creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and particularly the devil and his pompous allurements, were immersed under water, and received into Christ's kingdom by a solemn invocation of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, according to the express command of our blessed Lord.—*Ibid.*, Century II., Part II., Chap. IV., § 13, p. 49.

NEANDER.—In respect to the form of baptism, it was, in conformity with the original institution and the original import of the symbol, performed by immersion, as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Spirit, of being entirely penetrated by the same. It was only with the sick, when the exigency required it, that any exception was made; and in this case baptism was administered by sprinkling. Many superstitious persons, clinging to the outward form, imagined that such baptism by sprinkling was not fully valid; and hence they distinguished those who had been so baptized by denominating them the *clinici*. The bishop Cyprian expressed himself strongly against this delusion. "It is otherwise,"—he says,— "the beast of the believer is washed, the soul of man is cleansed by the merits of faith. In the sacraments of salvation, where necessity compels and God gives permission, the divine thing, though outwardly abridged, bestows all that it implies on the faithful."— *Church History*, Vol. I., pp. 422, 423.

PRESSENSE.—Baptism, which was the sign of admission

into the church, was administered by immersion. The convert was plunged beneath the water, and as he rose from it he received the laying on of hands. These two rites corresponded to the two great phases of conversion, the crucifixion of the old nature preceding the resurrection with Christ. Faith was thus required of every candidate for baptism. The idea never occurred to Paul that baptism might be divorced from faith—the sign for the thing signified; and he does not hesitate, in the bold simplicity of his language, to identify the spiritual fact of conversion with the act which symbolizes it. "We are buried with Christ by baptism into death," he says. With such words before us, we are compelled either to ascribe to him, in spite of all else that he has written, the materialistic notion of baptismal regeneration, or to admit that with him faith is so intimately associated with baptism that in speaking of the latter he includes the former, without which it would be a vain form. The writers of the New Testament all ascribe the same significance to baptism. It presupposes with them invariably a manifestation of the religious life, which may differ in degree, but which is in every case demanded. "The baptism which saves us," says St. Peter, "is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."—*The Early Years of Christianity*, pp. 334, 335.

PROCTOR.—Baptism was originally administered by immersion, and at a very early date by thrice-repeated or trine immersion, in symbolical allusion to the Trinity, and also to the three days of Christ's lying in the grave.—*History of the Book of Common Prayer*, p. 380.

RIDDLE, J. E.—The supposition that the practice of immersion was abandoned as soon as infant baptism became prevalent, is founded on a mistake. Infant baptism had become general in the sixth century; but the practice of immersion continued until the thirteenth or fourteenth, and in fact has never been formally abandoned or entirely renounced.—*Christian Antiquities*, p. 461.

ROBERTSON, J. C.—Baptism was administered by immersion, except in cases of sickness, where affusion or sprinkling was used. —*History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I., p. 163.

SCHAFF.—The usual form of baptism was immersion. This is inferred from the original meaning of the Greek *baptizein* and *baptismos*; from the analogy of John's baptism in the Jordan; from the apostles' 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; finally, from the general custom of the ancient church, which prevails in the East to this day.— *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I., p. 468.

SMITH, JAMES.— The initiatory rite of baptism was usually performed, by immersing the whole body in the baptismal font, and in the earlier periods of Christianity was permitted to all who acknowledged the truths of the Gospel, and promised conformity to its laws.—*History of the Christ. Church*, p. 51.

SMITH, PHILIP.—The regular mode of baptism was by immersion.—*History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I., p. 172.

STACKHOUSE.—Several authors have shown, that we read nowhere in scripture of any one's being baptized but by immersion, and from the acts of councils, and ancient rituals, have proved, that this manner of immersion continued (as much as possible) to be used for thirteen hundred years after Christ. — *History of the Bible*, Vol. V., p. 291.

STANLEY.—'Baptism' was not only a bath, but a plunge —an entire submersion in the deep water, a leap as into the rolling sea or the rushing river, where for the moment the waves close over the bather's head, and he emerges again as from a momentary grave; or it was the shock of a shower-bath—the rush of water passed over the whole person from capacious vessels, so as to wrap the recipient as within the veil of a splashing cataract. This was the part of the ceremony on which the apostles laid so much stress. It seemed to them like a burial of the old former self, and the rising up again of the new self. So St. Paul compared it to the Israelites passing through the roaring waves of the Red Sea, and St. Peter to the passing through the deep waters of the flood. "We are buried," said St. Paul, "with Christ by baptism at his death; that, like as Christ was raised, thus we also should walk in newness of life." Baptism, as the entrance into the Christian society, was a complete change from the old superstitions or restrictions of Judaism to the freedom and confidence of the Gospel. It was a complete change from the idolatries and profligacies of the old heathen world to the light and purity of Christianity. It was a change effected only by the same effort and struggle as that with which a strong swimmer or an adventurous diver throws himself into the stream and struggles with the waves, and comes up

with increased energy out of the depths of the dark abyss. — *Baptism, in the Nineteenth Century*, October, 1879, pp. 689, 690.

WADDINGTON.—The ceremony of immersion (the oldest form of baptism) was performed in the three names of the Trinity.—*History of the Church*, Vol. I., p. 48.

WALL.—Their general and ordinary way was to baptize by immersion, or dipping the person, whether it were an infant, or grown man or woman, into the water. This is so plain and clear by an infinite number of passages, that, as one can not but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it; so also we ought to disown and show a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the English Antipedobaptists merely for their use of dipping. It is one thing to maintain that that circumstance is not absolutely necessary to the essence of baptism, and another, to go about to represent it as ridiculous and foolish, or as shameful and indecent; when it was in all probability the way by which our blessed Saviour, and for certain was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians, did receive their baptism. I shall not stay to produce the particular proofs of this. Many of the quotations which I brought for other purposes, and shall bring, do evince it. It is a great want of prudence, as well as of honesty, to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true, and may be proved so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest that one says.—*History of Infant Baptism*, Vol. I., pp. 570, 571.

CHAPTER IV.

TESTIMONY OF THE "FATHERS."

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS.—After that, either them, O bishop, or a presbyter that is under thee, shall in the solemn form name over them the Father, and Son, and Holy Spirit, and shall dip them in the water; and let a deacon receive the man, and a deaconess the woman, that so the conferring of this inviolable seal may take place with a becoming decency. And after that, let the bishop anoint those that are baptized with ointment.—Book II., § 2, Chap. XVI., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VII., p. 431.

BARNABAS.—Mark how He has described at once both the water and the cross. For these words imply, Blessed are they who, placing their trust in the cross, have gone down into the water; for, says He, they shall receive their reward in due time: then, He declares, I will recompense them. . . . Further, what says He? "And there was a river flowing on the right, and from it arose beautiful trees; and whosoever shall eat of them shall live forever." This meaneth, that we indeed descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up, bearing fruit in our heart, having the fear [of God] and trust in Jesus in our spirit.—*Epistle*, Chap. XL, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., p. 144.

HOOK.—In performing the ceremony of baptism, the usual custom was to immerse and dip the whole body.

Thus St. Barnabas describing the baptized person says, "We go down into the water full of sin and filth, but we ascend bearing fruit in our hearts."—*Church Dictionary, Art. Baptism*, p. 81.

CHRYSOSTOM.—In baptism are fulfilled the pledges of our covenant with God; burial and death, resurrection and life; and these take place all at once. For when we immerse our heads in the water, the old man is buried as in a tomb below, and wholly sunk forever; then as we raised them again, the new man rises in its stead. As it is easy for us to dip and to lift our heads again, so it is easy for God to bury the old man, and shew forth the new.—*Homilies on John*, Hom. XXV. (on iii. 5), Vol. I, p. 211.

If we have been planted together, so, by the mention of planting, giving a hint of the fruit resulting to us from it. For as His Body, by being buried in the earth, brought forth as the fruit of it the salvation of the world; thus ours also, being buried in Baptism, bore as fruit righteousness, sanctification, adoption, countless blessings. And it will bear also hereafter the gift of the Resurrection. Since then we were buried in water, He in earth, and we in regard to sin, He in regard to His Body, this is why He did not say, *we were planted together in His Death*, but *in the likeness of His Death*.—*Homilies on Romans* (vi. 5), Horn. XI., p. 165.

CYPRIAN.—You have asked also, dearest son, what I thought of those who obtain God's grace in sickness and weakness, whether they are to be accounted legitimate Christians, for that they are not to be washed, but sprinkled, with the saving water. In this point, my diffidence and modesty prejudices none, so as to prevent any from

feeling what he thinks right, and from doing what he feels to be right. As far as my poor understanding conceives it, I think that the divine benefits can in no respect be mutilated and weakened; nor can anything less occur in that case, where, with full and entire faith both of the giver and receiver, is accepted what is drawn from the divine gifts. For in the sacrament of salvation the contagion of sins is not in such wise washed away, as the filth of the skin and of the body is washed away in the carnal and ordinary washing, as that there should be need of saltpetre and other appliances also, and a bath and a basin wherewith this vile body must be washed and purified. Otherwise is the breast of the believer washed; otherwise is the mind of man purified by the merit of faith. In the sacrament of salvation, when necessity compels, and God bestows his mercy, the divine methods confer whole benefits on believers; nor ought it to trouble any one that sick people seem to be sprinkled or affused, when they obtain the Lord's grace.—*Epistle LXXV.*, § 12; *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V., pp. 400, 401.

COXE, A. C.—St. Cyprian seems to be the earliest apologist for sprinkling.—*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V., p. 419.

GREGORY THAUMATURGUS.—Immerse me in the streams of Jordan, even as she who bore me wrapped me in children's swaddling-clothes. Grant me thy baptism even as the virgin granted me her milk. Lay hold of this head of mine, which the seraphim revere. With thy right hand lay hold of this head, that is related to thyself in kinship. Lay hold of this head, which nature has made to be touched. Lay hold of this head, which for

this very purpose has been formed by myself and my Father. Lay hold of this head of mine, which, if one does lay hold of in piety, will save him from ever suffering shipwreck. Baptize me, who am destined to baptize those who believe on me with water, and with the Spirit, and with fire: with water, capable of washing away the defilement of sins; with the Spirit, capable of making the earthly spiritual; with fire, naturally fitted to consume the thorns of transgressions. On hearing these words, the Baptist directed his mind to the object of the salvation, and comprehended the mystery which he had received, and discharged the divine command; for he was at once pious and ready to obey. And stretching forth slowly his right hand, which seemed both to tremble and to rejoice, he baptized the Lord. — *Four Homilies*, Horn. IV.; *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VI., p. 70.

HIPPOLYTUS. — For you have just heard how Jesus came to John, and was baptized by him in the Jordan. Oh things strange beyond compare! How should the boundless River that makes glad the city of God have been dipped in a little water! The illimitable Spring that bears life to all men, and has no end, was covered by poor and temporary waters! — *Disc. on the Holy Theophany*, § 2; *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V., p. 235.

BUNSEN. — The Apostolical Church made the School the connecting link between herself and the world. The object of this education was admission into the free society of the brotherhood of the Christian community. The Church adhered rigidly to the principle as constituting the true purport of the baptism ordained by Christ, that no one can be a member of the communion of Saints, but by his own free act and deed, his own solemn vow

made in the presence of the Church. It was with this understanding that the candidate for baptism was immersed in water, and admitted as a brother, upon his confession of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. — *Christ, and Mankind*, Vol. II., p. 105.

HERMAS.— And I said to him, "I should like to continue my questions." "Speak on," said he. And I said, "I heard, sir, some teachers maintain that there is no other repentance than that which takes place, when we descend into the water* and receive the remission of our former sins." He said to me, "That was sound doctrine which you heard; for that is really the case."— *Commandments*, Book II., Com. IV., Chap. III.; *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. II., p. 22.

IRENÆUS.—"And dipped himself," says [the Scripture], "seven times in Jordan." It was not for nothing that Naaman of old, when suffering from leprosy, was purified upon his being baptized, but [it served] as an indication to us. For as we are lepers in sin, we are made clean, by means of the sacred water and the invocation . of the Lord, from our old transgressions; being spiritually regenerated as new-born babes, even as the Lord has declared: "Except a man be born again through water and the Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." —*Fragment, XXXIV.*; *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., p. 574.

JUSTIN MARTYR.—I will also relate the manner in which we dedicated ourselves to God when we had been made new through Christ; lest, if we omit this, we seem|

*COXE, A. C.—Immersion continues to be the usage, then, even! in the West, at this epoch.—*Ibid.*, foot-note.

to be unfair in the explanation we are making. As many as are persuaded and believe that what we teach and say is true and undertake to be able to live accordingly, are instructed to pray and to entreat God with fasting, for the remission of their sins that are past, we praying and fasting with them. Then they are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated. For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water.—I. *Apology*, Chap. LXI.; *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., p. 183.

COX, HOMERSHAM.—That this baptism was practiced by immersion is clear from the statement, 'then they are brought by us where there is water,' an act which could not be necessary for baptism by affusion.—*The First Century of Christ.*, p. 278.

HEY.—The early Fathers seem to speak as if Baptism had been always, that is, in all ordinary cases, in ancient times, performed by *immersion* of the whole body; performed anywhere, at any Pond or River; till baths were made for the purpose, in buildings on the outside of churches, which were called *baptisteries*.—*Lectures in Divinity*, Vol. IV., Book IV., Art. XXVII., § 4, p. 270.

REEVES.—Then was he stript of his Garments, intimating thereby *the putting off the old Man*, and thrice plunged under Water at the naming of the Three Persons in the blessed Trinity. The Ancients carefully observed this Trine Immersion, as being so expressive a Ceremony of the Three Persons in the Godhead; insomuch, that by the Canons Apostolical, either Bishop or Presbyter who

baptized without it, was deposed from the Ministry, Can. 50. Though this Trine Immersion, not being of absolute Necessity, was laid aside in Spain by the Church, that they might not seem to gratify the Arians, who made use of it to denote the Persons in the Trinity to be three distinct Substances; and glorified that the Catholics used it to denote the same. The Person baptized being come out of the Water was clothed with a white Garment, hence that Expression of putting on Christ.—*Apologies*, Vol. I., p. 97.

STUART.—I am persuaded that this passage, as a whole, most naturally refers to immersion; for why, on any other ground should the convert who is to be initiated *go out to the place where there is water*? There could be no need of this if mere sprinkling or partial affusion only, was customary in the time of Justin.—*Mode of Christian Baptism*, p. 144.

TEACHING OF THE TWELVE.—And concerning baptism, thus baptize ye: Having first said all these things, baptize into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in living water. But if thou have not living water, baptize into other water; and if thou canst not in cold, in warm. But if thou have not either, pour out water thrice upon the head into the name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit. But before the baptism let the baptizer fast, and the baptized, and whatever others can; but thou shalt order the baptized to fast one or two days before.—Chap. VII., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VII., p. 379.

TERTULLIAN.—When entering the water, we make profession of the Christian faith in the words of its rule;

we bear public testimony that we have renounced the devil, his pomp, and his angels.—*De Spectaculis*, Chap. IV.; *Ante-Nicene fathers*, Vol. in., p. 81.

To deal with this matter briefly, I shall begin with baptism. When we are going to enter the water, but a little before, in the presence of the congregation and under the hand of the president, we solemnly profess that we disown the devil, and his pomp, and his angels. Hereupon we are thrice immersed, making a somewhat ampler pledge than the Lord has appointed in the Gospel.—*De Corona*, Chap. III.; *Ibid.*, p. 94.

He therefore seals man, who had never been unsealed in respect of him; washes man, who had never been defiled so far as he was concerned; and into this sacrament of salvation wholly plunges that flesh which is beyond the pale of salvation!—*Against Marcion*, Book I., Chap. XXVIII.; *Ibid.*, p. 293.

It makes no difference whether a man be washed in a sea or a pool, a stream or a fount, a lake or a trough; nor is there any distinction between those whom John baptized in the Jordan and those whom Peter baptized in the Tiber, unless withal the eunuch whom Philip baptized in the midst of his journeys with chance water, derived (therefrom) more or less of salvation *than others*. —*On Baptism*, Chap. IV.; *Ibid.*, 671.

Thus, too, in *our* case, the unction runs carnally, (*i. e.* on the body,) but profits spiritually; in the same way as the *act* of baptism itself too is carnal, in that we are plunged in water, *but* the *effect* spiritual, in that we are freed from sins.—Chap. VII., p. 672.

CHAPTER V.

TESTIMONY OF THEOLOGIANS.

BARCLAY. — If the *etymology* of the word should be tenaciously adhered to, it would militate against most of our adversaries, as well as against us: for the Greek *baptize* signifies *immergo*, that is, to *plunge* and *dip in*; and that was the proper use of water baptism among the *Jews*, and also by *John*, and the primitive Christians, who used it; whereas our adversaries, for the most part, only *sprinkle* a little water upon the forehead, which doth not at all answer to the word *baptism*. Yea, those of old among Christians that used water-baptism, thought this *dipping* or *plunging* so needful, that they thus *dipped* children: and forasmuch as it was judged that it might prove hurtful to some weak constitutions, *sprinkling*, to prevent that hurt, was introduced; yet then it was likewise appointed, that such as were only *sprinkled*, and not *dipped*, should not be admitted to have any office in the church, as not being sufficiently *baptized*. So that if our adversaries will stick to the word, they must alter their method of *sprinkling*.—*Apology*, Prop. XII., § 10, p. 440.

BARROW.—The action is baptizing or immersing in water; the object thereof, those persons of any nation whom his ministers can by their instruction and persuasion render disciples, that is, such as do sincerely believe the truth of his doctrine, and seriously resolve to obey his commandments. It is performed in the name,

that is, it is ministered by the authority, and bears special relations unto the Persons of the blessed Trinity, as the chief objects of the faith professed, and the sole objects of the obedience undertaken therein; as exhibiting gracious favors, unto the person baptized, and receiving special obligations from him.—*Theological Works*, Vol. I., pp. 546, 547.

BATES.—In ancient times all persons, when baptized, were divested of their garments, to represent their putting off the old man, and the putting on of the new, and their whole bodies were *immersed* or *dipped* in water, to represent the death, and burial, and resurrection of Christ, and to signify their own dying, unto sin, the destruction of its power, and their resurrection to a new life.—*College Lectures on Christian Antiquities*, p. 115.

BAXTER.—The action of the minister on God's part is to wash the body of the baptized with the water, which, in hot countries, was by dipping them overhead, and taking them up: to signify, 1. That they are washed from the guilt of sin by the blood of Christ. 2. And are as dead and buried to sin and the world and flesh, and risen to a new and holy life and heavenly hope. 3. And that by this act we are solemnly bound by God to be Christians.—*Works*, Vol. XIX., p. 263.

BENNETT.—The customary mode was used by the apostles in the baptism of the first converts. They were familiar with the baptism of John's disciples and of the Jewish proselytes. This was ordinarily by dipping or immersion. This is indicated not only by the general signification of the words used in describing the rite, but the earliest testimony of the documents which have been

preserved gives preference to this mode.—*Archaeology*, p. 396.

BEYSCHLAG.—The word *baptizein*, to dip, to immerge, derived from *baptein*, to dip in, means baptism by immersion; just as in the German, the words *taufen* and *tauchen* were originally the same word. Jesus was immersed by John in the river Jordan; likewise all that were baptized in apostolic times. Mere sprinkling was introduced simultaneously with infant baptism much later. Only as immersion could the reference in Romans vi. be compared to death and burial—the person baptized entering death by burial in water.—*Letter to the Author*, April 22, 1893.

BEZA.—To be baptized in water, signifies no other than to be immersed in water; which is the external ceremony of baptism.—*Annotat.* in Acts xix. 3, p. 488.

BONET-MAURY.—The literal meaning of the Greek word *baptizein* is to plunge, to immerse, to dip.—*Letter to Dr. Christian, in Immersion*, p. 133.

BOSTON.—The unlawfulness of dipping is not to be pretended, since it is not improbable that it was used by John, Matt. iii. 6, and Philip, Acts viii. 38; but seems to have been used in the ancient church, and in some places to be used to this day.—*Works*, Vol. II., p. 475.

CALVIN.—Whether the person baptized is to be wholly immersed, and that whether once or thrice, or whether he is only to be sprinkled with water, is not of the least consequence: churches should be at liberty to adopt either according to the diversity of climates, al-

though it is evident that the term *baptize* means to immerse, and that this was the form used by the primitive Church.—*Institutes*, Vol. III., p. 344.

CAMPBELL.—I have heard a disputant of this stamp, in defiance of all etymology and use, maintain that the word rendered in the New Testament *baptize*, means more properly to sprinkle than to plunge, and, in defiance of all antiquity, that the former word was the earliest, and, for many centuries, the most general practice of baptizing. One who argues in this manner never fails, with persons of knowledge, to betray the cause he would defend; and though, with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as arguments, sometimes better—yet a candid mind will disdain to take the help of a falsehood, even in support of the truth.—*Pulpit Eloquence*, Lecture X., p. 228.

CANDLISH.—The word 'baptize' means literally to immerse, to bathe, or to wash; and in some places it is rendered properly enough by the last of these, and 'baptism' by washing (Mark vii. 4; Heb. ix. 10). They might, perhaps, be translated 'bathe' and 'bathing' in these places; and in Matt. xx. 22, 23; Mark x. 38, 39; and Luke xii. 50, probably baptism might be better rendered 'immersion,' as that is undoubtedly the idea conveyed by the word as there used.—*The Christian Sacraments*, p. 48.

COLEMAN.—The term Baptism is derived from the Greek *bapto*, from which is formed *baptize*, with its derivatives *baptismos* and *baptisma*, *baptism*. The primary signification of the original is, to dip, plunge, immerse; the obvious import of the noun is immersion.—*Christian Antiquities*, Chap. XIV., § 1, p. 115.

COMBER.—It is indeed very probable, that at the first institution of baptism in those hotter regions where it was ordinary to bathe daily, the rite might be performed commonly by immersion.—*Companion to the Temple*, Vol. III., p. 408.

COXE.—The word means to dip. I think the "sacred writers" used the word in the primary sense; but also for other washings which were not dippings. So did also the classical writers, with great freedom and variety of meanings.—*Letter to Dr. Christian, in Immersion*, p. 221.

CUNNINGHAM.—Notwithstanding the numerous references to baptism in the New Testament, there is not one passage in which the mode of its administration is described. But there is no uncertainty as to the matter. Baptism means immersion, and it was immersion. The Hebrews immersed their proselytes, the Essenes took their daily bath, John plunged his penitents into the Jordan, Peter dipped his crowd of converts into one of the great pools which were to be found in Jerusalem. Unless it had been so, Paul's analogical argument about our being buried with Christ in baptism would have had no meaning.—*The Growth of the Church*, p. 178.

DENS.—Baptism stands grammatically, or literally, for immersion or dipping, and because things that are washed are usually immersed or dipped in water; therefore, baptism is used for washing or ablution.—*Theol. Moralis et Dogmatica*, Vol. V., p. 148.

FISHER.—Baptism, it is now generally agreed among scholars, was commonly by immersion.—*The Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 565.

FRITH.—The sign in baptism is the plunging down in the material water, and lifting up again, by the which, as by an outward badge, we are known to be of the number of them, which profess Christ to be their Redeemer and Savior.—*Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. I., p. 384.

GIBBONS.—For several centuries after the establishment of Christianity, Baptism was *usually* conferred by immersion.—*Faith of our Fathers*, p. 318.

GODET.—The verb *baptizein* signifies properly speaking: to plunge, but also to sprinkle, wash, anoint. In the New Test, the natural sense is the first of these.—*Letter to the Author*, June 8, 1893.

GOODWIN.—I have no knowledge about *baptize* which you will not find in the ordinary lexicons. It means dip,—a form of *bapto*, and I am not aware of anything peculiar in its use.—*Letter to the Author*, July 27, 1893.

HALLEY.—We believe that *baptizo* is to make one thing to be in another by dipping, by immersing, by burying, by covering, by superfusion, or by whatever mode effected, provided it be by immediate contact.—*The Sacraments*, Part I., p. 275.

HANNA.—We can scarcely doubt that at least partial immersion was at first the general practice. Jesus and the Baptist, Philip and the Eunuch went down into the water, and came up out of it,—processes of descent and emergence which the apostle employs in two of the passages already quoted as illustrative of the believer's death to sin and life to righteousness, the burial with Christ,

the rising together with him. John baptized at Ænon, near to Salim, because there was much water there,—a reason which would not have been a valid one had our present practice of sprinkling been followed by the Baptist.— *The Forty Days*, pp. 257, 258.

HARRIS.—Immersion was the mode of apostolic, and Ante-Nicene baptism, with recognition of clinic baptism of the sick.—*Letter to the Author*, April 6, 1893.

HOLSTEN.—*Baptizo* in the N. T. always means to baptize by *sub*-mersion (*unter-tauchen*) generally with the addition: in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ.—*Letter to the Author*, April 19, 1893.

HOLTZMANN.—The meaning of the word *baptizein*, as of the simple *baptein*, is to dip in, to dip under.—*Letter to Dr. Christian, in Immersion*, p. 133.

JACOB.—It only remains to be observed that baptism in the primitive Church was evidently administered by immersion of the body in the water,—a mode which added to the significance of the rite, and gave a peculiar force to some of the allusions to it.—*Ecclesiastical Polity of the N. Test.*, p. 260.

KEANE.—The best dictionaries show the classical meaning of the Greek word *baptizein* is primarily to plunge, to dip.—*Letter to Dr. Christian, in Immersion*, p. 21.

KENRICK.—The solemnity of immersion was dispensed with, when danger impeded; whilst it was observed, in general, to signify to the catechumen the entire change which became him, and the entire purification which

the sacrament effects. The death with Christ to sin, and the resurrection to a new life, and the washing away of sins, were strongly impressed on his mind, by the rite of immersion; and he rose from the font a new man, having put on Christ, and adopted his maxims as the rules of his belief and conduct.— *Treatise on Baptism*, p. 171.

KNAPP.—*Baptisma*, from *Baptizein*, which properly signifies *to immerse*, (like the German *tan/en*,) *to dip in*, *to wash*, (by immersion).—*Christian Theology*, p. 425.

LANGEN.—The meaning of *baptizein* in the New Testament is to immerse, to dip.—*Letter to the Author*, April 19, 1893.

LIMBORCH.— *Baptism* then consists in *washing*, or rather, *immersing* the whole body into water, as was customary in the primitive times.—*Comp. System of Div.*, Vol. II., p. 734.

LUTHER.—The term baptism is a Greek word; it may be rendered into Latin by *mersio*: when we immerse anything in water, that it may be entirely covered with water. And though that custom be quite abolished among the generality, (for neither do they entirely dip children, but only sprinkle them with a little water,) nevertheless they ought to be wholly immersed, and immediately to be drawn out again, for the etymology of the word seems to require it. The Germans call baptism *tauf*, from depth, which they call *tief* in their language; as if it were proper those should be deeply immersed, who are baptized. And truly, if you consider what baptism signifies, you shall see the same thing required: for it signifies that the old man and our native

character that is full of sin, entirely of flesh and blood as it is, may be overwhelmed by divine grace. The manner of baptism, therefore ought to answer to the signification of baptism, so that it may show forth a sign that is certain and full.—*Opera*, Tom. L, p. 72.

MAURICE.—"The practice," it is said, "of the early ages, so far as we can ascertain was to immerse; the emblematical character of Baptism as a burial is destroyed by the other practice; if we admit an outward ceremony at all, we can not afterwards pretend that the mode of performing it is indifferent." I acknowledge that there is truth in each of these propositions. I admit (with, I suppose, the majority of Churchmen) that there is a high probability in favor of the prevalence in early time of that practice which is least likely to have been afterwards introduced, and that most of the facts we know would confirm the opinion. I admit that the words "buried with him," in the sixth chapter of Romans, is the better argument for immersion, than the words "sprinkled from an evil conscience," in St. Peter, can ever furnish for the modern custom. I admit, that having received a certain form and not another, as the sign of a certain thing, we have no business to give ourselves airs about the unimportance of certain particulars of that which has been prescribed.—*The Kingdom of Christ*, Vol. I., p. 398.

MELANCTHON. — Baptism is immersion into water, which is performed with this accompanying benediction of admiration: *I baptize thee etc.*, . . . Plunging signifies ablution from sin and immersion into the death of Christ.—*Catechesis De Sacramentis, Opera Omnia*, Vol. L, p. 25.

MILTON. — Under the gospel the first of the sacraments commonly so called is BAPTISM, wherein THE BODIES OF BELIEVERS WHO ENGAGE THEMSELVES TO PURENESS OF LIFE ARE IMMERSSED IN RUNNING WATER, TO SIGNIFY THEIR REGENERATION BY THE HOLY SPIRIT, AND THEIR UNION WITH CHRIST IN HIS DEATH, BURIAL AND RESURRECTION.—*Treatise on Christ. Doct.*, Chap. XXVIII., p. 431.

MOBERLY.—We find that the Apostles were directed to go forth to all the world, to all nations, to every creature; to preach to them the Gospel, the glad tidings of repentance and remission of sins, and to make disciples of them. This was to be done by baptizing, or dipping them in water, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.— *The Great Forty Days*, p. 102.

MORISON. — The real action denoted by the verb *baptized* has been much debated in 'the baptismal controversy.' There can be no doubt that the term, in its primary acceptation, denoted *dipping, merging, mersing, whelming*; this should never be disputed.—*Commentary on Mark*, vii. 4, p. 180.

MOULE.—True, Scripture indicates a *usage* of immersion in the apostolic missions, very plainly. And it connects Baptism with our Lord's Death, Burial and Resurrection, doctrinally.—*Outlines of Christ. Doct.*, p. 258.

O'DONNOGHUE.—In the earlier ages of Christianity, it was performed *generally* by immersion; afterwards affusion, or pouring of the water on the face, was substituted in the place of immersion; and to this, aspersion or sprinkling succeeded about two centuries ago: this

custom now generally prevails in all the western churches, though immersion continues the common practice among the Christians of the East.—*Exposition of the 39 Articles*, p. 227.

PAINE.—Immersion was undoubtedly the *usual primitive form* of baptism. Whether there were *any exceptions* in the apostolic age is *not on record*.—*Letter to the Author*, April 15, 1893.

PICTET.—As to the *mode of administration*: the baptized had usually their whole body immersed in the water, (Matt. iii. 6, 16; John iii. 23; Acts viii. 38); this form could be well used in hot climates, and it must be allowed, that such a mode best figured that grace, by which our sins are as it were sunk, and we rise from the depths of sin.—*Christian Theology*, p. 488.

PLUMMER. — Baptism being usually administered by immersion, and adult baptism being very frequent, there was much need of female attendants.—*Pastoral Epistles*, p. 156.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—It is true, the first baptisms of which we read in holy writ, were by dippings of the persons baptized. It was in an hot country, where it might be at any time, without danger of persons' lives; where, it may be, we judge it reasonable, and most resembling our burial with Christ by baptism into death. —*Annotations*, on Matt. xxviii. 19.

POTTER.—I am quite free to say that the literal meaning of *baptizo*, as ordinarily found in classical writers, is usually to plunge, to dip, immerse, or whatever word

you want to strengthen your position.—*Letter to Dr. Christian, in Immersion*, p. 21.

PURVER.—*Baptized* is but a *Greek Word* used in *English*, and signifying plunged.—*Trans. of the O. and N. Test. with Notes*, on 1 Cor. xv. 29.

RIDDLE.—The common appellation, baptism (*ὁ Βαπτισμος, to Baptisma*), is drawn from the nature of the action. According to its etymology, it denotes immersion under water; and the choice of this term was doubtless made at a period when the modern practice of sprinkling had not been introduced. In the Old Testament, the words *Bapto* and *Baptizo* are used in translating the Hebrew *Tabal*, tingo, immergo, Exod. xii. 22, 2 Kings v. 14; and *Taba*, submerge, Psalm xix. 16, lxix. 2, Jerem. xxxviii. 6; *Tseba*, chald., tingo, to steep in dye, Dan. iv. 33, v. 21; and other such words, which contain the idea of submersion. In the New Testament, *Bapto* is used three times, and *Baptizo* about thirty times, in the same signification.—*Christian Antiquities*, p. 442.

STAPFERUS.—By baptism we understand that rite of the New Testament church, commanded by Christ, in which believers, by being immersed in water, testify their communion with the church.—*Institut. Theol. Polem.*, Vol. I., Par. iii., § 1635, p. 451.

STOKES.—The construction of the ancient Churches, with their baptisteries surrounded with curtain, and the female assistants for the service of their own sex, amply proves that in the ancient Church, as to this day in the Eastern Church, baptism was ordinarily by immersion. The Church proved its Eastern origin by the mode

wherein its initial sacrament was at first applied.—*The Acts of the Apostles*, pp. 142, 143.

STORR AND FLATT.—The disciples of our Lord could understand his command in no other manner than as enjoining immersion; for the baptism of John, to which Jesus himself submitted, and also the earlier baptism (John iv. 1) of the disciples of Jesus, were performed by dipping the subject into cold water, as is evident from the following passages:—Matt. iii. 6, *ebaptizonto en to Iordan*, "were baptized in Jordan;" ver. 16, *Iesous anebe apo tou hudatos*, "Jesus ascended out of the water;" John iii. 23, *oti hudata polla en ekei*, "because there was much water there."

And that they actually did understand it so is proved partly by those passages of the New Testament which evidently allude to immersion,—Acts viii. 38, &c., *ote anebesan ek ton hudatos*, "when they had come up out of the water;" ver. 39; xvi. 12-15, *para potamon*, "at the river;" Rom. vi. 4, *sunetaphemen auto (to Christo) dia tou baptismatos, ina osper egerthe Christos ek nekron*, "are buried with him (Christ) by baptism, so that as Christ was raised from the dead," &c.; comp. Col. ii. 12, and 1 Pet. iii. 21, where baptism is termed the antitype (*autitupon*) of the flood,—and partly from the fact that immersion was so customary in the ancient church that, even in the third century, the baptism of the sick, who were merely sprinkled with water, was entirely neglected by some, and by others was thought inferior to the baptism of those who were in health, and who receive baptism, not merely by aspersion, but who actually bathed themselves in water. This is evident from Cyprian, and Eusebius, where we find the following extract from the letter of the Roman bishop, Cornelius:

"Novatus received baptism on a sick bed by aspersion (*perichuthesis*,) if it can be said that such a person received baptism." "No person who had during sickness been baptized by aspersion was admitted into the clerical office." Moreover, the old custom of immersion was also retained a long time in the western church, at least in the case of those who were not indisposed. And even after aspersion had been fully introduced in a part of the western churches, there yet remained several who for some time adhered to the ancient custom. Under these circumstances it is certainly to be lamented that Luther was not able to accomplish his wish with regard to the introduction of immersion in baptism, as he had done in the restoration of wine in the eucharist.—*Biblical Theology*, p. 216.

STUART.—*Bapto* and *Baptizo* mean *to dip, plunge, or immerse*, into anything liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this.—*Mode of Christian Baptism*, p. 51.

But enough. "It is," says Augusti (*Denkw.* VII., p. 216), "a thing made out," viz., the ancient practice of immersion. So, indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this subject concede. I know of no one usage of ancient times which seems to be more clearly made out. I can not see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this.—*Ibid.*, p. 149.

SUMMERS.—The truth is, *baptizo*, *baptisma*, and *baptismos*, imply plunging the whole person or thing—dipping a part of it—immersing the whole or a part, with or without plunging or dipping—overwhelming, by bring-

ing water over the person or thing.—*Treatise on Baptism*, p. 94.

TOMLINE.—The ancient mode of baptizing was by immersion, or by dipping the whole body of the person, whatever his age, into water.—*Christian Theology*, Vol. II., p. 452.

TRUMBULL.—It is also true that most Christian scholars, of every denomination, are agreed in finding the primary meaning of the word *baptize* to be "to dip," or to "immerse;" and that very many who are not Baptists believe that the rite of baptism administered by John the Baptist and by the disciples of Jesus was immersion. . . . The sweep of scholarship, in and out of the Baptist Church, is in favor of "immersion" as the principal meaning of the word "baptize."—*Sunday School Times*, Vol. XXIX., Aug. 6, 1887, p. 498.

TURRETIN.—The word *baptism* is of Greek origin, and is derived from the verb *bapto*; which signifies *to dip*, and *to dye*: *baptizein*, to baptize; to dip into, to immerse. —*Institut. Theol.*, Tom. III., Loc. XIX., Quaest. 11, § 4, p. 422.

USHER.—Some there are that stand strictly for the particular action or diving or dipping the baptized under water, as the only action which the institution of this sacrament will bear; and our church allows no other, except in the case of the child's weakness; and there is expressed in our Savior's baptism, both his descending into the water and rising up.—*Body of Divinity*, p. 497.

VAN OOSTERZEE.—As concerns the administration of baptism, *history* teaches that it is as old and as universal as Christianity itself, but also that at a very early period it degenerated from the primitive simplicity. Originally administered, in connection with immersion, by the Apostles, and their fellow-laborers, we see Holy Baptism in the ancient Church already indicated by names which testify of a high degree of appreciation.— *Practical Theology*, p. 419.

VENEMA.—It is without controversy that baptism in the primitive church was administered by immersion into water, and not by sprinkling; seeing John is said to have baptized in Jordan, and where there was much water, as Christ also did by his disciples in the neighborhood of those places, Matt. iii., and John iii. Philip also going down into the water baptized the eunuch, Acts viii. To which also the apostle refers, Rom. vi.— *Inst. Eccles.*, Tom. III., *Secul. I.*, § 138, p. 149.

WILSON.—We maintain, moreover, the existence of perfect harmony between the testimony of the classics, and the testimony of the fathers. With respect to the value of the latter, in this instance, we have been led to entertain strong views. The baptism, in the ancient church, was generally administered by immersion, frequently by trine immersion, with some additional ceremonies, rests upon the uniform and consistent testimony of ecclesiastical writers. With this mode the fathers were necessarily familiar, and the fact of its prevalence must have exerted some influence on their interpretation of *baptizo*. If, then, subsequently to the Apostolic Commission, the meaning of the term underwent any change, the circumstances of the church of the early centuries

must have given to that change a direction more decidedly and exclusively *modal*. The *immersion* of patristic baptism, as a Christian ordinance, must have had a powerful tendency to identify baptism in all its occurrences with "dip, and nothing but dip."—*Infant Baptism*, p. 93.

WITSIUS.—It is certain that both John and the disciples of Christ ordinarily used dipping; whose example was followed by the ancient church: as "Vossius, *disput. I. de baptismo, theo. 6.* and Hoornbeck *de baptismo veterum, sect. 4.* have shown from many testimonies both of the Greeks and Latins. It cannot be denied, but the native signification of the words *baptein* and *baptizein* is to plunge or dip.—*Economy of the Covenants*, Vol. III., p. 368.

WHYTE.—Liddell and Scott in their Greek Lexicon give only the *classical* senses of the word *baptism*. The example, taken from Homer, is that of a smith tempering the red-hot steel by plunging it in water. The word was used of the dyer also who steeped his fabric in a vat; of a vessel also when let down to draw up water; and of a ship dipping when launched or loaded. These are the original and root ideas in the word *baptism*.—*Commentary on the Shorter Catechism*, p. 180.

CHAPTER VI.

JOHN'S BAPTISM.

I. GENERAL TESTIMONY.

ALFORD.—The baptism was administered in the daytime, by immersion of the whole person; and while standing in the water the proselyte was instructed in certain portions of the law. . . . It is most probable that John's baptism in outward form resembled that of proselytes.—*Greek Test.*, on Matt. iii. 6, Vol. I., p. 21.

BOYS.—Now the custom in old time was to dip, and as it were to dive the whole body of the baptized in the water, as may be showed in the monuments of the Ecclesiastical histories, as also by the register of God's own record: for *John* the Baptist is said to have baptized in *Eno* beside *Salim*, because there was much water there. And *S. Luke* reports, Acts viii. 38, 39. that the great *Eunuch of Ethiopia* went into the water, and came out of the water in baptism.—*Exposition*, p. 406.

CASAUBON.—For the manner of baptizing was to plunge or *dip* them into the water, as even the word *baptizein* itself plainly enough shows; which as it does not signify *dunein*, to sink down and perish, neither certainly does it signify *epipolazein*, (to swim or float on the surface); these three words, *epipolazein*, *baptizein*, *dunein*, being very different. Hence it appears, that it was not without reason that some have long since insisted on the immersion of the whole body, in baptism, for which they urge the word *baptizein*.—*Annotations on N. T.*, on Matt. iii. 6.

DIODATI.—*Baptized,*] that is to say ducked in the water for a sign and seal of the expiation and remission of sins.—*Annotation* Matt. iii. 6.

EBRARD.—The *mode* of the symbol itself was of preeminent importance. In the place of simple *washing*, he introduced *immersion*. Every one who passed through this new rite of being dipped by John completely under the water, was led at once to seek the meaning of the rite in something more than simple *purification*. And since what John required was not mere "improvement," but the *most thorough confession of sin* (cf. Mal. iii. 7. sqq.) and *change of heart* (*Metanoia*), the most natural interpretation of this immersion in the waves would be, that it was a symbol of *their confession of utter unworthiness and condemnation*. The baptism of John was a sign, that the man was *deserving of death*. So much has the baptism of John in common with Christian baptism, Rom. vi. 4. The difference is, that in the latter penitential submission to death is followed by communication of new life, the coming forth of a new man; the latter, therefore, is more than a mere symbol.—This signification of the rite of baptism is in perfect harmony with the word *baptizo*, which embodies simply the notion of *immersion*, not of *washing away*.—So far the baptism of John was something entirely new; and was introduced in consequence of divine revelation, i. e., of a command from God,—a fact that presents no *historical difficulties*, whatever *dogmatical* difficulties it may present for Strauss.—*The Gospel History*, pp. 194,195.

EWALD.—Every member of the nation that desired to be at all a member fit for the speedy coming of the Messiah and his salvation, was required most sincerely to

confess his sins in the presence of the preacher of repentance, and to promise to lead a new life. He had then to be plunged into the deep waters by the hand of him who had in God's stead heard this sacred promise, whence, having also been especially purified from the pollution of the sins he had profoundly repented of, he must emerge again to that new life the meaning and duties of which had already been explained to him. In conclusion, he must receive from him who had just been the instrument and witness of his repentance the promise of the Divine forgiveness and new mercy. The submersion in the depth of the flowing water by the hand of the Baptist became thus the most effective, visible, and sensible symbol of the moral purification and spiritual new birth of this generation, and as it were a pledge that every one who was thus regenerated was fit for the coming Messianic salvation as long as he remained pure, as he had now vowed to do.—*Hist. of Israel*, Vol. VI., pp. 158, 159.

GRIFFITH.—And John goes on to promise a much more effectual pledge of his mercy, to be vouchsafed by Jesus: "I bathe you in water as a sign of cleansing from guilt; but the Mightier than I, whose prerogative it is to pour out God's Spirit upon all flesh (Joel ii. 28), He will bathe you with that Spirit of adoption which infuses the *assurance* of such cleansing.—*Studies of the Divine Master*, p. 39.

GROTIUS.—That this rite was accustomed to be performed by immersion, and not by perfusion, appears both by the propriety of the word, and the places chosen for its administration, John iii. 23; Acts viii. 88; and by the many allusions of the apostles, which cannot be

referred to sprinkling, Rom. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12. The custom of perfusion or aspersion seems to have obtained some time after, in favor of such who lying dangerously ill were desirous to dedicate themselves to Christ: these were called *clinics* by other Christians. See Cyprian's Epistle to Magnus to this purpose. Nor should we wonder that the old Latin Fathers use *tingere* for *baptizare*, seeing the Latin word *tingo* does properly and generally signify the same as *mersare*, to *immerse* or *plunge*.—*Annotations on the N. T.*, on Matt. iii. 6.

HAYDOCK.—*Baptized*. The word baptism signifies a *washing*, particularly when it is done by *immersion*, or by *dipping* or *plunging* a thing under water, which was formerly the ordinary way of administering the sacrament of baptism. But the Church, which cannot change the least article of the Christian faith, is not so tied up in matters of discipline and ceremonies. Not only the Catholic Church, but also the pretended reform churches, have altered this primitive custom of giving this sacrament of baptism, and now allow of baptism by pouring or sprinkling water on the person baptized: nay, many of their ministers do it now adays by flipping a wet finger and thumb over the child's head, or by shaking a wet finger or two over the child, which it is hard enough to call baptizing in any sense.—*Annotat.*, on Matt. iii. 6.

KEIM.—Doubtless however this spiritual repentance took shape and found immediate expression in the external ceremony of dipping in the Jordan. The plunging the person in the water was the altogether new and characteristic sign of this repentance. Hence it was called a baptism of repentance or a baptism to repent-

ance, *i. e.*, an immersion, which has its meaning, essence, and aim in repentance.—*Jesus of Nazara*, Vol. II., p. 239.

KENRICK.—As to the mode in which John baptized many circumstances favor the opinion that it was by some kind of immersion.—*Treatise on Baptism*, p. 189.

LIGHTFOOT.—That the baptism of John was by plunging the whole body (after the same manner as the washing of unclean persons, and the baptism of proselytes, was), seems to appear from those things, which are related of him; namely, that he "baptized in Jordan;" that he baptized "in Ænon, because there was much water there;" and that Christ, being baptized, "came up out of the water:" to which, that seems to be parallel, Acts viii. 38, Philip and the eunuch "went down into the water," &c. Some complain, that this rite is not retained in the Christian church, as though it something derogated from the truth of baptism; or as though it were to be called an innovation, when the sprinkling of water is used instead of plunging.—*Whole Works*, on Matt. iii. 6, Vol. XL, p. 63.

MACEVILLY.—"*Baptized*" strictly means, *washing*, particularly by immersion or plunging into water, the form used by the Jews, and the form of conferring Christian baptism in use in the early Church. This mode of conferring Christian baptism being a mere matter of discipline, has been, for good reasons, since exchanged for that of infusion.—*Exposition of the Gospels*, Matt. iii. 6.

MEYER.—What was symbolized in the baptism of John was the *metanoia*. To this however, the immersion of the *whole* of the baptized person, as the *metanoia*, was to

purify the whole man, corresponded with profound significance, and to this the specifically Christian view of the symbolic immersion and emersion afterwards connected itself by an ethical necessity.—*Com. on Matt.*, iii. 5, p. 78.

PLUMPTRE.—The baptism was, as the name implied, an immersion, and commonly, though not necessarily, in running water.—*Com. on Mark*, i. 4.

RENAN.—The practice was baptism, or total immersion. Ablutions were already familiar to the Jews, as they were to all the religions of the East. The Essenes had given them a peculiar extension. Baptism had become an ordinary ceremony on the introduction of proselytes into the bosom of the Jewish religion, a sort of initiatory rite. Never before John the Baptist, however, had either this importance or this form been given to immersion.—*Life of Jesus*, p. 96.

REUSS.—This relative value might be more exactly defined as symbolical—that is to say, as representing in an outward and visible manner an inward spiritual fact. Perhaps, even in this aspect of it, we may note a gradation from the baptism of John to Christian baptism; the signification of the former was restricted to the idea and fact of repentance, which in itself contained nothing more than a resolution to change the life, and a declaration of such a resolve, in connection with which was the immersion in water, representing ablution, the purification of past defilements.—*Christian Theology*, Vol. I., pp. 208,209.

ROSENMÜLLER.—*To baptize* is to immerse, to dip; the

body or the part of the body which is said to be baptized, going under the water.—*Scholia in Novum Test.*, Matt. iii. 6, Vol. I., p. 59.

STRAUSS.—We will abandon the position that John so addressed the neophytes, and only urge that the gestures of those who plunged into the purifying water must have been those of contrition.—*Life of Jesus*, Vol. I., Part II., Chap. II., § 49, p. 351.

SUTCLIFFE.—The Jews, resident in a warm country, did baptize by dipping.—*Com. on Matt.*, iii. 7.

VALPY.—This rite as practiced by John, was by total immersion, of which sprinkling has properly taken the place.—*Novum Testamentum*, Matt. iii. 6, Vol. I., p. 14.

WEISS.—For he preached the approach of that great and terrible day of Jehovah which the prophets had proclaimed (Comp. Joel ii. 1; and Isa. xiii. 9 f; Zeph. i. 14 f.) In view of this he called the nation to repentance, to complete conversion, which they were to seal by immersion in the river Jordan, in order to emerge new born, a people prepared for the Lord.—*Life of Christ*, Vol. I., p. 307.

WITSIUS.—It is certain, that both John and the disciples of Christ ordinarily used dipping; whose example was followed by the ancient church.—(*Economy of the Covenants*, Vol. III., p. 368.

II. IN JORDAN.

GEIKIE.—Bathing in Jordan had been a sacred symbol, at least, since the days of Naaman; but immersion

by one like John, with open and contrite sorrow for sin, sacred vows of amendment, and hope of forgiveness, if these proved lasting, and all this in preparation for the Messiah, was something wholly new in Israel. It marked, in the most striking way, the wonderful moral revolution which had taken place in the hearts of the people. . . . The sorrows and hopes of Israel seemed to shine out from his eyes—bright with the inspiration of his soul, but sad with the greatness of his work—as he summoned the crowds to repentance, alarmed them by words of terror, or led them, in groups, to the Jordan, and immersed each singly in the waters, after earnest and full confession of their sins.—*Life and Words of Christ*, Vol. I., pp. 375, 384, 385.

HAMMOND.—And upon this fearful denouncing of his against the Jews, a great multitude of Jews of all parts went out to him, and confessed their sins, which might justly bring down these judgments on them, each acknowledging his own particular guilts, and promising reformation. And he received them by baptism, or immersion in the water of Jordan, pronouncing to them pardon upon the sincerity of their conversion, and amendment, or reformation of their lives.—*Paraphrase*, on Matt. iii. 5, 6.

HAUSRATH.—The penitent were *to be united through baptism* in the exercise of virtue, mutual righteousness and piety before God. Immersion, consequently, was not to be merely a symbol of conversion, as in the baptism of proselytes, but an act of communion of the converted, combined with the mystic working of grace. . . . Just as the Baptist no longer dealt with separate sins, but with the sinfulness of the whole man, so,

instead of the many washings, there was the plunge once for all in Jordan.—*New Test. Times*, Vol. II., p. 105.

LANGE.—*And were baptized*, immersed, in the Jordan, confessing their sins.—Immersion was the usual mode of baptism and the symbol of repentance.—*Com. on N. T.*, on Matt. iii. 6.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—A great part of those *who* went out to hear John were baptized, that is, dipped in Jordan.—*Annotations*, on Matt. iii. 6.

WEISS.—He preached the approach of the great and terrible day of Jehovah which the prophets had proclaimed (Comp. Joel ii. 1 f.; Isa. xiii. 9 f.; Zeph. i. 14 f.). In view of this he called the nation to repentance, to complete conversion, which they were to seal by immersion in the river Jordan. And, after confessing their sins, they went down, man by man, into the waters of Jordan, in order to emerge new born, a people prepared for the Lord.—*Life of Christ*, Vol. I., p. 307.

III. IN ÆNON, "BECAUSE THERE WAS MUCH WATER THERE."

CALVIN.—From these words, we may infer that John and Christ administered baptism by plunging the whole body beneath the water.—*Comment, on John*, iii. 23.

DODDRIDGE.—Nothing surely can be more evident than that *polla hudata*, *many waters*, signifies *a large quantity of waters*, it being sometimes used for the Euphrates, Jer. li. 13. Septuagint.—*Family Expositor*, John iii. 23, Vol. I., p. 158.

GROTIUS.—Understand not many streams, but simply an abundance of water, enough to easily immerse the human body, as baptism was then performed.—*Annotations on the N. T.*, on John iii. 23.

LAMPE.—*Because there was much water there.* That plenty of water was necessary to the administration of baptism by immersion, to a very great multitude of people, is readily acknowledged.—*Com. in Evangel. Secund. Joan*, iii. 23, Vol. I., p. 656.

LIGHTFOOT.—The baptism of the Jews was, by dipping, as is apparent by the records alleged: and herein, how far the manner of baptizing in the New Testament went along with them, may be some question. There are some passages that seem to carry a colour of conformity of the one to the other: as Matt. iii. 6, 'They were baptized of John in Jordan';—Matt. iii. 16, 'Jesus came straight out of the water'; Acts, viii. 38, 'The eunuch went down into the water':—and the words in hand, 'John baptized in Ænon, because there was much water'.—*Whole Works*, on John iii. 23, Vol. V., p. 65.

OLSHAUSEN. —When Jesus left the city, he bent his steps towards the Jordan, where he baptized; remaining, however, in the country of the Jews. John also was baptizing in the neighborhood, because the water there, being deep, afforded convenience for immersion.—*Com. on Gospels and Acts*, John iii. 23, Vol. III., p. 261.

PLUMMER.—*Much water*] For immersion; the Greek means literally *many* waters. The remark shows that these places were not on the Jordan. It would be gra-

tuitous to say of the Jordan that 'there was much water there'.—*Notes on John*, iii. 23.

WHITBY.—*Because there was much water there.* In which their whole bodies might be dipped; for in this manner only was the Jewish baptism performed, by a descent into the water (Acts viii. 38), and an ascent out of it (ver. 39), and a burial in it (Rom. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12).—*Com. on N. T.*, John iii. 23.

IV. AT BETHABABA.

BLUNT.—The name Bethabara, which means "the house of the ford," is said to have been substituted for Bethany by Origen, and most recent commentators have supposed that there was a Bethany on the east of Jordan, near the fords of Jericho, as well as the Bethany near Jerusalem. But the subsequent narrative shews that the place where those occurrences took place must have been much nearer to Galilee. It was most probably at a place now known as Makhádhet' Abára, one of the principal northern fords of the Jordan, about twenty miles below the southern end of the Sea of Galilee. Having baptized at the ford of Jericho, St. John had moved northward to the equally frequented fords between Peræa and Scythopolis. The name "Bethany" probably represents that of the district known in Roman times as "Batanæa," and which comprehended the ancient kingdom of Bashan, part of which is still known as "Ard-el-Bethanieh."—*Annotated Bible*, Annot. on John i.28.

EDERSHEIM.—Rapidly the tidings spread from town and village to distant homestead, still swelling the numbers that hastened to the banks of the sacred river. He

had now reached what seems to have been the most northern point of his Mission-journey, *Beth-abara* ('the house of passage,' or 'of shipping')—according to the ancient reading, Bethany ('the house of shipping')— one of the best known fords across the Jordan into Peræa. Here he baptized.—*Life and Times of Jesus*, Vol. I., Book II., Chap. XII., p. 284.

GEIKIE.—From the "circle of Jordan," including both sides of the stream, he passed upwards, apparently to the small sunken plain which borders it, just beneath Scythopolis, where Gideon's Brook of Trembling makes its steep way from the eastern end of Esdrælon, down the Wady Jalûd, to the Jordan. He chose a spot near this, on the eastern side, known in those days as Bethabara, where a ford crossed the river, and gave facilities for baptism.—*Life and Words of Christ*, Vol. I., p. 388.

LE CLERC.—With these and like Discourses *John* entertained the *Jews* concerning the *Messiah*, and this public witness he bore to *Jesus* at *Bethabara* near the Banks of the River *Jordan*, in which at that time he washed those that repaired unto him.—*Harmony of the Evangelists*, p. 50.

WESCOTT.—*Bethabara*] This name (Judg. vii. 24?) is a mere correction, made as early as the end of the second century (*Syr. vt.*), for *Bethany*, which was probably an obscure village in Peræa, and not to be confounded with the Bethany (xi. 18) on the Mount of Olives. According to a possible derivation Bethany may mean "the house of the boat" as Bethabara "the house of the passage," both equally marking the site of a ferry or ford across the Jordan.—*Com. on John*, i. 28, in Bible Com.

V. THE BAPTISM OF JESUS.

BLOOMFIELD.—The construction here, *bapt. eis ton for en to*, does not occur elsewhere, but is one formed on the sense *to plunge* or immerse into water, rather for the sake of bathing or washing, as in John ix. 7. Jos. Ant. iv. 4,6. Plut. de Superst. It would seem to be a phrase of Provincial Greek.—*Greek Test.*, Vol. I., p. 257.

BLUNT.—We now come to the materia proxima of baptism, or ablution. The word baptism signifies generally washing, and is used in this sense in Holy Scripture. Thus it means dipping or bathing [Naaman, 2 Kings v. 14, and Judith xii. 7, LXX.], the washing of cups and dishes [Mark vii. 3, 4; Heb. x. 10], and also signifies overwhelming sorrows and sufferings [Isa. xxi. 4, LXX.; Luke xii. 50; Matt. xx. 22]. From all which illustrations we may gather the meaning of a thorough cleansing, as by immersion or washing, and not by mere affusion or sprinkling a few drops of water. The bathing of Naaman and Judith was by immersion: cups and dishes were not cleansed by a few drops of water, but by a thorough washing; and the comparison of our Lord's sufferings is intended to shew how thorough and overwhelming, as it were, was their nature. Hence, as might be supposed, the primitive mode of baptizing was by immersion, as we learn from clear testimony of Holy Scripture and of the Fathers. Thus John baptized in Ænon, near Salim [John iii. 23], because "there was much water there," and Christ after baptism "ascended up out of the water." We cannot doubt in these cases there was immersion, for it is shown from the Baptist's *reasons* for baptizing at Ænon, and Christ's "ascending" from the waters of Jordan. St. Paul's language, however, is even more explicit: he speaks of our being

buried with Christ in baptism [Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12], and with the same illustration in view that Christians die with Christ, and are raised with him [Rom. vi. 11; Col. ii. 20; iii. 3], are immersed in the baptismal water, and rise from it as our Lord from His burial in the tomb.

That immersion was the ordinary mode of baptizing in the primitive Church is unquestionable. Tertullian says, "*ter mergitamar*" we are thrice immersed, and St. Ambrose speaks of immersion in the name of each Divine person. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and St. Basil also, mention the same usage. Immersion in the name of each Divine person was, indeed, the ordinary mode of baptizing [TRINE BAPTISM] during as long as twelve centuries.—*Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theology*, Art. Bap., pp. 74, 75.

BOSSUET.—It is a fact most certainly avowed in the Reformation, although at present some will cavil at it, that Baptism was instituted by immersing the whole body into water; that Jesus Christ received it so, and caused it to be so given by his apostles; that the Scripture knows no other Baptism than this; that antiquity so understood and practiced it; that the word itself implies it, to baptize being the same as to dip.—*Hist. of the Variations of the Prot. Churches*, Vol. II., § 140, p. 371.

CAJETAN.—But Jesus, when he had been baptized went up out of the water. Therefore, he was baptized by John, neither by sprinkling or pouring; but by immersion.—*Annotations*, on Matt. iii. 16.

EDERSHEIM.—Heaven seemed cleft, and, in bodily shape like a dove, the Holy Ghost descended on Jesus, remaining on Him. It was as if, symbolically, in the

words of St. Peter, that baptism was now a new flood, and He who now emerged from it, the Noah—or rest—and comfort—bringer—who took into His ark the dove bearing the olive branch, indicative of a new life. Here at these waters, was the Kingdom, into which Jesus had entered in the fulfillment of all righteousness; and from them He emerged as its Heaven-designated, Heaven-qualified, and Heavenly proclaimed King.—*Life and Times of Jesus*, Vol. I., Book II., Chap. XII., p. 284.

GEIKIE.—John resisted no longer, and leading Jesus into the stream, the rite was performed. Can we question that such an act was a crisis in the life of our Lord? His perfect manhood, like that of all other men, in all things except sin, forbids our doubting it. Holy and pure before sinking under the waters, He must yet have risen from them with the light of a higher glory in His countenance. His past life was closed; a new era had opened. Hitherto the humble villager, veiled from the world, He was henceforth the Messiah, openly working amongst men. It was the true moment of the opening of His new life. Past years had been buried in the waters of Jordan. He entered as Jesus, the Son of Man; He rose from them, The Christ of God. — *Life and Words of Christ*, Vol. L, p. 392.

KEIM.—When Jesus quickly emerged from the water, the heavens, as Matthew tells, were opened to him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and coming upon him.—*Jesus of Nazara*, Vol. II., p. 279.

M'CARTHY. — *And Jesus being baptized, forthwith came out of the water;*] Jesus came up out of the water immediately after baptism, and behold the heavens were

opened &c. As soon as He came forth from the waters (having been baptized by immersion) the heavens were opened. Comp. Mark, i. 10, "And forthwith coming up out of the water, He saw the heavens opened."—*Notes on Matthew*, iii. 16.

MEYER.—*Eis ton Iordanen*] Conception of *immersion*. —*Com. on Mark*, i. 9.

TALMAGE.—Yesterday on horseback we left Jericho, and having dipped in the Dead Sea, we came with a feeling that we cannot describe upon the Jordan, a river which more people have desired to see than any other. On our way we overtook an American who requested me to baptize him by immersion in the river Jordan. We dismounted at the place where Joshua and his host crossed the river dry-shod. We were near a turn in the river, and not far off from where rocks and sands are piled up in shape of cathedrals, domes and battlements. We pitched our tent, and after proper examination of the candidate for baptism, I selected portions of Scripture appropriate. One of our Arab attendants had a garment not unlike a baptismal robe. With that garment girdled around me, I led the candidate down under the trees on the bank, while near by were groups of friends and some strangers who happened to be there. After a prayer, I read of Christ's baptism in the Jordan, and the commission "Go teach all nations baptizing them." The people on the bank then joined in singing to the familiar tune that soul-stirring song: "On Jordan's stormy banks I stand."

With the candidate's hand in mine, we waded deep into the Jordan, and I then declared, "In this historical river, where the Israelites crossed, and Naaman plunged

seven times for the cure of his leprosy, and Christ was baptized, and which has been used in all ages as a symbol of the dividing line between earth and heaven, I baptize thee in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, Amen." As the candidate went down under the waves and then rose, I felt a solemnity that no other scene could have inspired.—*From Manger to Throne*, pp. 46-48.

WHITBY.—*And Jesus being baptized came up straightway out of the water.* The observation of the Greek church is this, that he who ascended out of the water, must first descend down into it: "baptism therefore is to be performed, not by sprinkling, but by washing the body;" and indeed it can be only from ignorance of the Jewish rites in baptism that this is questioned; for they, to the due performance of this rite, so superstitiously required the *immersion of the whole body in the water*, that if any dirt hindered the water from coming to any part of it, the baptism was not right, and if one held the baptized by the arm when he was let down into the water, another must dip after him, holding him by the other arm that was washed before; because his hand would not suffer the water to come to his whole body.—*Com. on N. T.*, Matt. iii. 16.

CHAPTER VII.

THE BAPTISM IN THE HOLY SPIRIT.

BLUNT.—John the Baptist had heralded the kingdom of God with a baptism of water, but the complete establishment of it was to take place by the Divine Presence coming into the midst of the Apostles and surrounding them as the water had surrounded those who went down into it to be baptized.—*Annotated Bible*, Annotat. on Acts i. 5.

CAMPBELL.—The word *baptizein*, both in sacred authors and in classical, signifies 'to dip,' 'to plunge,' 'to immerse,' and was rendered by Tertullian, the oldest of the Latin fathers, 'tingere,' the term used for dyeing cloth, which was by immersion. It is always construed suitably to this meaning. Thus it is *en hudati*, *en to Iordane*. But I should not lay much stress on the preposition *en*, which, answering to the Hebrew *beth*, may denote *with* as well as *in*, did not the whole phraseology in regard to this ceremony concur in evincing the same thing. Accordingly the baptized are said *anabainein*, 'to arise,' 'emerge,' or 'ascend,' ver. 16. *apo tou hudatos*, and Acts viii. 39, *ek tou hudatos*, 'from or out of the water.' Let it be observed further, that the verbs *raino* and *rantizo*, used in Scripture for *sprinkling*, are never construed in this manner. "I will sprinkle you with clean water," says God, Ezek. xxxvi. 25. or, as it runs in the English Translation literally from the Hebrew "I will sprinkle

clean water upon you," is in the Septuagint *raino eph humas katharon hudor*, and not as *baptizo* is always construed. *Raino humas en katharo hudati*. See also Exod. xxix. 21; Lev. vi. 27; xvi. 14. Had the *baptizo* been here employed in the sense of *raino*, 'I sprinkle,' (which, as far as I know, it never is in any use, sacred or classical), the expression would doubtless have been *Ego men baptizo eph humas hudor*, or *apo ton hudatos*, agreeably to the examples referred to. When therefore the Greek word *baptizo* is adopted, I may say, rather than translated into modern languages, the mode of construction ought to be preserved so far as may conduce to suggest its original import. It is to be regretted that we have so much evidence, that even learned and good men allow their judgments to be warped by the sentiments and customs of the sect which they prefer. The true partisan, of whatever denomination, always inclines to correct the diction of the Spirit by that of the party.—*On the Gospels*, Matt. iii. 11, Vol. II., p. 21.

CARR.—*With the Holy Ghost*] Lit. *in the Holy Ghost*. This preposition is used in Greek and especially in Hellenistic Greek to signify the instrument, but it also expresses the surrounding influence or element in which an act takes place. With water = in water; with the Holy Ghost = surrounded by, influenced by the Holy Ghost.—*Notes on Matthew*, iii. 11.

CASAUBON.—*Baptizein*, indeed, signifies to plunge as if for moistening clothing, and in this sense truly the apostles are said to be baptized. For the house in which this was done was filled with the Holy Spirit and in this, as into a fish pool, the apostles seem to have been plunged. —*Annotations on the N. T.*, on Acts i. 5.

CHRISTIAN CYCLOPEDIA.—BAPTISM IN THE HOLY GHOST, that overwhelming abundance of the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, which our Savior, after his ascension, poured upon his disciples. The basis of this beautiful metaphor is found in the literal signification of baptism, which is to cover one completely with any kind of element, particularly water. So the apostles and primitive believers are said to have been not only in a degree subjected to the influence of the Holy Spirit, but filled with it, immersed in it, as in a new element of existence, life, perception, feeling, and action. —*Art. Baptism in Holy Ghost*, p. 169.

COOK.—*With the Holy Ghost.*] Or, "in the Holy Ghost;" lit., "in Holy Spirit." The Holy Spirit is here represented as a life-giving stream; rather in His operation than in His Personality. "In" expresses the immersion of the convert's entire being in the influence.—*Com. on Mark*, i. 8, in *Bible Commentary*.

CYRIL.—But he came down to invest the Apostles with power, and to baptize them; for the Lord says, *Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence*. His grace is not in part, but his power is in full perfection; for as he who plunges into the waters and is baptized is encompassed on all sides by the waters, so were they also baptized completely by the Holy Ghost. The water however envelops but outwardly, but the Spirit baptizes also the soul within, and that perfectly.—*Catechetical Lectures*, Lect. XVII., Par. 14, p. 227.

HOPKINS.—As fire eats out and consumes the rust and dross of metals; so those, that are baptized with the Spirit, are as it were plunged into that heavenly flame,

whose searching energy devours all their dross, tin, and base alloy.— *Works*, Vol. II., p. 469.

LANGE.—He proceeds to point out the relation of his baptism to that of Christ. *He shall baptize, or immerse, you in the Holy Ghost and in fire.* He will either entirely immerse you in the Holy Ghost as penitents, or, if impenitent, he will overwhelm you with the fire of judgment, and at last with hellfire.—*Com. on Matthew*, iii. 11.

LECHLER.—The gift of the Spirit is here termed a *baptism*, and is thus characterized as one of most abundant fulness and as a submersion in a purifying and life giving element. The term and the image are both derived from the water-baptism of John.—*Com. on Acts*, i. 5.

MEYER.—To the characteristic *en hudati eis metanoian* stands opposed the higher characteristic *en pneumati agio kaipuri*, the two elements of which *together* antithetically correspond to that "baptism by water unto repentance;" see subsequently.—*en* is agreeably to the conception of baptizo* not to be taken as *instrumental*, but as *in*, in the meaning of the *element*, in which baptism † takes place.—*Com. on Matt.*, iii. 11.

NEANDER.—In respect to the form of baptism, it was in conformity with the original institution and the original import of the symbol, performed by immersion, as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Spirit, of being

*The Edinburgh edition of Meyer puts *immersion* in parentheses after *baptizo*.—J. W. S.

† The same edition has *immersion* here instead of *baptism*.—J. W. S.

entirely penetrated by the same.—*Church History*, Vol. I., p. 422.

NORTON.—When John says, "He will baptize you *in* the Holy Spirit and *in* fire," we must recollect that the ancient mode of baptizing was by plunging into water. The meaning of these words is, that Christ would come as the dispenser of spiritual blessings, in which those who received him would be, as it were, baptized, while they who rejected those blessings would be destroyed, baptized in fire.—*Notes on the Gospels*, on Matt. iii. 11, Vol. II., pp. 26, 27.

PYLE.—As John the Baptist made his disciples by the significant ceremony of plunging them in the water, so you shall be consecrated as my apostles in a manner much more solemn, by a miraculous effusion of the Holy Spirit.—*Paraphrase*, on Acts i. 5.

PLUMPTRE.—*He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.*—As heard and understood at the time, the baptism with the Holy Ghost would imply that the souls thus baptized would be plunged, as it were, in that creative and informing Spirit which was the source of life and holiness and wisdom.—*Com. on Matthew*, iii. 11.

TILLOTSON.—"It filled all the house." This is that, which, ver. 5 of first chapter, our Savior calls "baptizing the apostles with the Holy Ghost," so that they who sat in the house were, as it were, immersed in the Holy Ghost, as they who were baptized with water, were overwhelmed and covered all over with water, which is the proper notion of baptism.—*Works*, Vol. X., p. 4512.

VAN OOSTERZEE.—*He shall baptize you with [better in] the Holy Ghost, and with fire.*—He will, so to speak, wholly immerse you in the Holy Ghost, and in fire.—*Com. on Luke, iii. 16.*

CHAPTER VIII.

BAPTISM IN SUFFERINGS.

ALFORD.—The symbolic nature of Baptism is here to be borne in mind. *Baptism = Death*. The figure in the Sacrament is the *drowning*,— the *burial*, in the water, of the *old man* and the *resurrection* of the *new man*. —*Greek Testament*, Note on Luke xii. 51, Vol. I., p. 570.

BARNES.—Are ye able *to suffer* with me—to endure the *trials* and *pains* which shall come upon you and me in endeavoring to build up my kingdom? Are you able to bear it when sorrows shall cover you like water, and you shall be sunk beneath calamities as floods, in the work of religion? Afflictions are often expressed by being sunk in the floods and plunged in deep waters, Ps. lxi. 2; Isa. xliii. 2; Ps. cxxiv. 4, 5; Lam. iii. 54.—*Notes*. on Matt. xx. 22.

BENGEL.—To drink this *cup* was difficult (as often death is taken in the act of drinking). *Baptism* also, among the Jews, was a thing to be shuddered at, inasmuch as the whole body was dipped in a stream, however cold. Accordingly, by both words the passion of Christ is denoted: by *the cup*, His inward passion. He was *distended* inwardly with His passion [referring to *the cup*; He was *filled* with the cup of anguish]: He was *covered over* [as a person baptized is with water] with His passion. Moreover, both are appropriately employed.— *Gnomon*, on Mark x. 38, Vol. I., pp. 549, 550.

BLOOMFIELD.—' I, too, have to undergo a baptism of suffering,' i. e., as it is elsewhere said, 'to suffer *many things*,' 'to suffer very greatly,' in reference to his passion and death. In baptism the whole body was immersed under water; and, in reference to this, our Lord calls his sufferings a *baptism*, because he was about to be wholly immersed in sorrows, to become 'a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief.'—*Greek Testament*, Luke xii. 50, Vol. I., p. 446.

BROWN, JOHN.—Finally, in using the word baptism in reference to his sufferings, our Lord may intend to indicate their SEVERITY. Some, though not all, the legal baptisms, were immersions, submersions. When we consider the nature, the number, the variety, the severity, the early commencement, the close succession, the strange complication, the long continuance, of his sufferings, we may well say, he was plunged into an abyss of sufferings. He "came into deep waters, where the floods overwhelmed him." You see, then, what are the qualities of our Lord's sufferings, indicated by their being termed a "baptism":—they were divinely appointed;—the suffering of a sacred person,—severe sufferings. —*Disc. and Say. of our Lord*, Vol. I., pp. 463, 464.

CAMPBELL.—"Undergo an immersion like that which I must undergo," *to baptisma ho ego baptizomai, baptisthenai*. English Translation: "To be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with." The primitive signification of *baptisma* is 'immersion,' of *baptizein*, 'to immerse,' 'plunge,' or 'overwhelm.' The noun ought never to be rendered *baptism*, nor the verb *to baptize*, but when employed in relation to a religious ceremony. The verb *baptizein* sometimes, and *baptein*, which is synonymous,

often occurs in the Septuagint and Apocryphal writings, and is always rendered in the common version by one or other of these words, 'to dip,' 'to wash,' 'to plunge.' When the original expression, therefore, is rendered in familiar language, there appears nothing harsh or extraordinary in the metaphor. Phrases like these, to be overwhelmed with grief, to be immersed in affliction, will be found in most languages.—*On the Gospels*, Matt. xx. 22, Vol. II., p. 106.

CLARKE, ADAM.—Baptism among the Jews, as it was performed in the coldest weather, and the persons were kept under water for some time, was used not only to express *death*, but the most cruel kind of death.—*Com. on Matt.*, xx. 22.

DIODATI.—*Baptized*] this kind of figure is taken from the ancient manner of Christening, plunging the whole body in water above the head: So Christ hath been wholly plunged in anguish and torments, Psalm Lxix. 2. —*Annotat.*, on Matt. xx. 22.

DODDRIDGE.—*But I have* indeed, in the mean time, a most *dreadful baptism to be baptized with*, and know that I shall shortly be bathed, as it were, in blood, and plunged in the most overwhelming distress.—*Family Expositor*, Luke xii. 50, Vol. II., p. 122.

A LAPIDE.—Christ also calls his passion a baptism, because in it he was wholly immersed and plunged, i. e., He died.—*Com. on the Gospels*, on Matt. xx. 22.

LIGHTFOOT, JOHN.—Christ foretells his own death and their suffering martyrdom, under the title of Baptism; in

which sense the apostle also useth the word, 1 Cor. xv. 29. The Jewish baptizings, or dippings, in their purifications, was a very sharp piece of religion,—when, in frost and snow, and wind weather, they must *dip* overhead and ears in cold water; from which the phrase was used to signify death and the bitterest sufferings.— *Whole Works*, Vol. III., p. 126.

MALDONATUS.—Baptism is also put for suffering and death, as Christ speaks in S. Luke xii. 50. Hence martyrdom is also called baptism, a metaphor taken probably from those who are sunk into the sea to destroy them; for in the Greek baptism means submerging.— *Com. on the Holy Gospels*, on Matt. xx. 22.

MORISON.—*Or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?* Rather a peculiar expression, and explained by Campbell, Bleek, Meyer, Grimm, as denoting *immersing*, or *immerging*, and *consequent whelming* in calamities; *Can ye bear to be plunged into the trials into which I am plunged, and which are about to overwhelm Me?* Or, as Fetters explains, "Are ye able and fit to be dipped or drenched in those deep waters of affliction, pains, and miseries, in which I must shortly be drenched?" Principal Campbell's version is, *Can ye undergo an immersion, like that which I must undergo?* It is more likely however that the word *baptism* has, not its etymological, but its conventional Palestinian import (see chap. vii. 4), so that the idea of *purification* is brought into view: *Can ye endure the purifying ordeal through which I am passing, and which is just about to reach the climax in my experience?* Meyer objects that the idea of a *purifying ordeal* was not applicable to our Lord. Unreasonably. There was indeed no personal impurity in his character. He 'knew

no sin' (2 Cor. v. 21), as He passed through the ordeal, not the least atom of alloy was discovered. He stood the test; He came out of the fiery trial victorious. But it was a fiery trial, a most searching test and ordeal. It was, in a peculiar sense, *a baptism of fire*, or, to change the figure, *a salting with fire* (chap. ix. 49). It burned into his inmost sensibility, and produced 'agony' (Luke xxii. 44). He willingly endured it, and came out 'perfected through sufferings' (Heb. ii. 10). He now asked James and John *if they could endure such a baptism of fire*.—*Commentary on Mark*, x. 38, pp. 294, 295.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—Afflictions are ordinarily compared in scripture to water. To be baptized is to be dipped in water; metaphorically, to be plunged in afflictions. I am, saith Christ, to be *baptized with blood*, overwhelmed with sufferings and afflictions.—*Annotations*, on Matt. xx. 22.

SCOTT, THOMAS.—Our Lord might indeed, by a strong figure of speech, be said to have been *immersed* in sufferings, when he endured the wrath of God as the propitiation for our sins.—*Com. on Matt.*, xx. 22, 23.

STUART.—Inasmuch, now, as the more usual idea of *baptizo* is that of *overwhelming, immersing*, it was very natural to employ it in designating severe calamities and sufferings.—*Mode of Christian Baptism*, p. 73.

SUTCLIFFE.—*Are ye able—to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?* Baptism here is figuratively understood for being plunged into sorrows and afflictions.—*Com.*, on Matt. xx. 22.

TRAPP, JOHN.—*And be baptized with the baptism*] Or plunged over head and ears in the deep waters of affliction.—*Com. on N. T.*, on Matt. xx. 22.

TRAPP.—The *Baptism*—*i. e.* Being *plunged*, and *overwhelmed* in the *Waters of Affliction*; being *baptized* in *Blood*, &c.—*Notes upon the Four Gospels*, on Matt. xx. 22.

TROLLOPE.—*To drink of the same cup with another*, is to partake of the same lot, more generally in a bad sense. *Baptism* is also made to represent in Scripture *immersion in calamity*. Compare Ps. xlii. 7; cxxiv. 4, 5; Jerem. xlvii. 2; Dan. ix. 26.—*Greek Test.*, Note on Matt. xx. 22.

VALPY.—Figurative phrases like these are common in most languages. We say *the cup* of affliction, and to be overwhelmed or *immersed* in affliction. ... In the O. T. afflictions are represented under the image of great waters passing, and overwhelming a person.—*Novum Testamentum*, Note on Matt. xx. 22, Vol. I., p. 137.

VAN OOSTERZEE.—*A baptism to be baptized with*.—Over against the heavenly fire which he sends, stands the earthly water of the suffering which previously to that must roll entirely over him.—*To be baptized*.—An image of the depth and intensity of this suffering, like a baptism performed by immersion.—*Com. on Luke*, xii. 50.

WATSON.—*Baptized with the baptism*, &c.—The being immersed and overwhelmed with waters is a frequent metaphor, in all languages, to express the rush of successive troubles. This repetition of the same term is not peculiar to the Hebrew style, but is found also in the ancient Greek writers.—*Exposition*, Matt. xx. 22.

WHITBY.—The metaphor of baptism, or immersion in waters, or being put under floods, is also familiar in Scripture, to signify a person overwhelmed with calamities; as when the psalmist complains "that the waves had gone over him," Ps. xlii. 7, that he was "come into deep waters," Ps. lxi. 2, see Ps. lxxxviii. 7; Cant. viii. 7; Jer. xlvii. 2; Ezek. xxvi. 19; Dan. ix. 26; Jonah ii. 3. And in this sense Christ saith of his death, "I have a baptism to be baptized with" (Luke xii. 50). Of this cup the apostle James drank when he was killed by the sword of Herod (Acts xii. 2); and St. John, when he was put into a furnace of hot oil, exiled to Patmos, and suffered many other things for the name of Jesus.—Com. on N. T., on Matt. xx. 22.

WITSIUS.—The *immersion* into water, represents to us that tremendous *abyss of divine justice*, in which Christ was plunged for a time, in some measure, in consequence of his undertaking for our sins: as he complained under the type of David, Psal. lxi. 2. *I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing: I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me.*—*Economy of the Covenants*, Vol. III., p. 377.

WORDSWORTH.—Christ's *Death* was his *Baptism*. In it he was buried; He was, as it were, *drowned* (Ps. xlii. 9), and then he rose again, *emerged*, as it were, from the waterflood, with His body now prepared for glory and immortality. And therefore we are *baptized* into His *death*, "buried with Him, wherein also we are risen together with Him."—*Greek Testament*, Note on Luke xii. 49.

CHAPTER IX.

THE BAPTISM MENTIONED IN MARK VII. 1-4; LUKE xi. 38.

BEZA.—" *They were bathed*" *baptisontai*; Vulgate, *baptizentur*, which Erasmus with reason changed, since it was not performed by that solemn ablution, to which (as I before said) the appellation of *baptism* had been now for a long time, by the custom of all the churches, set apart and consecrated. But *baptizesthai* is more in this place than *cherniptein*, because the former would seem to be understood of the whole body, the latter of the hands only. Nor, indeed, does *to baptizein* signify *to wash*, unless by consequence. For it properly means to immerse, for the sake of dyeing.—*Annotat.*, in Mar. vii. 4, p. 161.

DÖLLINGER.—Even in Luke xi. 38 and Mark vii. 4 *baptizesthai* means dipping or taking a bath, not washing the hands. In the first passage it alludes to the Pharisees' custom of cleansing themselves from any impurities possibly contracted, after returning from market.—*The First Age of Christ, and the Church*, Vol. II., p. 183.

GREEN.—And there assembled to him the Pharisees and some of the scribes, having come from Jerusalem: and on seeing some of his disciples eating bread with defiled, that is, unwashed, hands—for the Pharisees and all the Jews do not eat, unless they wash their hands with nicety, holding fast the tradition of the elders: and coming from the market-place they do not eat, unless they dip themselves: and there are many other matters which

they have received to hold, dipping of cups and jars and brazen vessels and couches.—*Twofold New Test.*, Mark vii. 4.

But the Pharisees on seeing it wondered that he had not dipped before dinner.—*Ib.*, Luke xi. 38.

GROTIUS.—They were more solicitous to cleanse themselves from the defilement they had contracted in the market; and therefore they not only washed their hands, but immersed their whole body.—*Annotations on the N. T.*, on Mark vii. 4.

HAMMOND.—The word here used, *baptizesthai*, (as it differs from *niptesthai* v. 3.) signifies not only the *washing* of the whole body, (as when 'tis said of *Eupolis*, which wrote the tragedy called *bapta*, that being taken and thrown into the sea, *ebaptizeto*, *he was immersed all over*: and so the *baptisms* of cups, &c. in the end of this verse, is putting into water all over, rinsing them) but *washing* any part, as the hands here, by way of immersion in water, as that is opposed to affusion or pouring water on them.—*Annotations*, on Mark vii. 4.

MACLEAR.—The Israelites, who, like other Oriental nations, fed with their fingers, washed their hands before meals, for the sake of cleanliness. But these customary washings were distinct from the ceremonial ablutions; in the former water was *poured upon the hands*; in the latter the hands were *plunged in water*. When, therefore, some of the Pharisees remarked that our Lord's disciples ate with "*unwashed hands*" it is not to be understood literally that they did not at all wash their hands, but that they did not *wash them ceremonially* according to their own practice. . . .

Except they wash] "Wash" here implies complete immersion as contrasted with the mere washing of the hands in verse 3.—*Notes on Mark*, vii. 3, 4.

MEYER.—In this case *ean me baptis*. is not to be understood of *washing the hands* (Lightfoot, Wetstein), but of *immersion*, which the word in classic Greek and in the N. T. everywhere denotes, i. e., in this case according to the context: *to take a bath*. Having come from market, where they have contracted pollution through contact with the crowd, they eat not, without having first *bathed*. The statement proceeds *by way of climax*; before eating they observe the washing of hands *always*, but the *bathing*, *when they come from market* and wish to eat.—*Com. on Mark*, on vii. 4, p. 88.

MILTON.—It is in vain alleged by those who, on the authority of Mark vii. 4; Luke xi. 38, have introduced the practice of affusion in baptism instead of immersion, that to dip and to sprinkle mean the same thing; since in washing we do not sprinkle the hands, but immerse them.—*Treatise on Christ. Doct.*, Chap. XXVIII., p. 437.

PLUMPTRE.—Except they wash.—The Greek verb differs from that in the previous verse, and implies the washing or immersion (the verb is that from which our word "baptize" comes to us) of the whole body, as the former does of part.—*Com. on Mark*, vii. 4.

TROLLOPE.—Probably it may mean a *handful of water*, which was the smallest quantity allowed by the Rabins in washing the hands: and there is this difference between *niptesthai* and *baptizsthai*, that the first signifies to wash the hands by pouring water on them, the latter by

dipping them in the water.—*Greek Testament*, Note on Mark vii. 3.

VALPY.—*Pugme* according to the old lexicographers signifies the fist, or the hand contracted for grasping; and here, according to Wetstein, most probably denotes a *handful*. The same excellent critic shows at the same time the proper distinction and contrast between *niptesthai* and *baptizesthai*: the former, *manibus qffundere*, to wash by pouring water on the hands; the latter, *manus aquæ immergere*, to dip them. So that the meaning is, that *they eat not, until they have washed their hands with a handful*, i. e. a small quantity of water, or by pouring a little water on them; and *when they come from market, erchomenoi* und. See Bos at *erchomenos*, *they eat not except they dip them*.—*Novum Testamentum*, Note on Mark vii. 3, 4, Vol. I., p. 243.

VENEMA.—The word *baptizein*, *to baptize*, is no where used in the Scriptures for sprinkling; no not in Mark vii. 4. otherwise than appears to some.—*Hist. Eccles.*, Tom. III., Secul. L, § 138, p. 149.

CHAPTER X.

THE BAPTISMS MENTIONED IN ACTS OF APOSTLES.

I. BAPTISM OF THE THREE THOUSAND.

ABBOTT.—*Were baptized.* Immediately, though not necessarily on the same day. The 3000 accepted the truth at once, but time may have been taken, necessary for the rite of baptism. How it was performed is not indicated in the narrative. We cannot safely say that there was not time to baptize all by immersion, for what time was taken for the baptism we are not told; not that there could have been no opportunity for immersion, for there were abundant pools of water in and about Jerusalem, in some of which bathing was certainly allowed (John v. 4; ix. 7), and whether they could have been made available by the disciples for this purpose we have no means of knowing. The implication of the narrative is certainly that only those persons were at this time baptized who were old enough to accept, understandingly, the word.—*Com. on Acts*, ii. 41.

CUNNINGHAM.— Peter dipped his crowd of converts into one of the great pools which were to be found in Jerusalem. Unless it had been so, Paul's analogical argument about our being buried with Christ in baptism would have had no meaning.— *The Growth of the Church*, p. 173.

HALLEY.—I must candidly, as I do cheerfully acknowledge, that there must have been abundance of water in

the city to have washed away the blood of two hundred and fifty thousand lambs slain at one passover. How to reconcile the sufficiency of water for such a sacrifice with the accounts of its scarcity may not be easy; but that sufficient water must have been in Jerusalem, I am bound, to acknowledge. Let the reader consider both sides of these references to past events. Let him consider, on the one hand, the great quantity of water used for the sacrifices; on the other, the bringing of water on mules from Bethlehem for sale, as is done to this day. Considering the multitudes in Jerusalem at the feasts, there must have been means of preserving vast quantities of water. How, without large supplies, could they have sustained their long sieges, although they often suffered severely from scarcity? I have no doubt of the sufficiency of water.— *The Sacraments*, Part I., p. 318.

PLUMPTRE.—The largeness of the number has been urged as rendering it probable that the baptism was by affusion, not immersion. On the other hand (1) immersion had clearly been practiced by John, and was involved in the original meaning of the word, and it is not likely that the rite should have been curtailed of its full proportions at the very outset. (2) The symbolic meaning of the act required immersion in order that it might be clearly manifested, and Rom. vi. 4, and 1 Peter iii. 21, seem almost of necessity to imply the more complete mode. The pools or swimming-baths of Bethesda and Siloam (see John v. 7; ix. 7), or the so-called Fountain of the Virgin, near the temple enclosure, or the bathing-places within the Tower of Antony (Jos. Wars, V. 5, § 8), may well have helped to make the process easy.—*Com. on Acts*, ii. 41.

SCHAFF.—It is often urged that the pentecostal Baptism of three thousand persons by total immersion (Acts ii. 41; comp. iv. 4) was highly improbable in Jerusalem, where water is scarce and the winter torrent Kidron is dry in summer (I found it dry in the month of April, 1877). But immersion was certainly not impossible, since Jerusalem has several large public pools (Bethesda, Hezekiah, Upper and Lower Gihon) and many cisterns in private houses. The explorations of Captain Wilson (1864) and Captain Warren (1867) have shown that the water supply of the city, and especially of the temple, was very extensive and abundant. The Baptism of Christ in the Jordan and the illustrations of Baptism used in the New Testament (Rom. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12; 1 Cor. x. 2; 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21) are all in favor of immersion rather than sprinkling, as is freely admitted by the best exegetes, Catholic and Protestant, English and German. Comp. *e. g.* Meyer and Weiss on Rom. vi. 3, and Lightfoot on Col. ii. 12. Nothing can be gained by unnatural exegesis.—*Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, pp. 55, 56.

VENEMA.—Nor is there any necessity to have recourse to the idea of sprinkling in our interpretation of Acts ii. 41, where three thousand souls are said to be added to Christ by baptism; seeing it might be performed by immersion equally as by aspersion, especially as they are not said to have been baptized at the same time.—*Inst. Eccles.*, Tom. III., Seoul. I., § 138, p. 149.

WEISS.—From those, however, who should henceforth be gained by the apostolic preaching, and who should wish to connect themselves with this Church, Peter already according to his first Pentecostal sermon, demanded the baptism of repentance, (Acts ii. 38), which John

had once demanded from the whole nation. By submersion the resolution to abandon entirely the old disposition, and to begin a new life as a new man, was to be represented and confirmed in a symbolical act. That which was new was only this, that the act of submersion was performed in the name of Jesus.—*Biblical Theology*, Vol. I. § 41, p. 186.

II. THE BAPTISM OF THE EUNUCH.

ABBOTT.—*Into the water . . . out of the water.* The original unquestionably implies a going, not *to*, but *into* the water.—*Com. on Acts*, viii. 88, 39.

BLOOMFIELD.—Probably some fountain, or pool, formed by a brook either running into the Eschol, or else formed at a bend thereof. Ancient tradition fixes the spot to a place called Bethsur, 20 miles from Jerusalem, as Jerome testifies, on the *old road* leading to Gaza. This is confirmed by Pocock, who found near a village called Betur, a fountain at the head of a considerable brook (running, I doubt not, into the river Eschol), built over, and near which are the remains of a Christian Church.—*Greek Test.*, Note on Acts viii. 36, Vol. I., p. 752.

BLUNT. — *What doth hinder me to be baptized?*] This question evidently arose out of the Evangelist's discourse. He had spoken of the death of Jesus, and he had also spoken of being "baptized into His death;" he had spoken of the Resurrection, and also of being "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 also should walk in newness of life."

And they went down into the water] Such a baptism, by immersion, would associate itself very forcibly with the

idea of death in Christ when going down into the water, and of resurrection in Christ when coming up out of it. —*Annotated Bible*, Annotat. on Acts viii. 36, 38.

BURKITT.—Observe the manner of the administration of baptism to the eunuch: he went down into the water, and was baptized by Philip. In those hot countries it was usual so to do; and we do not oppose the lawfulness of dipping in some cases, but the necessity of dipping in all cases.—*Notes on the New Testament*, on Acts viii. 38.

CALVIN.—Here we see the rite used among the men of old time in baptism; for they put all the body into the water. Now the use is this, that the minister doth only sprinkle the body or the head.—*Commentary*, on Acts viii. 38.

COX, HOMERSHAM.—This [immersion] was clearly the mode of baptizing the Ethiopian eunuch, 'They both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch, and he baptized him' (Acts viii. 38).—*The First Cent. of Christ*. (Foot-note), p. 277.

DODDRIDGE.—Considering how frequently bathing was used in those hot countries, it is not to be wondered that baptism was generally administered by immersion, though I see no proof that it was essential to the institution. It would be very unnatural to suppose that they went down to the water, merely that Philip might take up a little water in his hand to pour on the eunuch. A person of his dignity had, no doubt, many vessels in his baggage, on such a journey through so desert a country, a precaution absolutely necessary for travelers in

those parts, and never omitted by them.—*Family Expositor*, Acts viii. 38, Vol. III., p. 119.

LINDSAY.—*Into the water*, for it was the almost universal practice in the early Church for the recipient of baptism to lay aside his garments, to enter into and stand waist deep in the water, and be plunged beneath the surface "in the name of the Lord Jesus."—*Notes on Acts*, viii. 38.

PLUMPTRE.—The Greek preposition might mean simply "*unto* the water," but the universality of immersion in the practice of the early Church supports the English version. The eunuch would lay aside his garments, descend chest-deep into the water, and be plunged under it "in the name of the Lord Jesus."—*Ellicott's N. T. Com.*, Vol. V., p. 145.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—In hot countries this was usual, to baptize by dipping the body in the water; and to this the apostle alludes, when he tells the Corinthians, 1 Cor. vi. 11, that they are washed.—*Annotations*, on Acts viii. 38.

THOMPSON.—If the eunuch came down Wady 'Aly from Jerusalem, he would follow nearly the same track from Latron that I once took, and this is now regarded as the earliest and safest route; if he came by Wady Sûrar, entering the plain near Beth-shemesh, he would cross it further south; and if he descended by Eleutheropolis, his route would be still nearer the southern desert. Then another question is, whether Philip set out from Samaria or from Jerusalem; most probably from Samaria, as I think, for he appears to have been in that city when

he received the command to go. He would then have met the chariot somewhere southwest of Latron. There is a fine stream of water, called Murūbbah, deep enough even in June to satisfy the utmost wishes of our Baptist friends.— *The Land and the Book*, p. 536.

TURRETIN.—In former times, the persons to be baptized were immersed in the water, continued under the water, and emerged out of it, Matt. iii. 16; Acts viii. 38; so the old man died in them and was buried, and the new man arose.—*Institut. Theol.*, Tom. III., Loc. XIX., Quaes. 11, § 14, p. 426.

III. THE BAPTISM OF SAUL.

LECHLER.—He was probably baptized in one of the rivers which Naaman had extolled in his day, the Abana or Pharpar.—*Com. on Acts*, ix. 18.

PLUMPTRE.—It is clear that both Saul and Ananias looked on this as the indispensable condition for admission into the visible society of the kingdom of God. No visions and revelations of the Lord, no intensity of personal conversion exempted him from it. For him, too, that was the "washing of regeneration" (Tit. iii. 5), the moment of the new birth, of being buried with Christ (Rom. vi. 3, 4). It may be inferred almost as a matter of certainty that it was at the hands of Ananias that he received baptism. The baptism would probably be administered in one or other of the rivers which the history of Naaman had made so famous. And so the waters of "Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus" (2 Kings v. 12), were now sanctified no less than those of Jordan for the "mystical washing away of sin."—*Com. on Acts*, ix. 18.

IV. THE BAPTISM OF CORNELIUS.

ABBOTT. — Alford's deduction from the form of expression here, *the* water, that the practice was to bring the water to the candidates, not the candidates to the water, appears to me far-fetched.—*Com. on Acts*, x. 47.

BLOOMFIELD.—By *to hudor* is meant the 'water of baptism;' or perhaps the word is used to make it match with *to pneuma*.—On further consideration, I cannot see reason to argue with those expositors (including Mr. Alford) who regard the expression *kolusai*, used with *to hudor*, as proving that the practice was, to bring the water to the candidates (for baptism), not the candidates to the water. No practice can be inferred from a *single case* so extraordinary as this. Besides the very same expression, *ti koluei me baptisthenai*; occurs *supra* viii. 36; a case where it is plain that baptism by immersion was employed.—*Greek Testament*, Note on Acts x. 47, Vol. I., p. 769.

KRUMMACHER.—His old heathen and natural man was, in the sight of God slain and entombed by the baptismal element; and he himself arose from the water a new man. —*Cornelius the Centurion*, p. 287.

V. THE BAPTISM OF THE JAILER.

MEYER.—*He took and washed them*. Vividness of delineation. Probably he led them to a neighboring water, perhaps in the house, in which his baptism and that of his household was immediately completed.

[In a foot-note Meyer adds]: This is confirmed by the fact that baptism took place by complete immersion,— in opposition to Baumgarten, p. 515, who, transferring the performance of baptism to the house, finds here "an

approximation to the later custom of simplifying the ceremony," according to which complete immersion did not take place. Immersion was, in fact, quite an essential part of the symbolism of baptism (Rom. vi.).—*Com. on Acts*, xvi. 33, p. 317.

CHAPTER XI.

THE REFERENCES TO BAPTISM IN THE EPISTLES.

I. BURIED IN BAPTISM, ROM. VI. 4; COL. II. 12.

AITKEN.—In this passage St. Paul speaks of our being buried with Him by baptism into death. We never understand Holy baptism till we take this view of it. It is not a mere washing; it is a burial and raising from the grave; its lesson is death and resurrection. We can understand how eloquently this symbol must have appealed to the feelings of those converted to God from heathen or Jewish systems. We can understand as they passed down into the waters of baptism, and rose up again recognized Christians, how completely they would feel they were severed from their old relations, and identified with Him in whom they had professed their faith. They were saying farewell to all associations of their former years; they were saying farewell to all the habits of their former lives; they were turning their backs on their old selves. As they rose up from the water they must have felt that they occupied a new relationship to the world, a new relationship to their fellow-Christians; nay, a new relationship (if I may use such an anomalous expression) to themselves; their own nature possessing a harmony in itself to which it had previously been a stranger, and most of all, a new relationship to the God into whose family they had thus been introduced, and to whom they had become bound by an indissoluble tie.—*Newness of Life*, pp. 4, 5.

ALFORD.—*Buried together* (i. e. ' when we were buried:' the aorist participle, as so often is contemporary with the preceding past verb) *with Him in your baptism* (the new life being begun at baptism,—an image familiar alike to Jews and Christians,—the process itself of baptism is regarded as the burial of the former life): originally, perhaps, owing to the practice of immersion, which would most naturally give rise to the idea.—*Greek Test.*, Note on Col. ii. 12, Vol. III., p. 220.

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS.—This baptism, therefore, is given into the death of Jesus: the water is instead of the burial, and the oil instead of the Holy Ghost; the seal instead of the cross; the ointment is the confirmation of the confession; the mention of the Father as of the Author and Sender; the joint mention of the Holy Ghost as of the witness; the descent into the water the dying together with Christ; the ascent out of the water the rising again with Him.—B. III., § 2, Chap. XVII., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VII., p. 431.

BANNERMAN.—There are two things which seem plain enough to be included in this remarkable statement. *In the first place*, the immersion in water of the persons of those who are baptized is set forth as their burial with Christ in His grave because of sin; and their being raised again out of the water is their resurrection with Christ in His rising again from the dead because of their justification. Their death with Christ was their bearing the penalty of sin, and their resurrection with Christ was their being freed from it, or justified. And *in the second place*, their burial in water, when dying with Christ, was the washing away of the corruptness of the old man beneath the water; and their coming forth from

the water in the image of His resurrection was their leaving behind them the old man with his sins, and emerging into newness of life. Their immersion beneath the water, and their emerging again, were the putting off the corruption of nature and rising again into holiness, or sanctification.—*The Church of Christ*, Vol. II., pp. 47, 48.

BARNES.—It is altogether probable that the apostle in this place had allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion.—*Notes*, on Rom. vi. 4.

BAUR.—Baptism, as baptism into Christ, is itself a baptism into his death, and in its form as an immersion, baptism represented this fellowship in Christ's death as symbolically a fellowship in his burial. It was very graphically represented in the rite, how he had to descend with Christ into death, and the grave, and the under-world, in order to rise with him again to a new life.—*Paul, His Life and Work*, Vol. II., p. 178.

BAXTER.—It is commonly confessed by us to the Anabaptists (as our commentators declare) that in the apostle's times the baptized were dipped over head in water, and that this signified their profession, both of believing the burial and resurrection of Christ; and of their own present renouncing the world and flesh, or dying to sin and living to Christ, as the apostle expoundeth in the fore-cited texts, of Col. ii. and Rom. vi.—*Disput. of Right to Sac.*, p. 58.

BECON.—The plunging into the water signified that we are buried with Christ, as the plucking of us out of the water preacheth unto us that we be risen again with

Christ; which thing St. Paul also teacheth.—*Catechism*, p. 227.

BEET.—From the earliest sub-apostolic writings we learn immersion was the usual, though not the only valid form of Baptism. Barnabas (about 100) says in ch. XI. of his Epistle; "We go down into the water full of sins and defilement, and we go up bearing fruit in the heart." And we cannot doubt that to this Paul refers.—*Com. on, Horn.*, vi. 4, p. 180.

BENECKE.—When we are plunged into the water (according to the ancient custom) and, as it were, into the purifying Christ, (*eis Christon*,) we are plunged into his death. A death must ensue within us, and a new life commence. We are buried with him through baptism into his death, that as Christ was raised to a new life through the power and glory of the Father, working mightily and gloriously in him, so we also may rise to a new life, to a perfectly changed existence. The immersion as a symbol of the burial, and the emersion of the resurrection to a new life.—*Exp. of Paul's Epist. to the Rom.*, vi. 4, p. 230.

BENNETT.—The terms of Scripture describing the rite, most of the figures used by the writers of the New Testament to indicate its significance (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 10, et al), the explanations in the Apostolic Constitutions, the comments of the foremost Christian fathers for the first six centuries, and the express instructions of ecclesiastical councils indicate that immersion was the more usual mode of baptism.—*Archaeology*, p. 397.

BENSON.—*Therefore we are buried with him*—Alluding

to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.—Com. *on Rom.*, vi. 4.

BINGHAM.—Persons, thus divested or unclothed, were usually baptized by immersion, or dipping their whole bodies under water, to represent the death, and burial, and resurrection of Christ together; and therewith to signify their own dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and their resurrection to a new life. There are many passages in the Epistles of St. Paul, which plainly refer to this custom: "We are buried with him by baptism: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."—Rom. vi. 4. So again, Col. ii. 12: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein ye are also risen with him, through the faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead." And as this was the original apostolic practice, so it continued to be the universal practice of the Church for many ages, upon the same symbolical reasons as it was first used by the apostles.—*Christ. Antiquities*, Vol. III., Book XI., Chap. XI., § 4, p. 598.

BLOOMFIELD.—'We were thus buried (in the water of baptism),'—for the term has allusion to Baptism, according to that mode in which it was originally administered, viz., by *immersion* (see Bingham's *Antiquities*);—a mode especially intended to represent at once the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ (the body being thus *hidden* in the water as a *tomb*), and so serving to *signify* the dying unto sin on the part of the baptized, the destruction in them of the power of sin, and their rising from the death of sin unto a life of righteousness.—*Greek Test.*, Rom. vi. 4, Vol. II., p. 46.

BOYS.—The dipping in holy baptism hath three parts, the putting into the water, the continuance in the water, and the coming out of the water: the putting into the water doth ratify the mortification of sin by the power of Christ's death, as *Paul, Rom. vi. 3. Know ye not, that all we which have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have been baptized into his death, and that our old Man is crucified with him* f The continuance in the water notes the burial of sin, to wit, a continual increase of mortification by the power of Christ's death and burial, *Rom. vi. 4.* The coming out of the water signifieth our spiritual resurrection, *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.* —*Exposition*, p. 294.

BURKITT.— *We are buried with him by baptism unto death.* The apostle alludes, no doubt, to the ancient manner and way of baptizing persons in those hot countries, which was by immersion, or putting them under water for a time, and then raising them up again out of the water; which rite had also a mystical signification, representing the burial of our old man, sin in us, and our resurrection to a newness of life.—*Notes on the New Test.*, Rom. vi. 4.

BURNETT.—They led them into the water; and with no other garments but what might cover nature, they at first laid them down in the water, as a man is laid in the grave, and then they said those words, *I baptize or wash thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; then they raised them up again, and clean garments were put on them; from whence came the phrases of *being baptized into Christ's death*; of *being buried with him by baptism into death*; of *our being risen with Christ*, and of

our putting on the Lord Jesus Christ; of putting off the old Man, and putting on the new.—*Expo. of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 358.

CAJETAN.— *We are buried with him by baptism into death.* By our burying he declares our death, from the ceremony of baptism: because he who is baptized is put under the water, and by this bears a likeness of him that was buried, who is put under the earth. Now, because none are buried but dead men, from this very thing we are buried in baptism, we are assimilated to Christ when he was buried.—*Annotat.*, Rom. vi. 4.

CANDLISH.—It is thought by most of those who have investigated the subject, that immersion was the earliest form of Christian baptism, on the ground of Paul's allusion to the going down and rising up out of the water as a figure of burial and rising with Christ (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12), and also of the statements of early Christian writers.—*The Christ. Sacraments*, p. 49.

CAVE.—The action having proceeded thus far, the party to be baptized was wholly immersed, or put under water, which was the almost constant and universal custom of those times, whereby they did more notably and significantly express the three great ends and effects of baptism; for as in immersion there are, in a manner, three several acts, the putting of the person into the water, his abiding there for a little time, and his rising up again, so by these were represented Christ's death, burial, and resurrection, and in conformity thereto, our dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and our resurrection to a new course of life: by persons being put into the water was lively represented the putting off

of the body of sins of the flesh, and being washed from the filth and pollution of them: by his abode under it, which was a kind of burial in the water, his entering into a state of death or mortification, like Christ remained for some time under the state or power of death, therefore "as many as are baptized into Christ" are said "to be baptized into his death, and to be buried with him by baptism into death, that the old man being crucified with him, the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth he might not serve sin, for he that is dead is freed from sin," as the apostle clearly explains the meaning of this rite: and then by his emersion, or rising up out of the water, was signified his entering upon a new course of life, differing from that which he lived before; "that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life."—*Primitive Christianity*, pp. 155,156.

CHALMERS.—The original meaning of the word 'baptism' is immersion, and though we regard it as a point of indifference whether the ordinance so named be performed in this way or by sprinkling, yet we doubt not that the prevalent style of the administration in the apostle's day was by all actual submerging of the whole body under water. We advert to this for the purpose of throwing light on the analogy that is instituted in these verses. Jesus Christ by death underwent this sort of baptism—even immersion under the surface of the ground, whence He soon emerged again by His resurrection. We by being baptized into His death are conceived to have made a similar translation—in the act of descending under the water of baptism to have resigned an old life, and in the act of ascending to emerge into a

second or a new life—along the course of which it is our part to maintain a strenuous avoidance of that sin which as good as expunged the being that we had formerly; and a strenuous prosecution of that holiness which should begin with the first moment that we were ushered into our present being, and be perpetuated and make progress toward the perfection of full and ripened immortality.—*Lectures on the Romans*, vi. 3, 4, Vol. I., p. 307.

CHRYSOSTOM.—For the being baptized and immersed, and the emerging, is a symbol of the descent into hell, and the return thence. Wherefore also Paul calls baptism a burial, saying, *Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death.*—*Homilies on 1 Cor.*, Horn. XL., on xv. 29, Vol. II., p. 572.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND.—As St. Paul exhorteth us, saying, *As we be buried with Christ by our baptism into death, so let us daily die to sin, mortifying and killing the evil desires and motions thereof. And as Christ was raised up from death by the glory of the Father, so let us rise to a new life, and walk continually therein, that we may likewise as natural children live a conversation to move men to glorify our Father which is in heaven.*—*Homilies*, Hom., on Resur., p. 400.

CHURTON AND JONES.—In the words 'we were *buried* with him,' there is an allusion both to the death of Christ, and to the symbolical act of baptism, which, when administered by that immersion, aptly represents burial.—*The New Test., with Exp. Com.*, on Rom. vi. 4, Vol. II., p. 120.

CLARKE, ADAM.—It is *probable* that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by *immer-*

sion, the whole body being put *under the water*, which seemed to say, the man is *drowned*, is *dead*; and, when he came up out of the water, he seemed to have a *resurrection* to life; *the man is risen again; he is alive!* He was, therefore, supposed to throw off his old *Gentile* state as he threw off his clothes, and to assume a new character, as the baptized generally put on new or fresh garments.—*Com. on Rom.*, vi. 4.

CLARKE, SAMUEL.—In the primitive times, the *manner* of baptizing, was by *immersion*, or *dipping the whole body into the water*. And this *manner* of doing it, was a very *significant* emblem of the *dying* and *rising again*, referred to by St. *Paul* in the above mentioned similitude.—*Exposition of the Ch. Catechism*, p. 294.

COLENSO.—Going down under the water, (as the custom was of Baptism in those days,) as into a grave, they were 'buried,' as it were,' with Him by baptism into His Death.'—*Com. on Horn.*, vi. 3, p. 135.

COMBER.—The first collect is taken out of Rom. vi. 4, 5, 6, where the apostle teacheth us, that a principal end of baptism is for the mortifying of the old man, or old Adam, that is, for the destruction of original corruption, and the extirpation of all evil concupiscence, which when it is slain and buried, as it were, then the new man, that is, a gracious disposition, doth succeed by the Spirit's entering into us: and as of old the baptized person was plunged over the head, and came up again like a new person, as Jesus came out of his grave after his resurrection.—*Companion to the Temple*, Vol. III., p. 397.

CONYBEARE AND HOWSON.—This clause, which is here

left elliptical, is fully expressed in Col. ii. 12. This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion.—*Life and Epistles of Paul*, Vol. II., p. 209.

CRANMER.—The dipping into the water, doth betoken, that the old Adam, with all his sins and evil lusts, ought to be drowned and killed by daily contrition and repentance; and that by renewing of the Holy Ghost, we ought to rise with Christ from the death of sin, and to walk in a new life, that our new man may live everlastingly, in righteousness and truth before God, as saint Paul teacheth, saying: All we that are baptized in Christ Jesus, are baptized into his death. For we are buried with him by baptism into death, that as Christ hath risen from death by the glory of his Father, so we also should walk in newness of life.—*Catechism*, p. 190.

CUNNINGHAM, JOHN.—When a person is plunged under the water he is, for the moment, like one buried under the earth. This struck Paul, and, not content with the old and more beautiful analogy, he now uses this new one in his letters both to the Romans and Colossians. "Are you ignorant," he says, "that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life." And so in like style to the Church at Colossae: "Having been buried with him (Christ) in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead." Paul's idea is, that as a buried person has parted with his old life, so every baptized person has parted

with his former way of living; and that as Christ rose from his burial-place, so the Christian rises from the burial-bath a new creature.—*The Growth of the Church*, pp. 170,171.

CYRIL.—Thou descendest into the water bearing sins, but the invocation of grace having sealed thy soul, allows not that thou shouldest henceforth be swallowed up by the fearful Dragon. Dead in sins thou wentest down, quickened in righteousness thou earnest up; *for if thou wert planted together in the likeness of the Savior's death, thou shalt be counted worthy of his resurrection also*. For as Jesus took on Him the world's sins, and died, that having been the death of sin, He might raise thee up in righteousness, so thou also, by descending into the water, and in some sense being in the waters buried, as he was in the rock, are raised again, to walk in newness of life.—*Catechetical Lectures*, Lect. III., Par. 12, p. 31.

DAILLÉ.—In the primitive church, this double effect of baptism was more clearly represented in the external performance of the sacrament than it is at this day. For the greater part of those who were baptized, being persons of age, who came over to Christianity from Judaism, or paganism, they were unclothed, and then plunged into the water, from whence they immediately came forth, and so were baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; by which they testified that they put off the body of sin, the habit of the first Adam, and buried it in the saving waters of Jesus Christ, as in its mystical grave, and came forth thence risen up to a new life.—*Exposition of Colossians*, ii. 12, Serm. XXIII., p. 328.

DAVENANT.—This burial of the body of sins, or of the old Adam, is signified in baptism, when the person to be baptized is let down into the water; like as the resurrection is when he is raised out: For in the ancient Church they not only sprinkled, but immersed in the water those whom they baptized.

Ye are also risen.] This is the second effect of baptism, which is shadowed forth when the baptized person, after immersion in the water, is drawn out of it.—*Exposition of Colossians*, ii. 12.

DIODATI.— *We are,*] in baptism being dipped in water according to the ancient ceremony it is a sacred sign unto us that sin ought to be drowned in us by God's Spirit. As that is a seal unto us, of the washing of our souls before God.—*Annotat.*, on Rom. vi. 4.

DODDRIDGE.—It seems the part of candor to confess that here is an allusion to the manner of baptizing by *immersion*, as most usual in these early times.—*Family Expositor*, Rom. vi. 4, Vol. IV., p. 64.

DÖLLINGER.—St. Paul made this immersion a symbol of burial with Christ, and the emerging a sign of resurrection with Him to a new life: Baptism is a "bath."— *The First Age of Christ, and of the Church*, Vol. II., p. 183.

DORNER.—Paul combines the Johannine and Christian baptism, but so as to give repentance a Christian character, and uses the outward action as a symbol, seeing in the submersion the dying of the old man with Christ, the being planted into His death which procured the forgiveness of sins, and in the rising again from the

grave of the water the resurrection of the new man into Christ's fellowship.—*System of Christ. Doct.*, Vol. IV., § 138, p. 278.

EDWARDS, JOHN.—Those that were proselytes to the Christian religion were interpreted to make an open profession of these in their being plunged into the baptismal water, and in being there overwhelmed and *buried* as it were in the consecrated element. The immersion into the water was thought to signify the death of Christ, and their coming out denoted his rising again, and did no less represent their own resurrection.—*Enquiry into Four Remark. Texts*, pp. 143, 144.

ESTIUS.—For immersion represents to us Christ's burial, and so also his death, since none but the dead are buried. Moreover, the emersion, which follows the immersion, has a resemblance to the resurrection. We are therefore in baptism conformed not only to the death of Christ, as he has just said, but also to his burial and resurrection.—*Com. on Romans*, vi. 3.

EWALD.—Whoever might be received into the Church, baptism remained for every one the most indispensable medium of transition into the perfect purity of life which Christianity required. For Christianity was never able to separate itself from the baptism of John as its own deepest and firmest basis, as was shown in the previous volume. And now the rite easily received a new significance by being brought into close relation with the death of Christ himself. If the Christian is called to follow Christ in all things as his head, so that Christ's painful death also shows him that he must die to the errors of the past world and rise with Christ to new life,

baptism, which was in its primitive form such a powerful submersion into the dark depth of the water and emergence from them, can be regarded by him as a similar immersion into the death of Christ; a thought which Paul was the first to work out in its place in the whole connection of his Christian views, (Rom. vi. 4; comp. Col. ii. 12), though as a separate idea it was natural enough as early as the period before us, and shows in any case what a high significance continued to be attached to baptism all along.—*Hist. of Israel*, Vol. VII., p. 134.

FARRAR.—The life of the Christian being hid with Christ in God, his death with Christ is a death to sin, his resurrection with Christ is a resurrection to life. The dipping under the water of baptism is his union with Christ's death; his rising out of the waters of baptism is a resurrection with Christ, and the birth to a new life.—*Life and Work of St. Paul*, pp. 603, 604.

FAUSSETT.—Baptism is regarded as the burial of the old carnal life, to which act immersion symbolically corresponds; and in warm climates where *immersion* is safe, it is the mode most accordant with the significance of the ordinance.—*Com. on Col.*, ii. 12.

FELL.—The Primitive fashion of immersion under the water representing our death, and elevation again out of it, our resurrection, or regeneration: See Col. ii. 12; Phil. iii. 10.—On *Paul's Epistles*, on Rom. vi. 4.

FINDLAY.—*Baptism* stands for the entire change of the man which it symbolizes and seals (Rom. vi. 3-5; Gal. iii. 27). The double of this change was indicated by the

twofold movement taking place in immersion, the usual form of primitive baptism—first the *katadusis*, the descent of the baptized person beneath the symbolic waters, figuring his death with Christ as a separation from sin and the evil past (ver. 20),—there for a moment he is *buried*, and burial is death made complete and final (Rom. vi. 2-4); then the *anadusis*, the emerging from the baptismal wave, which gave baptism the positive side of its significance. In which (or, whom) also ye were raised with (him) through your faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead.—*Com. on Col.*, ii. 12, in *Pulpit Commentary*.

FRITH.—The *signification* of baptism is described of Paul in the sixth of the Romans, that we are plunged bodily into the water; even so, we are dead and buried with Christ from sin: and as we are lifted again out of the water; even so, are we risen with Christ from our sins, that we might hereafter walk in a new conversation of life. So, that these two things, that is, to be plunged in the water, and lifted up again, do signify and represent the whole pith and effect of baptism, that is the mortification of our old Adam, and the rising up of our new man.—*Writings*, in *Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. I., pp. 389, 390.

FOWLER.—And again he saith, *Rom.* vi. 4. that, *Therefore we are buried with him by baptism unto death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life*; that is, Christians being plunged into the water in baptism, signifieth their obliging themselves in a spiritual sense to die and be buried with Jesus Christ (which death and burial consist in an utter renouncing and forsaking of

all their sins) that answerably to this *resurrection*, they may live a holy and a godly life.—*The Design of Christianity*, Sec. I., Chap. VIII., in *Watson's Tracts*, Vol. VI., p. 345.

GATAKER.—As in the Christian rite, when persons are baptized, they are overwhelmed, and as it were buried in water, and seem in a manner to be *buried with Christ*; and again, when they emerge, they arise as out of a sepulcher, and are represented as risen with Christ, Rom. vi. t. 5; Col. ii. 12.—*Adversaria Miscellanea*, Cap. IV., p. 30.

GIFFORD.—The expression, "*We were buried*," may have been suggested by the momentary burial beneath the baptismal water (see Bingham, 'Antiq.' XI. xi. § 4): it declares in the strongest manner our union with Christ in death, and our entire separation from the former life in which sin reigned. But burial being a sign and seal which attest the reality of death, serves also to attest the reality of the resurrection: hence the significance which St. Paul attaches to Christ's burial, and to our baptismal burial with him; compare Col. ii. 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*"—*Com. on Rom.*, vi. 4.

GODET.—Modern commentators are not at one on the question whether the apostle means to allude to the external form of the baptismal rite in the primitive church. It seems to us very probable that it is so, whether primitive baptism be regarded as a complete immersion, during which the baptized disappeared for a moment under water (which best corresponds to the figure of *burial*), or

whether the baptized went down into the water up to his loins, and the baptizer poured the water with which he had filled the hollow of his hands over his head, so as to represent an immersion.—*Com. on Romans*, vi. 4, p. 240.

GOODWIN.—The eminent thing signified and represented in baptism is not simply the blood of Christ as it washeth us from sin; but there is a farther representation therein of Christ's death, burial, and resurrection, in the baptized's being first buried under water, and then rising out of it; and this not in a bare conformity unto Christ, but in a representation of a communion with Christ in that, his death and resurrection. Therefore it is said, 'we are buried with him in baptism;' and 'wherein you are risen with him.' It is not simply said, *like as* he was buried, and rose, but *with him*. So as our communion and oneness with him in his resurrection, is represented to us therein, and not only our conformity or likeness unto him therein. And so baptism representeth this to us, that Christ having once in himself sustained the persons of all the elect, in his burial and resurrection, that now, upon the party himself who is baptized, is personally, particularly, and apparently reacted the same part again, in his baptism; thereby showing what his communion with Christ before was, in what was then done to Christ; that he then was buried with Christ, and rose with him; and upon that ground is now in this outward sign of baptism, as in a show or representation, both buried and also riseth again.—*Works*, Vol. IV., *Christ Set Forth*, § 3., Chap. VII., pp. 41, 42.

GOULBURN.—There can be no doubt as it is a means, when duly received, of spiritual Resurrection, so, when

it is administered in the primitive and most correct form, is a divinely constituted emblem of bodily Resurrection. And it is to be regretted that the form of administration unavoidably (if it be unavoidably) adopted in cold climates, should utterly obscure the emblematic significance of the rite, and render unintelligible to all but the educated the apostle's association of Burial and Resurrection with the Ordinance. Were immersion (which is the rule of our Church, in cases where it may be had without hazard to the health) universally practised, this association of two at present heterogeneous ideas would become intelligible to the humblest. The water closing over the entire person would then preach of the grave which yawns for every child of Adam, and which will one day engulf all of us in its drear abyss. But that abyss will be the womb and seed plot of a new life. Animation having been for one instant suspended beneath the water (a type this of the interruption of man's energies by death) the body is lifted up again into the air by way of expressing emblematically the new birth of resurrection.—*Hampton Lectures*, for 1850, pp. 18, 19.

GROTIUS.—*Buried with him in baptism*. Not only the word baptism, but the very form of it, intimates this. For the immersion of the whole body in the river so that it was completely out of sight, bore the image of the burial that is given to the dead.—*Annotations on the N. T.*, on Rom. vi. 4.

HALL, JOSEPH.—Ye are in baptism buried together with Christ, in respect of the mortification of your sins, represented by lying under the water; and, in the same baptism, ye rise up with him, in newness of life, repre-

seated by your rising up out of the water again; through that faith of yours which is grounded upon the mighty power of God, who hath raised him from the dead.—*Works, Par. on Hard Texts*, Col. ii. 12, Vol. IV., p. 411.

HAMMOND.—'Tis a thing that every Christian knows, that the immersion in baptism refers to the death of Christ, the putting the person baptized into the water denotes and proclaims the death and burial of Christ, and signifies our undertaking in baptism, that we will give over all the sins of our former lives (while in our being buried together with Christ, or baptized to his death) that so we may live that regenerate new life (answerable to Christ's resurrection) which consists in a course of all sanctity, a constant Christian walk all our days.—*Paraphrase on New Test.*, Rom. vi. 4.

HAYDOCK.—*We . . . are baptized in his death.* Greek, *unto his death.* The apostle here alludes to the manner of administering the sacrament of baptism, which was then done by immersion, or plunging the person baptized under the water, in which he finds a resemblance of Christ's death, and burial under ground, and his resurrection to an immortal life. So must we after baptism, rise to lead a quite different life: having been also, when we were baptized and made Christians, *planted*, as branches ingrafted in Christ, let us endeavor to bring forth the fruits of a virtuous life.—*Annotat. on Rom.*, vi. 3.

HEY.—The metaphor of being *buried*, was probably the effect of the custom of immersion.—Men were as it were buried in the water, and rose again to newness of

life; or new birth.—*Lectures in Divinity*, Book IV., Art. XXVII., § 25, p. 299.

HILL.—The Apostle Paul, Rom. vi. 4, 5, illustrates this connection by an illustration drawn from the ancient method of administering baptism. The immersion in water of the bodies of those who were baptized is an emblem of that death unto sin by which the conversion of Christians is generally expressed: the rising out of the water, the breathing the open air again after having been for some time in another element is an emblem of that new life, which Christians by their profession are bound, and by the power of their religion are enabled to lead. The time during which they remained under the water is a kind of temporary death, after the image of the death of Christ, during which they deposited under the stream the sins of which the old man was composed: when they emerged from the water, they rose, after the image of his resurrection, to a life of righteousness here, and a life of glory hereafter. Here is a significant representation both of what the baptized persons engaged to do and also the grace by which their sins were forgiven, and the strength communicated to their souls: so that the action of baptism, as interpreted by an apostle, rises from being a profession of faith, a mere external rite, to be a federal act, by which the mutual stipulations of the covenant of grace are confirmed.—*Lectures in Divinity*, Vol. III., p. 307.

HOADLEY.—This latter expression, made use of by St. *Paul*, with relation to *Baptism*, is taken from the Custom of *Immersion*, in the first days; and from that particular manner of baptizing Proselytes: by which they were first covered with Water, and in a State as it were

of Death and Inactivity; and then arose out of it into a sort of New State of *Life and Action*. And if *Baptism* had been then performed, as it is now amongst us; we should never have so much as heard of this Form of Expression, *of dying and arising again* in this rite.— *Works*, Vol. III., p. 890.

HOLE.—As for our conformity to the death of Christ, the apostle asks the question in the beginning, 'Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?' meaning, that it was a thing well known among Christians that the immersion in baptism referred to the death of Christ: the putting of the person baptized into the water, represented and proclaimed his death; and the plunging him over head and ears in the water, according to the custom of those countries, signified their being buried with Christ. 'Therefore,' saith the apostle in the next verse, 'we are buried with him by baptism into death:' our being dipped in water in the font being a sacred figure of his being dipped in blood, and laid up in the grave: which in the next verse is styled, our being planted together in the likeness of his death, that, like as Christ was swallowed up of death, and buried in the earth, so we are overwhelmed in baptism, and buried in the water. —*Prac. Disc. on the Liturgy*, Vol. III., p. 84.

JASPIS.—Paul in this place alludes to the custom then usual of immersing the whole body, which immersion resembled the laying of a man in a sepulcher.—*Latin Ver. of the Apost. Epist.*, Note on Rom. vi. 4, p. 53.

JOWETT.—The meaning of the former part of this verse will be more clearly brought out if we recall the picture

of Baptism in the apostolic age, when the rite was performed by immersion, and Christians might be said to be buried with Christ; and the passing of the Israelites through the cloud and the sea (1 Cor. x. 1, 2.) and even the Deluge itself (1 Pet. iii. 21.), seemed no inappropriate type of its waters. Imagine not infants, but crowds of grown up persons already changed in heart and feelings ; their life seeming to themselves hidden with Christ and God, losing their very personal consciousness in the laver of regeneration ; rising again from its depths into the light of heaven, in communion with God and nature; met as they rose from the bath with the white raiment, which is the righteousness of the saints, and ever after looking back on that moment as the instant of their new birth, of the putting off of the old man, and the putting on of Christ. The symbol itself was in a figure death and burial at once, the most apt expression of the greatest change that can pass upon man, like the sudden change into another life when we leave the body.—*Com. on Rom.*, vi. 4, Vol. II., p. 171.

KEBLE.—The action of dipping sets forth to the very eye the proper force and meaning of Christian Baptism, how that it is both a Death and Resurrection ; the pouring of the water scarcely gives that meaning at all. This is what St. Paul so often alludes to, "buried with Him by Baptism, wherein also we are risen again with Him, through the faith of the operation of God, Who raised Him from the dead." And in the text, "We are buried with Him by Baptism unto death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life." Yes, we are buried with Him even bodily; buried in the baptizing water for a moment, and in the next moment

raised out of it: whereby are shown to the very eyes and ears of the bystanders a lively Image of the Death and Resurrection of Christ Crucified, an Image also of the spiritual death and Resurrection of every one of us, the death unto sin, and the new birth unto righteousness.— *Village Sermons on the Bap. Service*, p. 249.

KNAPP.—"We are, like Christ, buried as dead persons by baptism, and should arise, like him, to a new life"— i. e., by baptism we obtain the assurance of the pardon of sin on account of the death of Christ; and so, when we are baptized, take upon ourselves the obligation to die to sin in a spiritual manner, as Christ died and was buried bodily, &c. The image is here taken from baptized persons as they were *immersed*, (*buried*,) and as they *emerged*, (*rose again*;) so it was understood by Chrysostom. Since immersion has been disused, the full significance of this comparison is no longer perceived.—*Christian Theology*, p. 481.

LANGE.—Buried in death : an oxymoron, according to which burial precedes and death follows, as is illustrated in the immersion into the bath of baptism. The analogous feature in the life of Christ was His rejection by the world, and his violent death on the cross. The expression denotes not only a burial before death and for death, but it is likewise an expression of the decision and completion of death, and, finally, a reference to the transition from death to the resurrection. The finished *katadusis*, as the bringing about of the *anadusis*; Col. ii. 12.—*Com. on Rom.*, vi. 4.

LECHLER.—Baptism is immersion into the communion of Christ, it is especially a baptism into His death, Rom.

vi. 3; Col. ii. 12, etc.—*Apost. and Post-Apost. Times*, Vol. II., p. 80.

LIDDON.—The very form of the sacrament of regeneration, as it was administered to the adult multitudes who in the early days of the Church pressed for admittance into her communion, harmonizes with the spiritual results which it effects. As the neophyte is plunged beneath the waters, so the old nature is slain and buried with Christ. As Christ, crucified and entombed, rises with resistless might from the grave which can no longer hold Him, so, to the eye of faith, the Christian is raised from the bath of regeneration radiant with a new and supernatural life.—*Divinity of our Lord, Bampton Lectures for 1866*, p. 346.

LIGHTFOOT, JOHN B.—Baptism is the grave of the old man, and the birth of the new. As he sinks beneath the baptismal waters, the believer buries there all his corrupt affections and past sins; as he emerges thence, he rises regenerate, quickened to new hopes and a new life. This is because it is not only the crowning act of his own faith but also the seal of God's adoption and the earnest of God's Spirit. Thus baptism is an image of his participation both in the death and in the resurrection of Christ.—*Com. on Col*, ii. 12, p. 82.

LOCKE.—We did own some kind of death, by being buried under water, which being buried with him, i. e. in conformity to his burial, as in confession of our being dead, was to signify, that as Christ was raised up from the dead, into a glorious life with his Father, even so we being raised from our typical death and burial in baptism, should lead a new sort of life, wholly different from

our former, in some approaches toward that heavenly life that Christ is risen to.—*Paraphr.*, on Rom. vi. 4, *Works*, Vol. III., p. 272.

LUTHER.—Baptism then signifies two things, death and resurrection; that is, full and complete justification. When the minister dips the child into the water, this signifies death; when he draws him out again this signifies life, thus Paul explains the matter: "Therefore we are 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 also should walk in newness of life." (Rom. vi. 4.) This death and resurrection we call a new creation, a regeneration, and a spiritual birth; and these words are not only to be understood allegorically, as they are by many, of the death of sin and the life of grace, but of a real death and resurrection. For baptism has no fictitious meaning, nor does sin die or grace rise fully within us, until the body of sin which we bear in this life is fully destroyed; for, as the apostle says, as long as we are in the flesh, the desires of the flesh work in us and are worked upon. Hence where we begin to believe, we begin at the same time to die to this world, and to live to God in the future life; so that faith is truly a death and resurrection; that is, that spiritual baptism in which we are submerged and emerge.

When the washing away of sin is attributed to baptism, it is rightly so attributed; but the meaning of the phrase is too slight and weak to fully express baptism, which is rather a symbol of death and resurrection. For this reason I could wish that the baptized should be totally immersed, according to the meaning of the word and the signification of the mystery; not that I think it necessary to do so, but that it would be well

that so complete and perfect a thing as baptism should have its sign also in completeness and perfection, even as it was doubtless instituted by Christ. — *Primary Works*, p. 192.

MACEVILLY.—He shows how our spiritual death to sin is signified by baptism. For our immersion in baptism is a type of our burial, and, consequently, of our death to sin, of which his death on the cross was the model. "For we are buried together with him by baptism," his burial, and, consequently, his death, being the model of our burial and death to sin, signified by our immersion in the waters of baptism.—*Exp. of St. Paul's and Cath. Epist.*, Rom. vi. 4, Vol. I., p. 50.

MACKNIGHT. — *Buried together with him in baptism*, Christ's baptism was not the baptism of repentance; for he never committed any sin: but, as was observed, Prelim. Ess. i. at the beginning, he submitted to be baptized, that is, to be buried under the water by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of his future death and resurrection. In like manner the baptism of believers is emblematical of their own death, burial, and resurrection. Perhaps also it is a commemoration of Christ's baptism.

Having been planted together in the likeness of his death. The burying of Christ and of believers, first in the water baptism, and afterwards in the earth, is fitly enough compared to the planting of seeds in the earth, because the effect in both cases is a revivescence to a state of greater perfection.—*On the Epistles*, Rom. vi. 4,5, Vol. L, p. 294.

MANTON.—"We are buried with him in baptism into

his death.' The like expression you have, Col. ii. 12, 'Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him.' The putting the baptized person into the water denoteth and proclaimeth the burial of Christ, and we by submitting to it are baptized with him, or profess to be dead to sin; for none but the dead are buried. So that it signifieth Christ's death for sin, and our dying unto sin.—*Complete Works*, Vol. XL, p. 171.

MARSHALL.—Baptism signifieth the application of Christ's resurrection to us, as well as His death; we are raised with Him in it to newness of life, as well as buried with Him; and we are taught thereby, that because "He died unto sin once, and liveth unto God, we should likewise reckon ourselves to be dead indeed unto sin, and alive unto God, through Jesus Christ our Lord."—*Gospel Mystery of Sand.*, p. 57.

MARTYR, PETER.—And as Christ by baptism hath washen us with him into his death and burial, so hath he washen us out unto life. This doth the dipping into the water and the issuing forth again signify, when we were baptized.—*Oration Concern, the Res. of Christ*, p. 11.

MEYER.—*Buried with Him therefore* (not merely *dead* with Him, but, as the dead Christ was *buried* in order to rise again, *buried* with Him also) *were we, in that we were baptized into his death*. The recipient of baptism, who by his baptism enters into the fellowship of *death* with Christ, is necessarily also in the act of baptism ethically *buried* with Him (1 Cor. xv. 4), because offer baptism he is spiritually *risen* with Him. In *reality* this burial with Him is not a moral fact *distinct* from the having died with Him, as actual burial is distinct from actual dying;

but it sets forth the fulness and completeness of the relation, of which the recipient, in accordance with the *form* of baptism, so far as the latter takes place through *katadusis* and *anadusis* (see Suicer, *Thes.*), becomes conscious *successively*. The recipient—thus has Paul figuratively represented the process—is conscious, (a) in the baptism *generally*: now I am entering into fellowship with the *death* of Christ, *eis ton thanaton autou baptizomai*; (b) in the *immersion in particular*: now I am becoming *buried* with Christ; (c) and then, in the emergence: now I *rise* to the new life with Christ.—*Commentary on Rom.*, vi. 4, p. 231.

MOBERLY.—We believe that like as the body was anciently dipped in the water in the external act of Baptism, and thence raised up again, so the souls of the baptized have been made in a mysterious and Divine way, by the means of that action, to partake of the death and burial, and of the Resurrection of Christ.—*The Great Forty Days*, p. 259.

MOULE.— *We are buried with him*] Better, *we were buried*, &c.; the reference being to the past fact of baptism. *Burial* is the final token of death, and so the strongest expression of death as a fact. Perhaps there is an allusion to the immersion of baptism, as a quasi-burial.— *Com. on Romans*, vi. 4.

NEWCAMBE.—We were undoubtedly baptized into his death. The fact therefore is, that having the body covered with water in baptism is intended to remind us of dying to sin: that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glorious power of the Father, so we may rise out of the water to a new life.—*Notes on Romans*, vi. 4.

NICHOLSON.—The ancient manner in Baptism, the putting the person baptized under water, and then taking him out again, did well set forth these two acts, the first his dying, the second his rising again.

That which is here taught is the doctrine of St. Paul, "Ye are buried together with Christ in baptism, in Whom also ye have risen," &c. Into the grave with Christ we went not; for our bodies were not, could not be buried with His; but in our Baptism, by a kind of analogy or resemblance, while our bodies are under the water, we may be said to be buried with Him; and all that dwells in, and adheres to, our mortal bodies; that is, the whole body of sin is then buried, when the power thereof is weakened, repressed, and as a dead carcass covered with earth, removed out of our sight, so bound with grave-clothes it cannot stir, and carry a man whither it pleases, to act what, as a tyrant, it commands. This is it with which St. Paul presses the Romans, "as many of you as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death."—*Exposition of Catechism*, p. 161.

NORRIS.—*Buried*. Baptism by immersion represents a burial followed by a resurrection.—*Notes on New Test.*, on Rom. vi. 4.

OLSHAUSEN.—In this place, also, we must by no means think of their own resolutions only at baptism, or see no more in it than a figure, as if by one half of the ancient rite of baptism the *submersion*, the death and the burial of the old man—by the second half, the *emersion*, the resurrection of the new man.—*Com. on Rom.*, vi. 4, p. 210.

ORNSBY.—"*Were baptized into Christ*," *i. e.*, by baptism

enrolled ourselves under him, and were engrafted into his mystical body. *Eis ton than., i. e.*, into the likeness and representation of his death. The death and passion of Christ being not only the cause but the type of our justification. He shows that immersion in baptism corresponds to the sepulture of Christ, now the dead only are buried, it represents therefore his death also; and the emerging from it his resurrection.—*Notes on Greek Testament*, on Rom. vi. 3, 4.

PICONIO. — *We ham been buried with him.* Baptism is also a type of the burial of Christ. In the Apostolic age, baptism was administered by three immersions of the body in the water. These were held to represent the death and burial of Christ, and the rising again from the water, represented his resurrection from the dead. —*Expos. of St. Paul's Epistles*, Rom. vi. 4, Vol. I., p. 67.

PICTET.—Immersion in the water, and emerging from it, as practiced by the ancients, signify the death of the old man, and the resurrection of the new. (Horn. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12.) *In the water*, says Chrysostom, *as in a kind of grave, the old man is buried, since, being wholly immersed, he is concealed under the water; then, when we emerge from it, the new man rises up.*—*Christian Theology*, p. 486.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—Some think he alludes here to the manner of baptizing in those warm eastern countries, which was to plunge or dip the party baptized under water.—*Annotations*, on Rom. vi. 4.

POPE.—*Buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through a faith in the working of God, who raised Him from the dead.* This passage makes baptism

represent the dying to sin and rising to holiness: one part of the ceremony, the immersion, signifying the conformity to our Lord's death; the other, the rising out of the water, conformity with his resurrection.—*Christian Theology*, Vol. III., p. 315.

PUSEY.—He saith not also, if we have been *made partakers* of the likeness of death, but if we have been *planted*; hinting, by the name *planting*, at the *fruit* derived to us therefrom. For as His body, buried in the earth, bore for fruit the salvation of the world; so ours, also, buried in Baptism, bore fruit, righteousness, sanctification, adoption, unnumbered blessings, and hereafter shall bear that of the resurrection. Since, then, we were buried in water, He in the earth, and we in respect to sin, He in regard to the body: therefore he says not 'planted with Him in death,' but 'in the likeness of death.' For each was death, but not the same object.— *Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism*, pp. 23, 24.

PYLE.—Our being covered with *water*, signifies our being dead and buried as it were to all sinful courses, as Christ died and was buried in the *earth*. And our ascending again out of the *water* represents the great obligation we are under of rising from those evil courses, to a new and virtuous conversation, answerable to his resurrection, and ascension to the glory of God the Father.

For it would signify nothing for us to resemble his *death*, by being plunged in *water*, if we do not take care to answer his *resurrection* by a new and religious course of *obedience*.

It being plainly the only thing meant by our *baptism*, That all our former habits of sin should be in a manner killed and crucified, and we freed from all slavish obe-

dience to them; thus *dying to sin*, signifies our *freedom* from it, as *slaves* are freed from their *masters*.—*Paraphrase*, on Rom. vi. 4-7.

PLUMMER.—What act could more simply express a death to sin and a rising again to righteousness than a plunge beneath the surface of the water and a re-issuing from it? As St. Paul says in the Epistle to the Romans: "We were buried therefore with Him through baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life" (vi. 4). And again to the Colossians: "Having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of God, Who raised him from the dead" (ii. 12). Faith in the inward gift, promised by God to those who believe and are baptized, become more easy, when the outward means of conferring the gift, not only are readily perceived, but are recognized as suitable. In this way our Faith is aided by God's employment of means.—*Pastoral Epistles*, p. 291.

RIDDLE, M. B.—The fellowship with Christ finds its sign and seal in the rite of baptism, which as then administered, had its external resemblance to the burial and resurrection of Christ. This resemblance is not exact, since fellowship in the death of Christ is the main thought, and the immersion does not suggest this. The passage shows that immersion was in the apostle's mind. —*Com. on Col.*, ii. 12.

ROSENMÜLLER.—Immersion in the water of baptism, and the coming out of the same, was a sign that the old life had been abandoned and a new one, in the opposite

direction, established. Hence it was customary for those baptized to be spoken of on the one hand as *dead* and *buried*, on the other, as *resuscitated* again into a new life. The learned rightly admonish us that, on account of this mystical sense of baptism, the rite of *immersion* ought to have been retained in the Christian Church.—*Scholia in Nov. Test.*, Rom. vi. 4, Vol. III., p. 456.

SAURIN.—Paul says, 'We are buried with him by baptism into death,' Rom. vi. 4, that is, the ceremony of wholly immersing us in water, when we were baptized, signified, that we died to sin, and that of raising us again from our immersion signified, that we would no more return to those disorderly practices, in which we lived before our conversion to Christianity.—*Sermons*, Vol. II., p. 440.

SCHAFF.—All commentators of note (except Stuart and Hodge) expressly admit or take it for granted that in this verse, especially in *sunetaphemen* and *egerthe*, the ancient prevailing mode of baptism by immersion and emersion is implied, as giving additional force to the idea of the going down of the old and the rising up of the new man. . . . Bloomfield: "There is a plain allusion to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion; on which, see Suicer's *Thes.* and Bingham's *Antiquities.*" Barnes: "It is altogether probable that the Apostle has allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion." Conybeare and Howson: "This passage cannot be understood, unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion." Webster and Wilkinson: "Doubtless there is an allusion to immersion, as the usual mod& of baptism, introduced to show that baptism symbolized our spiritual resurrection, *osper egerthe ch.*"

Comp. also Bengel, Ruckert, Tholuck, Meyer. The objection of Philippi (who however, himself regards this allusion probably in ver. 4), that in this case the Apostle would have expressly mentioned the symbolic act, has no force in view of the daily practice of baptism.— *Foot-note on Rom. vi. 4, in Lange's Commentary, Vol. V., p. 202.*

SCOTT, JOHN.— It is plain that those Phrases, *buried with Christ*, and *risen with Christ*, are only the *Sense* and *Signification* of that *Eastern Custom* in Baptism, *viz.* of *plunging* the Baptized Person under Water, and *raising* him up again; which being *Sacramental Actions*, must be supposed to have a peculiar *import* and *significancy*; and the *significancy* of them, the Apostle here plainly tells us, wholly refers to the *Death*, and *Burial*, and *Resurrection* of Christ: And therefore the *plunging* under Water must necessarily refer to Christ's *Death* and *Burial*, and the *raising* up again, to his *Resurrection*.— *Works, Vol. I., p. 446.*

SECKER.—Burying as it were, the person baptized, in the water, and raising him out of it again, without question was anciently the more usual method: on account of which St. *Paul* speaks of baptism as representing both the death, and burial, and resurrection of Christ, and what is grounded on them, our being *dead and buried to sin*; renouncing it, and being acquitted of it; and our rising again *to walk in newness of life*.—*Works, Led. on the Catech., Vol. IV., p. 482.*

STANHOPE.—But I confine myself to St. Paul's Instance before us. The Christian's Privilege is a Release from the Guilt and Dominion of Sin, and from the Death in-

flicted as a Punishment upon it. This Release is procured by the Death and Resurrection of Christ, considered not in his private and personal Capacity, but as the Common Ransom and Representative of Mankind. This Death is represented; by the Baptized being put under Water; this Resurrection, by his being taken out of the Water.—*Para, and Com. on Epis. and Gos.*, Rom. vi. 4, Vol. III., p. 260.

STIER.—"The sinner is not so much to be washed as *to die*," writes Luther. The latter does not indeed exclude the former; but it brings the full and deeper meaning to it. This follows from the reference to Christ's baptism in Jordan: see Vol. ii. The perfect *immersion* is not accidental in form, but manifestly intended in the *baptizein eis*; nevertheless, the Smalkald articles require it too rigorously, and therefore have never been obeyed.—*The Words of the Lord Jesus*, Vol. VIII., p. 303.

SUTCLIFFE.— *We are buried with him by baptism into death*. The allusion here is to the ancient mode of baptism in warm climates, by dipping the body under water.—*Com.*, on Rom. vi. 4.

TAYLOR.—"We are buried with Him in baptism," saith the apostle. So S. Chrysostom, "The old man is buried and drowned in the immersion under water, and when the baptized person is lifted up from the water, it represents the resurrection of the new man to newness of life." In this case therefore the contrary custom not only being against an ecclesiastical law, but against the analogy and mysterious signification of the sacrament, is not to be complied with, unless in such

cases that can be of themselves sufficient to justify a liberty in a ritual and a ceremony; that is a case of necessity.— *Whole Works*, Vol. X., p. 370.

THOLUCK.—For the explanation of this figurative description of the baptismal rite, it is necessary to call the attention to the well known circumstance, that, in the early days of the church, persons when baptized, were first plunged below, and then raised above the water, to which practice, according to the direction of the Apostle, the early Christians gave a symbolical import.—*Expos. of Epis. to Rom.*, vi. 4, Vol. I., p. 252.

THOROLD.—"*Buried ... in baptism.*" This may refer to the form of baptism by immersion, in which the baptized person plunged underneath the water, was then, as from a momentary grave, in which the "death unto sin" (Rom. vi. 4.) was set forth, raised up into light and life.—*Com. on Col.*, ii. 12.

TILLOTSON.—"To be baptized into the death and resurrection of Christ," is to be baptized into the similitude and likeness of them; and the resemblance is this; that as Christ being dead was buried in the grave, and after some stay in it, that is, for three days, he was raised out of it, by the glorious power of God, to a new and heavenly life, being not long after taken up into heaven to live at the right hand of God; so Christians, when they were baptized, were immersed into the water three times, their bodies being covered all over with it; which, is therefore called, our being "buried with him by baptism into death;" and after some short stay under water, were "raised" or taken up again out of it, as they had been "recovered to a new life;" by all which is spir-

itually signified, our dying to sin, and being raised to a divine and heavenly life, "through the faith of the operation of God;" that is, by that divine and supernatural power, which raised up Christ from the dead, so that Christians from thenceforth were "to reckon themselves dead unto sin, but alive unto God, through Jesus Christ," as the apostle speaks, Rom. vi. 11.—*Works*, Vol. X., pp. 4474 & 5.

TOMLINE.—Immersion, that is, burying, as it were, the person baptized in the water, and raising him out of it again, may be considered as representing the death, burial and resurrection of Christ, and our being dead and buried to sin, and rising again to a life of piety and virtue. "We are buried," says St. Paul, "with him by baptism unto death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even we also should walk in newness of life."—*Christian Theology*, Vol. II., p. 461.

TROLLOPE.—The Christian convert could not be ignorant, being of course previously instructed in the typical nature of *baptism*, that in that rite the immersion of the body, in imitation of Christ's death and burial *for sin*, implies an engagement on the part of the baptized to die *to sin*; and the rising from the water, in imitation of his resurrection, implies the commencement of a *new life*, pledged to virtue and holiness.—*Analecta Theologica*, Rom. vi. 4, Vol. II., p. 345.

TURRETIN.—When persons are immersed in water, they are overwhelmed, and as it were buried, and in a manner buried together with Christ; and again, when they emerge, seem to be raised out of the grave, and are said

to rise again with Christ.—*Disputed, de Bapt. Nubis et Mans*, Disp. VII., § 24, p. 146.

TYNDALE.—The plunging into the water signifieth that we die, and are buried with Christ, as concerning the old life of sin, which is *Adam*. And the pulling out again, signifieth that we rise again with Christ in a new life, full of the Holy Ghost, which shall teach us and guide us, and work the will of God in us, as thou seest (Rom. vi.).— *Writings, in Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. I., p. 182.

VALPY.—There is here an allusion to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, as it was then practiced.—*Nov. Test.*, Note on Col. ii. 12, Vol. III., p. 83.

VINCENT.— *We are buried with. (Sunetaphemen)*. Rev., more accurately, *were* buried. Therefore, as a natural consequence of death. There is probably an allusion to the immersion of baptism.— *Word Studies in N. T.*, on Rom. vi. 4.

WALL.—St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way of speaking, call baptism a *burial*; which allusion is not so proper, if we conceive them to have gone into the water only up to the armpits, &c., as it is if their whole body was immersed.—*Hist. of Infant Bapt.*, Vol. II., p. 452.

WEBSTER AND WILKINSON.—Doubtless there is an allusion to immersion, as the usual mode of baptism, introduced to show that baptism symbolized our spiritual resurrection, by means of our baptism into his death.— *Greek Test.*, Note on Rom. vi. 4.

WEISS.—To the Christian, Christ is primarily necessarily the one that died; for as such He is to him the Mediator of salvation. If, therefore, the Christian feels himself in a real fellowship with this Christ, he has been crucified with Him (Gal. ii. 20; cf. vi. 14; Rom. vi. 6), and has died with Him (ver. 8; cf. Gal. ii. 20). Baptism which has translated him into this fellowship, is, accordingly, not only a being baptized into Him, but, in particular, a being baptized into His death; and as the certainty of the death of Christ is sealed by His burial, so the submersion of the person who is being baptized is, as it were, a being by means of which the fact that he has died with Christ is also sealed (Rom. vi. 4; cf. Col. ii. 12).—*Biblical Theology*, Vol. II., § 84, pp. 461, 462.

WELLS.—S. *Paul* alludes here to Immersion, or Dipping the whole Body under Water in Baptism: which He intimates did typify the Death and Burial (of the Person baptized) to Sin, and his Rising up out of the Water did typify his Resurrection to Newness of Life. —*Annotat.*, on Rom. vi. 4.

WESCOTT.—Baptism, again, was regarded as embodying the teaching of the same facts: 'We are buried with Him by baptism unto death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' So thoroughly was the faith in the Resurrection of Christ inwrought into the mind of the first Christians, that the very entrance into their society was apprehended under the form of a resurrection. The fact was not an article of their creed, but the life of it. It was confessed in action as well as in word.—*Gospel of the Resurrection*, p. 131.

WESLEY.— *We are buried with him*—Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.—*Notes on New Testament*, Rom. vi. 4.

WHEATLEY.—*The priest (if the godfathers, &c. certify him that the child may well endure it) is to dip it in the water discreetly and warily*; which was in all probability the way by which our Savior, and for certain was the usual and ordinary way by which the primitive Christians did receive their baptism. And it must be allowed that by dipping, the ends and effects of baptism are more significantly expressed; for as in immersion there are three several acts, viz. the putting the person under the water, his abiding there for some time, and his rising up again; so by these were represented Christ's death, burial, and resurrection; and in conformity thereto (as the apostle plainly shews) our dying unto sin, the destruction of its power, and our resurrection to newness of life.—*On the Common Prayer*, p. 841.

WHITBY.— *We are buried with him by baptism.*] It being so expressly declared here, and Col. ii. 12, that "we are buried with Christ in baptism," by being buried under water; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death by dying to sin, being taken hence, and this immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries, and approved by our church, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the Author of this institution, or any license from any council of the church, being that which the Romanist still urgeth to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity, it were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use, and aspersion only permitted,

as of old, in case of the clinici, or in present danger of death.—*Com. on New Test.*, on Rom. vi. 4.

WHITEFIELD.—It is certain, that in the words of our text there is an allusion to the manner of immersion, which our own church allows, and insists upon it that children should be immersed in water, unless those that bring the children to be baptized assure the minister that they cannot bear the plunging.—*Sermons, Serm. on Rom. vi. 4*, p. 731.

WILSON.—The expression *buried with him in baptism* alludes to the ancient form of administering that ancient ordinance still directed in our own church, except where health forbids, of the immersion or burial, so to speak, of the whole body in the water, after the example of the burial of the entire body of our Lord in the grave—*Exp. of the Colossians*, ii. 12, p. 219.

WITSIUS.—But *more particularly*, an immersion of this kind deprives us of the benefit of the light, and the other enjoyments of this world; so it is a very fit representation of the *death* of Christ. *The continuing* how short soever *under the water*, represents his *burial*, and the lowest degree of humiliation, when he was thought to be wholly cut off', while in the grave, that was both sealed and guarded. *The emersion, or coming out of the water*, gives us some resemblance of his *resurrection*, or victory, obtained in his death over death, which he vanquished within its inmost recesses, even the grave. All these particulars the apostle intimates, Rom. vi. 3, 4.—(*Economy of the Covenants*, Vol. III., pp. 377, 378.

WOLFIUS.—Formerly immersion into water furnished

a sign of burial in baptism. . . . Moreover, there have been some of the Christian teachers, who have thought that the same rite of immersion ought to be recalled into use at this day, lest that mystical signification should perish.—*Curæ Phil. et Crit.*, Rom. vi. 4, Vol. III., p. 104.

WORDSWORTH.— *We were buried with Him.* Not only did we die with Christ, but we were also *buried* with Him by our Baptism into *His* death (*eis ton thanaton*); therefore we have not only a *negative* work, but a *positive* one also; we have not only *died* unto *sin*, but we have *risen* unto *Righteousness*. And Burial is necessary as prior to Resurrection. We are therefore "buried with Him in Baptism, wherein also we are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God" (Col. ii. 12).—*Greek Test.*, Note on Rom. vi. 4.

WYCLIFFE.—Bodily washing of a child is not the end of baptizing, but baptizing is a token of washing of the soul from sin, both original and actual, by virtue taken of Christ's death. And thus, *we have been buried with him by baptism into a manner of death.* And so Christ's resurrection was a figure to us, how we should live. And therefore saith Paul thus after that, as *Christ was risen from death by the glory of the Father* of heaven, and so *should we live* by this figure *in newness* of a godly *life*. And so this water that we have been put into is a token of Christ's tribulation, from his beginning to his death, and teacheth how we should live here so. The baptizing of us in this water betokeneth both the burying of Christ, and how we have been buried with him from sin that reigneth in this world. Our taking up out of this water betokeneth the rising of Christ from death, and

how we should rise godly in cleanness of new life.—*Sel. Eng. Works*, Vol. II., p. 328.

ZWINGLI.—*Into his death.*] When ye were immersed into the water of baptism, ye were ingrafted into the death of Christ; that is, the immersion of your body into water was a sign, that ye ought to be ingrafted into Christ and his death, that as Christ died and was buried, ye also may be dead to the flesh and the old man, that is. to yourselves.—*Opera*, Vol. VI., *Annotat.*, in *Epis. ad Rom.* vi. 3, p. 420.

II. THE BAPTISM OF THE ISRAELITES (1 COR. X. 2).

ALFORD.—Received baptism (lit. baptized themselves: middle, not passive, see var. read.) to Moses; entered by the act of such immersion into a solemn covenant with God, and became his church under the law as given by Moses, God's servant,—just as we Christians by our baptism are bound in a solemn covenant with God, and enter His Church under the Gospel as brought in by Christ, God's eternal Son. . . . The cloud and the sea being both *aqueous*, and this point of comparison being obtained, serves the Apostle to indicate the outward symbols of their initiation into the church under the government of Moses as the servant of God, and to complete the analogy with our baptism. The allegory is obviously not to be pressed minutely: for neither did they *enter* the cloud, nor were they *wetted by the waters* of the sea; but *they passed under* both, as the baptized passes under the water, and as it was said of them, Exodus xiv. 31, "*Then the people feared the Lord, and believed the Lord and his servant Moses.*"—*Greek Test.*, Note on 1 Cor. x. 2, Vol. II., p. 552.

BURKITT.—The Red sea, through which they passed, and its waters gathered into two heaps, one on the right hand, and the other on the left, betwixt which the Israelites passed, and in their passage seem to be buried in the waters, as persons in that age were put under the water when they were baptized.—*Notes on the New Testament*, on 1 Cor. x. 2.

EDWARDS, T. C.—It is used, as Hoffman rightly observes, to make the analogy between the baptism of the Israelites, which was not by immersion, and the baptism of Christians, which was, at least as a rule, by immersion, more complete.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, x. 2, p. 244.

EVANS.—The two phrases 'were under the cloud,' and 'passed through the sea,' seem to prefigure the double process of *submersion* and *emersion* in baptism.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, x. 2.

FAUSSETT.—The cloud and sea consist of water, and as these took the Israelites out of sight, and then restored them again to view, so the water does to the baptized. —*Com. on 1 Cor.*, x. 2.

GATAKER.—The going down of the Israelites into the bottom and middle of the sea, and their coming up from thence to dry ground, have a great agreement with the rite of Christian baptism, as it was administered in the first times: seeing the persons to be baptized went down into the water, and again came up out of it; of which *going down* and *coming up*, express mention is made in the baptism of the Ethiopian Eunuch, Acts viii. 38, 39. Nay, further, as in the Christian rite, when persons are baptized, they are overwhelmed, and as it were buried in

water, and seem in a manner to be *buried with Christ*; and again when they emerge, they arise as out of a sepulcher, and are represented as risen again with Christ, Rom. vi. 4, 5; Col. ii. 12: so the Israelites might seem, when passing through the waters of the sea that were higher than their heads, to be overwhelmed, and as it were buried; and again to emerge and arise, when they escaped to the opposite shore.—*Adversaria Miscellanea*, Cap. IV., p. 30.

GROTIUS.—The matter of baptism consists in those two things, which we have mentioned, viz., liberation from the Divine wrath and freedom from the world. Then there is something similar in the appearance. A cloud rested over their heads, so likewise, the water over those who are baptized. Water surrounded them on all sides, and likewise the water surrounds those who are baptized.—*Annotations on N. T.*, on 1 Cor. x. 2.

KLING.—The cloud is, in a measure, taken together with the water (not symbolically of the Spirit) as the element into which they entered, and wherein they became, as it were, submerged, in order thence to emerge again. According to the true reading, he says, *ebaptisanto* (Mid.): *they baptized themselves*, inasmuch as in the baptism of adults there is a voluntary entering into the Divine bestowments of grace and a free surrender to them.—*Com. on 1 Corinthians*, x. 2.

MACEVILLY.—The baptism in question, caused probably, by their immersion in the thick vapours from the cloud that overhung them, and from the sea through which they passed, was typical of our baptism; and several other circumstances attending their passage, were

types of the effects which baptism produces (verse 9); the drowning of Egyptians was a type of the destruction of our sins in baptism, &c.—*Expos, of 1 Cor.*, x. 2, Vol. II., p. 209.

MACKNIGHT.—*In the cloud and in the sea.*—Because the Israelites, by being hid from the Egyptians under the cloud, and by passing through the Red Sea, were made to declare their *belief in the Lord and in his servant Moses*, Exod. xiv. 31. the apostle very properly represents them as *baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea.*—*On the Epistles*, 1 Cor. x. 2, Vol. II., p. 152.

MEYER.—*En te neph.*] *en* is *local*, as in *baptizein en hudati*, Matt. iii. 11, *al.*, indicating the *element in which* by immersion, and emergence, the baptism was effected. Just as the convert was baptized *in water* with reference to *Christ*, so also that O. T. analogue of baptism, which presents itself in the people of Israel at the passage of the Red Sea with reference to *Moses*, was effected in the *cloud* under which they were, and in the *sea* through which they passed.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, x. 2, p. 219.

OLSHAUSEN.—All attempts to render the type more perfect by means of trifling suppositions, such as, that drops from the clouds fell on the Israelites, or that they were sprinkled by the sea, must be utterly discarded.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, x. 2, p. 156.

ROBERTSON. — Now there is a remarkable passage in which we find St. Paul expressing the meaning of Baptism as symbolizing submission, discipleship to any particular teacher: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that all our fathers were un-

der the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." When the Israelites passed through the Red Sea they cut themselves off for ever from Egypt, so that figuratively speaking, the Apostle teaches that in that immersion they were baptized unto Moses, for thereby they declared themselves his followers, and left all to go with him. And so, just as the soldier who receives the bounty money is thereby pledged to serve his sovereign, so he who has passed through the Baptismal waters is pledged to fight under the Redeemer's banner against sin, the world, and the devil.—*Expos. Lect. on 1 Cor.*, Lect. IV., p. 28.

STUART.—Here, then, was the cloud which first stood before them, and then behind them; and here were the waters of the Red Sea, like a wall on their right hand and on their left. Yet neither the cloud nor the waters touched them. "They went through the midst of the sea upon dry ground." Yet they were *baptized in the cloud and in the sea*. The reason and ground of such an expression must be, so far as I can discern, a surrounding of the Israelites on different sides by the cloud and by the sea, although neither the cloud nor the sea touched them. It is, therefore, a kind of figurative mode of expression, derived from the idea that baptizing is surrounding with a fluid.—*Mode of Christian Baptism*, pp. 112, 113.

TURRETIN.—The passage of the Israelites through the Red sea, wonderfully agrees with our baptism, and represents the grace it was designed to express. For, as in baptism, when performed in the primitive manner, by immersion and emersion, descending into the water,

and again going out of it, of which descent and ascent we have an example in the Eunuch, Acts viii. 38, 39: yea, and what is more, as by this rite, when persons are immersed in water, they are overwhelmed, and as it were buried, and in a manner buried together with Christ; and again, when they emerge, seem to be raised out of the grave, and are said to rise with Christ, Rom. vi. 4, 5; Col. ii. 12: So in the Mosaic baptism, we have an immersion, and an emersion; that, when they descended into the depths of the sea; this, when they went out and came to the opposite shore. The former, was an image of death; the latter, of a resurrection. For, passing through the bottom of the sea, were they not near to death? And escaping to the opposite shore, were they not as it were revived from the dead?—*Disputat. de Bapt. Nubis et Maris*, Disp. VII., § 24, p. 146.

WEBSTER AND WILKINSON.—The prepositions used, *hupo*, *dia*, *en*, are evidently intended to reduce the process undergone by the Israelites to a greater similarity with immersion. The introduction of *nephele* is probably with the same object. In the passage of the Red Sea the cloud had passed over them, from front to rear, Ex. xiv. 19.—*Greek Testament*, Note on 1 Cor. x. 2.

WHITBY.—*They were baptized unto Moses in the cloud.*] i. e. Into the doctrine taught by Moses: for the cloud was not only for direction, but for a covering over them; according to the words of the psalmist, "He spread out the cloud for a covering" (Ps. cv. 39).

And in the sea.] For they were covered with the sea on both sides (Exod. xiv. 22): so that both the cloud and the sea had some resemblance to our being covered with water in baptism; their going into the sea resem-

bled the ancient rite of going into the water, and their coming out of it their rising up out of the water.—*Com. on New Test.*, on 1 Cor. x. 2.

WITSIUS.—The other difficulty is something more considerable; namely, how the Israelites could be *baptized in the cloud and in the sea*, since they were not dipped in the water of the sea, nor wetted by the cloud. But we are to know, 1. That the apostle uses the term *baptism* here in a figurative sense, For, because the Corinthians glorified of baptism, the apostle applies the name of baptism to those things, of which the Israelites might glory, as much as the Corinthians could of baptism, and which were to them instead of baptism. 2. There is also some sort of agreement in the external sign; a cloud differs very little from water, and the sea is water already; the cloud hung over their heads, so also water hangs over baptized persons. . . . The sea surrounded them on all sides; so does water also, those that are baptized. — (*Economy of the Covenants*, Vol. III., pp. 180, 181.

III. BAPTIZED FOR THE DEAD (I COR. XV. 29).

BLOOMFIELD.—The interpretation most likely to be the true one, must be such as shall depend on no remote or far-fetched allusion, shall be agreeable to the context, and inherent in the words themselves. Now this, if I mistake not, will apply to the one adopted by Chrysostom and the Greek commentators, and the generality of expositors in modern times, including Hammond, Burkitt, and Wetst., who explain: 'What will they do (i. e. what will they benefit themselves) who are baptized on the score of, i. e. in the hope of the resurrection of the dead?' q. d. 'They will be no better for it, either in this world or the next;' by an *argumentum ex absurdo*.

. . . There may also be (as the ancient commentators think) an allusion to the ancient mode of baptism by *immersion*; which, while typifying a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness, had also a reference to the Christian's communion with his Lord, both in death and resurrection from the dead. See Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12. Certainly baptism is, if not a type of the resurrection, yet a sign and seal thereof. We may add, that as the reception of Christian baptism and the adoption of the religion was one with the recognition of a resurrection of the dead; so, for any persons, professing to be Christians, to *disavow* that doctrine, was gross inconsistency, and must deprive them of all benefit from that *religion*.—*Greek Test.*, Note on 1 Cor. xv. 29, Vol. II., p. 248.

CHRYSOSTOM.—For the being baptized and immersed, and then emerging, is a symbol of the descent into hell, and the return thence. Wherefore also Paul calls baptism a burial, saying, *Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death*. By this he makes that also which is to come credible, I mean, the resurrection of our bodies. For the blotting out sins is a much greater thing than the raising up of a body.—*Homilies on 1 Cor.*, Vol. II., Horn. XL. on xv. 29, p. 572.

CLARK, SAMUEL.—What shall they that are baptized be the better for that significant Ceremony of Rising again out of the Water, after they have been as it were buried in it; (*Rom. vi. 4.*) which is, a being Baptized for the dead, *i. e.* to give assurance that after they are dead they shall be raised again by the power of Christ. —*Annotations*, on 1 Cor. xv. 29.

EDWARDS, JOHN.—Now let us see how they apply these

words to the death of the body. They hold that the Apostle's argument in the text is of this sort, If there shall be no *rising of the dead* hereafter, why is *baptism* so significant a symbol of our dying and rising again, and also of the death and resurrection of Christ? For those that were proselytes to the Christian religion were interpreted to make an open profession of these in their being plunged into the baptismal water, and in being there overwhelmed and *buried* as it were in the consecrated element. The immersion into the water was thought to signify the death of Christ, and their coming out denoted his rising again, and did no less represent their own future resurrection. On which account the Minister's putting in of the Christian converts into the sacred waters, and his taking them out thence, are styled by St. Chrysostom the sign and pledge of descending into the state of the dead, and of his return from thence. —*Enquiry into Four Item. Texts*, pp. 143, 144.

LEWIN.—This text has been variously explained, but the only two hypotheses at all admissible appear to be these: 1. Where persons had died unbaptized, it was the custom to substitute a post mortem vicarious baptism. See Renan's *St. Paul*, p. 241. 2. In baptism we use *immersion* to signify our death and rising again; but if there be no resurrection, why do we baptize by immersion? The first interpretation has been objected to as implying the Apostle's approval of a practice that could be of no avail: but the language of the Apostle is merely an *argumentum ad homines*. "What shall they do," i. e. 'How will they justify themselves,' &c. The second interpretation was applicable to the practice throughout the East in that day, though not to the practice in our own country at the present day. Baptism in the

East was then immersion, but now among ourselves by sprinkling.—*Life and Epist. of Paul*, Vol. I., pp. 400, 401.

MACKNIGHT.—I told you, ver. 22. That by Christ all shall be made alive; and verses 25, 26. That he must reign till death, the last enemy, is destroyed by the resurrection, *Otherwise what shall they do*, to repair their loss, who are *immersed in sufferings for testifying the resurrection of the dead, if the dead rise not at all? And what inducement can they have to suffer death for believing the resurrection of the dead?*—*On the Epistles*, Paraphrase on 1 Cor. xv. 29, Vol. II., pp. 267, 269.

IV. THE WASHING OF REGENERATION (TITUS III. 5).

FAUSSETT.—*The washing*—rather, "the laver," i. e., the baptismal font, or lavatory. . . . The laver of cleansing stood outside the door of the tabernacle, wherein the priest had to wash before entering the Holy Place: so we must wash in the laver of regeneration before we can enter the church, whose members are a royal priesthood.—*Com. on Titus*, iii. 5.

HOPKINS.—The word signifies, the Bath of Regeneration, which is that baptismal water wherein we are buried with Christ.—*Works*, Vol. II., p. 402.

VAN OOSTERZEE.—*By the laver of regeneration, &c.*; a reference to baptism, which might all the more be exhibited as a laver, *loutron*, since it was originally performed by the entire submersion of the person baptized (comp. Eph. v. 26). . . . Whoever, with the desire of salvation, went down into the baptismal water, with the confession of an honest faith, came forth therefrom

as one newborn, to live henceforth a new life (comp. Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 11, 12). On this ground Paul could say that God had saved them *by (did)* the laver of regeneration; since, as a general rule, the submission to the rite of baptism was necessarily, in the case of those who repeated the question of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts viii. 36), the decisive act, the great turning-point in the history of their inner and outer life.—*Com. on Titus*, iii. 5.

V. THE DOCTRINE OF BAPTISMS (HEB. VI. 2).

DAVIDSON.—The act of immersion naturally suggested that the old life was done away and that a new man had arisen, and thus the preceding repentance and faith were confirmed.—The plural *baptisms* probably refers to the various Jewish washings (ix. 10), the baptism of John (Acts xix. 3), and Christian baptism, in their distinction from one another and in the meanings of the last.—*Commentary on the Epis. to Hebrews*, vi. 2, p. 120.

MACKNIGHT.—*Of the doctrine of baptisms*. In the Levitical ritual many *baptisms*, or immersions of the body in water, were enjoined as emblematical of that purity of mind which is necessary to the worshipping of God acceptably.—*On the Epistles*, Note on Heb. vi. 2, Vol. V., p. 119.

VI. DIVERS BAPTISMS (HEB. IX. 10).

GURNEY.—It is notorious, that, according to the ceremonial law of the Jews, there could be no removal of uncleanness, no purification either of things or persons, without ablution in water. On various occasions the performance of that ceremony was appointed by the di-

vine law: and on many others, it was observed on the authority of Rabbinical tradition. Now, these "divers washings," to which the Jews were so much accustomed as a ritual means of purification, are in the Greek Testament, described as *baptisms*; and it is certain that the principal of them were effected by dipping or immersion. Before going into the temple to minister or officiate, the priests of the Jews were accustomed to dip their whole body in water, and the house in which this ceremony was performed was called the house of baptism. Persons of every description, who had contracted any bodily pollution, were strictly enjoined by the law to wash or *bathe* their flesh; and the learned Jews determine that, if the least part of the surface of the body was not wetted by dipping, the purification was incomplete. In the Greek original of the book of Ecclesiasticus a person purified, after touching a dead body, is described as one *dipped* or *baptized*. Judith, when on the point of performing an action which she erroneously deemed to be of a highly religious nature," washed (or, as in the Greek, baptized) herself in a fountain of water." Now, although the baptism practised by John and by the apostles did not, in all its circumstances, resemble those Jewish washings to which I have now adverted, yet it was precisely similar to them in that main particular of *immersion in water*; and, in all these instances, this immersion was typical of one and the same thing— that is to say, of *a change from a condition of uncleanness to one of purity*. But the Jewish dipping, from which the baptism, first of John, and afterwards, of the apostles, principally took its rise, and of which those baptisms may, indeed, be considered as mere instances, was the *dipping on conversion*.— *Views and Practices of Friends*, pp. 113-115.

MACKNIGHT.—Only *with* meats and drinks, and divers (*baptismois*) immersions, and ordinances concerning the flesh, imposed until the time of reformation.—*On the Epistles*, Trails, of Heb. ix. 10, Vol. V., p. 183.

VII. BAPTISM AND THE FLOOD (1 PET. III. 21).

HAMMOND.—Baptism is quite contrary to the Ark of *Noah*, but yet saved as that saved. There the destruction was by water, and only they were saved which got into the Ark; but here water is the means of saving from destruction, and they perish which have not this immersion, or baptism here spoken of.—*Annotations*, on 1 Pet. iii. 21.

SUTCLIFFE.—*The like figure, even baptism, doth now save us.* The figure is immersion, the mode of baptizing among the Jews.—*Com.*, on 1 Peter iii. 21.

LEIGHTON.—Now that Baptism doth apply and seal to the believer his interest in the death and resurrection of Christ, the Apostle, St. Paul teaches to the full: *We are buried with Him*, says he, *by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.* The dipping into the waters representing our dying with Christ; and the return thence our rising with Him.

The last thing is, the resemblance of Baptism, in these things, to the saving of Noah in the flood. *The like figure whereunto even Baptism.* And it holds in that we spoke of last; for he seemed to have rather entered into a grave, as dead, than into a safeguard of life, in going into the Ark; yet, being buried there, he arose again, as it were, in his coming forth to begin a new world. The waters of the Flood drowned the ungodly, as a heap of filthiness washed them away, them and their sin together as one,

being inseparable; and upon the same waters the Ark floating, preserved Noah. Thus the waters of Baptism are intended as a deluge to drown sin and to save the Believer, who by faith is separated both from the world and from his sin; so it sinks and he is saved.—*Commentary on 1 Peter*, iii. 21, Part II., p. 570.

MACKNIGHT.—The water of baptism is here called *the antitype to the water of the flood*, because the flood was *a type or emblem* of baptism, in the three following particulars: 1. As by building the ark and by entering into it, Noah showed a strong faith in the promise of God, concerning his preservation by the very water which was to destroy the antediluvians for their sins, so, by giving ourselves to be buried in the water of baptism, we show a like faith in God's promise, that though we die and are buried, he will save us from death, the punishment of sin, by raising us from the dead at the last day.—2. As the preserving of Noah alive, during the nine months he was in the flood, is an emblem of the preservation of the souls of believers while in the state of the dead, so, the preserving believers alive while buried in the water of baptism, is a prefiguration of the same event.—3. As the water of the deluge destroyed the wicked antediluvians, but preserved Noah, by bearing up the ark in which he was shut up, till the waters were assuaged and he went out of it to live again on the earth, so baptism may be said to destroy the wicked, and to save the righteous, as it prefigures both these events; the death of the sinner it prefigures by the burying of the baptized persons in the water; and the salvation of the righteous, by raising the baptized person out of the water to live a new life.—*On the Epistles*, Note on 1 Peter iii. 21, Vol. V., pp. 482, 483.

CHAPTER XII.

REVIEWS.

EDINBURGH.—What, then, was baptism in the apostolic age? The fewest words will most reverently tell what indeed it requires but few words to describe. We must place before our minds the greatest religious change which the world has ever seen or can see. Imagine thousands of men and women seized by one common impulse,—abandoning, by the irresistible conviction of a day, an hour, a moment their former habits, friends, associates, to be enrolled in a new society under the banner of a new faith, conceive what that new society was—a society of brothers,' bound by ties closer than any brotherhood—filled with life and energy such as fall to the lot of none but the most ardent enthusiasts, yet tempered by a moderation, a wisdom, and a holiness such as mere enthusiasts have never possessed. Picture that society, swayed by the presence of men whose very names seem too sacred for the converse of admiring mortals, and by the recollections of One, whom 'not seeing they loved with love unspeakable.' Into this society they passed by an act as natural as it was expressive. The plunge into the bath of purification, long known among the Jewish nation as the symbol of the change of life, was still retained as the pledge of entrance into this new and universal communion—retained under the express sanction of Him, into whose most holy name they were by that solemn rite 'baptized.' The water in those Eastern regions, so doubly significant of all that was pure

and refreshing, closed over the heads of the converts, and they rose into the light of heaven, new and altered beings.— *Volume XCII.*, pp. 285, 286.

LONDON.—That the letter of the Scripture is in favor of the Baptists (or, as they are *still absurdly* called *Anabaptists*) cannot, without evasion and equivocation be denied. — *Volume III.*, p. 489.

MONTHLY.—The word *baptize* doth certainly signify immersion, absolute and total immersion, in Josephus and other Greek writers. But this word is in some degree equivocal; and there are some eminent Greek scholars who have asserted that immersion is not *necessarily* included in baptism. The examples produced, however, do not exactly serve the cause of those who think that a few drops of water sprinkled on the forehead of a child, constitute the essence of baptism. In the Septuagint it is said, that Nebuchadnezzar "was *baptized* with the dew of heaven:" and in a poem attributed to Homer (called) *the battle of the Frogs and Mice*, it is said that "a lake was *baptized* with the blood" of a wounded combatant. A question hath arisen, in what sense the word *baptize* can be used in those passages. Doth it signify immersion, properly so called? Certainly not. Neither can it signify a partial sprinkling. A body wholly surrounded with a mist; wholly made humid with dew; or a piece of water so tinged with and discolored by blood, that if it had been a solid body and dipped into it, it could not have received a more sanguine appearance, is a very different thing from that partial ablution which in modern times is supposed sufficient to constitute full and explicit baptism. The accommodation of the word [*baptism*] to the instances we

have referred to, is not unnatural though highly metaphorical; and may be resolved into a *trope* or figure of speech, in which though the primary idea is maintained, yet the mode of expression is altered; and the word itself is to be understood rather allusively than really: rather relatively than absolutely: If the body had been baptized or immersed, it could not have been more wet than Nebuchadnezzar's: if the lake *had been* dipped in blood it could not have put on a more bloody appearance.

Such modes of speech, however, improper, strictly considered, were very common with ancient writers, both sacred and profane.

We have not yet seen any thing on this subject that hath thoroughly satisfied us. Hitherto the antipædobaptists seem to have had the best of the argument, on the mode of administering the ordinance. The explicit authorities are on their side. Their opponents have chiefly availed themselves of inference, analogy, and doubtful construction.—*Volume LXX., May, 1784?* p. 396.

QUARTERLY.—There can be no question that the original form of baptism—the very meaning of the word—was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters; and that for at least four centuries, any other form was either unknown, or regarded as an exceptional, almost a monstrous case. To this form the Greek Church still rigidly adheres; and the most illustrious and venerable portion of it—that of the Byzantine empire—absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid. The Latin Church, on the other hand—doubtless in deference to the requirements of a northern climate, to a change of manners, to the con-

venience of custom—has wholly altered the mode, surrendering as it would fairly say, the letter to the spirit —preferring mercy to sacrifice; and with the two exceptions (of the Cathedral of Milan and the sect of the Baptists), a few drops of water are now the Western substitutes for the threefold plunge into the rushing river, or the wide baptisteries of the East.— *Volume XCV.*, p. 52.

RELIGIOUS REVIEW OF.—Immersion was clearly the mode of baptism in early times; in cold countries, baptism by sprinkling is "permitted" only (the rule is—immersion), on the ground that mercy rather than sacrifice is a note of the Christian dispensation.— *Volume I., May, 1891*, p. 388.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE PRACTICE OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

BENHAM.—In the East *Immersion* has remained the practice as well as the primary rule.—*Dict. of Rel.*, Art. Bap., p. 98.

BUNSEN.—In the East people adhered to immersion, although this symbol of man voluntarily and conscientiously making a vow of the sacrifice of self, lost all meaning in the immersion of a new born child. The Eastern Church, moreover, practiced the unction immediately after immersion, although unction implies, even more than immersion. Man's full consciousness, and is to be the seal of a free pledge, of a responsible act. Yet the Eastern Church requires, nevertheless, the general recognition of both, as necessary to salvation, and denies that there is any efficacy in the Western form of baptism.—*Christianity and Mankind*, Vol. II., pp. 120, 121.

COLEMAN.—The Eastern church, however, in direct opposition to these views, has uniformly retained the form of immersion as indispensable to the validity of the ordinance, and repeated the rite whenever they have received to their communion persons who had been previously baptized in another manner.—*Christ. Antiq.*, Chap. XIV., § 8, p. 123.

EDINBURGH CYCLOPEDIA.—The Greek Church universally adheres to immersion.—*Art. Bapt.*, Vol. III., p. 246.

ENCYCLOP. AMERICANA.—The Greek Church, as well as the schismatics in the East retained the custom of immersing the whole body.—*Art. Bapt.*, Vol. I., p. 557.

RIDDLE.—In the western churches, although immersion was never renounced by any statute or canon, yet, in practice, aspersion or sprinkling was generally substituted for it, after the lapse of several centuries; and it is agreed by all parties, in those communions, that this particular in the administration of baptism does not affect the validity of the sacrament. This point, however, is strongly contested by the Greek church; which not only retains the primitive practice of immersion, but maintains that it is essential to the nature of true and effectual baptism; nor will it consent to receive into its communion any persons who have been otherwise baptized, unless they submit to a second baptism by immersion.—*Christian Antiquities*, p. 463.

SCHAFF.—The Oriental and the orthodox Russian churches require even a *threefold* immersion, in the name of the Trinity, and deny the validity of any other. They look down upon 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." Marriott (in Smith and Cheetham, 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."—*History of the Christ. Church, Note*, Vol. I., p. 468.

STACKHOUSE.—The operation of the Greek church, in relation to this matter, is this, that he who ascended out of the water must first descend down into it; and consequently, that baptism is to be performed, not by sprinkling, but by washing the body. And indeed, he must be strangely ignorant of the Jewish rite of baptism, who seems to doubt of this, since, to the due performance of it, they required the immersion of the whole body to such a degree of nicety, that if any dirt was upon it that hindered the water from coming to that part, they thought the ceremony was not rightly done. —*Hist. of the Bible*, Vol. V., p. 291.

STANLEY.—There can be no question that the original form of baptism—the very meaning of the word—was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters; and that, for at least four centuries, any other form was either unknown, or regarded, unless in the case of dangerous illness, as an exceptional, almost monstrous case. To this form the Eastern Church still rigidly adheres; and the most illustrious and venerable portion of it, that of the Byzantine Empire, absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid.—*Hist. of the East. Church*, p. 28.

VENEMA.—In pronouncing the baptismal form of words, the Greeks use the third person, saying, *Let the Servant of Christ be baptized, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit*; and immerse the whole man in water.—*Hist. Eccles.*, Tom. VI., *Secul. XVI.*, § 7, p. 660.

WALL.—The Greek church, in all the branches of it, does still use immersion; and they hardly count a child, except in case of sickness, well baptized without it. And so do all the other Christians in the world, except the Latins. That which I hinted before, is a rule that does not fail in any particular that I know of, viz. all those nations of Christians that do now, or formerly did, submit to the authority of the bishop of Rome, do ordinarily baptize their infants by pouring or sprinkling. And though the English received not this custom till after the decay of popery; yet they have since received it from such neighbor nations as had begun it in the time of the pope's power. But all other Christians in the world, who never owned the pope's usurped power, do, and ever did, dip their infants in the ordinary use.—*History of Infant Baptism*, Vol. I., p. 589.

CHAPTER XIV.

HISTORY OF SPRINKLING.

BLUNT.—The innovation of affusion, or pouring water on the baptized, afterwards began in the Latin Church, and has become the general Western usage. In the Eastern Church baptism has always been by immersion, and as a modern, well-informed writer says, the Eastern Church has never ceased to protest against the innovation in the mode of baptizing in the Latin Church.— *Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theology*, Art. Bapt., p. 75.

BONET-MAURY.— The literal meaning of the Greek word *baptizein* is to plunge, to immerse, to dip. Baptism by immersion is still practiced by all the orthodox Greek churches of the East. This form was practiced in the West until the close of the thirteenth century. But at the close of the thirteenth century, baptism by aspersion prevailed definitely for the baptism of children. In 1311 the Council of Ravenna allowed free choice between immersion and aspersion. Thomas Aquinas declares the two forms equally legitimate. Baptism by immersion has been preserved until the present time in the Cathedral of Milan. In the sixteenth century Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth were baptized by immersion and the English liturgy of baptism enjoined immersion for the public baptism of little children. Since the beginning of the seventeenth century this form has been very rare in the non-Baptist churches.—*Letter to Dr. Christian, in Immersion*, pp. 183, 134.

BOSSUET.—We have seen the illusions of the Anabaptists, and are sensible it was by following the principles of Luther and the rest of the Reformers that they rejected baptism without immersion, and infant baptism; for this reason, that they did not find them in the Scripture, where they were made believe all was contained.— *Variations of the Prot. Churches*, Vol. II., Book XV., § 12, p. 359.

BUNSEN.—The Western Church evidently commenced her career under the guidance of Rome, with more freedom of thought. She abolished, together with adult baptism, its symbol, immersion, and introduced sprinkling in its stead.— *Christianity and Mankind*, Vol. II., p. 121.

BURNETT.—The danger of dipping in cold climates, may be a very good reason for changing the form of baptism to sprinkling.— *Exp. of the, Thirty-Nine Art.*, p. 418.

CANDLISH.—It is thought by most of those who have investigated the subject, that immersion was the earliest form of Christian baptism, on the ground of Paul's allusion to the going down and rising up out of the water as a figure of burial and rising with Christ (Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12), and also of the statements of early Christian writers. However, in cases of sickness, pouring or sprinkling was allowed instead of immersion; but the latter continued to be the regular form for many ages, and in England till after the Reformation. Indeed, it is still the form theoretically enjoined as preferable in the Church of England Prayer-Book, though pouring is also allowed. In France, Italy, and Germany, dipping went out of use much earlier than in England; and

pouring or sprinkling had become the usual form before the Reformation.—*The Christian Sacraments*, pp. 49, 50.

CATHOLIC DICTIONARY.—The Scripture makes it clear enough that water is to be used, but it is not so plain at first sight that the sprinkling or pouring of water will suffice. In Apostolic times the body of the baptized person was immersed, for St. Paul looks on this immersion as typifying burial with Christ, and speaks of baptism as a bath. [Rom. vi. 4; Eph. v. 26]. Immersion still prevails among the Copts and Nestorians, and for many ages baptism was so given among the Latins also, for even St. Thomas, in the thirteenth century, speaks of baptism by immersion as the common practice of his time. Still the rubric of the Roman Rituale, which states that baptism can be validly given by immersion, infusion, or aspersion, is fully justified by tradition.—*Art. Bapt.*, p. 60.

COLEMAN.—*Immersion, or dipping.* In the primitive church this was undeniably the common mode of baptism. The utmost that can be said of *sprinkling* in that early period is, that it was, in case of necessity, permitted as an exception to a general rule. This fact is so well established that it were needless to adduce authorities in proof of it. The reader will be directed to them by references elsewhere; but there are some points in connection with this rite which require particular attention.

It is a great mistake to suppose that baptism by immersion was discontinued when infant baptism became prevalent. This was as early as the sixth century; but the practice of immersion continued until the thirteenth or fourteenth century. Indeed, it has never been form-

ally abandoned, but, is still the mode of administering infant baptism in the Greek Church.—*Christ. Antiquities*, Chap. XIV., § 8, pp. 122,123.

COX, HOMERSHAM.—The Jews baptized by immersion, and this undoubtedly was the form of the Christian institution originally, though subsequently baptism by affusion was allowed. Even so late as the age of Cyprian (the third century) this method, though tolerated, was not the most usual.—*The First Century of Christianity*, p. 277.

COXE.—1. The word means to dip. 2. I think the "sacred writers" used the word in the primary sense, but also for other washings which were not dippings. So did also the classical writers, with great freedom and variety of meanings.

3. In the Church of England dipping is even now the primary rule. But it is not the ordinary custom. It survived far down into Queen Elizabeth's time, but seems to have died out early in the seventeenth century. It never has become obsolete. I, myself, have baptized by dipping both adults and babes.

I ought to add that in Prance (unreformed) the custom of dipping became obsolete long before it was disused in England. But for this *bad example* my own opinion is that dipping would still prevail among Anglicans.

I wish that all Christians would restore the primitive practice. I say this, tho' I believe the other to be valid—as in the case of clinic baptism—in early Christian history. —*Letter to Dr. Christian, in Immersion*, pp. 221, 222.

CUNNINGHAM, JOHN.—Change leads to change. Immersion was the only mode of baptism in the Apostolic

Church. No other would have been understood. But when baptism no longer immediately followed conversion, when it was frequently deferred till death was near, immersion in such a case was impossible. When infant baptism became common the necessity for some relaxation of the rule became still more pressing. You could not take a dying man from his bed, nor a sickly child from its mother's lap and plunge it in cold water. Already in the second century there are indications of some yielding to circumstances. In the passage in the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," which I previously quoted, we are told that where cold water could not be used warm might; and that where a bath could not be resorted to it was enough to pour water three times on the head. Here was the first beginning of what were afterwards called clinical baptisms—baptisms accommodated to the babe of a day old, to the sick and the dying. When Christianity pushed its way northward among barbarians living amid dark forests and by frozen rivers, averse to being plunged in the icy stream, the accommodating missionaries of the new faith insisted only on such a baptism as had hitherto been reserved for cradles and deathbeds. Sprinkling instead of immersion became common in cold latitudes, but by no means universal. The German "taufen" means to dip. The original mode stiffly kept its ground, and it took a thousand years still to beat it off the field. By the thirteenth century it was disappearing, but when the Reformation came it was not extinct. Calvin allowed either mode. Both Queen Elizabeth and King Edward VI. were immersed. According to the rubric for the public baptism of infants in the Church of England at this day, the infant is to be dipped "discreetly and warily" if it is certified that it can endure it; while those of riper years

may be either dipped or have the water poured on them.

Even yet the original method of immersion divides Christendom with the more modern method of sprinkling. In the great Eastern Church immersion is the only method of baptism known. It is joyfully submitted to amid the snows of Russia and on the frozen plains of Siberia as well as by the warm rivers of Greece and Ethiopia. In the Cathedral of Milan alone, of all the churches of the West, is immersion still adhered to.— *The Growth of the Church*, pp. 190, 191.

EDINBURGH CYCLOPEDIA.—It is impossible to mark the precise period when sprinkling was introduced. It is probable, however, that it was invented in Africa, in the second century, in favor of clinics. But it was so far from being approved by the church in general, that the Africans themselves did not account it valid. The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner. Pope Stephen III. being driven from Rome by Astulphus, king of the Lombards, in 753, fled to Pepin, who a short time before had usurped the crown of France. Whilst he remained there, the Monks of Cressy in Brittany consulted him, whether, in case of necessity, baptism performed by pouring water on the head of the infant, would be lawful. Stephen replied, that it would. But though the truth of this fact should be allowed, which some Catholics deny, yet pouring and sprinkling was only admitted in case of necessity. It was not till 1311, that the legislature, in a council held at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent. In this country, however, sprinkling was never practised, in ordinary cases, till after the Reformation; and in England, even in the reign of Edward VI. trine

immersion, dipping first the right side, secondly, the left side, and last the face of the infant, was commonly observed. But during the persecution of Mary, many persons, most of whom were Scotsmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions of that church. In 1556, a book was published at that place, containing, "The form of prayer and ministration of the sacraments, approved by the famous and godly learned man, John Calvin," in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand, and lay it upon the child's forehead. These Scottish exiles, who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of Calvin; and returning to their own country, with Knox at their head, in 1559, established sprinkling in Scotland. From Scotland, this practice made its way into England in the reign of Elizabeth; but was not authorized by the established church. In the Assembly of Divines, held at Westminster, in 1643, it was keenly debated, whether immersion or sprinkling should be adopted; 25 voted for sprinkling, and 24 for immersion; and even this small majority was obtained" at the earnest request of Dr. Lightfoot, who had acquired great influence in that assembly. Sprinkling is therefore the general practice of this country. Many Christians, however, especially the Baptists reject it. The Greek Church universally adheres to immersion.—*Art. Bapt.*, Vol. III., pp. 245, 246.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA METROPOLITANA. — We readily admit, that the literal meaning of *Baptism* is immersion, and that the desire of restoring again the most ancient practice of the church, of immersing the body, which has been expressed by many divines, is well worthy of being considered. The origin of sprinkling with water

instead of dipping, must be derived from regard to health: that necessity, as in case of persons wishing to be baptized on their death-bed, and of weakly children, would justify the use of a small quantity of water, no charitable person can doubt.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. XV., p. 250.

ENCYCLOPEDIA PERTHENSIS.—The custom of sprinkling children, instead of dipping them in the font, which at first was allowed in case of weakness or sickness of the infant, has so far prevailed, that immersion is quite excluded. What principally tended to confirm the practice of affusion or sprinkling, was, that several of our Protestant divines, flying into Germany and Switzerland during the bloody reign of Mary, and returning home when Queen Elizabeth came to the crown, brought back with them a great zeal for the Protestant churches beyond the sea, where they had been sheltered and received; and having observed, that at Geneva and some other places, baptism was administered by sprinkling, they thought they could not do the Church of England a greater piece of service, than by introducing a practice dictated by so great oracle as Calvin. This, together with the coldness of our northern climate, was what contributed to banish entirely the practice of dipping infants in the font.—*Article Baptism*, Vol. III., p. 277.

FISHER.—The ordinary mode of baptism was immersion. Whether in this rite the pouring of water on the head was sometimes practiced then, as it certainly was subsequently, is an open question. The first distinct reference to baptism by affusion is in the early writing called the "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," written perhaps about 120, where the direction is given, in case

there is not a sufficiency of water, to pour water on the head thrice.—*Hist. of the Ch. Church*, p. 41.

GIBBONS.—For several centuries after the establishment of Christianity, Baptism was *usually* conferred by immersion; but since the twelfth century, the practice of baptizing by infusion has prevailed in the Catholic Church, as this manner is attended with less inconvenience than Baptism by immersion.—*Faith of Our Fathers*, p. 318.

GHASTLIER.—The condition of catechumens necessarily continued several years; but the catechumens often deferred even baptism as long as possible on account of the remission of sins by which it was to be accompanied. Hence it was often necessary to baptize the sick; and for them the rite of sprinkling was introduced.—*Eccl. History*, Vol. I., p. 277.

HAGENBACH.—*Sprinkling* also (instead of dipping) gave rise to many discussions. *Thomas Aquinas* preferred the more ancient custom (*Summa*, P. III. qu. 66, art. 6), because immersion reminded Christians of the *burial* of Christ; but he did not think it absolutely necessary. From the thirteenth century sprinkling came into more general use in the West. The Greek Church, however, and the Church of Milan still retained the practice of immersion. —*History of Christian Doctrines*, Vol. II., p. 332.

HEFELE.—The Church has always been tender towards the sick; she has always hastened to confer baptism upon them, because it is necessary to salvation; and for that reason she introduced *clinical* baptism.—*History of Church Councils*, p. 153.

HILGENFELD—Only in the Western Church, and after the thirteenth century, did sprinkling come in as the usual mode of baptism, so that it became the general custom in the fourteenth century. The baptism by immersion, however, is still preserved by the Greek Catholic Church. —*Letter to Dr. Christian, in Immersion*, p. 133.

HOLTZMANN.—The meaning of the word *baptizein*, as of the simple *baptein*, is to 'dip in, to dip under.' At a late date, instead of immersion, aspersion occurs in the cases of sickness, and was called clinic baptism. Aspersion became only more common in consequence of the baptism of children, and never obtained a meaning similar to immersion until after the thirteenth century.— *Letter to Dr. Christian, in Immersion*, p. 133.

HOOK.—But though immersion was the usual practice, yet sprinkling was in some cases allowed, as in clinic baptism, or the baptism of such persons as lay sick in bed. It is true, this kind of baptism was not esteemed so perfect and effectual as that by immersion or dipping; for which reason, in some churches, none were advanced to the order of the priesthood, who had been so baptized; an instance of which we have in Novatian, whose ordination was opposed by all the clergy upon that account; though afterward, at the entreaties of the bishop, they consented to it.—*Church Dic.*, Art. Bap., p. 82.

JOHNSON.—They may think, that in what is merely ritual, deviations from the primitive mode may be admitted on the ground of convenience, and I think they are as well warranted to make this alteration, as we are to substitute sprinkling in the room of the ancient baptism.—*Boswell's Life of Johnson*, Vol. IV., p. 289.

KENRICK.—When religion had consummated her triumphs over Paganism in the various countries of Europe, and the regenerated parents were diligently instructed in the duty of presenting their children to be baptized at the earliest period possible, ages passed away without scarcely an instance of the baptism of adults. Hence the necessity of receding from the mode of immersion became still more frequent, since the tender infant oftentimes could not be immersed without peril to its life. The cases thus multiplying, the more solemn method fell into gradual disuse, until it has, in most places, been entirely superseded.—*Treatise on Baptism*, p. 175.

KNAPP.—*Immersion* is peculiarly agreeable to the institution of Christ, and to the practice of the apostolical church, and so even John baptized, and immersion remained common for a long time after; except that in the third century, or perhaps earlier, the baptism of the sick (*baptisma clinicorum*) was performed by sprinkling or affusion. Still some would not acknowledge this to be true baptism, and controversy arose concerning it, so unheard of was it at that time to baptize by simple affusion. Cyprian first defended baptism by sprinkling, when necessity called for it, but cautiously and with much limitation. By degrees, however, this mode of baptism became more customary, probably because it was found more convenient; especially was this the case after the seventh century, and in the Western church, but it did not become universal until the commencement of the fourteenth century. Yet Thomas Aquinas had approved and promoted this innovation more than a hundred years before. In the Greek and Eastern church they still held to immersion. It would have been better to

have adhered generally to the ancient practice, as even Luther and Calvin allowed.—*Christian Theology*, p. 428.

KURTZ.—Sprinkling was still [323-692] confined to *Baptismus Clinicorum* and was first generally used in the West in infant baptism in the 12th century, while the East still retained the custom of immersion.—*Church History*, Vol. I., § 58, p. 367.

LIGHTFOOT.—*Wednesday, Aug. 7, [1644.]*: . . . Then fell we upon the work of the day; which was, about baptizing "of the child, whether to dip him or to sprinkle." And this proposition, "It is lawful and sufficient to besprinkle the child," had been canvassed before our adjourning, and was ready now to vote; but I spake against it, as being very unfit to vote, that it is lawful to sprinkle, when every one grants it. Whereupon, it was fallen upon, sprinkling being granted, whether dipping should be tolerated with it. And here fell we upon a large and long discourse, whether dipping was essential or used in the first institution, or in the Jew's custom. Mr. *Coleman* went about, in a large discourse, to prove *tbilh* to be dipping overhead. Which I answered at large:— . . .

After a long dispute, it was at last put to the question, whether the Directory should run thus,— "The minister shall take water, and sprinkle or pour it with his hand upon the face or forehead of the child:" and it was voted so indifferently, that we were glad to count names twice: for so many were unwilling to have dipping excluded, that the votes came to an equality within one; for the one side was twenty-four, the other, twenty-five: the twenty-four for the reserving of dipping, and twenty-five against it: and there grew a great heat upon it: and

when we had done all, we concluded upon nothing in it; but the business was recommitted.

Thursday, Aug. 8.] ... Then fell we upon our work about dipping in baptism: and first it was proposed by Dr. *Burgess*, that our question proposed yesterday might be proposed again. And this cost some time before we could get off this business: at last it was put to the question, Whether the question put yesterday should be more debated before determined; and it was voted affirmatively.

And so we fell upon the business: and I first proposed, that those that stand for dipping, should show some probable reason why they hold it. Dr. *Temple* backed me in the thing: and Mr. *Marshall* began; and he said, that he doubted not that all the Assembly concluded that dipping was lawful. I flatly answered, that I hold it unlawful, but an *ethelothrekeia*; and therefore desired, that it might be proved. But it was first thought fit to go to the business by degrees; and so it was first put to the vote, and voted thus affirmatively,—"that pouring on of water, or sprinkling of it in the administration of baptism, is lawful and sufficient." But I excepted at the word "lawful" as too poor, for that it was as if we should put this query,—Whether it be lawful to administer the Lord's supper in bread and wine? and I moved that it might be expressed thus,—"It is not only lawful, but also sufficient;" and it was done so accordingly. But as for the dispute itself about dipping, it was thought fit and most safe to let it alone, and express it thus in our Directory,—"He is to baptize the child with water, which for the manner of doing is not only lawful, but also sufficient, and most expedient to be by pouring or sprinkling on the face of the child, without any other ceremony." But this cost a great deal of

time about the wording it.— *Works*, Vol. XIII., pp. 299-301.

McCLINTOCK AND STRONG'S CYCLOPEDIA. — SPRINKLING, as a form of baptism took the place of immersion after a few centuries in the early Church, not from any established rule, but by common consent, and it has since been very generally practiced in all but the Greek and Baptist churches, which insist upon immersion.—*Art. Sprinkling*, Vol. IX., p. 968.

MEDE.—There was no such thing as *sprinkling*, or *rantismos*, used in Baptism in the Apostles' times, nor for many Ages after them.— *Works*, p. 63.

MILMAN.—The baptism was usually by immersion; the stripping off of the clothes was emblematic of "putting off the old man;" but baptism by sprinkling was allowed, according to the exigency of the case. —*Hist. of Christ.*, Vol. III., Book IV., Chap. II., p. 428.

NEANDER.—After his [Novatian's] restoration from this demoniacal disease, it is objected again, that he fell into a severe fit of sickness (which may be very naturally explained: the crisis of his whole organic system, for which he was indebted to the restoration from that frenzy-like condition, was the cause of the sickness), and that in the apprehension of death, he received baptism, but baptism only by sprinkling, as his condition required (the *baptismus clinicorum* not being, according to the usual practice of those times, by immersion), if it could be said, indeed, that such a one had been baptized at all.—*Church History*, Vol. I., p. 325.

REES' ENCYCLOPEDIA.—Some are of the opinion that sprinkling in baptism was begun in cold countries. It was introduced into England about the beginning of the ninth century. At the council of Celchynth, in 816, it was ordered, that the priest should not only sprinkle the holy water upon the head of the infant, but likewise plunge it in the basin. Some have referred to the introduction of sprinkling in the Roman Church to a canon of pope Stephen III., who, during his residence in France in 754, was consulted by some monks of Cressy in Brittany with regard to several questions; one of which is said to have given occasion to the first authentic law for administering baptism by pouring, which in time was interpreted to signify sprinkling. The question proposed was, whether in case of necessity occasioned by illness of an infant, it were lawful to baptize by pouring water out of the hand or a cup on the head of the infant? To which Stephen replied, that if such a baptism were performed in such a case of necessity, in the name of the Holy Trinity, it should be held valid. This, says the learned James Basnage, is accounted the first law for sprinkling, but it doth not forbid dipping; allowing it only in case of imminent danger. He adds, that the authenticity of it is denied by some Catholics; that many laws were made after this time in Germany, France, and England, to compel dipping, and without any provision for cases of necessity; and therefore that this law did not alter the mode of dipping in public baptisms, and that it was not till 557 years after, that the legislature, in Council at Ravenna, in the year 1311, declared dipping or sprinkling indifferent. It has been alleged, that this answer of Stephen is the true origin of private baptism and of sprinkling. The introduction of sprinkling instead of dipping, in ordinary cases, into this island, is

said to have been effected by such English, or more strictly speaking Scots exiles, as were disciples of Calvin at Geneva, during the Marian persecution; and it is added, that the Scots Calvinists, who first introduced sprinkling in ordinary baptism into the northern parts of the island, were importers of it into the southern. In the reign of king Edward, the established church practised in ordinary cases trine immersion; and pouring or sprinkling was allowed, only in cases of danger, in private. It is further argued by those who maintain that in the primitive church there is no mention of baptizing by pouring, that the administration of baptism by sprinkling was first invented in Africa in the third century, in favor of clinics, or bedridden people; but that even African Catholics, the least enlightened and most depraved of all Catholics, derided it, and reputed it no baptism. In the liturgy of the English church at Frankfort, king Edward's service book was used, and baptism was administered by trine immersion. In the Scots church at Geneva, the minister was directed to take water in his hand, and lay it upon the child's forehead, which was called pouring. About 100 years after, in the assembly of divines, Dr. Lightfoot caused dipping to be excluded, and sprinkling declared sufficient.—*Art. Baptism, Vol. III.*

RIDDLE.—Aspersion did not become general in the west until the thirteenth century; although it appears to have been introduced some time before that period. Thomas Aquinas says (*Summa*, p. 3, quaest. 66, article 7,) "Tutius est baptizare per modum immersionis, quia *hoc* habet usus communis,"—*i. e.*, "it is safer to baptize by immersion, because this is the general practice."—*Christian Antiquities*, p. 463.

SCHAFF.—The question now arises, when and how came the mode of pouring and sprinkling to take the place of immersion and emersion, as a rule. The change was gradual and confined to the Western churches. The Roman Churches, as we have seen, backed by the authority of Thomas Aquinas, "the Angelic Doctor," took the lead in the thirteenth century, yet so as to retain in her Rituals the form for immersion as the older and better mode. The practice prevailed over the theory, and the exception became the rule.

It is remarkable that in the cold climate of England the old practice should have survived longer than in the Southern countries of Europe. Erasmus says: "With us" (on the Continent) "infants have the water poured on them, in England they are dipped."

King Edward VI. and Queen Elizabeth were immersed. The first Prayer-Book of Edward VI. (1549), following the Office of Sarum, directs the priest to dip the child in water thrice, "first, dypping the right side; secondly, the left side; the third time, dypping the face towards the fonte." In the second Prayer-Book (1552), the priest is simply directed to dip the child discreetly and warily, and permission is given, for the first time in Great Britain, to substitute pouring if the godfathers and godmothers certify that the child is weak. During the reign of Elizabeth, says Dr. Wall, "many fond ladies and gentlewomen first, and then by degrees, the common people would obtain the favor of the priests to have their children pass for weak children too tender to endure dipping in the water." The same writer traces the practice of sprinkling to the period of the Long Parliament and the Westminster Assembly.

This change in England and other Protestant churches from immersion to pouring and from pouring to

sprinkling was encouraged by the authority of Calvin, who declared the mode to be a matter of no importance, and by the Westminster Assembly of Divines (1643-1652), which decided that pouring or sprinkling is "not only lawful but also sufficient." The Westminster Confession declares: "Dipping of the person into water is not necessary; but Baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person."

But the Episcopal ritual retains the direction of immersion, although it admits sprinkling or pouring as equally valid. In the revision of the Prayer-Book under Charles II. (1662) the mode is left to the judgment of the parents or godfathers, and the priest is ordered: "If the godfathers and godmothers shall certify him that the child may well endure it, to dip it in the water discreetly and warily; but if they certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it." The difference is only this: by the old rubric the minister was to dip unless there was good cause for exception in case of weakness; by the new rubric he was to dip if it was certified that the child could endure it. The theory of the Anglican Church favors dipping, but the ruling practice is pouring. On the Continent the change had taken place earlier.— *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, pp. 51, 52, 53.

SMITH, PHILIP.—The regular mode of baptism was by immersion; but it was administered by sprinkling or affusion to persons who lay sick or dying; and when performed in such cases it was called *clinical baptism*.— *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I., p. 172.

STANLEY.—We now pass to the changes in the form itself. For the first thirteen centuries the almost uni-

versal practice of Baptism was that of which we read in the New Testament, and which is the very meaning of the word 'baptise' *—that those who were baptized were plunged, submerged, immersed into the water. That practice is still, as we have seen, continued in Eastern Churches. In the Western Church it still lingers amongst Roman Catholics in the solitary instance of the cathedral of Milan, amongst Protestants in the austere sect of the Baptists. It lasted long into the Middle Ages. Even the Icelanders, who at first shrank from the water of their freezing lakes, were reconciled when they found that they could use the warm water of the Geysers. And the cold climate of Russia has not been found an obstacle to its continuance throughout that vast empire. Even in the Church of England it is still observed in theory. Elizabeth and Edward the Sixth were both immersed. The rubric in the Public Baptism for Infants enjoins that, unless for special cases, they are to be dipped, not sprinkled. But in practice it gave way since the beginning of the seventeenth century. With the few exceptions just mentioned, the whole of the Western Churches have now substituted for the ancient bath the ceremony of sprinkling a few drops of water on the face. The reason of the change is obvious. The practice of immersion, apostolic and primitive as it was, was peculiarly suitable to the Southern and Eastern countries for which it was designed, and peculiarly unsuitable to the tastes, the convenience, and the feelings of the countries of the North and West. *Not* by any decree of Council or Parliament, but by the general sentiment of Christian liberty, this great change was affected. Not beginning till the thirteenth century, it has gradually driven the ancient Catholic usage out of

* It is also the meaning of the word *taufen* ('dip').

the whole of Europe. There is no one who would now wish to go back to the old practice. It had no doubt the sanction of the Apostles and of their Master. It had the sanction of the venerable Churches of the early ages, and of the sacred countries of the East. Baptism by sprinkling was rejected by the whole ancient Church (except in the rare case of death-beds or extreme necessity) as no baptism at all. Almost the first exception was the heretic Novatian. It still has the sanction of the powerful religious community which numbers among its members such noble characters as John Bunyan, Robert Hall, and Havelock. In a version of the Bible which the Baptist Church has compiled for its own use in America, where it excels in numbers ail but Methodists, it is thought necessary, and on philological grounds it is quite correct, to translate John the Baptist by John the Immerser. It has even been defended on sanitary grounds. Sir John Floyer dated the prevalence of consumption to the discontinuance of baptism by immersion. But, speaking generally, the Christian civilized world has decided against it. It is a striking example of the triumph of common sense and convenience over the bondage of form and custom. Perhaps no greater change has ever taken place in the outward form of Christian ceremony with such general agreement. It is a greater change even than that which the Roman Catholic Church has made in administering the sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the bread without the wine. For that was a change which did not affect the thing that was signified; whereas the change from immersion to sprinkling has set aside the larger part of the Apostolic language regarding Baptism, and has altered the very meaning of the word.—*Baptism*, in *The Nineteenth Cent.*, Oct., 1879, pp. 697, 698.

STILLINGFLEET.—Rites and customs Apostolical are altered; therefore men do not think that Apostolical practice doth bind. For if it did, there could be no alteration of things agreeable thereunto. Now let any one consider but these few particulars, and judge how far the pleaders for a divine right of Apostolical practice do look upon themselves as bound now to observe them: as Dipping in baptism, the use of Love-feasts, Community of goods, the Holy kiss; yet none look upon themselves as bound to observe them now, and yet all acknowledge them to have been the practice of the Apostles.—*Irenicum*, Part II., Chap. VI., p. 345.

STOKES.—The method of sprinkling is completely unknown to the Church ancient or modern, and should be absolutely rejected, as tending to a disuse of the element of water at all.—*The Acts of the Apostles*, p. 142.

STUART.—We have collected facts enough to authorize us now to come to the following general conclusion, respecting the practice of the Christian church in general, with regard to the mode of baptism, viz., that from the earliest ages of which we have any account, subsequent to the apostolic age, and downward for several centuries, the churches did generally practice baptism by immersion; perhaps *by immersion of the whole person*; and that the only exceptions to this mode which were usually allowed, were in cases of urgent *sickness* or other cases of immediate and imminent danger, where immersion could not be practised.

It may also be mentioned here, that *aspersion* and *affusion*, which had in particular cases been now and then practised in primitive times, were *gradually* introduced. These became at length, as we shall see hereafter, quite

common, and in the western church almost universal, some time before the Reformation.

In what manner, then, did the churches of Christ, from a very early period, to say the least, understand the word *baptizo* in the New Testament? Plainly they construed it as meaning *immersion*. They sometimes even went so far as to forbid any other method of administering the ordinance, cases of necessity and mercy only excepted. —*Mode of Christian Baptism*, p. 153.

TAYLOR.—The custom of the ancient churches was not sprinkling, but immersion, in pursuance of the sense of the word in the commandment and the example of the blessed Savior. Now this was of so sacred account in their esteem, that they did not count it lawful to receive him into the clergy who had been only sprinkled in his baptism; as we learn from the epistle of Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch: 'it is not lawful that he who was sprinkled in his bed by reason of sickness should be admitted into holy orders.' Nay it went farther than this, they were not sure that they were rightly christened, yea or no, who were only sprinkled; as appears in the same epistle of Cornelius in Eusebius, 'if at least such a sprinkling may be called baptism:' and this was not only spoken in diminution of Novatus and indignation against his person, for it was a formal and solemn question made by Magnus to S. Cyprian, 'whether they are to be esteemed right Christians who were only sprinkled with water, and not washed or dipped.'—*Works*, Vol. X., p. 369

TURRETIN.—Immersion was used in former times and in warm climates, as we are taught by the practice of John the Baptist, Matt. iii. 6, 16; of Christ's Apostles,

John iii. 23, and iv. 1, 2; and of Philip, Acts viii. 38. But now, especially in cold countries, when the church began to extend itself towards the North, plunging (*katapontismos*) was changed into sprinkling, and aspersion only is used.—*Institut. Theol*, Tom. III., Loc. XIX., Quaest. 11, § 11, p. 425.

VAN OOSTERZEE.—This sprinkling, which appears to have first come generally into use in the thirteenth century, in place of the entire immersion of the body, in imitation of the previous baptism of the sick, has certainly this imperfection, that the symbolical character of the act is expressed much less conspicuously, than by complete immersion and burial under the water.—*Christian Dogmatics*, p. 749.

WALL.—On the other side, the antipædobaptists will be as unfair in their turn, if they do not grant that in the case of sickness, weakness, haste, want of quantity of water, or such like extraordinary occasions baptism by affusion of water on the face was by the ancients counted sufficient baptism. I shall, out of the many proofs for it, produce two or three of the most ancient.

Anno Dom. 251 Novatian was by one party of the clergy and people of Rome chosen bishop of that church, in a schismatical way, and in opposition to Cornelius, who had been chosen by the major part, and was already ordained. Cornelius does in a letter to Fabius bishop of Antioch vindicate his right: and shews that Novatian came not canonically to his orders of priesthood; much less was he capable of being chosen bishop: for 'that all the clergy, and a great many of the laity, were against his being ordained presbyter, because it was not lawful (they said) for any one that had been baptized in

his bed in time of sickness, as he had been, to be admitted to any office of the clergy.'—*History of Infant Baptism*, Vol. L, pp. 571,572.

France seems to have been the first country in the world where baptism by affusion was used ordinarily to persons in health, and in the public way of administering it. Gennadius of Marseilles, whose words I gave before, is the first author that speaks of it as indifferent. . . .

From France it spread (but not till a good while after) into Italy, Germany, Spain, &c., and last of all into England.—*Ibid.*, pp. 576, 577.

And in queen Mary's time the custom of dipping seems to have continued. . . .

But there are apparent reasons why that custom should alter during queen Elizabeth's reign.

The latitude given in the Liturgy, which could have but little effect in the short time of king Edward's reign, might, during the long reign of this queen, produce an alteration proportionately greater. It being allowed to weak children (though strong enough to be brought to church) to be baptized by affusion, many fond ladies and gentlewomen first, and then by degrees the common people, would obtain the favor of the priest to have their children pass for weak children, too tender to endure dipping in the water. 'Especially,' (as Mr. Walker observes,) 'if some instances really were, or were but fancied and framed, of some child's taking cold or being otherwise prejudiced by its being dipped.'

And another thing that had a greater influence than this, was; that many of our English divines and other people had, during queen Mary's bloody reign, fled into Germany, Switzerland, &c., and coming back in queen Elizabeth's time, they brought with them a great love to the customs of those protestant churches wherein

they had sojourned: and especially the authority of Calvin, and the rules which he had established at Geneva, had a mighty influence on a great number of our people about that time. Now Calvin had not only given his dictate in his Institutions, that 'the difference is of no moment, whether he that is baptized be dipped all over; and if so, whether thrice or once; or whether he be only wetted with the water poured on him:' but he had also drawn up for the use of his church at Geneva (and afterwards published to the world) a form of administering the sacraments, where, when he comes to order the act of baptizing, he words it thus: 'then the minister of baptism pours water on the infant: saying, I baptize thee,' &c. There had been, as I said, some synods in some dioceses of France that had spoken of affusion without mentioning immersion at all; that being the common practice: but for an office or liturgy of any church, this is, I believe, the first in the world that prescribes affusion absolutely.—*Ibid.*, pp. 580, 581.

And for sprinkling, properly called, it seems it was at 1645 just then beginning, and used by very few. It must have begun in the disorderly times after 1641; for Mr. Blake had never used it, nor seen it used.

But then came the Directory, which forbids even the carrying of the child to the font; and says, 'Baptism is to be administered, not in private places, or privately,' (these are the men that have since brought baptism in private houses to be so spreading a custom as it is,) 'but in the place of public worship, and in the face of the congregation, &c. —And not in the places where the fonts in the time of popery were unfitly and superstitiously placed.' So (parallel to the rest of their reformations) they reformed the font into a bason. This learned assembly [of divines] could not remember that fonts to

baptize in had been always used by the primitive Christians, long before the beginning of popery, and ever since churches were built: but that sprinkling for the common use of baptizing, was really introduced (in France first, and then in other popish countries) in times of popery: and that accordingly all those countries, in which the usurped power of the pope is, or has formerly been owned, have left off dipping of children in the font: but that all other countries in the world (which had never regarded his authority) do still use it: and that basons, except in case of necessity, were never used by papists, or any other Christians whatever, till by themselves.— *Ibid.*, pp. 582, 583.

ZELL'S ENCYCLOPEDIA. — In the time of the apostles, the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or a vessel, with the words which Christ had ordered, and to express more fully his change of character, generally adopted a new name. The Greek Church retained this custom ; but the Western Church adopted in the 13th century the mode of baptism by sprinkling, which has been continued by the Protestants, the Baptists only excepted. The introduction of this mode of baptism was owing to the great inconvenience which arose from the immersion of the whole body in the northern climates of Europe.—*Art. Baptism*, Vol. I., p. 236.

PART SECOND.

THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

JEWISH PROSELYTE BAPTISM.

BENHAM.—There is so much obscurity and doubt about the Jewish habit of baptizing proselytes and their families, that nothing can be proved or argued from it.— *Dict. of Rel*, Art. Inf. Bap. (Note), p. 551.

BLUNT.—But independently of its supposed scriptural sanction, an attempt has been made to prove this usage in the Apostolic age from the alleged fact, that the Jews then baptized proselytes from heathenism. *Now* this alleged fact of the baptism of proselytes is very uncertain, and, even if admitted would by no means establish the Apostolic usage of infant baptism. The baptism of proselytes is first mentioned in the Mishna, a collection of Jewish traditions completed in the third century [A. D. 219], and the usage there mentioned (baptism of adults and infants) might have been derived, directly or indirectly, from Christians. But whether this supposed Jewish usage existed at all (amongst Jews or Christians) in the Apostolic age is uncertain. It is not mentioned by Josephus, even when we might fairly expect it would have been recorded, as when he relates that the Idumæans were received amongst the Jewish people by circumcision, without mentioning baptism. Were the usage undoubted, it would only have been an unauthorized

addition to the scriptural command, since it was by circumcision only that proselytes were to be added to the Jewish Church [Exod. xii. 48]. It is, however, very unlikely that the Jews would adopt the usage of baptism from Christians; and the Mishna being founded on previous collections reaching to the Apostolic age, there is just a probability that, at the time of our Lord and His Apostles, a Jewish custom prevailed of baptizing proselytes and their children. Even admitting this, yet before this custom can be alleged in proof or confirmation of an Apostolic usage, it must be proved that the Jewish custom was adopted by our Lord or His Apostles; but of this neither the Scriptures nor the early Fathers afford any proof whatever. Besides, it should be considered that the baptism of proselytes widely differs in theory from the Christian doctrine of baptism. The convert to Judaism was baptized and all his family then born; but if he had children born afterwards, *they* were not baptized, the previous baptism of their parents being deemed sufficient.—*Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theology*, Art. Inf. Bap., p. 344.

ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA.—The connection between the baptism of John and the Jewish baptism of proselytes, of which a great deal has been made, is also founded on assumptions which cannot be proved. This very plausible theory first assumes that proselytes were baptized from an early time in the Jewish Church, although the Old Testament tells us nothing about it, and then supposes that John simply made use of this ordinary Jewish rite for the purpose of declaring symbolically that the whole Jewish nation were disfranchised, and had to be re-admitted into the spiritual Israel by means of the same ceremony which gave entrance to members

of heathen nations. But the subject of the baptism of proselytes is one of the most hopelessly obscure in the whole round of Jewish antiquities, and can never be safely assumed in any argument; and the general results of investigation seem to prove that the baptism of proselytes was not one of the Jewish ceremonies until long after the coming of Christ, while there is much to suggest that this Jewish rite owes its origin to Christian baptism.—*Article Baptism*, Vol. III., pp. 348, 349.

FAIRBAIRN.—Later and more discriminating investigations, however, have shown this view to be untenable. It may almost indeed, be held fatal to it, that both Philo and Josephus, who on so many occasions refer to the religious opinions and practices of their countrymen, never once allude to any such initiatory baptismal rite; in Josephus the admission of strangers is expressly said to have been by circumcision and sacrifice (*Ant.* 13. 9; 20. 2); and there is the like silence respecting baptism in the apocryphal writings, in the Targums of Onkelos and of Jonathan. It were impossible to account for such general silence, if the practice had really existed at the time. There is no evidence of a Jewish proselyte baptism till about the fourth century of the Christian era, when it does appear as a custom already in use, but one not probably introduced till the end of the third century; and the statements of rabbinical writers respecting its pre-Christian, and even Mosaic institution, are mere assertions without proof. It probably sprung up thus: The admission of proselytes was originally made by circumcision and sacrifice, but as usual, a lustration preceded the sacrifice, performed, like legal lustrations generally, by the persons themselves. By and by, however, when sacrifice had ceased, and lustrations took the

place of discontinued sacrifice, and at last grew into a sort of initiatory rite, holding with those formally received from without into the Jewish faith (such as slaves and foundlings) relatively much the same place as with converts to Christianity.—*Imp. Dict., Article Baptism*, Vol. I., pp. 184,185. .

GODET.—The rite of *baptism*, which consisted in the plunging of the body more or less completely into water, was not at this period in use amongst the Jews, neither for the Jews themselves, for whom the law only prescribed lustrations, nor for proselytes from paganism, to whom, according to the testimony of history, baptism was not applied until after the fall of Jerusalem. The very title *Baptist*, given to John, sufficiently proves that it was he who introduced this rite. This follows also from John i. 25, where the deputation from the Sanhedrim asks him by what right he baptizes, if he is neither the Messiah nor one of the prophets, which implies that this rite was introduced by him ; and further, from John iii. 26, where the disciples of John make it a charge against Jesus, that He adopted baptism, of which the institution, and consequently, according to them, 'the monopoly, belonged to their master.—*Commentary on Luke*, iii. 3.

MEYER.—The baptism of John has been erroneously regarded as a modified application of the Jewish baptism of proselytes. For the baptism of proselytes, the oldest testimony to which occurs in the *Gemera Babyl. Jebamoth*, xlvi. 2, and regarding which Philo, Josephus, and the more ancient Targumists are altogether silent, did not arise till after the destruction of Jerusalem. The reception of proselytes was accomplished, so long as the

temple stood, by means of circumcision and the presentation of a sacrifice, which was preceded, like every sacrifice, by a lustration, which the proselyte performed on himself. It is not, however, with this lustration merely, but chiefly with the religious usages of the Jews as regards washings, and their symbolical meaning, that the baptism of John has its general point of connection in the history of the people, although it is precisely as *baptism*, accompanied by the *confession of sin*, that it appears only as something new given to this dawn of the Messiah's kingdom, under the excitement of the divine revelation, of which John was the bearer.—*Commentary on Matthew*, iii. 5, p. 77.

PRESENSE.—Regarded from the apostolic point of view, baptism cannot be connected either with circumcision or with the baptism administered to proselytes to Judaism. Between it and circumcision there is all the difference which exists between the theocracy to which admission was by birth, and the Church which is entered only by conversion. It is in direct connection with faith, that is, with the most free and most individual action of the human soul. As to the baptism administered to the Jewish proselyte, it accompanied circumcision, and was of like import. It purified the neophyte and his family from the defilements of paganism, and sealed his incorporation and that of his children with the Jewish theocracy; its character was essentially national and theocratic. Christian baptism is not to be received any more than faith, by right of inheritance.—*The Early Years of Christ.*, pp. 336, 337.

STUART.—In fine we are destitute of any early testimony to the practice of proselyte baptism antecedently to

the Christian era. The original institution of admitting Jews to the covenant, and strangers to the same, prescribed no other rite than that of circumcision. No account of any other is found in the Old Testament; none in the Apocrypha, New Testament, Targums of Onkelos, Jonathan, Joseph the Blind, or in the work of any other Targumist, excepting Pseudo-Jonathan, whose work belongs to the 7th or 8th century. No evidence is found in Philo, Josephus, or any of the earlier Christian writers. How could any allusion to such a rite have escaped them all if it were as common and as much required by usage as circumcision.—*Mode of Christian Baptism*, p. 140.

WEISS.—The requirement which John laid on the people, to seal their repentance by immersion in the Jordan, must really be referred to the divine command given to him as a prophet. In tradition he bears the name Baptist, from this rite which he introduced.*—*Life of Christ*, Vol. I., p. 313.

*To account for the rite by proselyte baptism, which in the full sense was not customary till a much later date, presupposes an utterly unhistorical view of it, for in the latter case of the question it concerns fellow-countrymen comprehensively, and in the former it concerns the reception of unclean Gentiles.—*ib.*, *Note*, pp. 313, 314.

CHAPTER II.

BAPTISM IN ROOM OF CIRCUMCISION.

BARCLAY.—What ground from *scripture* or *reason* can our adversaries bring us, to evince that one *shadow* or *figure* should point to another *shadow* or *figure*, and not to the *substance*? And yet they make the figure of *circumcision* to point to *water-baptism*, and the *paschal lamb* to *bread and wine*. But was it ever known that one figure was the *anti-type* of the other, especially seeing *Protestants* make not these their *anti-types* to have any more virtue and efficacy than the *type* had?—*Apology*, Prop. XIII., § 9, p. 482.

BEYSCHLAG.—The Abrahamic and Mosaic circumcision has no further relation to Christian baptism than that the former was the sign and seal of the Old Covenant, and the latter the sign and seal of the New Covenant. No conclusion can be drawn from this similarity for infant baptism; for, it is a very different thing to enter by birth into an allied people as the Israelite boy, and to enter by personal faith a community of believers.—*Letter to the Author*, April 22, 1893.

BROOKS.—To those that hold we may go no farther than Scripture, for doctrine or discipline, it may be very easy to err in this point now in hand; since the Scripture seems not to have clearly determined this particular. The analogy which *Baptism* now hath with *Circumcision* in the old law, is a fine rhetorical argument, to

illustrate a point well proved before; but I somewhat doubt, whether it be proof enough, for that which some would prove by it: since, (beside the vast difference in the ordinances,) the persons to be circumcised are stated by a positive law, so express, that it leaves no place for scruple: but it is far otherwise in *Baptism*; where all the designation of persons fit to be partakers, for ought I know, is only, *such as believe*. For this is the qualification that, with exact search, I find the Scripture requires, in persons to be *baptized*: and *this* it seems to require in all such persons. Now, how infants can be properly said to *believe*, I am not yet fully resolved.—*Discourse on the Episcopacy*, § 2, Chap. VII., p. 100.

COLERIDGE.—Equally vain is the pretended analogy from Circumcision, which was no sacrament at all; but the means and mark of a national distinction. . . . Nor was it ever pretended that any grace was conferred by it, or that the rite was significant of any inward or spiritual operation.—*Aids to Reflection*, p. 245.

GODET.—In a discussion on Baptism, I would not use the argument of circumcision; for one might always retort that, in the old Dispensation, free adhesion was not required, whereas it is in the New. The qualification of *Jewish citizen* implied in itself that of membership of a religious community of Israel. In the New Dispensation it is no longer so.—*Letter to the Author*, June 8, 1893.

HALLEY.—The principal argument for restricting baptism to the children of believers, is founded upon the opinion that, as the ancient sign of the covenant was administered to the seed of Abraham in testimony of his

faith, (the covenant being made with him and with his seed,) so the modern sign of that covenant is to be administered to the seed of believers on account of the faith of their parents. We have therefore to consider the very important subject of the relation which baptism, the seal of the evangelical covenant, bears to circumcision, the seal of the Abrahamic covenant. After some anxious consideration, it appears to me that the argument in favor of the transmission of the Christian covenant from the believing parent to his children, founded upon the transmission of the sign of the Abrahamic covenant, through the hereditary line of succession in the posterity of Abraham, fails in almost every particular. Independently of the feebleness of its foundation, the administration of baptism only to believing adults, the general opinion that baptism is substituted for circumcision, as a kind of hereditary seal of the covenant of grace, appears to be ill sustained by scriptural evidence, and to be exposed to some very serious, if not absolutely fatal, objections.—*The Sacraments*, Part II., p. 34.

HAMMOND.—By all this it appears, First, how little needful it will be to defend *Baptism of Christian Infants*, from the law of *circumcising the Infants* among the *Jews*, the foundation being far more fitly laid in that other of *Jewish Baptism*, a ceremony of initiation for all, especially for *proselytes*, as well as that, and whereas that of *circumcision* belonged only to one, this other being common to both sexes. ... As for the placing the *analogy betwixt Circumcision and Baptism*, (and so betwixt the adherences of both) *in the letter of one, but in the spirit and signification of the other, that as infants were circumcised, so spiritual infants should be baptized, i. e. that they that be*

children in malice, &c. That is, first, but a *fancy*, and a new way of making *parallels betwixt Sacraments*; for *Sacraments*, as such, are all *significant*, and so are both these, and in that sense both *spiritual*, and not *one* to be taken in the *letter*, and the *other* in the *spirit*. And indeed, *baptism* is no more *spiritual circumcision*, than *circumcision* is *spiritual baptism*, but both of them are *rites of initiation* among the Jews, and one of them by *Christ* continued among *Christians*.— *Works*, Vol. L, pp. 610, 617.

KENRICK.—Neither shall I allege, as a matter of mere inference, the divine command that each male infant on the eighth day after his birth should be circumcised, and thus incorporated with the people of God: whence it is said the Apostles must have understood that infants should be admissible to the Christian rite which supersedes circumcision, especially inasmuch as the children of proselytes are said to have been washed with water, when their parents were admitted to Jewish privileges. I do not at all allow that the Apostles were left to guess their Master's will from any such circumstance.—*Treatise on Baptism*, pp. 129,130.

LANGEN. — Circumcision has no bearings on Infant Baptism.—*Letter to the Author*, April 19,1893.

LIMBORCH.—*Baptism* [it is claimed] came in the room of circumcision, and since the latter was administered to *infants*, the former ought to be administered to them likewise. *Answ.* Taking this for granted, yet it will by no means follow that all the circumstances prescribed in *circumcision* should likewise be observed in *baptism*. For (1.) *Infant-Baptism* is nowhere so expressly commanded as *circumcision* is. (2.) It would from thence follow, that

infants should be baptized on the *eighth day* precisely, or else they would be cut off from the people of God. (3.) Nay they should be baptized as soon as they are born: for since there is no day prefixed for *Infant-Baptism*, and it may be administered to infants immediately upon their birth without any prejudice, and children may die as soon as they are born; no reason can be assigned why it should be put off even for one day. (4.) And lastly, if this consequence were of any force, I might with parity of reason infer, that since the *males* were only circumcised, therefore now it is unlawful for the *females* to be baptized; which (as any one may perceive) being very absurd, 'tis plain that with respect to the outward circumstances the case of *circumcision* and *baptism* is not in all things the same.—*Comp. System of Div.*, Vol. II., p. 741.

MILTON.—There is therefore no necessary analogy between circumcision and baptism; and it is our duty not to build our belief on vague parallels, but to attend exclusively to the institution of the sacrament itself, and regard its authority as paramount, according to the frequent admonitions of our opponents themselves.—*Treat. on Christ. Doct.*, Chap. XXVIII., p. 436.

MOZLEY.—It has been urged, indeed, that baptism and circumcision stand on the same ground as infant rites, but the two ordinances differ considerably in the whole manner and circumstances of their institution. Circumcision was by the very form of its original institution a rite for infants and adults equally. "This is My covenant which ye shall keep between Me and you, and thy seed after thee; every man child among you shall be circumcised. And he that is eight days old shall be

circumcised among you, every man child in your generations." Adults and infants then stood on equal ground with respect to circumcision by the very letter of Scripture. But when Scripture describes the original institution of Christian Baptism, it makes no mention of infants, and everything relating to the rite is given in connexion with adults.

If this distinction in the original type of the institution be true, it would seem that practice has been in the contrary direction to original type, has selected for the field of growth not a first application but a second, and has made an institution almost wholly for infants out of an institution primarily for adults. But whether we accept this distinction or not, it still remains true that the practice of Infant Baptism is no essential part of the original institution of baptism, but only the particular shape it has taken in its practical working in the Christian community.—*Baptismal Controversy*, p. 24.

NEWMAN.—This defective view of the Sacrament of Baptism, [that the H. S. is not given to infants on their baptism] for so I must not shrink from calling it, shall now be considered, and considered in connection with a popular argument for the Baptism of infants, which, most true as it is in its proper place, yet is scarcely profitable for these times, as seeming to countenance the error in question. I mean, the assumed parallel between Baptism and Circumcision.

It is undeniable that Circumcision in some important respects resembles Baptism, and may allowably, nay usefully, be referred, to in illustration of it. Circumcision was the entrance into the Jewish Covenant, and it typified the renunciation of the flesh. In respects such as these it resembles Baptism; and hence it has been of

service in the argument for Infant Baptism, as having been itself administered to infants. But, though it resembles Baptism in some respects, it is unlike it in others more important. When, then, it is found to be the chief and especially approved argument in favor of Infant Baptism among Christians, there is reason for some anxiety, lest this circumstance should betoken, or introduce, insufficient views of a Christian Sacrament. This remark, I fear, is applicable in the present day. I observe that the partly assumed and partly real parallel of Circumcision comes, in fact, whether they know it or not, as a sort of refuge to those who have taken up this intermediate position between Catholic doctrine and heretical practice. They avail themselves of the instance of Circumcision as a proof that a divinely-appointed ordinance need not convey grace, even while it admits into a state of grace; and they argue from the analogy between Circumcision and Baptism, that what was the case with the Mosaic ordinance is the case with the Christian also. Circumcision admitted to certain privileges, to the means of grace, to teaching, and the like; Baptism, they consider, does the same and no more. It has also the same uses as Circumcision, in teaching the necessity of inward sanctification, and implying the original corrupt condition of our nature. In like manner, it ought to be administered to infants, since Circumcision was so administered under the Law.

I do not deny that this view is consistent with itself, and plausible. And it would be perfectly satisfactory, as a view, were it Scriptural. But the plain objection to it is, that Christ and his Apostles do attach a grace to the ordinance of Baptism, such as is not attached in the Old Testament to Circumcision—which is exactly that difference which makes the latter a mere rite, the former

a Sacrament; and if this be so, it is nothing to the purpose to build up an argument on the assumption that the two ordinances are precisely the same.—*Parochial and Plain Sermons*, Vol. III., pp. 272, 275, 276.

PRESSENSE.— Regarded from the apostolic point of view, baptism cannot be connected either with circumcision or with the baptism administered to proselytes to Judaism. Between it and circumcision there is all the difference which exists between the theocracy to which admission was by birth, and the Church which is entered only by conversion. It is in direct connection with faith, that is, with the most free and most individual action of the human soul.—*The Early Years of Christ.*, p. 336.

STUART.—How unwary, too, are many excellent men, in contending for infant baptism on the ground of the Jewish analogy of circumcision ! *Are females* not proper subjects of baptism? And again, are a man's slaves to be all baptized because he is? Are they church-members of course when they are so baptized? Is there no difference between ingrafting into a *politico-ecclesiastical* community, and into one of which it is said, that "it is not of this world?" In short, numberless difficulties present themselves in our way, as soon as we begin to argue in such a manner as this.—*Old Testament Canon*, § XXII., p. 369.

THAYER.—Circumcision furnishes only a distant and imperfect analogy and warrant for the rite—as is evident from the fact that it is applicable to the infants *of only one sex.*—*Letter to the Author*, May 5, 1893.

CHAPTER III.

IDENTITY OF THE COVENANTS.

ALEXANDER, W. L.—As a Pædobaptist he rested his practice mainly on the connection between children and parents under the Abrahamic covenant (which, he contended, was in its spiritual aspect *identical* with the covenant of grace), and on the use of circumcision as the sign and seal of that covenant. The subversion of this argument would not, indeed, have left him defenceless, but it would have been felt by him very much as the overthrow of his chief bulwark.

Of the great ability which is displayed in this part of the book there can be but one opinion; and it is impossible to read it without feeling that whatever acuteness and ingenuity could do to substantiate such a line of argument has been done here. At the same time I question if any one ever tried to reproduce the argument in his own mind without feeling that there were some serious gaps in it, over which one had to take a flying leap in order to reach the conclusion. It may be conceded to the author that the Abrahamic covenant, in its spiritual aspect, was identical with the covenant of grace, and that circumcision stood related to the covenant as a whole, and not only in its temporal part as distinguished from its spiritual; but after all, it does appear startling that, on the ground of this, we would be asked to admit that because that covenant recognized a connection between a child and his father as one of the

natural posterity of Abraham, it also recognized a connection between a child and his parent, whether father or mother, as one of the *spiritual* seed of Abraham. How this follows from the premises I confess I have never been able to see. I can understand how a certain class of privileges should run along the line of natural descent, and how another class should run along the line of spiritual descent; but how the two should interlace so as that natural descent should entitle to privileges which belong only to spiritual descent, I find nothing in the reasoning of this book that helps me to comprehend. Suppose a nobleman had received his lands and titles on the condition that all his natural posterity, as such, should inherit his lands, but that his titles should be borne only by such, whether his natural descendants or not, as resembled him in character; and suppose that after some generations a man claimed to sustain a title, not on the plea that his character resembled that of the head of the succession, but on the ground that he was the son of one who possessed that resemblance; would his plea be admitted? I judge not; and is not this case exactly analogous to that of one claiming privilege under the Abrahamic charter, on the ground that he is a natural descendant of a person whose title to its privileges was not natural descent but spiritual character? I would advance with diffidence when I venture to charge the reasoning of such a logician as Dr. Wardlaw with a fallacy. And yet, turn it as I may, this argument from the Abrahamic Covenant in favor of infant baptism always presents itself to my mind as fallacious. The fallacy seems to me to lie in a *petitio principii*, an assuming the thing to be proved, viz., that the children of believers are, in virtue of their parent's faith, under the covenant. Let this be proved, and there can be no

further question as to their title to receive the sign of the covenant—be it circumcision or be it baptism. But I confess it does appear to me a paralogism to argue that because the natural seed of Abraham received the sign of the covenant *in virtue of their descent from him*, by which they were brought undoubtedly under the covenant, therefore the natural seed of *Gentile believers* are also to be held as included under the covenant, and as entitled to receive of this. There may be a logical consequence here, but I confess it is as yet hid from my perception.

I do not wish to obtrude my own views on the reader by entering at large into this question here, but I may be permitted to observe, that to my mind, if baptism is to be regarded as having come in the place of circumcision, the argument from the Abrahamic Covenant lies altogether with the Baptists and not with us. For, in virtue of the relation of type and antitype, the natural descent of the Israelites corresponds to the spiritual descent of believers, that is their succession through one becoming the spiritual father of others; and consequently as natural descent entitled the son of a Jew to circumcision as the sign of the covenant, it is spiritual descent which alone entitles a man to receive baptism as that which, under the spiritual dispensation, has come in the place of circumcision. Hence as descent from Jewish parents must be proved before a child could be circumcised of old, so spiritual descent by faith from those who have conveyed to us the gospel—in other words real conversion—must be proved before a man is entitled to be baptized.—*Life and Writings of Wardlaw*, pp. 237-239.

BONWETSCH.—From the Covenant of God with Abra-

ham and the Old Testament circumcision, cannot be immediately derived the rite of infant baptism, as in the new covenant no more appurtenances are needed to ally a definite people, and for the community of God, than was the case in the Old Covenant in Israel.—*Letter to the Author*, April 20, 1893.

BONET-MAURY.—Qu. "*What bearings have the Abrahamic Covenant and Circumcision on infant baptism?*" *Answ.* No direct bearings, because Circumcision was the sign of the Old Covenant (Ancienne-Alliance), whereas the sign of the New Covenant is the CUP of the Lord's *blood, which was poured out for us*, and not the baptism (Luke xxii. 20). There is only an indirect or figurative link established by Paul (Col. ii. 11-13), between the "*Circumcision of Christ*" or spiritual circumcision and the baptism where the old man with his sins and trespasses is, as it were, crucified and buried.—*Letter to the Author*, May 8, 1893.

DITZLER.—We have agreed not to debate the question of the Covenants further, as I here express my conviction that the Covenants of the Old Testament have nothing to do with Infant Baptism.—*Graves-Ditzler Debate*, p. 692.

HOLSTEN.—The covenant with Abraham and circumcision have no significance as to infant-baptism not with (in) the knowledge of Jesus, but later circumcision and baptism were placed in connection. The first Jewish Christians in Jerusalem demanded that the faithful heathen also should be circumcised. When Paul opposed this demand (see the letter to the Galatians) and the Jewish Christians saw that their demand did not prevail,

baptism as a consecration (or initiation) in the New Testament was looked upon like circumcision as a consecration in the Old Testament. But this view has not reference to infant-baptism.—*Letter to the Author*, April 19, 1893.

CHAPTER IV.

NO SCRIPTURAL WARRANT FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

ALFORD.—The language of the Bible is against them; and, on their own ground, this is a very sore perplexity. There is one escape, and that a perfectly effectual one; but they are unwilling to avail themselves of its assistance. They might declare, and they ought to declare, that infant baptism was a practice unknown to the Apostles; that not only does the New Testament not give one single expression which plainly and necessarily implies that infants were baptized in the apostolical churches, but it can be fairly argued from a passage in chap. vii. of 1 Corinthians that such a practice could not have existed at Corinth. The recognition that the baptism of adults was the only baptism known to the Apostles would clear every difficulty on this point out of the way of the Low Churchmen. It is natural that the sacred writers should assume that men who, at great worldly sacrifice, not free from risk of life, came forward to profess the Christian faith by a solemn initiatory rite, possessed the frame of mind which that fact implied—that they were honestly changed and renewed beings. And then it would be easy to pass on to the conclusion that the baptismal service of the Church of England has been constructed on the language of the Bible, and that the embarrassment has proceeded not from a mistaken view of baptism, but from the application of words used by Scripture of an adult person to an unconscious and,

so to say, mindless infant.—*Contemporary Review*, Vol. X., March, 1869, p. 329.

BANNERMAN.—Nothing but the most violent injustice done to the language of Scripture by a bold and unscrupulous system of interpretation can suffice to get rid of the evidence which, in the case of the Baptism of converts mentioned in Scripture, connects the administration of the rite with a profession of faith in Christ on the part of the person who was the recipient of it. The association of the person's profession, faith, repentance, or believing, with Baptism, appears in a multitude of passages; while not one passage or example can be quoted in favor of the connection of Baptism with an *absence* of profession. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved;" "repent every one of you, and be baptized;" "many having believed, and been baptized,"— these and many other passages of a like import connect together, as inseparable in the process by which under the eye of the Apostles many in their days were added to the Christian Church, the two facts of the religious profession of the candidate, and the administration of the religious ordinance by which formally he became a member of the Church of Christ. In the history, although brief and incomplete, of the Baptism of the early converts to the Christian faith, there is almost invariably some statement by which is attested the distinctive Christian profession that stands connected with the administration of the outward rite; while in no instances are there any statements from which it could be proved that Baptism ever stood connected with the absence of such profession. ... In connection with the Baptism of Lydia, and as preceding the administration of the rite, we have the statement: "whose heart the Lord

opened, that she attended unto the things that were spoken of Paul." Connected with the Baptism of the Philippian jailer, there stands the statement: "And he rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house." In short, in almost every example of Baptism which the New Testament records, there is enough in the narrative, however scanty and compressed it be, to bring out the fact, that in close association with the administration of the rite appears the religious profession of the recipient. And, on the other hand, it may be safely asserted, that in no example of Baptism recorded in the New Testament can it be proved that no such profession was made. —*The Church of Christ*, Vol. II., pp. 64, 65.

BARCLAY.—As to the baptism of *infants*, it is a mere human tradition, for which neither *precept* nor *practice* is to be found in all the scripture.—*Apology*, Proposition XII., p. 409.

BARLOW.—*I do believe and know, that there is neither precept nor example in Scripture for Pædo-Baptism, nor any just evidence for it for above 200 years after Christ; that Tertullian condemns it as an unwarrantable custom, and Nazianzen a good while after him, dislikes it too; sure I am, that in the primitive times they were Catechumeni, then Illumenati or Baptizati; and that not only Pagans, and children of Pagans converted, but children of Christian parents.*

The truth is, I do believe Pædo-Baptism, how, or by whom, I know not, came into the world in the second century, and in the third and fourth, began to be practiced; though not generally, and defended, as lawful, from the text grossly misunderstood, John iii. 5. Upon the like gross mistake of John vi. 53. they did for many centuries, both in the Greek and Latin church, communicate infants, and give them the

Lord's Supper; and I do confess, they might do both as well as either: But although they baptize some infants, and thought it lawful so to do; yet Austin was the first that ever said it was necessary.

I have read what my learned and worthy friends Dr. Hammond, Mr. Baxter, and others say in defence of it, and I confess I wonder not a little, that men of such great parts should say so much to so little purpose; for I have not as yet seen any thing like an argument for it.—Letter, in Danver's Treatise on Baptism, pp. 63, 64.

BAXTER.—God hath been pleased to speak so little in Scripture of the case of infants, that modest men will use the words, 'certainly' and 'undoubtedly' about their case with very great caution. And many great divines have maintained that their very baptism itself, cannot be certainly and undoubtedly proved by the word of God but by tradition.— *Works*, Vol. V., p. 320.

BEET.—It must be at once admitted that the New Testament contains no clear proof that infants were baptized in the days of the Apostles. It is true that Paul baptized the houses of Stephanas and of Lydia, and the Philippian Goaler and all who belonged to him: 1 Cor. i. 16; Acts xvi. 15, 33. But this mention of baptized households by no means proves or suggests that he baptized infants. For a courtier from Capernaum and Crispus at Corinth believed with their entire households : John iv. 54; Acts xviii. 18. So apparently did the Goaler: Acts xvi. 34. Cornelius feared God with all his house : ch. x. 2. And the household of Stephanas was a firstfruit of Achaia: 1 Corinthians xvi. 15. This does not mean that in these five families there were no infants, or that the infants believed; but that all capable of understanding

the Gospel believed it. Just so in reference to Baptism. The early readers of the Book of Acts and of St. Paul's Epistles knew whether it was usual to baptize infants. If it was, they would infer that, if in these three families there were infants, St. Paul baptized them. If it was not, they would interpret these words to mean that he baptized all who were of suitable age. From these passages, therefore, we can draw no inference whether or not infants were baptized in the Apostolic Churches. And we have no clearer references in the New Testament.—*Christian Baptism*, pp. 28, 29.

BENNETT.—The first converts, whose names and the circumstances of whose baptism are recorded in the Scriptures, were of adult age. That infants and young children were baptized during the apostolic age is nowhere positively affirmed in the New Testament. The mention of the baptism of entire households furnishes a strong presumptive argument, but it is not decisive. So the relation of circumcision to Christ's kingdom, the recognition of young children as objects of his special favor, the comprehensiveness of the apostolic commission, and various other considerations, are, to many proofs that the children of Christian believers were regarded by the apostolic Church as fit subjects for baptism. But this, in the absence of clear, unequivocal Scripture statement, cannot produce universal conviction. "Christ left no command about it; it was one of those things his Church was to learn in her gradual development through the paraclete whom he had given."—*Archaeology*, p. 391.

BEYSCHLAG.—The New Testament contains neither command for, nor, example of infant baptism. The

apostolic baptism in every instance requires that it be preceded by preaching and faith.—*Letter to the Author*, April 22, 1893.

BLEDSON.—It is an article of our faith, that 'the baptism of young children (infants) is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as *most agreeable to the institution of Christ.*' But yet, with all our searching, we have been unable to find, in the New Testament, a single express declaration, or word, in favor of Infant Baptism. We justify the rite, therefore, solely on the ground of logical inference, and not on any express word of Christ or his Apostles. This may, perhaps, be deemed, by some of our readers, a strange position for a pædobaptist. It is by no means, however, a singular opinion. Hundreds of learned pædobaptists have come to the same conclusion; especially since the New Testament has been subjected to a closer, more conscientious, and more candid exegesis than was formerly practiced by controversialists.—*Southern Review*, Vol. XIV., April, 1874, p. 334.

BONWETSCH.—I find no commandment for, or clear example of infant baptism in the New Testament.—*Letter to the Author*, April 20, 1893.

BOSTON.—See how Peter sets himself to his work, Acts ii. 38. "Repent and be baptized;" where it is plain, that he requires their repentance antecedently to baptism, as necessary to qualify them for the right and due reception thereof. And there is no example of baptism recorded in the Scriptures, where any were baptized but such as appeared to have a saving interest in Christ.—*Works*, Vol. VI., p. 127.

BROWNE.—It is true, that we read nothing of infants being baptized by any of the Apostles.—*Exposition of the XXXIX. Art.*, p. 673.

BUNSEN.—Pæobaptism, in the more modern sense, meaning thereby new-born infants, with the vicarious promises of parents or other sponsors, was utterly unknown in the early Church; not only down to the second, but indeed to the middle of the third century.—*Christ, and Mankind*, Vol. II., p. 106.

BURNETT.—There is no express precept or rule given in the New Testament for the baptism of infants.—*Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 366.

CALVIN.—As Christ enjoins them to *teach* before *baptizing*, and desires that none but *believers* shall be admitted to *baptism*, it would appear that *baptism* is not properly administered unless when preceded by faith.—*Harmony of the Evangelists*, Vol. III., p. 386.

DÖLLINGER.—There is no proof or hint in the New Testament that the Apostles baptized infants or ordered them to be baptized. When the baptism of whole households is spoken of, it is left doubtful whether they contained little children, and whether, if so, these also were baptized.—*The First Age of Christ, and the Church*, Vol. II., p. 184.

DWIGHT.—There is no instance in which it is declared, in so many terms, that infants were baptized.—*System of Theology*, Semi. CLVII., Vol. V., p. 236.

FISHER.—Whether infants were baptized in the Apos-

tolie age, or exactly when the custom arose of administering this rite to them, is a controverted question on which the New Testament writings furnish no direct information. The mention of the baptism of households is not entirely conclusive, since we are not certain that infants were contained in them; and, besides, if it were known that infants were not baptized, they would be understood to be excepted in a general statement of this sort respecting a household.—*The Beginnings of Christianity*, p. 565.

FRENCH.—In what book is to be found one word relative *to the baptism of infants!*—Acts viii. 37—"If thou believest with all thine heart," says the Scripture, "thou mayest" (be baptized). What was the answer? "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Now, I ask, unless tradition comes to the rescue of my learned friend, by what refining ingenuity will he call upon the Bible to protect him in baptizing infants, that cannot answer, that cannot exclaim, "*I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?*" See ye not, my friends, that my antagonist in argument lies prostrate at my feet? See ye not that he is, in practice in actual hostility with the very book which he holds up as the fountain of all his tenets, as the rule of all his actions?—*Protestant Discussion*, p. 443.

GODET.—I know of no passage in the New Testament where mention is made of the baptism of a child.—*Letter to the Author*, June 8, 1893.

HAHN.—Baptism was in the appointment of Christ to be administered to all those who penitently confessed their sin, and believed in the Gospel of Jesus. According to its original character and design, it could be ad-

ministered only to adults, who alone were capable of the knowledge of sin, and repentance, and faith. Neither in the Scripture, nor in the history of the first century and a half, is there a certain example of infant-baptism to be found.—*In Stier's Words of the Lord Jesus*, Vol. VIII., p. 309.

HANNA.—No express mention is made of infants in the command of Christ which instituted this rite; no distinct case of the baptism of infants is mentioned in the sacred Scriptures.—*The Forty Days*, p. 265.

HEY.—With regard to the *Scriptures*, what can be deduced from them lies in a small compass. On the one hand, they mention *no instance* of infant-baptism; on the other they afford no instance of baptism being *delayed*. Some *Families* are spoken of collectively, as being baptized, but the *children* are not mentioned particularly.

How soon any accounts of infant-baptism, appear in reputable writers, is a matter in dispute. Some Pædo-baptists have, in their candour, allowed a longer time before any appear, than others have approved of.—Bingham begins his evidences from the earliest times; so indeed; but the first proofs are only by implication. —*Lect. in Divinity*, Book IV., Art. XXVII., §§ 12, 13, p. 277.

HOLSTEN.—There is in the New Testament neither a precept nor an example of infant-baptism. Catholic and Protestant churches have searched the N. T. most carefully for centuries and have found neither the one nor the other. Examples in its favor, as for instance, that Paul baptized the household of Stephanas 1 Cor. i.

16, are arguments simply lugged in (the German says *pulled in by the hair*).—*Letter to the Author*, April 19, 1893.

JACOB.—For myself, I desire to express my entire assent to the words of our twenty seventh Article, "The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ." But, at the same time, notwithstanding all that has been written by learned men upon this subject, it remains indisputable that infant-baptism is not mentioned in the New Testament. No instance of it is recorded there;—no allusion is made to its effects;—no directions are given for its administration.

However reasonably we may be convinced that we find in the Christian Scriptures "the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterwards developed," and by which it may now be justified; it ought to be distinctly acknowledged that it is not an apostolic ordinance. Like modern Episcopacy it is an ecclesiastical institution legitimately deduced by Church authority from apostolic principles, but not apostolic in its actual existence.

There is no trace of it till the last part of the second century, when a passage is found in Irenæus, which may possibly—and only possibly—refer to it. Nor is it anywhere distinctly mentioned before the time of Tertullian, who, while he testifies to the practice, was himself rather opposed to it. As an established order of the Church, therefore it belongs to the third century, where its use, and the mode of its administration, and the whole theory of it as a Christian ceremony, were necessarily molded by the baptismal theology of the time. A circumstance which ought to be distinctly kept in view in

every consideration of the subject.—*Ecclesiastical Polity of the N. Test.*, pp. 272, 273.

JACOBI.—INFANT BAPTISM was established neither by Christ nor the apostles. In all places where we find the necessity of baptism notified, either in a dogmatic or historical point of view, it is evident that it was only meant for those who were capable of comprehending the word preached, and of being converted to Christ by an act of their own will. A pretty sure testimony of its non-existence in the Apostolic age may be inferred from 1 Cor. vii. 14, since Paul would certainly have referred to the baptism of children for their holiness (Comp. Neander, *Hist. of the Planting, &c.*, I., p. 206). But even in later times, several teachers of the church, such as Tertullian (*De Bapt.* 18) and others, reject this custom; indeed, his church in general (that of North Africa) adhered longer than others to the primitive regulations. Even when baptism of children was already theoretically derived from the apostles, its *practice* was nevertheless for a long time confined to a maturer age.—*Art. Bap.*, in *Kitto's Cyclo. of Bib. Lit.*, Vol. I., p. 287.

KÄCHLER.—Qu. "Is there precept for, or example of, infant baptism in the New Testament?" Ans. Neither precept nor example, so far as one can distinctly see.—*Letter to the Author*, April 20, 1893.

KNAPP.—Many of the ancients and moderns have disapproved of infant baptism. It was first expressly dissuaded by Tertullian (*De Bapt.* C. 18), although he does not entirely reject it, as it was at that time in common use. But it was also quite common then to *delay* baptism; and those who approved of this could not at the

same time approve of infant baptism. Vide s. 141, I. Infant baptism was also rejected by the Anabaptists of the sixteenth century, and their followers, for reasons mentioned in s. 141, ad finem. Mich. Servetus, too, in the sixteenth century, would have no one baptized under thirty years of age. There is no decisive example of this practice in the New Testament; for it may be objected against those passages where the baptism of whole families is mentioned—viz., Acts x. 42, 48; xvi. 15, 33; 1 Cor. i. 16, that it is doubtful whether there were any children in these families, and if there were, whether they were then baptized. From the passage, Matt. xxviii. 19, it does not necessarily follow that Christ commanded infant baptism; (the *matheteuein* is neither for nor against;) nor does this follow any more from John iii. 5, and Mark x. 14,16. There is therefore no express command for infant baptism found in the New Testament; as Morus (p. 215, s. 12) justly concedes. Infant baptism has been often defended on very unsatisfactory *à priori* grounds—e. g., the necessity of it has been contended for, in order that children may obtain by it the faith which is necessary to salvation, &c.—*Christian Theology*, p. 435.

LANGEN.—There is no precept nor example of Infant Baptism in the New Testament.—*Letter to the Author*, April 19, 1893.

LIMBORCH.—As for our own parts we say that it is not absolutely necessary, (1.) Because there is no express command for it in the Scripture, nay all those passages wherein baptism is commanded do immediately relate to *Adult* persons, since they are ordered to be instructed, and faith is prerequisite as a necessary qualification,

which are peculiar to the *Adults* alone. (2.) There is no instance that can be produc'd, from whence it may indisputably be infer'd that any child was baptized by the Apostles. (3.) The necessity of *Pædo-Baptism* was never asserted in any council before that of *Carthage* held in the year 418. True it is, it was an ancient rite used for several ages in the Church of Christ, especially in *Africa*; but it was only received as a rite that might lawfully and with edification be administered, without any notion of the necessity thereof. So that since there are no marks in antiquity before the said Council, of the necessity of *Infant-Baptism*, there is no reason why at present it should be held as necessary.—*Com. System of Div.*, Vol. II., p. 740.

LUTZ.—It must be admitted that the baptism of children has no ground in Scripture.—*In Stier's Words of the Lord Jesus*, Vol. VIII., p. 310.

MEYER.—The baptism of the children of *Christians*, of which no trace is found in the N. T., is not to be held as an apostolic ordinance, as, indeed, it encountered early and long resistance; but it is an *institution of the church*, which gradually arose in post-apostolic times in connection with the development of ecclesiastical life and of doctrinal teaching, not certainly attested before Tertullian, and by him still decidedly opposed, and, although already defended by Cyprian, only becoming general after the time of Augustine in virtue of that connection. —*Com. on Acts*, xvi. 15, p. 312.

MOULE.—In the New Testament we have not indeed any mention of Infant Baptism. But we find not the least explicit caution against it, and no injunction to

Christian parents to prepare their children for Baptism. —*Outlines of Christ. Doct.*, p. 256.

MOZLEY.—On referring then, in order to decide this question, to the original institution of baptism, as described or alluded to in Scripture, we find, in the first place, no mention made in Scripture of the baptism of infants at all, and no statement in Scripture from which the obligation to baptize infants can properly be inferred. —*Baptismal Controversy*, p. 20.

NEWMAN.—It is but fair and right to acknowledge at once that Scripture does not bid us baptize children.— *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, Vol. VII., p. 219.

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.— The baptismal service is founded on the Scripture. But its application to an unconscious infant is destitute of any express Scriptural warrant. Scripture knows nothing of the baptism of infants. There is absolutely not a single trace of it to be found in the Few Testament.— *Volume XVII.*, p. 388.

O'DONNOGHUE.—" The baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ." On this subject no positive directions are found in the New Testament.—*Exposition of the 39 Articles*, p. 232.

PAINE.—There is no *direct* precept for, or *specific* case of, *infant* Baptism, in the Few Testament.—*Letter to the Author*, April 15, 1893.

PRENTISS.—I do not think there is in the F. T. any

precept *enjoining* infant baptism; or any *certain* example of the practice.—*Letter to the Author*, Oct. 31, 1893.

PRESSENSE.—Christian baptism is not to be received, any more than faith, by inheritance. This is the great reason why we cannot believe that it was administered in the apostolic age to little children. No positive fact sanctioning the practice can be adduced from the New Testament; the historical proofs alleged are in no way conclusive. There is only one case [Acts xvi. 15] affording any ground for doubt, and those who attach more importance to the general spirit of the new covenant than to an isolated text, unhesitatingly admit that it is of no force.— *The Early Years of Christ.*, p. 337.

RAYMOND.—There is no direct precept or command in the New Testament requiring Infant Baptism.—*Letter to the Author*, Oct. 25, 1893.

SCHMIDT.—With respect to the question of infant baptism, this cannot be directly proved from the word of the Lord.—*Biblical Theology*, p. 254.

STANLEY.—In the apostolic age, and in the three centuries which followed, it is evident that, as a general rule, those who came to baptism came in full age, of their own deliberate choice. We find a few cases of the baptism of children; in the third century we find one case of the baptism of infants. Even amongst Christian households the instances of Chrysostom, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Ephrem of Edeasa, Augustine, Ambrose, are decisive proofs that it was not only not obligatory but not usual. They had Christian parents, and yet they were

not baptized till they reached maturity. The liturgical service of Baptism was framed entirely for full-grown converts, and is only by considerable adaptation applied to the case of infants. Gradually, however, the practice spread, and after the fifth century the whole Christian world, East and West, Catholic and Protestant, Episcopal and Presbyterian (with the single exception of the sect of the Baptists before mentioned), have baptized children in their infancy. Whereas, in the early ages, adult baptism was the rule, and infant baptism the exception, in later times Infant baptism is the rule, and adult baptism the exception. What is the justification of this almost universal departure from primitive usage? There may have been many reasons, some bad, some good. One, no doubt, was the superstitious feeling already mentioned which regarded Baptism as a charm, indispensable to salvation, and which insisted on imparting it to every human being who could be touched with water, however unconscious. Hence the eagerness with which Roman Catholic missionaries, like St. Francis Xavier, have made it the chief glory of their mission to have baptized heathen populations wholesale, in utter disregard of the primitive or Protestant practice of previous preparation. Hence the capture of children for baptism without the consent of their parents, as in the celebrated case of the Jewish boy Mortara. Hence the curious decision of the Sorbonne quoted in *Tristram Shandy*. Hence in the early centuries, and still in the Eastern Churches, co-extensive with Infant Baptism, the practice of Infant Communion, both justified on the same grounds, and both based on the mechanical application of Biblical texts to cases which by their very nature were not contemplated in the Apostolic age.—*Nineteenth Century*, Oct., 1879, p. 699.

STAPFERUS.—There is not any express command in the holy Scripture concerning the baptism of infants.—*Institut. Theol. Polem.*, Vol. I., Par. III., § 1647, p. 455.

STEITZ.—There is no trace of infant baptism in the New Testament. All attempts to deduce it from the words of institution, or from such passages as 1 Cor. i. 16, must be given up as arbitrary. Indeed, 1 Cor. vii. 14 ("For the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother : else were your children unclean; but now they are holy,") rules out decisively all such deductions; for, if pedobaptism were taught by Paul, he would have linked the salvation of the children with their baptism, and not with the faith of their parents.—*Art. Baptism*, in *Schaff-Herzog's Cyclopaedia*, Vol. I., p. 200.

STILLINGFLEET.—Whether baptism shall be administered to infants or no, is not set down in express words, but left to be gathered by Analogy and consequences.—*Irenicum*, Part II., Chap. IV., p. 178.

STUART.—On the subject of *infant-baptism* I have said nothing. The present occasion did not call for it; and I have no wish or intention to enter into the controversy respecting it. I have only to say, that I believe in both the propriety and expediency of the rite thus administered; and therefore accede to it *ex ammo*. Commands, or plain and certain examples, in the New Testament relative to it, I do not find. Nor, with my views of it, do I need them.—*Mode of Christian Baptism*, pp. 189, 190.

THAYER.—I know of no explicit, indubitable, precept

for or example of infant baptism in the New Testament. —*Letter to the Author*, May 5, 1893.

TOMLINE.—We conclude that THE BAPTISM OF YOUNG CHILDREN IS IN ANYWISE TO BE RETAINED IN THE CHURCH AS MOST AGREEABLE WITH THE INSTITUTION OF CHRIST. It is to be observed, that it is not here asserted that the baptism of young children is itself commanded in the Gospel, for there certainly is no such command.—*Christian Theology*, Vol. II., p. 474.

TULLOCH.—Adult baptism and baptism by immersion were the rule in the early church,—infant baptism was the exception; every scholar knows this, and our sketch sets it forth plainly.—*The Christ. School, and Christ. Worship of the II. Century*, in *Good Words*, 1861, pp. 72, 73.

WATERLAND.—A profession of faith was, from the beginning, always required of persons before baptism: we have plain examples of, and allusions to, something of that kind, even in Scripture itself [Acts viii. 12, 37; 1 Peter iii. 21]. Upon these instances the Christian Church proceeded.—*Works*, Vol. II., p. 191.

WELLFORD.—The case of Infant Baptism, taken in all its branches and bearings, is allowed by all parties to be one of considerable difficulty. It is not, therefore, to be expected that any view of the subject shall be altogether clear from inconveniences and objections. Very little is said in the Scriptures of infants, and nothing at all, directly, of infant baptism.—*On Baptism*, p. 10.

WITSIUS.—We readily acknowledge that there is no express and special command of God, or of Christ, concerning infant-baptism.—*Economy of the Covenants*, Vol. III., p 385.

CHAPTER V.

INVITATION TO LITTLE CHILDREN (MATT. XIX. 14; MARK X. 13; LUKE XVIII. 15).

ABBOTT.—It certainly *does not* teach (1) that children are by nature, and without a spiritual change, *true children of God*, in the face of such explicit declarations as John iii. 5, 6; nor (2), except by a very doubtful implication, that they should be members of the visible earthly church; nor (3) that they are proper subjects of baptism. This last is argued for by Alford. But surely the question whether the rite of baptism is properly employed for the consecration of children, or only as a symbol of self-consecration, is not in the remotest degree touched on here.—*Com. on Matt.*, xix. 15.

BURKITT.—But say some, Christ did neither baptize them nor command his disciples to do so? *Answer*, That is not to be wondered at, if we consider that they had already entered into covenant with God by circumcision, and Christian baptism was not yet instituted : John's baptism was the baptism of repentance, of which infants were incapable.—*Notes on N. T.*, on Matt. xix. 14.

MILTON.—It is remarkable to what futile arguments those divines have recourse, who maintain the contrary opinion. They allege Matt. xix. 14. *Suffer little children, and forbid them not to come unto me, for of such is the king-*

dom of heaven. It appears however that they were not brought to him for the purpose of being baptized; v. 13. *then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them and pray;* neither did Christ baptize them but only put his hands on them, v. 15. Mark x. 16. *he took them up in his arms, put his hands upon them, and blessed them.* Seeing that they were neither brought to Christ to be baptized, nor, when received, were actually baptized by him, it is impossible to admit the sophistical inference, that they were properly qualified for baptism; or, which is still more difficult to conceive, that not little children merely, but infants are so qualified.—*Treat. on Christ. Doct.*, Chap. XXVIII., p. 432.

OLSHAUSEN.—Of that reference to infant baptism which it is so common to seek in this narrative, there is clearly not the slightest trace to be found. The Savior sets the children before the apostles as symbols of spiritual regeneration, and of the simple childlike feeling therein imparted.—*Com. on Gospels and Acts*, Matt. xix. 14, Vol. II., p. 406.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—We must take heed we do not found infant-baptism upon the example of Christ in this text, for it is certain that he did not baptize these children. Mark only saith, 'he took them up in his arms, laid his hands on them, and blessed them.' The argument for infant-baptism, from this text, is founded upon his words, uttered on this occasion, not upon his practice.—*Annotations*, on Matt. xix. 14.

CHAPTER VI.

THE COMMISSION (MATT. XXVIII. 19).

ATHANASIUS.—On this account therefore our Saviour also did not simply command to baptize, but first says, *Teach*; and then "Baptize into the Name of the Father, and Son and Holy Ghost;" that the right faith might follow upon learning, and together with faith might come the consecration of Baptism.—*Select Treatises, IV. Disc. Against the Arians, Disc. II., Chap. XVIII., § 42, ¶ 17, p. 339.*

BANNERMAN.—There are three particulars embraced in the authoritative commission addressed to the Apostles, and through them binding upon the Church in every age. *First*, the command to make disciples of all nations, turning them to the profession and belief of the faith of Christ. *Second*, there is the command to baptize all nations, granting them the formal and public rite by which their admission into the Church was to be attested and ratified. And *third*, there is the command to teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever Christ had appointed for His Church, collectively, or His people individually. This is the order in which, according to the nature of the various particulars embraced in the commission, they were to be accomplished. That the order of procedure here indicated is in harmony with the nature of the work to be done by the Church in reference to the world, is abundantly plain from the

scriptural account given of it in many other passages of the Bible. First of all is the preaching of the Gospel, as the grand instrument employed by the Church to gather in the disciples of Christ within its pale. Next there is the affixing to the disciples thus gathered the characteristic badge of discipleship, and granting them, by the initiatory rite of Baptism, formal admission into the Christian Church. And lastly, there is the instructing those thus admitted in the observance of all their appointed duties as disciples of Christ and members of His Church. This is plainly, I think, the order of procedure indicated in the apostolic commission; and it is an order which implies that a knowledge and profession of the faith as disciples preceded the administration of Baptism to them.—*The Church of Christ*, Vol. II., p. 63.

BARNES.—*Teach all nations*. The word rendered *teach*, here, is not the one that is usually so translated in the New Testament. This word properly means *disciple*, or *make disciples of*. This was to be done, however, by teaching, and by administering the rite of baptism.—*Notes*, on Matt. xxviii. 19.

BARROW.—What the action itself enjoined is, what the manner and form thereof, is apparent by the words of our Lord's institution; *Going forth therefore*, saith he, *teach* (or *disciple*) *all nations, baptizing them*.

The action is baptizing, or immersing in water; the object thereof, those persons of any nation whom his ministers can by their instruction and persuasion render disciples; that is, such as do sincerely believe the truth of his doctrine, and seriously resolve to obey his commandments.—*Theological Works*, Vol. VI., p. 546.

BAXTER.—This is not like some occasional Historical mention of baptism, but it is the very commission of Christ to his Apostles for preaching and baptism, and purposely expresseth their several works in their several places and order. Their task is by teaching to make disciples, which are by *Mark* called *believers*. The second work is to baptize them, whereto is annexed the promise of their salvation. The third work is to teach them all other things which are afterward to be learnt in the school of Christ. To contemn this order, is to renounce all rules of order. For where can we expect to find it, if not here? I confess my conscience is fully satisfied from this text, that it is *one sort of faith*, even *saving*, that must go before baptism, and the profession whereof the minister must expect.—*Disput. of Right to Sac.*, pp. 149, 150.

BLED SOE.—We object to the bold statement of Mr. Miller, that Matt. xxviii. 19 'is the only authority we have for administering baptism to any one.' For if so, then we have no authority whatever for administering baptism to infants, since Matt. xxviii. 19 does not say one word about infants, and cannot be extended to infants, unless we look beyond the words themselves for our authority to do so. Hence, in confining our authority for baptism to these words alone, he has betrayed the cause of infant baptism into the hands of its enemies.—*Southern Review*, Vol. XV., July, 1874, p. 177.

BLOOMFIELD.—And though nothing is said in Scripture to *enjoin* infant baptism, it was not *necessary* that it should be expressly enjoined.—*Greek Test., with Eng. Notes*, Matt. xxviii. 19, Vol. I., p. 249.

BOSTON.—"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c. They must first be discipled; and then, and not till then have they a right to baptism. To be a disciple of Christ and a believer are reciprocal terms, as Christ teacheth us, comparing with this Mark xvi. 16. "He that believeth and is baptized," &c.—*Works*, Vol. VI., p. 127.

BURNETT.—The institution of baptism as it is a federal act of the Christian religion, must be taken from the commission that our Savior gave to his disciples—to go preach and make disciples to him in all nations (for that is the strict signification of the word,) baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, Matt. xxviii. 19, 20. By the first teaching or making of disciples, that must go before baptism, is to be meant the convincing of the world that Jesus is the Christ, the true Messiah, anointed of God with a fullness of grace and of the Spirit without measure, and sent to be the Savior and Redeemer of the world, and when they were brought to acknowledge this, then they were to baptize them.—*Exp. of the Thirty-Nine Articles*, p. 357.

CALVIN.—Christ sends his disciples to publish the gospel to all nations of the world, that by the doctrine of salvation they may gather men, who were previously lost, into his kingdom. But who or what are those men? It is certain that mention is made only of those who are fit to receive his doctrine. He subjoins, that such, after being taught, were to be baptized, adding the promise, Whosoever believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved. Is there one syllable about infants in the whole discourse? What then is the form of argument with which they as-

sail us? Those who are of adult age are to be instructed and brought to the faith, before being baptized, and, therefore, it is unlawful to make baptism common to infants. They cannot, at the very utmost, prove any other thing out of this passage, than the gospel must be preached to those who are capable of hearing it before they are baptized: for of such only the passage speaks. Prom this let them, if they can, throw an obstacle in the way of baptizing infants.—*Institutes*, Vol. III., p. 377.

CANDLISH.—What is expressly commanded by Christ in regard to baptism is, that those who are made disciples by the preaching of the gospel should be baptized, *i. e.* those who had been heathens or unbelieving Jews, but had come to believe in Jesus. These only are referred to in Matt. xxviii. 19; Mark xvi. 15, 16, and in all the instances in which baptism is said to have been administered, it was to such persons. There is no express precept or example as to what was to be done in the case of those who, being born of believing parents, would be taught from their earliest infancy the truths about Jesus, and trained to look to Him with reverence, trust, and love. . . .

It might be said, that they need not be baptized at all; and this indeed has been the opinion of some, though of comparatively few Christians. This would be to follow most literally the express commands of Scripture, and refuse to go beyond them. Children trained up in the Christian faith are not among those of whom Jesus expressly spoke in commanding baptism.—*The Christian Sacraments*, pp. 64, 65.

CLARKE, ADAM.—*Teach, Metheteusate, make disciples of all nations, bring them to an acquaintance with God who*

bought them, and then *baptize them in the name of the Father*. It is natural to suppose that *adults* were the first subjects of baptism; for as the Gospel was, in a peculiar manner, sent to the Gentiles, they must hear and receive it, before they could be expected to renounce their old prejudices and idolatries, and come into the bonds of the Christian covenant.—*Com.*, on Matt. xxviii. 19.

DODDRIDGE.—I render the word *metheteusate, proselyte*, that it may be duly distinguished from *didaskontes, teaching*, (in the next verse,) with which our version confounds it. The former seems to import instruction in the essentials of religion, which it was necessary adult persons should know and submit to, before they could regularly be admitted to baptism; the latter may relate to those more particular admonitions in regard to Christian faith and practice, which were to be built on that foundation.—*Family Expositor*, Matt. xxviii. 19, Vol. II., p. 626.

DWIGHT.—In the text, the apostles are directed to make disciples of all nations, and then to baptize them. That they understood their commission in this manner, is unanswerably evident from their own declarations. "Repent, therefore," said Peter to the Jews, "and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus." When the eunuch said to Philip, "See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Philip replied, "If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest." Lydia was baptized after the Lord had "opened her heart." The goaler was baptized in consequence of his faith. So was Paul. So were Cornelius and his household.—*System of Theology*, Sermon CLVI., on Matt. xxviii. 19, Vol. V., p. 224.

GRIMM.—*Matheteuo*: 1. intrans. *tini*, to be the disciple of one; to follow his precepts and instruction. 2. trans. to make a disciple; to teach, instruct.

Mathetes, a learner, pupil, disciple.—*Lex. of N. T.*, in loco.

KENRICK.—Whether infants should be baptized, cannot be inferred with certainty from the words of the commission. . . . But, then, it may be asked, on what authority can they be baptized? If the commission do not regard them, they are necessarily beyond its reach, and the attempt to baptize them is an unauthorized measure. I care not to answer with some that the term rendered "teach," may be understood of making disciples, and initiating into the school of Christ.—*Treatise on Baptism*, pp. 128, 129.

LESLIE.—When Christ sent his apostles to convert all nations, his commission of baptizing was as large as that of teaching, Matth. xxviii. 19, *Go teach all nations, baptizing them*, &c. i. e. baptize all who shall receive your word. And accordingly it is said, Acts ii. 41, *They that received the word were baptized*; pursuant to what the apostle had preached, ver. 38, *Repent and be baptized*.—*Theological Works*, Vol. VII., p. 21.

LUTZ.—Infant-baptism is *essentially* excluded by the words of institution, Matt. xxviii. 19 and Mark xvi. 16; for the words *Matheteuein* and *pisteuein* preceding the *baptizein* shut them out as incapable of both.—In *Stier's Words of the Lord Jesus*, Vol. VIII., p. 310.

MACEVILLY.—Our Redeemer enjoins three things on His Apostles, intimately connected with one another, which they should perform on their mission, as His vice-

gerents throughout the whole world—1st. Preaching the doctrines of faith, "TEACH *all nations*." The Greek word for "teach" (*methodized*), is clearly expressive of dogmatic teaching. Hence, for it, St. Mark has, "PREACH *the gospel*." 2nd. The conferring of baptism, to introduce the nations into His Church. 3rd. The inculcation of a practical observance of His Commandments, and of the precepts of a holy life, "*teaching them to observe*," &c. The Greek word for "teaching" (*didaskontes*), is well suited to express moral teaching.

Before baptism, they were to be instructed in what appertains to Christian faith; after it, in those things which appertain to morals and a holy Christian life, manifested by good works.—*Exposition of the Gospels*, on Matt. xxviii. 20.

MEYER.—*Didaskontes autous, k. t. l.*] without being conjoined by *kai*, therefore not co-ordinate with, but *subordinate* to the *baptizontes*, intimating that a certain *ethical teaching* must necessarily accompany in every case the administration of baptism: *while ye teach them to observe everything*, etc. This moral instruction must not be omitted when you baptize, but it must be regarded as an essential part of the ordinance. That being the case, *infant baptism* cannot possibly have been contemplated in *baptiz.*, nor, of course, in *panta t. ethne* either.—*Com. on Matt.*, xxviii. 20, pp. 530, 531.

OLSHAUSEN.—By the introducing of pædo-baptism, the position which this ordinance occupied is changed. Pædo-baptism is certainly not apostolic.—*Commentary on the Gospels*, Matt. xxviii. 19, Vol. IV., p. 186.

PARKHURST.—*Matheuo*, I. Governing a dative, *To be*

a disciple to, or follower of another's doctrine, occ. Matt. xxvii. 57. II. Governing an accusative, *To make a disciple*, occ. Matt. xxviii. 19; Acts xiv. 21. III. *To instruct*.

Mathetes, From *Matheo to learn*. *A disciple, follower of doctrine*.—*N. T. Lexicon* in loco.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—*Go ye therefore, and teach all nations*. The Greek is *Methodized*, make disciples of all nations, but that must be first by preaching and instructing them in the principles of the Christian faith. And Mark expounds it, telling us, our Savior said, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every Creature;' that is, to every reasonable creature, capable of hearing and receiving it. I cannot be of their mind who think that persons may be baptized before they be taught; we want precedents of any such baptism in scripture, though we find precedents of persons baptized who had but a small degree of the knowledge of the gospel, but it should seem that they were all first taught, that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, and were not baptized till they professed such belief, Acts viii. 37, and John baptized them in Jordan, confessing their sins, Matt. iii. 6.—*Annotations*, on Matt. xxviii. 19.

RIDGELEY.—I am sensible that some who have defended infant baptism, or rather attempted to answer an objection taken from this and similar scriptures against it, have endeavored to prove that the Greek word [*Methodized*] signifies, 'make persons disciples;' that it is a metaphor taken from the practice of persons being put under the care of one who is qualified to instruct him, whose disciple he is said to be, in order to his being taught by him; and that, therefore, we are made

disciples by baptism, and afterwards are 'taught to observe all things whatsoever Christ hath commanded.' This meaning of the Greek word is taken notice of in the marginal reading of our Bibles; which supposes that the passage may be rendered, 'make disciples of all nations.' But I cannot think this meaning of the word so defensible, or agreeable to the design of our Savior, as that of our translation, namely, 'Go, teach all nations;' which agrees with the words of the other evangelist, 'Go, preach the gospel to every creature.' Besides, if we have recourse to the sense in question, to defend infant baptism, we do not rightly consider that it cannot be well applied to adult baptism, which the apostles were first to practice; for it cannot be said concerning the heathen, that they are first to be taken under Christ's care by baptism, and then instructed in the doctrines of the gospel by his ministers.—*Body of Div.*, Vol. II., Quest. 166, p. 497.

ROBINSON.—*Matheteuo*, to disciple, i. e. a) intrans. *to be the disciple of any one.* b) in IT. T. also trans. *to train as a disciple, to teach, to instruct.*

Mathetes, a disciple, scholar, follower of a teacher. Emphatic, for true disciple, John xiii. 35; xv. 8. After Christ's death the term *disciple* took the wider sense of *follower, believer*, eg. to Christian, Acts vi. 1, 2; xi. 26. —*N. T. Lexicon*, in loco.

SCOTT, THOMAS.—There are two words in this passage, which are translated *teach*, and *teaching*; but they are of a different meaning. The former means that general instruction, which was necessary to bring men to profess themselves the disciples of Christ; and the other relates to their more particular subsequent instruction, in all

the various parts of Christianity.—*Commentary, on Matt. xxviii. 19.*

VALPY.—There is an evident distinction between *Metheteusate* and *didaskontes*, in the next verse, which has not been observed in our translation. There are manifestly three things, which our Lord here distinctly enjoins his Apostles to execute with regard to the nations, including not merely the Jews as before, x. 5, 6, but also the Gentiles; and they are, *matheusate*, *baptizontes*, and *didaskontes*, i. e. convert them to the faith, initiate the converts into the church by baptism, and instruct the baptized in all the duties of the Christian life.—*Novum Testamentum*, Note on Matt. xxviii. 19, Vol. I., p. 211.

WATSON.—*Teach all nations.*—Make disciples of all nations; which means, instruct them in the faith, and persuade them to the belief and reception of it; for how else should men be made disciples but by instructing them in the doctrine held out to their acceptance?

Baptizing them, &c.—So that instruction as to those capable of it, which is manifestly implied, must precede baptism; this being a rational ordinance to be submitted to on knowledge and conviction, and not that to which it has often been debased, something little better than a superstitious charm and ceremony. . . .

Arguments for and against the baptism of infants have been deduced from these words. "How," say some, "are all nations to be baptized, if children are to be excluded?" "How," says the antipædo-baptist, "should children be included, if baptism is to follow INSTRUCTION and BELIEVING?" The truth is, that adults could only be spoken of in the text; and the right of the children of believers rests on other grounds, and

may be sufficiently established by them.—*Exposition*, on Matt. xxviii. 19.

WEBSTER AND WILKINSON.—*Methodized*] 'make disciples,' convert to the faith. So in A. xiv. 21. A promise is implied in the command: the thing commanded is contemplated as done. Mk. xvi. 15; Luke xxiv. 47. In *matheteuein* two distinct processes are enunciated: (1) the bringing the nations to a formal acknowledgment of discipleship; the receiving them into the ark of Christ's church by baptism, the sign and seal of their professed subjection to Jesus, (*baptizontes*); upon this would follow (2) all the catechetical and pastoral instruction necessary, (*didaskontes*), for the willing susception and complete fulfilment of the duties entailed by that profession, and for the realization of the privileges to which they were admitted.—*Greek Test.*, Note on Matt. xxviii. 19.

WHITBY.—*Matheteuein* here is "to preach the gospel to all nations," and to engage them to believe it in order to their profession of that faith by baptism; as seems apparent (1.) from the parallel commission, Mark xvi. 15: "Go preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." (2.) From the Scripture notion of a disciple, that being still the same as a believer. ... If here it should be said that I yield too much to the antipbaptists, by saying, that to be made disciples here is to be taught to believe in Christ, that so they might be his disciples; I desire any one to tell me how the apostles could *Matheteuein*, "make a disciple," of a heathen or unbelieving Jew, without being *Mathetai*, or "teachers" of them; whether they were not sent to preach to those that could hear,

and to teach them to whom they preached that "Jesus was the Christ" and only to baptize them when they did believe this?—*Com. on New Test.*, Matt. xxviii. 19.

CHAPTER VII.

"YOUR CHILDREN" (ACTS II. 39).

ABBOTT.—*Is unto you and your children.* The original (*teknon*) may mean either *descendants*, as in ch. xiii. 33, Matt. xxvii. 25, or *children*, as in ch. xxi. 5; Matt. vii. 11. The promise is, however, conditional on repentance and baptism, and therefore does not, by its terms, include any except such as are capable of repentance. The former meaning, *descendants*, suits the context better, for thus it includes the latter, *children*, and makes the promise include the whole family of mankind.—*Com. on Acts*, ii. 39.

HAMMOND.—If any have made use of that very unconvincing *argument*, I have nothing to say in defense of them; I think the *practice* is founded on a better *basis* than so, and that the word *children* there, is really the *posterity of the Jews*, and not peculiarly their *Infant* children.— *Works*, Vol. I., p. 622.

LIMBORCH.—It may be said, That St. *Peter* exhorting the converted *Jews* to be baptized, makes use of this argument, *For the promise is unto you and to your children.* Answ. It cannot be proved that by *children* in this place are understood *Infants*, but rather their *Posterity*, according to the usual acceptance of that word.—*Comp. System of Div.*, Vol. II., pp. 740, 741.

MILTON.—*The promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Your children, that is, as they understand it, your infants: in other words, God calls those who cannot understand, and addresses those who cannot hear; an interpretation which can only have proceeded from the infancy of reasoning. Had these commentators but read two verses farther, they would have found it expressly stated, they that gladly received his word were baptized; whence it appears that understanding and will were necessary qualifications for baptism, neither of which are possessed by infants.—Treat. on Christ. Doct., Chap. XXVIII., p. 434.*

VALPY.—*And to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call: i. e. and to all the Gentiles who shall obey, and come in to Christ at his call, or upon our preaching to them. —Nov. Test., Note on Acts ii. 39, Vol. II., p. 134.*

CHAPTER VIII.

HOUSEHOLD BAPTISM.

I. THE HOUSE OF LYDIA.

ABBOTT.—To me it appears very clear that there is no *authority* for the practice of *infant* baptism in such incidental historical references such as this; for (1) *infant* and *household* baptism are not the same; there is nothing to indicate that there were any infant children in this household, or that Lydia was a married woman. On the other hand, it is hardly credible that there should have been no *adults*, and it will hardly be argued, that because their faith is not stated, they were baptized upon the faith of Lydia; (2) assuming that there were infants in the household in this and analogous cases mentioned in the N. T., it does not follow that they were baptized. If it was not the usage in the primitive church to baptize infants, but only adults, and upon a personal confession of faith, the historian would assume, and the reader would understand, that only those capable of making an intelligent confession of faith were included in the baptism. Thus if a modern writer were to use the phraseology, "Mr. A. and his family have been baptized and joined the baptist church," it would be assumed by both writer and reader that only those capable of making an intelligent confession of faith were included. The whole question of infant baptism must be determined, not by doubtful deductions from inci-

dental references to the baptism of households.—*Com. on Acts*, xvi. 15.

BEET.—It must be at once admitted that the New Testament contains no clear proof that infants were baptized in the days of the Apostles. It is true that St. Paul baptized the houses of Stephanas and of Lydia, and the Philippian Gaoler and all who belonged to him : 1 Corinthians i. 16, Acts xvi. 15, 33. But this mention of baptized households by no means proves or suggests that he baptized infants. For a courtier from Capernaum and Crispus at Corinth believed with their entire households : John iv. 54, Acts xviii. 18. So apparently did the Gaoler: Acts xvi. 34. Cornelius feared God with all his house : ch. x. 2. And the household of Stephanas was a firstfruit of Achaia : 1 Corinthians xvi. 15. This does not mean that in these five families there were no infants, or that the infants believed; but that all capable of understanding the Gospel believed it. Just so in reference to baptism.—*Christian Baptism*, p. 28.

BLUNT.—It is argued that as the household of Lydia and the jailer were baptized [Acts xvi. 15,33], there were probably infants amongst them; but, admitting this *probability*, there is no proof that the Apostle baptized them. We cannot fairly prove the Apostolic origin of infant baptism by assuming the existence of the usage itself.—*Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theology*, Art. *Infant Bap.*, p. 343.

LIMBORCH.—Whether any infants were in her house is uncertain. An undoubted argument therefore cannot be drawn from this instance, by which it may be demonstrated that infants were baptized by the Apostles. It

might be, that all in her house were of a mature age; who, as in the exercise of a ripe understanding they believed, so they were able also to make a public profession of that faith when they received baptism. As I neither will nor can deny that there were infants in that house; so likewise I cannot affirm the contrary.—*Com. on Acts*, xvi. 15.

LUMBY.—*And her household*] Of a like baptizing of a household see below (v. 33), and also cp. xi. 14. We are not justified in concluding from these passages that infants were baptized. "Household" might mean slaves and freedwomen.—*Com. on Acts*, xvi. 15.

MEYER.—Of what members her family consisted, cannot be determined. This passage and ver. 33, with xviii. 8, and 1 Cor. i. 16, are appealed to in order to prove *infant baptism* in the apostolic age, or at least to make it probable. . . . But on this question the following remarks are to be made: (1) If, in the Jewish and Gentile families which were converted to Christ, there were children, their baptism is to be assumed in *those* cases, when they were so far advanced that they could and did confess their faith on Jesus as the Messiah; for this was the universal, absolutely necessary qualification for the reception of baptism. (2) If, on the other hand, there were children still incapable of confessing, baptism could not be administered to those to whom that, which was the necessary presupposition of baptism for Christian sanctification, was still wanting. (3) Such young children, whose parents were Christians, rather fell under the point of view of 1 Cor. vii., according to which, in conformity with the view of the apostolic church, the children of Christians were no longer regarded as *akath-*

artioi, but as *agioi*, and that not on the footing of having received the character of holiness by baptism, but as having part in the Christian *agiotēs* by their fellowship with Christian parents. Besides, the circumcision of children must have been retained for a considerable time among the Jewish-Christians, according to xxi. 21. Therefore (4) the baptism of the children of *Christians*, of which no trace is found in the N. T., is not to be held as an apostolic ordinance, as, indeed, it encountered early and long resistance; but it is an *institution of the church*, which gradually arose in post-apostolic times in connection with the development of ecclesiastical life and of doctrinal teaching, not certainly attested before Tertullian, and by him still decidedly opposed, and, although already defended by Cyprian, only becoming general after the time of Augustine in virtue of that connection.—*Com. on Ads*, xvi. 15, pp. 311, 312.

OLSHAUSEN.—There is altogether wanting any conclusive proof—passage for the baptism of children in the age of the apostles, nor can the necessity of it be deduced from the nature of baptism.—*Com. on Gospels and Acts*, Acts xvi. 14, 15, Vol. IV., p. 430.

PRESSENSE.—The single doubtful case is that of the baptism of the family of Lydia (Acts xvi. 15), but it loses this character when we connect it with the instances already referred to. [Acts x. 44, 47; xvi. 32; xviii. 8; 1 Cor. i. 16; xvi. 15.] It appears evident that the family of Lydia was the first-fruits of Macedonia, as the family of Stephanas was of Achaia.—*The Early Years of Christ.*, p. 337.

II. THE HOUSE OF THE JAILER

ABBOTT.—*He and all his*. The *all* here, who were bap-

tized, are the *all* to whom the word was preached (ver. 32), and the *all* who believed (ver. 34). It does not therefore seem to me that any were baptized, probably except those who personally heard and accepted the word of God.—Com. *on Acts*, xvi. 33, Vol. IV., p. 183.

BEYSCHLAG.—In Acts xvi. 33 we are to understand adult relatives and servants, not infants.—*Letter to the Author*, April 22, 1893.

BLUNT.—As regards the jailer's household, we are told that Paul and Silas spake the Word of the Lord "to him and to all that were in his house," and that "he and all his were baptized." Now, it would appear from this statement, that the baptized were those to whom the Word of the Lord was preached, who assuredly were *not* infants. The evidence on this subject from Scripture amounts to this, that we only read of baptism after a profession of faith and repentance. This by no means, it is true, excludes the possibility of the existence at the same time of infant baptism without such conditions; but the fact must not be assumed without evidence, and the utter want of proof from Holy Scripture obviously leads to a different conclusion.—*Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theology*, Art. *Inf. Bap.*, pp. 343, 344.

COLERIDGE.—If I should inform any one that I had called at a friend's house, but had found no body at home, the family having all gone to the play; and if he, on the strength of his information, should take occasion to asperse my friend's wife for unmotherly conduct in taking an infant, six months old, to a crowded theatre,—would you allow him to press on the words '*nobody*' and '*all the family*,' in justification of the slander? Would you

not tell him, that the words were to be interpreted according to the nature of the subject, the purpose of the speaker, and their ordinary acceptation; and that he must, or might have known, that infants of that age would not be admitted into the theatre? Exactly so with regard to the words *he and all his household*. Had baptism of infants, at that early period of the Gospel been a known practice, or had this been previously demonstrated,—then indeed the argument, that in all probability there were infants or young children in so large a family, would be no otherwise objectionable than as being superfluous, and a sort of anti-climax in logic. But, if the words are cited as proof, it would be a clear *petitio principii* [a begging of the question], though there had been nothing else against it. But when we turn back to the Scriptures preceding the narrative, and find repentance and belief demanded as the terms and indispensable conditions of Baptism—then the case above imagined applies in its full force.—*Aids to Reflection*, pp. 244, 245.

JACOBI.—In support of the contrary opinion, the advocates in former ages (now hardly any) used to appeal to Matt. xix. 14; but their strongest argument in its favor is the regulation of baptizing all the members of a house and family (1 Cor. xvi. 15; Acts xvi. 33; xviii. 8). In none of these instances has it been proved that there were little children among them; but, even supposing that there were, there was no necessity for excluding them from baptism in plain words, since such exclusion was understood as a matter of course.—*Kitto's Cyclo. of Bib. Lit.*, Art. *Bap.*, Vol. I., p. 287.

LIMBORCH.—It may be urged, that we read of whole

families being baptized, wherein doubtless there were some children. *Answ.* As for my part, I will readily grant that there might be children in those families, yet the Holy Scripture furnishes me with no solid argument, whereby I can demonstrate it evidently against others who shall deny or question the truth of it; since it does not expressly say that there were any children in them. And tho this should be granted, yet we are not informed that they were baptized together with their parents: on the contrary, all those who were baptiz'd are said to give God thanks, which children could never do.—*Comp. System of Div.*, Vol. II., p. 740.

PRESSENSE.—Five baptized households are mentioned in the New Testament. The family of Cornelius was baptized only after the descent of the Holy Ghost upon all its members. (Acts x. 44, 47.) The family of the jailer at Philippi had heard the preaching of Paul and Silas : "They spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." (Acts xvi. 32.) The house then contained no child incapable of comprehending the Gospel. We read in Acts xviii. 8 : "Crispus believed on the Lord with all his *house*."—*The Early Years of Christ.*, p. 337.

WILSON.—The apostle proceeded (v. 32) to speak "unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." Concerned for his spiritual state, and that of his house, they opened up more fully the glad tidings of salvation. This was no unmeaning parade, no empty ceremony conducted by men who were prepared to baptize the jailor, whether or not he professed faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. That the gospel message was received by him with all readiness of mind, it appears to

us, in view of all the circumstances, no easy matter to doubt; and besides, his baptism as a professed believer is the only hypothesis that can maintain a shadow of consistency between the apostle's faithful *preaching of the word*, and their *administration of the ordinance*. The jailor's reception of the word paved the way for his admission to the ordinance; and as the happy result, "he rejoiced, believing (exercising faith) in God, with all his house." "He is not said," as Dr. Wardlaw well observes, "to have believed afterwards, but to have 'rejoiced believing.'" It is the joy, not the faith, that is recorded as subsequent.—*Infant Baptism*, pp. 367, 368.

III. THE HOUSE OF STEPHANAS (1 COR. I. 16).

BEET.—Dr. Whedon, under Acts xvi. 34, supposes that all the goaler's household were infants (! ! !), and that their faith was implied in his. Under Acts xvi. 15, he quotes approvingly Dr. Schaff, who asserts five cases of baptized households, and in proof quotes passages of which two are seen in a moment to be actually against him. Dr. S. adds: "It is hardly conceivable that all the adult sons and daughters in these five" (he ought to have said three) "cases so quickly determined on going over with their parents to a despised and persecuted religious society." I understand him to mean that the fact that the household was baptized makes it inconceivable that it contained adult children. But we are told that three men believed with "all" their houses : and we cannot conceive this to mean that the faith of infants was implied in their father's faith. Schaff and Whedon say that the baptized households are "given merely as examples :" but of this they give no proof whatever.—*Commentary on 1 Cor.*, i. 16.

HAMMOND.—I return my explicit consent, and think it unreasonable that the *Apostle's* bare mention of *baptizing* his *household*, 1 Cor. i. 16, should be thought competent to conclude, that *Infants* were *baptized* by him, when it is uncertain, whether there were any such at all in his *house*.— *Works*, Vol. L, p. 625.

MACKNIGHT.—The family of Stephanas seem all to have been adults when they were baptized; for they are said, chap. xvi. 15. *to have devoted themselves to the ministry of the saints*.—*On the Epistles, I Cor. i. 16*, Vol. II., p. 23.

OLSHAUSEN.—For infant baptism nothing is to be deduced from the word *oikos*, for the adult members of the family, or the slaves likewise, might be signified by it. —*Com. on 1 Corinthians, i. 16*.

NEANDER.—We cannot infer the existence of infant baptism from the instance of the baptism of whole families, for the passage in 1 Cor. xvi. 15, shows the fallacy of such a conclusion, as from that it appears that the whole family of Stephanas, who were baptized by Paul consisted of adults.—*Planting and Training*, Vol. L, p. 168.

PRESSENSE.—St. Paul says (1 Cor. i. 16), that he baptized the family of Stephanas; and in the same Epistle (xvi. 15), he mentions that this family was the first-fruits of his ministry in Achaia, a statement which implies that all its members were converted.—*The Early Years of Christ.*, p. 337.

CHAPTER IX.

1 CORINTHIANS VII. 14.

BEYSCHLAG.—In 1 Cor. vii. 14 Paul compares the children of Christians with non-Christian husband of many a Christian wife: "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the wife is sanctified by the husband : else were your children unclean; but now are they holy." This shows that at that time there was no thought of infant baptism. For, had the children of Christian parents been baptized they would have been holy by virtue of the baptism and not for the sake of the parents, and could not then have been compared to unbaptized man and wife.—*Letter to the Author*, April 22, 1893.

EDWARDS, T. C.—As to the bearing of this verse on infant baptism, it neither proves nor disproves that infants were baptized in the Apostolic Church. It does not prove it; for the sanctification here spoken of is the children's inheritance in virtue, not of their baptism, but of their relation to a Christian parent.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, vii. 14, p. 173.

FARRAR.—*But now are they holy.* This does not necessarily imply that they were baptized as infants, but only that they were hallowed as the fruit of a hallowed union. —*Com. on 1 Cor.*, vii. 14.

KLING.—This whole argument militates against, rath-

er than favors the existence of Infant baptism at that period. (Comp. Meyer and de Wette, *Stud. and Krit.*, 1830, p. 669 if.; [also Neander, Stanley and Alford *in loco*). Had such a practice existed, it would be fair to presume, that the Apostle would have alluded to it specifically, in confirmation of his position. Here, most of all, would have been the place to have mentioned it by name, as furnishing ecclesiastical authority for the view he had taken. The fact that he did not mention it, therefore affords some reason for concluding that the rite did not exist.].*—*Com. on 1 Cor.* vii. 14.

MEYER.—Had the *baptism* of Christian children been then in existence, Paul could not have drawn this inference, because in that case the *agiotés* of such children would have had *another* basis. That the passage before us does not even contain an exegetical *justification* of infant baptism, is shown in the remarks on Acts xvi. 15. Neither is it the point of departure, from which, almost of necessity, pædobaptism must have developed itself; such a point is rather to be found in the gradual development of the doctrine of original sin.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, vii. 14, p. 160.

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.—Nay more, it may be urged that 1 Cor. vii. 14, is incompatible with the supposition that infant baptism was then practiced at Corinth. The Apostle in this passage seeks to remove the scruples of those Christian partners in mixed marriages, who believed that a conjugal union with a heathen was a state profane and unholy in God's sight. He reassures them by an argument founded on a *reductio ad absurdum*.

*The matter enclosed in brackets is added by D. W. Poor, the American translator, a Presbyterian. —J. W. S.

You admit, says he, that your children are holy; then be persuaded that the marriage from which that sanctity was derived is holy also. For, were it otherwise; if, as you imagine, the marriage is unholy, then it would follow that the children that are the fruits of it would be unclean and unholy also; whereas you know and admit the reverse; you confess them to be holy. It is absolutely indisputable for the validity of this argument, that the sanctity of the children should have been *exclusively* derived from the sanctity of the marriage; for on no other hypothesis could the sanctity of the children have furnished a proof of the sanctity of the marriage. Had the children been baptized, they would have been holy in their own right, as members of Christ; and a father who had had his children baptized, would have effectually demolished the Apostle's reasoning by the simple reply, that the holiness of his children, as members of Christ's Church, was no reason for his thinking the marriage holy, or his not putting away his unbelieving wife. Many, indeed, have explained the term holy as meaning, "have been admitted to baptism," making the verse say, that if the faith of the believing partner had not sanctified the marriage, the children would not have been admitted to baptism, whereas they had been baptized. But this is to rewrite Scripture, not to interpret *it*.—*Volume XVII.*, pp. 388, 389.

OLSHAUSEN.—It is moreover clear that St. Paul would not have chosen this line of argument had infant baptism been at that time practiced.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, vii. 14, p. 122.

STANLEY.—The passage, on the other hand, is against the *practice* of infant baptism in the Apostle's time. For

(1) he would hardly have founded an argument on the derivation of the children's holiness from their Christian parent or parents, if there had been a distinct act by which the children had themselves been admitted formally into the Christian society; and (2) he would not have spoken of the heathen partner as being "holy" in the same sense as the children are regarded as "holy," viz. by connection with a Christian household, if there had been so obvious a difference between the conditions of the two, as that one was, and the other was not baptized.—*Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 1 Cor. vii. 14, p. 104.

CHAPTER X.

TESTIMONY OF THE "FATHERS."

I. CYPRIAN.

CYPRIAN.—Cyprian and others of his colleagues who were present in council, in number sixty-six, to Fidus their brother, greeting. We have read your letter, dearest brother, in which you intimated concerning Victor, formerly a presbyter. . . . But in respect of the case of infants, which you say ought not to be baptized within the second or third day after their birth, and the law of ancient circumcision should be regarded, so that you think that one who is just born should not be baptized and sanctified within the eighth day, we all thought very differently in our council. For in this course which you thought was to be taken, no one agreed; but we all rather judge that the mercy and grace of God is not to be refused to any one born of man. For as the Lord says in His Gospel, "The Son of man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them," as far as we can, we must strive that, if possible, no soul be lost. . . . But again, if even to the greatest sinners, and to those who had sinned much against God, when they subsequently believed, remission of sins is granted—and nobody is hindered from baptism and from grace—how much rather ought we to shrink from hindering an infant, who, being lately born, has not sinned, except in that, being born after the flesh according to Adam, he has

contracted the contagion of the ancient death at its earliest birth, who approaches the more easily on this very account to the reception of the forgiveness of sins—that to him are remitted, not his own sins, but the sins of *another*.—*Epistle LVIII., Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. V., pp. 353, 354.*

BLED SOE.—Thus, according to the decision of the whole council [Carthage], not excepting a single voice, if an infant dies before it is baptized *it will be lost*; and for this reason it is urged that its baptism should not be delayed until the eighth day after its birth. The grounds on which this monstrous decision is based are far from being clear, consistent, satisfactory, or steady. 'If, then,' says the letter of the council, 'the greatest offenders, and they that have grievously sinned against God before, have, when they afterwards come to believe, forgiveness of their sins; and no persons are kept off from baptism and the grace : how much less reason to refuse to an infant, who *being newly born, has no sin, save that being descended from Adam according to the flesh, he has from his very birth contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened*: who comes for this reason more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, *because they are not his own but others' sins that are forgiven him.*' The death, anciently threatened, is *the only sin* with which the infant stands charged. How strange the confusion of ideas ! The *death* is the only *sin*! Moreover, the infant may the more easily obtain the forgiveness of sins, because they are the sins of others, and not his own! One would suppose, indeed, that a poor little infant might receive the forgiveness of other people's sins, even without baptism. All this confusion of language is, no doubt, a faithful reflection of the confusion of mind and thought

from which it emanated. We shall see, as we proceed, how this primitive chaos of error clears away and leaves, as the residuum, the dry, hard, dreadful dogma, that every unbaptized infant, dying in infancy, is doomed to 'hell-torments forever,' on account of what is called 'original or birth-sin.'—*Southern Review*, Vol. XIV., April, 1874, pp. 347, 348.

II. IRENÆUS.

IRENÆUS.—Being a Master, therefore, He also possessed the age of a Master, not despising or evading any condition of humanity, not setting aside in Himself that law which he had appointed for the human race, but sanctifying every age, by that period corresponding to it which belonged to Himself. For He came to save all through means of Himself—all, I say, who through him are born again [regenerated] to God—infants, and children, and boys, and youths, and old men. He therefore passed through every age, becoming an infant for infants, thus sanctifying infants; a child for children, thus sanctifying those who are of this age, being at the same time made to them an example of piety, righteousness, and submission; a youth for youths, becoming an example to youths, and thus sanctifying them for the Lord. So likewise He was an old man for old men, that He might be a perfect Master for all, not merely as respects the setting forth of the truth, but also as regards age, sanctifying age also, and becoming an example to them likewise.—*Against Heresies*, Book II., Chapter XXII., § 4, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., p. 391.

BLED SOE.—Irenæus is his [Bishop of Ely's] next witness. 'Irenæus,' says he, 'next in succession to Justin says : "Christ came to save all by Himself; all, that is, who by Him are regenerated to God—infants and little

ones, and boys and youths and old men. Therefore He went through every age, being made an infant for infants, that He might sanctify infants," etc. If we consider that Irenæus, like other of the fathers, commonly calls baptism by the name of regeneration, this passage will seem conclusive of the custom and doctrine in his day.'

This inference is bad. For, in order to make the testimony of Irenæus 'conclusive,' it must be shown, not that he *commonly*, but that he *always* 'calls baptism by the name of regeneration.' Nay, it must be moreover shown, *e converso*, that he never uses the word *regeneration* without meaning baptism. For if, in his vocabulary, the term *regeneration* is sometimes applied to other things, as well as to baptism, how do we know but it is so applied in the passage under consideration? The argument proceeds on the supposition, or the assumption, that, in the language of Irenæus, baptism means regeneration, and regeneration means baptism. But this assumption is purely gratuitous; it is not proved; and, besides, it is false.—*Southern Review*, Vol. XIV., April, 1874, p. 338.

III. JUSTIN MARTYR.

JUSTIN MARTYR.—And many, both men and women, who have been Christ's disciples from childhood, remain pure at the age of sixty or seventy years; and I boast that I could produce such from every race of men.—*I. Apology*, Chap. XV., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., p. 167.

BLED SOE.—Those who maintain that it was instituted by the Apostles, and handed down, not by written word, but only by oral tradition, have discovered traces of this practice, as they imagine, in the writings of Justin Mar-

tyr and Irenæus. Thus says the Bishop of Ely [E. H. Browne], 'Justin Martyr wrote his *Second Apology* about A. D. 148 (*i. e.*, 48 years after the death of the last Apostle). He speaks of persons, 60 or 70 years old, who had been made disciples of Christ *in their infancy*. How can infants be made disciples but by baptism? And, if they had been baptized in their infancy, it must have been in the lifetime of the Apostle St. John, and of other apostolic men.'

To this passage we have several objections. In the first place, it is based on a wrong translation of the words *oi ek paidon*—'in their infancy.' For *pais*, of which *paidon* is the genitive plural, simply means 'a child, a son, a daughter,' and not an infant. The term *infants*, or *infancy*, when employed in connection with infant baptism, signifies very young children, while the word *childhood* includes all ages from 5 to 15 at least. . . . In the second place, it is taken out of its connection, and, instead of being construed in the light of the scope and design of the writer's discourse, it is turned to a foreign purpose, and *misconstrued*. Justin Martyr, in whose *Apology* these words are found, is not treating of infants, or infant baptism. He is, on the contrary, pleading the cause of Christians before the Roman Emperor and the other persecuting powers of the earth. How silly, then, would it have been to assure the emperor, or other enemies of Christ, that he knew several persons, 60 or 70 years old, who had been baptized in their infancy! Why, according to our author, infant baptism was then the universal practice of the Church; and hence how foolish as an apology for Christians, that several old persons had been actually baptized in their infancy! Justin Martyr offers no such ridiculous plea. As his words were intended to vindicate the Christian religion, so he

insisted that persons, then in their old age who had become Christians in their childhood, '*do continue uncorrupted* [or virgins].' Thus did he plead for the divine power and efficacy of the Christian religion, which, in an age of all but universal corruption, had preserved the purity of its genuine disciples from childhood to old age. . . . Not one word about baptism. In the third and last place, if Justin had found it necessary to allude to the fact, that a few persons had been baptized in their infancy, how would this have proved the universal practice of infant baptism among Christians? Would it not, on the contrary, have shown how very limited the practice was, since a few instances required to be signalized? —*Southern Review*, Vol. XIV., April, 1874, pp. 336-338.

BLUNT.—Bingham endeavors to prove that infant baptism must have prevailed during the age of the Apostles, and has thus an Apostolic or Divine sanction. Suicer, on the contrary, asserts that, during the first two centuries, adults only were baptized. Now, let us examine the arguments, and patristic evidence, alleged by Bingham. He admits that there is no direct evidence to be found of infant baptism in the writings of the Apostolical Fathers, St. Clement and St. Hermas. He then asserts of Justin Martyr that he "very plainly speaks of infant baptism as used from the time of the Apostles." He quotes St. Justin, who says [1. *Apol.* sec. 15] "there are many men and women of sixty and seventy years of age who were disciplined (*ematheteuthesan*) to Christ from their youth" (*apo paidon*). Bingham argues that, "as St. Justin wrote his *Apology* A. D. 150, those whom he speaks of as baptized in their infancy must have been persons baptized in the first age, when some of the Apostles were living." But, unfortunately for

this argument, St. Justin does not speak of any one being baptized *in infancy*, but of boys or youths [paides] being baptized, whose baptism would be the same as that of adults.—*Dict. of Doct. and Hist. Theology*, Art. *Inf. Bap.*, p. 344.

HAGENBACH.—*Justin M. Apol.* i. 15, speaks of *matheteuesthai ek paidon*, but this does not necessarily involve baptism; comp. *Semis* ii. S. 431 ff. Nor does the earliest definite passage in the writings of the Fathers, *Iren. Adv. Haer.* ii. 22,4, p. 147, afford any absolute proof. It only expresses the beautiful idea that Jesus was Redeemer *in every stage of life*, and *for every stage of life*; but it does not say that He redeemed children by the *water of baptism*, unless baptism is interpreted into the term *renasci*.—*History of Christian Doctrines*, Vol. I., pp. 281, 282.

KNAPP.—Some have endeavored to find evidence for this practice even in the writings of Justin the Martyr and Irenæus; but they are not sufficiently decisive on this point.—*Christian Theology*, p. 435.

SEMISCH.—Whenever Justin refers to baptism, *adults* appear as the objects to whom the sacred rite is administered. Of an *infant-baptism* he knows nothing. The traces of it which some persons believe they have detected in his writings, are groundless fallacies, artificially produced.—*Life of Justin Martyr*, Vol. II., p. 334.

IV. ORIGEN.

ORIGEN.—For this also it was, that the church had from the apostles a tradition to give baptism even to infants. For they, to whom the divine mysteries were

committed, knew that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be done away by water and the Spirit: by reason of which the body itself is also called the body of sin.—*Com. in Epist. ad Rom.*, Lib. V., Chap. IX.

BUNSEN.—A passage in our Alexandrian Church-Book gives the true explanation of the assertion of Origen, himself an Alexandrian, that the baptism of children was an Apostolical tradition, and it removes the origin of infant baptism from Tertullian and Hippolytus to the end of our present period, Cyprian being the first Father who, impelled by a fanatical enthusiasm and assisted by a bad interpretation of the Old Testament, established it as a principle.—*Christianity and Mankind*, Vol. II., p. 113.

BLEDSE.—After noticing the importance of Origen's testimony, Dr. Knapp adds, that 'here it might be objected, that the Church Fathers appeal much too freely to apostolic tradition, for the sake of giving to their own opinions and to the appointments of the Church the more authority.' (Vol. II., p. 537.) 'Augustine,' says Dr. Knapp, on the same page, 'calls infant baptism *apostolica traditio*; and we should, unquestionably, attach much importance to this testimony, if he had not also called infant communion *apostolica traditio*. We know he was mistaken in this case. Why not then in the other? The truth is, that when the Fathers were called upon to defend any custom of the Church, they seldom, if ever, failed to plead an apostolical tradition in its favor. As Dr. Knapp says, they made this appeal 'much too freely.' Having inferred, from the prevalence of custom, that it originated in an apostolical tradition,

they did not hesitate to assert this inference as a fact.— *Southern Review*, Vol. XIV., April, 1874, p. 344.

KENNEDY.—Although the practice of baptizing infants is referred by Origen to apostolical tradition, and is shown by certain testimony to have existed from an early period, yet the Church of the first four centuries appears not to have ranked the Baptism of Infants as of equal importance with that of Adults; seeing that its blessings are nowhere described in the same glowing language; that Tertullian, in the beginning of the third century, while he magnifies highly the gifts of Baptism, does not hesitate to argue against that of Infants; and the Fathers of the fourth century, while they remonstrate earnestly and frequently with Adults against the prevalent custom of delaying their Baptism, does not appear, in general, to have warned Parents of peril incurred by deferring the Baptism of their Infants.—*Occasional Sermons*, p. 228.

NEANDER.—Origen, in whose system infant baptism could readily find its place, though not in the same connection as in the system of the North African Church, declares it to be an apostolical tradition, an expression, by the way, which cannot be regarded as of much weight in this age, when the inclination was so strong to trace every institution which was considered of special importance to the apostles; and when so many walls of separation, hindering the freedom of prospect, had already been set up between this and the apostolic age.— *Church History*, Vol. L, p. 428.

V. TERTULLIAN.

TERTULLIAN.—And so, according to the circumstances

and disposition, and even age, of each individual, the delay of baptism is preferable; principally, however, in the case of little children. For why is it necessary—if (baptism itself) is not so necessary—that the sponsors likewise should be thrust into danger? Who both themselves, by reason of mortality, may fail to fulfil their promises, and may be disappointed by the development of an evil disposition, *in those for whom they stood?* The Lord does indeed say, "Forbid them not to come unto me." Let them "come," then, while they are growing up; let them "come" while they are learning, while they are learning whither to come; let them become Christians when they have become able to know Christ. Why does the innocent period of life hasten to the "remission of sins?" More caution will be exercised in worldly matters: so that one who is *not* trusted with earthly substance is trusted with divine! Let them know how to "ask" for salvation, that you may seem (at least) to have given "to him that asketh." For no less cause must the unwedded also be deferred—in whom *the ground of* temptation is prepared, alike in such as *never were* wedded by means of their maturity, and in the *widowed* by means of their freedom—until they either marry, or else be more fully strengthened for continence. If any understand the weighty import of baptism, they will fear its reception more than its delay: sound faith is secure of salvation.—*On Baptism*, Chap. XVIII., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. III., p. 678.

BEET.—The earliest definite mention of the Baptism of Infants is at the close of the second century by Tertullian at Carthage.—*Christian Baptism*, p. 30.

BLED SOE.—Tertullian is the first writer in the Church

who makes any express mention of the custom of infant baptism. Before his time, A. D. 200, there is not an allusion to the custom from which its existence may be fairly inferred. It is frequently argued, that the practice of infant baptism must have been an apostolic institution, because it prevailed, and became universal, without the least opposition from any source whatever. But, however strange it may seem, the fact is, that the first Father, or writer, by whom the practice is noticed, condemns it as having no foundation either in reason or revelation.—*Southern Review*, Vol. XIV., April, 1874, p. 339.

CUNNINGHAM.—Infant baptism is never heard of during the first hundred and fifty years of the Church's history. Tertullian mentions it, but he mentions it as a custom that was just coming into vogue in his day, and he remonstrates against it. He even thought the young people should not be baptized till they were married, lest they should misbehave and discredit their spiritual birth. But, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Tertullian, infant baptism came slowly into use. ... So adult baptism continued to be the rule, and infant baptism the exception, for at least two centuries more. Even in the fourth century Gregory Nazianzen, Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine, though they had Christian mothers, were not baptized till they were grown up to manhood.—*The Growth of the Church*, pp. 184, 185, 186.

NEANDER.—But immediately after Irenæus, in the last years of the second century, Tertullian appears as a zealous opponent of infant baptism; a proof that the practice had not as yet come to be regarded as an apostolical institution; for otherwise he would hardly have

ventured to express himself so strongly against it. We perceive from his argument against infant baptism, that its advocates already appealed to Matthew xix. 14, a passage which it would be natural for every one to apply in this manner. "Our Lord rebuked not the little children, but commanded them to be brought to him that he might bless them." Tertullian advises, that in consideration of the great importance of the transaction, and of the preparation necessary to be made for it on the part of the recipients, baptism as a general thing, should rather be delayed than prematurely applied, and he takes this occasion to declare himself particularly opposed to haste in the baptism of children. In answer to the objection drawn from those words of Christ, he replies : "Let them come while they are growing up; let them come while they are learning, while they are being taught to what it is they are coming; let them become Christians when they are susceptible of the knowledge of Christ. What haste, to procure the forgiveness of sins for the age of innocence! We show more prudence in the management of our worldly concerns, than we do in entrusting the divine treasure to those who cannot be entrusted with worldly property. Let them first learn to feel their need of salvation; so it may appear that we have given to those that wanted." Tertullian evidently means, that children should be led to Christ by instructing them in Christianity; but they should not receive baptism, until, after having been sufficiently instructed, they are led from personal conviction and by their own free choice, to seek for it with sincere longing of the heart. It may be said, indeed, that he is only speaking of the course to be followed according to the general rule; whenever there was momentary danger of death, baptism might be adminis-

tered, even according to his views. But if he had considered this to be necessary, he could not have failed to mention it expressly. It seems, in fact, according to the principles laid down by him, that he could not conceive of *any efficacy whatever* residing in baptism, without the conscious participation and individual faith of the person baptized; nor could he see any danger accruing to the age of innocence from delaying it; although this view of the matter was not logically consistent with *his own* system.—*Church History*, Vol. I., pp. 425, 426.

CHAPTER XI.

TESTIMONY OF HISTORIANS.

CUNNINGHAM, WILLIAM.—When the subject of the sacraments in general,—that is, of their general nature, design, and efficacy,—is under consideration, it is usually assumed that the persons who partake of them are possessed of the necessary preliminary qualifications; and, more particularly, that when statements are made upon this subject which are applied equally to baptism and the Lord's Supper, or when the general object and design of baptism and the Lord's Supper are set forth in the abstract, it is adult participation only which theologians have ordinarily in view,—the participation of those who, after they have grown up to years of understanding, desire to hold communion with the visible Church of Christ. It is in this aspect that baptism, as well as the Lord's Supper, is usually referred to, and presented to us, in the New Testament; and it is from the case of adult participation that we ought to form our general views and impressions of the meaning and design of these ordinances. It tends greatly to introduce obscurity and confusion into our whole conceptions upon the subject of baptism, that we see it ordinarily administered to infants, and very seldom to adults. This leads us insensibly to form very defective and erroneous conceptions of its design and effect, or rather to live with our minds very much in the state of blanks, so far as concerns any distinct and definite views upon the sub-

ject. There is a difficulty felt,—a difficulty which Scripture does not afford us materials for altogether removing, —in laying down any very distinct and definite doctrine as to the precise bearing and efficacy of baptism in the case of infants, to whom alone ordinarily we see it administered. And hence it becomes practically, as well as theoretically, important to remember, that we ought to form our primary and fundamental conceptions of baptism from the baptism of adults, in which it must be, *in every instance*, according to the general doctrine of Protestants, *either the* sign and seal of a faith and regeneration *previously existing*,—already effected by God's grace,—or else a hypocritical profession of a state of mind and feeling which has no existence. This is the original and fundamental idea of the ordinance of baptism, as it is usually represented to us in Scripture. And when we contemplate it in this light, there is no more difficulty in forming a distinct and definite conception regarding it than regarding the Lord's Supper.—*Historical Theology*, Vol. II., pp. 125, 126.

CAVE, WILLIAM.—And this I say, without in the least retracting my former concession, that the texts appealed to, as commanding or authorizing Infant Baptism, are all without exception made to bear a sense neither contained nor deducible: and likewise that (historically considered) there exists no sufficient *positive* evidence, that Baptism of infants was instituted by the apostles in the practice of the Apostolic age.—*Primitive Christianity*, p. 246.

FISHER.—The baptism of infants is neither explicitly required nor forbidden in the New Testament. Whether this early practice can be traced as far back as the

Apostles themselves, is a point on which the evidence is not so decisive as to produce a settled opinion among scholars.—*Hist. of the Ch. Ch.*, p. 41.

GUERICKE.—That this rite was actually practiced by the Apostles themselves is not, indeed, capable of a strict and absolute demonstration from New Testament data.—*Church History*, § 39, p. 140.

HAGENBACH.—The passages from Scripture cited in favor of infant baptism as a usage of the primitive Church are doubtful, and prove nothing: viz. Mark x. 14; Matt. xviii. 4, 6; Acts ii. 38, 39, 41; x. 48; 1 Cor. i. 16; Col. ii. 11, 12.—*History of Christian Doctrines*, Vol. I., p. 281.

MOSHEIM.—In the earliest times of the church, all who professed firmly to believe that Jesus was the only Redeemer of the world, and who in consequence of this profession, promised to live in a manner conformable to the purity of his holy religion, were immediately received among the disciples of Christ. This was all the preparation for baptism then required; and a more accurate instruction in the doctrines of Christianity was to be administered to them after their reception of that sacrament. But, when Christianity had acquired more consistence, and churches rose to the true God and his eternal Son, almost in every nation, this custom was changed for the wisest and most solid reasons. Then baptism was administered to none but such as had been previously instructed in the principal points of Christianity, and had also given satisfactory proofs of pious dispositions, and upright intentions.—*Eccl. Hist.*, Cent. I., Part II., Chap. III., § 5, p. 25.

NEANDER.—Baptism was administered at first only to adults, as men were accustomed to conceive baptism and faith as strictly connected. We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution, and the recognition of it which followed somewhat later, as an apostolical tradition, serves to confirm this hypothesis.—*Church History*, Vol. I., p. 424.

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.—History confirms the inference drawn from the sacred volume. Infant baptism cannot be clearly traced higher than the middle of the second century; and even then it was not universal. Some, indeed, have agreed that in the silence of Scripture it is fair to presume that a custom whose existence is seen in the second century must have descended from the Apostles; but the presumption is wholly the other way. Baptism appears in the New Testament avowedly as the rite whereby *converts* were incorporated into the Christian society: the burden of proof is entirely on those who affirm its applicability to those whose minds are incapable of any conscious act of faith.—*Volume XVII.*, p. 389.

SCHAFF.—The apostolic origin of *infant* baptism is denied not only by the Baptists, but also by many pædo-baptist divines.—*History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I., p. 469.

CHAPTER XII.

ORIGIN OF INFANT BAPTISM.

JACOB.—The belief that baptism was absolutely necessary for *all*, and that it conferred spiritual life by the inherent virtue of its material elements, and by the administration of a priest, led the Church to the conclusion, that infant baptism was not merely justifiable, but *altogether necessary*; and also that its force and efficacy were *exactly the same* in the unconscious infant as in the believing man. This was nothing more than a simple and logical consequence of such an idea of this sacrament, and the infant having been placed on the same standing ground as the adult, it was then unfortunately thought requisite to use, as far as possible, the same formula for both; and thus, as the adult by his own mouth professed the faith which he had,—the infant was by the mouth of another to profess the faith which he had not.—*Ecclesiastical Polity of the N. Test.*, pp. 273, 274.

JACOBI.—Many circumstances conspired early to introduce the practice of infant-baptizing. The confusion between the outward and inward conditions of baptism, and the magical effect that was imputed to it; confusion of thought about the visible and invisible church, condemning all those who did not belong to the former; the doctrine of the natural corruption of man so closely connected with the preceding; and finally, the desire of distinguishing Christian children from the Jewish and

Heathen, and of commending them more effectually to the care of the Christian community—all these circumstances and many more have contributed to the introduction of infant baptism at a very early period.—*Art. Sap.*, in *Kitto's Cyclo. of Bibl. Lit.*, Vol. I., pp. 287, 288.

KENRICK.—The necessity of baptism for salvation being established, the admissibility of infants to this divine rite naturally follows. All of us are by nature children of wrath, being stained by sin: baptism is the laver wherein sin is washed away: it must, then, be applicable to the infant, unless it be maintained that the blood of the New Testament was not shed for the remission of the hereditary sin. The child of earth needs a heavenly birth: he must be born anew to God of water and the Holy Ghost; for the sentence is most express: "unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."—*Treatise on Baptism*, p. 125.

NEANDER.—But when now, on the one hand, the doctrine of the corruption and guilt, cleaving to human nature in consequence of the first transgression was reduced to a more precise and systematic form, and on the other, from the want of duly distinguishing between what is outward and what is inward in baptism, (the baptism by water and the baptism by the Spirit,) the error became more firmly established that without external baptism no one could be delivered from that inherent guilt, could not be saved from the everlasting punishment that threatened him, or raised to eternal life; and when the notion of a magical influence, a charm connected with the sacraments continually gained ground, the theory was finally evolved of the *uncondi-*

tional necessity of infant baptism.—Church History, Vol. I., pp. 426, 427.

WESLEY.—But the grand question is, Who are the proper subjects of baptism? grown persons only, or infants also? In order to answer this fully, I shall, First, lay down the grounds of infant baptism, taken from Scripture, reason, and primitive universal practice; and Secondly, answer the objections against it.

As to the grounds of it: If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism; seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved, unless this be washed away by baptism. It has been already proved, that this original stain cleaves to every child of man; and thereby they are children of wrath, and liable to eternal damnation. It is true, the Second Adam has found a remedy for the disease which came upon all by the offence of the first. But the benefit of this is to be received through the means which he hath appointed; through baptism in particular, is the ordinary means he hath appointed for that purpose; and to which he hath tied us, though he may not have tied himself.—*Treatise on Baptism, in Doctrinal Tracts, p. 251.*

PART THIRD.

THE DESIGN OF BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

JOHN'S BAPTISM FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS.

ARMITAGE.—He made their immersion in water the exterior method of 'confessing' the reality of an honest, heart-felt reform. Here, then, he required a spiritual revolution, a baptism for the 'remission' or forgiveness of sins, and the implanting of a new principle of life in keeping with the kingdom of heaven at hand.—*Hist. of the Baptists*, p. 22.

BICKERSTETH.—They who were baptized with his baptism confessed their sins, and thus made the first step towards the forgiving mercy which was to be found in Christ, and the seal of his forgiveness they were to look for in his baptism, which is a baptism for the remission of sine to all true penitents and faithful believers. Christ's baptism was therefore, the perfection and consummation of the baptism of John.—*Expos. of Mark's Gospel*, i. 4.

BLISS.—*Baptism of repentance for the (unto) remission of sins*. This might be paraphrased: "Proclaiming the duty of all people to repent, and on the ground of this repentance to be baptized, and all with a view to the forgiveness of their sins. . . . *For remission of sins, i. e., unto*, in order to, with a view to obtaining remission, (305)

or "release from," "forgiveness." The baptism of repentance thus grammatically looked forward to the *forgiveness*, and was not based upon it. If the pledge given in baptism was truly kept, forgiveness would follow at the coming of the Messiah, when this change of mind would have prepared the subject of it for faith in Christ. —*Com. on Luke*, iii. 3, pp. 60, 62.

BURKITT.— *The baptism of repentance for the remission of sins*: that is, the doctrine of baptism, which sealeth remission of sins to the party baptized.—*Notes on the New Testament*, on Luke iii. 3.

CLARKE, W. N.—It was *for the remission of sins*—*i. e.*, the obtaining of forgiveness for a sinful life was the end to which the submission to baptism was one of the means. Not that pardon was promised or expected upon submission to baptism, in itself regarded; but this act, in which repentance was confessed and reformation of life was promised, was evidently a suitable act for one who wished to forsake his sins and be forgiven. If a man honestly sought full remission, it was only right that he should perform this act: so Peter said on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii. 38); and so it could fitly be called a baptism for, or with reference to, the remission of sins.—*Com. on Mark*, i. 4, p. 16.

EWALD.—This instrument and this sign was found by him in Baptism after sincere confession of sins: every member of the people who would look on himself as meet for the speedy coming of the Messiah and his salvation, must with all sincerity confess his sins before him who called him to repentance, and promise a new and better life; then, at the hand of him, whose it was

to make this sacred promise in God's stead, immersed in the depths of the water, rise purified from the stain of his deeply repented sins to the new life which had already been explained to him in its meaning and its duties; and then, at the conclusion of that which was the very instrument and token of his cleansing, receive the divine promise of forgiveness of sins and fresh grace. The immersion in the depths of the flowing water under the Baptist's hand became thus the strongest visible and sensible token of the life-cleansing and spiritual regeneration of this race, and served, as it were, for a pledge that every one thus born again was worthy of the coming salvation of the Messiah, so long as he remains as pure as he had then vowed to remain.—*Life of Christ*, pp. 34, 35.

GODET.—Baptism, like every divinely instituted ceremony, contained also a grace for him who observed it with the desired disposition. As Strauss puts it: if, on the part of man, it was a declaration of the renunciation of sin, on the part of God it was a declaration of the pardon of sins.—The words *for the pardon* depend grammatically on the collective notion, *baptism of repentance*.—*Commentary on Luke*, iii. 3.

HAMMOND.—All the region about Jordan came to hear him, and he warned all the people to repent and be baptized of him, to come in as proselytes of his, that so their sins might be forgiven, which would otherwise bring certain destruction on them. — *Paraphrase*, on Luke iii. 3.

WEBSTER AND WILKINSON.—*Eis* marks the object or point towards which baptism tended; denotes also the

intention or purpose, the final aim. . . . John's baptism, as well as Christian baptism, tended to the remission of sins.—*Greek Testament*, Note on Luke iii. 3.

WILLMARTH.—The first mention of Baptism is in connection with the mission of John, the forerunner of Christ. He came *preaching the baptism of repentance unto [eis] i. e.*, in order to, *remission of sins*. This his father, Zachariah, had predicted, explaining how he "should go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways, in order to give knowledge of salvation to his people, in remission of their sins." "Confessing their sins" and being baptized, sincere penitents were sure of Remission. That Baptism, as commanded and administered by John, was not an emblem of Remission previously granted, but (with Repentance) a condition of Remission promised, is clear, not only from the use of *eis*, but from John's own words to certain hypocrites, Pharisees and Sadducees: "Who hath warned you to flee from the coming wrath?" and also from our Lord's words, "But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God concerning themselves, not being baptized by him." And in refusing Baptism they refused everything.—*Baptism and Remission*, in *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1877, p. 308.

CHAPTER II.

BAPTIZED INTO THE NAME, ETC. (MATT, XXVIII. 19, 20).

BROWNE.—The command which He gave to His Apostles was to 'make disciples of all nations by baptizing them' (Matt. xxviii. 19): that is to say, persons from all nations, who believed the Gospel, were to be admitted into the number of the disciples, the Church of Christ, by the Sacrament of baptism. We know, that the Apostles acted on this command; ever receiving by the rite of baptism all who had been converted to the truth. (See Acts ii. 38, 41; viii. 12, 13, 36-38; ix. 18; x. 47, 48; xvi. 14, 15, 33; xix. 3, 5; Rom. vi. 3, 4; Gal. iii. 27; Col. ii. 11, 12; 1 Pet. iii. 20, 21, Ac.) Nay! our Lord himself declared, 'Except a man be born of *water* and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God' (John iii. 5). Whence it is quite clear, that a Christian Church must administer baptism according to our Lord's command and the example of the Apostles, for otherwise its members could not be 'born of water.' —*Exp. of the XXXIX. Art.*, p. 465.

HILL.—Baptizing them into the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, while it certainly implies a profession of faith in them, also exhibits these three persons under certain characters, and in certain relations, which give an assurance of the communication of blessings to those who are thus baptized. Agreeably to this exhibition made in the form of baptism, are such ex-

pressions as these, "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved:" "baptism saves us:" "be baptized for the remission of sins:" expressions which could not have been used unless there was an intimate connection between this rite and the two characteristic blessings of the Gospel, viz. forgiveness of sins, and the communication of inward grace.—*Lectures in Divinity*, Vol. III., pp. 306, 307.

KNAPP.—They were to be baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—i. e. by baptism they were to be obligated to accept and obey the doctrine which acknowledges and receives Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Whoever, therefore, is baptized, declares by this rite that he acknowledges Father, Son, and Spirit for his God, that he will obey his laws, and that he expects protection and blessing from him; and God on the other hand, promises and grants to him the enjoyment of all the benefits which the gospel of Christ enjoins upon us to expect from the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.—*Christian Theology*, p. 426.

SCOTT, THOMAS.—To be baptized into the name of any one, implies in the person to be baptized a professed dependence on him, and devoted subjection to him : to be baptized therefore "into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," implies a professed dependence on these three divine Persons, jointly and equally, and a devoting of ourselves to them as worshippers and servants. This is proper and obvious, upon the supposition of the mysterious unity of three Co-equal Persons in the unity of the Godhead; but not to be accounted for upon any other principles. Christianity is the religion of a sinner, who relies for salvation from

wrath, and sin, and all evil, on the mercy of the Father, through the Person, righteousness, atonement, and mediation of the incarnate Son, and by the sanctification of the Holy Spirit; and who in consequence gives up himself to be the worshipper and servant of the triune JEHOVAH, in all his ordinances and commandments. . . . When an adult is baptized, he avows his acceptance of this salvation, and makes this surrender of himself to the service of God his Savior.—*Commentary*, on Matt. xxviii. 19.

STIFFLER.—*'Baptizing them.'* There is absolutely no question as to what the 'baptizing' was. He who declares that it was anything else than immersion, thereby declares his own ignorance. The scholarship of every denomination has *settled* this question. It is not disciple them by immersing them; but disciple them and *at the same time* immerse them. The immersion *expressed and declared the discipleship. Baptism is the expression and embodiment of faith in Christ.* Hence infants must not be baptized (see Gal. iii. 27). For baptism is an assertion and expression of the heart's belief.

'In (into) the name of the Father,' etc. The *in* should certainly be *'into.'* Believers are not to be immersed *by the authority* of the three divine persons, but into fellowship with them. *Baptism rightly administered unites with Christ.* (Gal. iii. 27). The soldier in the act of donning his uniform, declares his allegiance and fellowship. He comes 'into' something. And so baptism brings men 'into' all that the divine names imply.—*The Baptist Teacher*, June 27, 1888.

STORK AND FLATT.—When Christ commands his disciples to administer the ordinance of baptism in honor of

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, he thereby declares Father, Son, and Holy Spirit to be the God of those who are baptized. This declaration amounts to (1) a solemn promise of the divine protection and favor; and as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are to be considered the God of the baptized, it includes a promise of those specific blessings which, according to the doctrines of Christ, are to be expected from Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. In short, by virtue of the union with Christ (2) into which we enter by baptism, we are assured not only of an interest in the death of Christ, and of the remission of sins (3) which result from it, but also of our union with God the Father as our Father (4), and our consequent title to eternal life (5), as well as our union with the Holy Spirit and the participation of his gracious influences (6). In short, all the blessings which have a reference to salvation, and for which we are indebted to Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are promised to the subjects of baptism; and, in case they do not deny themselves the enjoyment of them, are actually bestowed upon them.—*Biblical Theology*, p. 219.

WILLMARTH.—In giving the "Great Commission" to his Apostles, the risen Lord commanded: *Go ye therefore and disciple all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. . . . He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.* Here Faith and Baptism are united as conditions, to the fulfillment of which is affixed his royal promise of salvation, including, of course, Remission. The circumstances invest this declaration with peculiar solemnity. It is a part of the Fundamental Law of Christianity, ordained by the great Founder himself, in his last hours on earth. It is a part of the Prime Article in the Charter of the

Christian ministry. It is the last direction and promise to lost sinners, that fell from our Redeemer's lips ere he ascended to the right hand of God.—*Baptism and Remission*, in *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1877, p. 309.

CHAPTER III.

COMMISSION AS GIVEN BY MARK (XVI. 16).

BARNES.—It is worthy of remark that Jesus has made *baptism* of so much importance. He did not say, indeed, that a man *could not* be saved without baptism, but he has strongly implied that where this is neglected *knowing it to be a command of the Savior*, it endangers the salvation of the soul. *Faith and baptism* are the beginnings of a Christian life: the one the beginning of piety *in the soul*, the other of its manifestation *before men*, or of *& profession* of religion. Every man endangers his eternal interest by being ashamed of Christ before men. See Mar. viii. 38.—*Notes*, on Mark xvi. 16.

BARROW.—*He that shall believe and shall be baptized, shall be saved*, is our Saviour's own word and promise: *shall be saved*; that is, shall be put into a state and way of salvation; continuing in which state, proceeding in which way, he assuredly *shall be saved*, — *Theological Works*, Vol. VI., p. 552.

BEET.—With these words of Christ, [Matt. xxviii. 19, 20] those recorded in Mark xvi. 16 agree so completely that it is almost needless to inquire whether they originally formed a part of the Second Gospel. By solemnly ordaining Baptism our Lord made it obligatory on all who seek His favour; and thus made it a condition of salvation. For we cannot enjoy His smile while we refuse to obey His express command. We therefore do

not wonder to find that in this passage salvation is promised only to those who both believe the Gospel and confess their faith by receiving Baptism : *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*. The absolute rigour of the second condition is somewhat softened by its absence from the latter clause: *he that disbelieveth shall be condemned*. In view of this command, thousands in all ages and countries, seeking salvation, have received the sacred rite at great cost and great peril. They have dared thus to confess Christ in joyful confidence that He will confess them before His Father in heaven.—*Christian Baptism*, pp. 14,15.

BENSON.—*He that believeth*—The gospel which you preach, "with his heart unto righteousness;" he that receives your testimony with a faith productive of love to God and man, of obedience to the divine will; and who, in token of that faith, *is baptized*, and continues till death to maintain a temper and conduct suitable to that engagement. *Shall be saved*—That is, he shall, by virtue of that faith and baptism, be put into a state of salvation; he shall be saved from the guilt and power of his sins, into the image and favor of God.—*Com. on the Bible*, on Mark xvi. 16.

BICKERSTETH.—These words are very important. The first clause opposes the notion that faith alone is sufficient for salvation, without those works which are the fruit of faith. *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*; that is, he that believeth, and as evidence of his faith accepts Christ's baptism, and fulfills the promise and vows which he then took upon himself, working out his own salvation with fear and trembling shall be saved.—*Exp. of Mark's Gospel*, xvi. 16.

BURTON.—*Sothesetai, will be put in the way of salvation:* he will be released from all his former sins, and at the moment of his baptism will be in a state of salvation, and reconciled with God.—*Greek Testament*, Note on Mark xvi. 16.

BURKITT.—*He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved;* that is, he that receiveth and embraceth the gospel preached by you, and thereupon becomes a proselyte and disciple of Christ, and receives baptism, the seal of the new covenant, shall for all former sins receive pardon, and upon his perseverance obtain eternal life.—*Notes on the New Test.*, on Mark xvi. 16.

CLARKE, ADAM. — *He that believeth]* He that credits this gospel as a revelation from God : *and is baptized*— takes upon him the *profession* of it, obliging himself to walk *according* to its *precepts*: *he shall be saved*—redeemed from sins here, and brought at last to the enjoyment of my eternal glory.—*Com. on Mark*, xvi. 16.

CLARKE, W. N.—*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.* Broad announcement of the purpose and result of the proclamation. It was the preaching of a Savior, and the promise was that salvation should follow for every one who accepted the glad tidings and obeyed the Savior. The first step is believing—*i. e.*, believing the message, intellectually, without the faith that trusts the soul to the Savior, is by no means the "believing" of the Scriptures. (See John v. 24; vi. 40; Acts xvi. 31.)—The second step is baptism. *He that believeth, and is baptized.* Baptism was with the apostles a first and natural result of believing, an expression of loyalty to Jesus that almost formed a part of the original

act of faith. Any thought of separating baptism from believing, whether by anticipation or by delay, would have seemed to them a perversion of its meaning. (Study especially in its connection, the exhortation of Peter on the day of Pentecost, Acts ii. 38.) It is on this principle that the expressions were made by which Christians who reject all ideas akin to baptismal regeneration have sometimes been perplexed. Baptism was regarded as almost a part of the receiving of Christ, so closely was it connected with the beginning of the new life in him. This promise is, substantially, "believe and confess—accept Christ inwardly in the heart, and outwardly before the world—and thou shalt be saved" well represents the thought of the Apostolic age on the subject.—*Com. on Mark*, xvi. 16, pp. 256, 257.

MEYER.—*He who shall have become believing, and have been baptized, shall attain the Messianic salvation* (on the establishment of the kingdom). The necessity of baptism —of baptism, namely, regarded as a necessary *divinely ordained consequent* of the having become believing, without, however (as Calvin has observed), being regarded as *dimidia salutis causa* "half the ground of salvation" —is here (comp. John iii. 5) expressed for all *new converts*, but not for the *children of Christians* (see on 1 Cor. vii. 14).—*o de apistesas*"] That in the case of such *baptism* had not occurred, is obvious of itself; refusal of faith necessarily excluded baptism, since such persons despised the salvation offered in the preaching of faith. In the case of a baptism *without* faith, *causa salutis* "ground of salvation," would be wanting.—*Com. on Mark*, xvi. 16, p. 204.

MOBERLY.—"He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."

This saying, regarded in connection with the words that precede it in St. Mark's Gospel, seems in the first place to point out who are the fit subjects for Holy Baptism. Sent out into all the world to make disciples of all nations, by what rule were the Apostles to proceed in admitting persons to the great Name with which they were entrusted? What was to be the qualification for baptism? what the attainment which should fit persons to be taken out of heathenism, out of the power of Satan, and admitted into the kingdom of God, the mysterious and saving Name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost? These words supply the true answer to such a question. "He that believeth" may be baptized. "If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest," were the express words of the deacon Philip to the Ethiopian eunuch. "He that believeth," but what? What is the truth, the message, the doctrine to be believed by the Apostles, and believed in all the world? No doubt, as has been fully explained in the last discourse, the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. So in effect, and almost in words, the eunuch confessed; so Timothy doubtless professed his good profession before many witnesses; so Christians have made profession at the holy font of baptism in every age of the Church's history.—*The Great Forty Days*, pp. 234, 235.

NORRIS.—*And is baptized.* This is illustrated in the cases of Saul and Cornelius, in both of which baptism is spoken of as necessary for those who had already *believed*, in order to put them in a state of salvation.—*Notes on New Test.*, on Mark xvi. 16.

VALPY.—The fulfillment of both conditions in every

individual is insisted on. *Sothesetai, shall be saved*, i. e. he shall, by virtue of that faith and baptism, be put into a state of salvation. The word *saved* does not signify the final and complete salvation which we shall enjoy in heaven, but only our being placed in that way and state, in which, *if we continue grounded and settled in the faith, and be not moved from the hope of the gospel*, Col. i. 23, but *patiently continue in well-doing*, Rom. ii. 7, we shall undoubtedly be saved.—*Novum Test.*, Note on Mark xvi. 16, Vol. I, p. 288.

WHITBY.—He shall be saved, i. e. he shall by virtue of that faith and baptism be put into a state of salvation. —*Com. on New Test.*, on Mark xvi. 16.

WILLMARTH.—Suppose we force *eis* in Acts ii. 38 to bear the unnatural and unauthorized meaning of "on account of." After all we have gained nothing. Other passages there are which cannot be explained away. Thus our Saviour said, just before he ascended the heavens : *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*. We shall hardly dare to tamper with his royal word and make it run, *He that believeth and is saved shall be baptized*. And unless we do thus change his saying, we have by the highest authority, an importance attributed to Baptism certainly not less than that given to it in Acts ii. 38, translated according to its obvious meaning. What then is the advantage of violently torturing *eis*, the construction and the context?—*Baptism and Remission*, in *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1877, p. 306.

CHAPTER IV.

BORN OF WATER (JOHN III. 5).

ALFORD.—There can be no doubt, on any honest interpretation of the words, that *gennethenai ek hudatos* refers to the token or outward sign of baptism,—*gennethenai ek pneumatatos* to the thing signified, or inward grace of the Holy Spirit. All attempts to get rid of *these two plain facts* have sprung from doctrinal prejudices, by which the views of expositors have been warped.—*Greek Test.*, Note on John iii. 5, Vol. I., p. 714.

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS.—He that out of contempt, will not be baptized, shall be condemned as an unbeliever, and shall be reproached as ungrateful and foolish. For the Lord says: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he shall by no means enter into the kingdom of heaven." And again: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."—*B. VI.*, § 3, Chap. XV., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VII., pp. 456, 457.

BARNES.—*Be born of water.* By *water*, here, is evidently signified *baptism*. Thus the word is used in Eph. v. 26; Tit. iii. 5.—*Notes*, on John iii. 5.

BARROW.—Our Saviour instructed Nicodemus, that no *man can enter into the kingdom of God* (that is, become a Christian, or subject of God's spiritual kingdom) *without*

being regenerated by water, and the Spirit, that is, without baptism, and the spiritual grace attending it.—*Theological Works*, Vol. IV., p. 165.

BEET.—These last words are from the lips of Christ speaking to Nicodemus, as recorded in John iii. 5. And they are easily explained. This member of the Sanhedrim, a Pharisee, and apparently (see verse 4) an old man, shrank from the public confession involved in the water of Baptism. But in these words the *teacher sent from God* reminds him that the New Birth wrought by the Spirit, without which none can see the Kingdom of God, is only for those who confess Christ in His appointed way, that even for Nicodemus there was no way into the Kingdom except through the gate of Baptism. The *water* is mentioned first as that which presented to Nicodemus the chief obstacle to salvation. It is mentioned only once, while the *Spirit* occurs in verses 5-8 three times, because He is the active Personal Agent, whereas Baptism is only a condition of the New Birth.—*Christian Baptism*, p. 17.

BENSON.—*Of water*—that is, baptized.—*Com. on the Bible*, on John iii. 5.

BLOOMFIELD.—As the mere natural, or animal, life depends upon flesh and blood, so does the *spiritual* life depend upon the baptism by water and the Spirit.—*Greek Test.*, Note on John iii. 5, Vol. I. p. 539.

BLUNT.—A few weeks before, John the Baptist had spoken of Christ as One Who should baptize, not with water alone, as he had done, but with the Holy Ghost; and these words of our Lord carry on the revelation, de-

claring that "water and the Spirit" are to originate a new life, the spiritual life of the kingdom of God. As the Holy Spirit moved upon the face of the waters and brought life to an inanimate world, so the Holy Spirit by means of water endows the natural man with spiritual life.—*Annotated Bible*, Annot. on John iii. 5.

BOYS.—Some few modern Divines have conceited, that these words are not to be construed of external baptism, because, say they, *Christ taketh water here by a borrowed speech for the Spirit of God, the effect whereof it shadoweth out; and so water, and the spirit are all one.* To this interpretation answer is made; first, that it is an old rule in expounding of holy Scripture, that where a literal sense will stand, the farthest from the letter is commonly the worst; and there is nothing more dangerous in a Christian University, than this licentious and deluding art, changing the meaning of words, as Alchymy doth or would do the substance of metals; everting the truth is perverting the text. . . . Thirdly, that *Origen, Chrysostom, Augustine, Cyril, Beda, Theophylact, Euthymius*, in their Commentaries upon this place; *Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Ambrose, Hierome, Basil, Gregory Nyssen*, and many more, yea most of the Fathers, *Hooker*, a man of incomparable reading, openeth his mouth wider, avowing peremptorily, that all the Ancients have construed this Text, as our Church doth, of outward Baptism.—*Exposition*, pp. 360, 361.

BROWNE.—The necessity of baptism has constantly been inferred from our Lord's declaration, 'Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God' (John iii. 5).—*Expo. of the XXXIX. Art.*, p. 672.

CLARKE, ADAM.—Baptism by water, into the Christian faith, was necessary to every Jew and Gentile that entered into the kingdom of the Messiah.—*Com. on John, iii. 5.*

CLARKE, SAMUEL.—A Man must be entirely changed from all the corrupt Opinions he has before entertained, and from whatever wicked Practices he has formerly been guilty of, and enter upon a perfectly new Course of life: That he must be baptized into the Profession of the true Religion, which God is about to reveal to Mankind.—*Paraphrase, on John iii. 5.*

COMBER.—Our Saviour himself hath said, that *except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, John iii. 5; and Mark xvi. 16. he makes baptism as well as faith necessary to salvation; whereupon the ancient Christians did constantly affirm that there could be no salvation in an ordinary way without baptism.—*Companion to the Temple, Vol. III., p. 366.*

COX, HOMERSHAM.—The phrase is used by Christ in His discourse with Nicodemus. 'Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' That Christ refers to baptism is obvious from His subsequent words, 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' Unless baptism were intended the word 'water' would be absolutely without meaning.—*The First Century of Christianity, p. 275.*

CYPRIAN.—It behooves those to be baptized who come from heresy to the Church, that so they who are pre-

pared, in the lawful, and true, and only baptism of the holy Church, by divine regeneration, for the kingdom of God, may be born of both sacraments, because it is written, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."—*Epistle LXXII.*, § 21, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V., p. 386.

CYRIL.—Now then that thou art to descend into the waters, consider not the bare element; look for its saving power by the operation of the Holy Ghost; for without the two thou canst not be made perfect. This is not my word, but the Lord Jesus Christ's, who has the power to do it; He saith, *Except a man be born again*, and he enlarges, *of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*. Neither he who is baptized with water, without the privilege of the Spirit, hath the gift entire; nor be he ever so virtuous in his deeds, shall he enter into the kingdom of heaven, except with the seal vouchsafed through water. A bold word, but it is not mine; Jesus hath uttered it.—*Catechetical Lectures*, Lect. III., Par IV., pp. 26, 27.

DALE.—Our Lord tells Nicodemus that the Divinely appointed preparation for the Kingdom of heaven was John's baptism, *which assumed the repentance of those who submitted to it*, and the remission of sins which John's baptism assured to all who truly repented.—*Manual of Congregational Principles*, p. 137.

DODS.—And when Jesus told Nicodemus that in order to enter this kingdom he must be born again, He told him just what John had been telling the whole people. John had assured them that, though the King was in

their midst, they must not suppose they were already within His kingdom by being the children of Abraham. He excommunicated the whole nation, and taught them that it was something different from natural birth that gave admission to God's kingdom. And just as they had compelled Gentiles to be baptized, and to submit to other arrangements when they wished to partake of Jewish privileges, so John compelled them to be baptized. The Gentile who wished to become a Jew had to be symbolically born again. He had to be baptized, going under the cleansing waters, washing away his old and defiled life, being buried by baptism, disappearing from men's sight as a Gentile, and rising from the water as a new man. He was thus born of water, and this time born, not a Gentile, but a Jew.—*Gospel of St. John*, iii. 5, p. 105.

DWIGHT.—" Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God. Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." These two declarations, every person will see, are exactly parallel. To be "born again," in the first of them, is precisely the same thing as to be "born of water and of the Spirit," in the last. To be "born of water," as here intended, is, in my view, to be *baptized*; and is as absolutely necessary to our lawful admission into the *visible* kingdom of God; as to be born of the *Spirit* is to our admission into his *in-visible* kingdom. That to be born of water, and of the Spirit, is the same thing with being born again, must be admitted by every one, who is willing that our Savior should speak good sense, since he obviously mentions in this whole discourse but one birth; which he introduces to Nicodemus under the phraseology of being born again. . . .

It is however to be observed here, that he who, understanding the nature and authority of this institution, refuses to be baptized, will never enter either the visible or invisible kingdom of God. As he refuses to become a member of the visible, he will certainly be shut out of the invisible kingdom. Considered with reference to the case of this nature, the passage may be justly construed in the literal manner. For he, who persists in this act of rebellion against the authority of Christ, will never belong to his kingdom.—*System of Theology*, Sermon CLVI., Vol. V., pp. 222, 223.

HALLEY.—" Jesus said, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." I have, in previous lectures, assigned my reasons for interpreting this passage, as a declaration that of the kingdom of God there are the internal grace and the external sign; the internal grace, called the birth of the Spirit; and the external sign, called the birth of water. As, beneficially, no man is in the kingdom without the birth of the Spirit, so no one is recognized of the kingdom, in its visible administration, without the birth of water. If this interpretation be correct, it will follow that only the baptized are to be recognized as belonging to the kingdom of heaven; that Nicodemus, who came to Jesus by night, and therefore, we suppose, declined the profession of baptism, was not to be acknowledged as belonging to that kingdom.—*Congregational Lectures*, Vol. XV., pp. 66, 67.

HOOKE.—To hide the general consent of antiquity agreeing in the literal interpretation, they cunningly affirm that "certain" have taken those words as meant of material water, when they know that of all the ancients

there is not one to be named that ever did otherwise either expound or allege the place than as implying external baptism. Shall that which hath always received this and no other construction be now disguised with the toy of novelty?—*Works*, Vol. II., p. 263.

HOVEY.—We may say that being "born of water" (baptized), must signify being cleansed from sins or forgiven ; while being " born of Spirit" cannot signify less than being ingenerated, if we may use the word, with a new and holy principle of life by the Spirit of God. It is not, therefore, surprising that Jesus alludes to baptism in the briefest manner, while he dwells with special emphasis upon the work of the Spirit.—*Com. on John (Appendix)*, p. 422.

IRENAEUS.—"And dipped himself," says [the Scripture], "seven times in Jordan." It was not for nothing that Naaman of old, when suffering from leprosy, was purified upon his being baptized, but [it served] as an indication to us. For as we are lepers in sin, we are made clean, by means of the sacred water and the invocation of the Lord, from our old transgressions; being spiritually regenerated as newborn babes, even as the Lord has declared: "Except a man be born again through water and the spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."—*Fragment XXXIV., Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., p. 574.

JUSTIN MARTYR.—As many as are persuaded and believe that what we teach and say is true, and undertake to be able to live accordingly, are instructed to pray and to entreat God with fasting, for the remission of their sins that are past, we praying and fasting with them.

Then they are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated. For in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then receive the washing with water. For Christ also said, "Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."—*I. Apology*, Chap. LXI., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. L, p. 183.

KNAPP.—John iii. 5, "Whoever is not born of water and of the Spirit cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven"—i. e., whoever does not take upon himself the obligation to live in an entirely altered and renewed temper of mind, which is effected through baptism by aid of the Holy Spirit, has no part in the saving blessings of Christ's spiritual kingdom, (forgiveness of sins and eternal blessedness.)—*Christian Theology*, p. 481.

LANGE.—It is only to be observed, first, that a merely negative beginning is inconceivable; and secondly, that the *Metanoia* in question is one which completes itself by entrance into a new, higher fellowship by means of the corresponding lustration. And this lustration, of course, was not yet before Nicodemus in the Christian form, but only in the form of the baptism of John. The word refers, therefore, *primarily to the baptism of John*. But to this as the *lustration of its time*. The word found its fulfillment in the *Christian baptism*, which actually asserts its character as a dividing lustration between the old world and the new.—*Com. on John*, iii. 5.

LESLIE.—*Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*. Here the water

and the Spirit are plainly distinguished, and both made necessary to salvation, the outward as well as the inward; as it is written, Rom. x. 10, *For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.* The belief of the heart is necessary unto righteousness, i. e., to make us righteous before God; but the outward confession of the mouth is likewise as necessary to our salvation; as Christ said, (Matt. x. 32,) *Whosoever shall confess me before men, &c.* We must outwardly, and before men, confess to Christ, by the due performance of his outward ordinances, without which our inward belief in him will not be sufficient to our salvation. Baptism is an outward badge of Christianity, by being the outward form appointed to admit men as members of the church of Christ, and whereby they own themselves to be such *before men*: but those who will not wear this badge, as a confession to Christ, before men, Christ will not confess them before his Father in heaven.—*Theological Works*, Vol. VII., pp. 89, 90.

LIGHTFOOT.—"*Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit.*"] He tells him, that the Jew himself cannot be admitted into the kingdom of the Messiah, unless he first strip himself of his Judaism by baptism,—and then put off his carnal, and put on a spiritual, state. That by *water* here is meant *baptism*, I make no doubt.—*Whole Works*, John iii. 5, Vol. XII., p. 256.

MACKNIGHT.—May not our Lord's words to Nicodemus, *Except a man be born again of water*, be an allusion to the history of the deluge, and a confirmation of its typical meaning? For Noah's coming forth from the water to live again on the earth, after having been full nine months in the water, might fitly be called his being

born of water. Consequently, as baptism is *the antitype*, or thing signified by the deluge, a person's coming out of the water of baptism may have been called by our Lord, his being *born again of water.*—*On the Epistles*, Vol. V., p. 483.

MEYER.—*Ek hudatos k. pneumatos*] *water*, inasmuch as the man is *baptized* therewith (1 John v. 7, 8; Eph. v. 26) for the forgiveness of sins Acts ii. 38; xxii. 16; 2 Cor. vi. 11), and *spirit*, inasmuch as the *Holy Ghost* is given to the person baptized in order to his spiritual renewal and sanctification; both *together*—the former as *causa medians*, the latter as *causa efficiens*—constitute the objective and causative *element, out of which* (comp. i. 13) the birth from above is produced (*ek*), and therefore baptism is the *loutron palingenesias* (Titus iii. 5; Comp. Tertullian *c. Marc.* i. 28). But that *Christian baptism* (ver. 22, iv. 2), and not that *of John* is to be thought of in *hudatos*, is clear from the *k. pneumatos* joined with it, and from the fact that He had already appeared as the Messiah could no longer make the baptism of His forerunner the condition, not even the preparatory condition, of His Messianic grace. . . . All explanations, moreover, must be rejected which, in order to do away with the reference to baptism, adopt the principle of *en dia duoin*, for water and Spirit are two quite separate conceptions. This is especially in answer to Calvin, who says: "of water, *which is the Spirit*," and Grotius : "*spiritus aqueus, i. e. aquæ instar emundans.*" It is further to be observed, (1) that both the words being without the article, they must be taken *generically*, so far as the water of baptism and the Holy Spirit are included in the general categories of *water* and *Spirit*; not till we reach ver. 6 is the concrete term used;—(2) that *hudatos* is put first, because

the gift of the Spirit as a rule (Acts ii. 38) *followed* upon baptism (Acts x. 47 is an exceptional case);—(3) that believing in Jesus as the Messiah is presupposed as the condition of baptism (Mark xvi. 16); (4) that the necessity of baptism in order to participation in the Messianic kingdom (a doctrine against which Calvin in particular, and other expositors of the Reformed Church contend) has certainly its basis in this passage, but with reference to the convert to Christianity, and not extending in the same way to the Children of Christians, for these by virtue of their Christian parentage are already *agioi* (see on 1 Cor. vii. 14). Attempts to explain away this necessity —*e. g.* by the comparative rendering : "*not only* by water, *but also* by the Spirit"—are meanings *imported into* the words.—*Com. on John*, iii. 5, pp. 123,124.

McLEAN.—If we consult the word of God, we shall find that this divine ordinance is intended to be a sign of *regeneration*, or that the person baptized, is *born of the Spirit*. Jesus says to Nicodemus, " Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Water here undoubtedly represents baptism, for it is distinguished from the *Spirit*; so that to be *born of water*, is to be baptized.— *Works*, Vol. I., pp. 130, 181.

MOULE.—We cannot similarly exclude (as has been done) Joh. iii. as not referring to literal Baptism in the word "water." The collocation there of that word with "Spirit" seems clearly to point to something so far not of the spiritual order; while yet the question remains, of course, *what* is the connection of the water with the new birth. Besides this passage we have our Lord's parting command to His Church to baptize in

the Triune Name (Matt. xxviii. 19; cf. Mar. xvi. 16), and many places in the Acts, recording the practice, and here and there indicating the doctrine ("for the remission of sins," ii. 38; "wash away thy sins," xxii. 16). In the Epistles eight or nine places deal with Baptism, teaching that in it we are baptized into our Lord (Gal. iii. 27), into His death, into His grave (Rom. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12); raised with Him (Col. ii. 13); clothed with Christ (Gal. iii. 27); saved, that is, saved by the answer of a good conscience in it (1 Pet. iii. 21); all knit into one body (1 Cor. xii. 13). The church is (Eph. v. 26) "sanctified and cleansed by the laver of the water, attended, or conditioned, by an utterance" (of the divine name and promise). Baptism is the "laver of new birth" (Tit. iii. 5).—*Outlines of Christ. Doct.*, pp. 236,237.

MOBERLY.—In that discourse, [with Nicodemus] the reference of which to the subject of Holy Baptism is attested by the unanimous voice of Catholic antiquity, the Lord no longer speaks only of a "forgiveness" by means of water, but unfolding more exactly the nature of the blessing about to be given, speaks of a new birth, to be given by water and Holy Ghost. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "Forgiveness of sins" is comprised within, and is a property of this sacred new birth of the Holy Ghost, for man receives remission of sins by spiritual regeneration; and water is, to the earlier prophecies, still the external instrument and means whereby this precious gift is conveyed to man.—*The Great Forty Days*, pp. 110, 111.

NICHOLSON.—"Except," saith our Savior to Nicode-

mus, "a man be born again of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," out of which the wisest Divines (in respect of God's ordinance) have collected the necessity of Baptism.—*Exposition of the Catechism*, p. 160.

NORRIS.—The New Birth which Christ required of Nicodemus was not regeneration by the Spirit only, but by *water* also : the outward visible sign as well as the inward spiritual grace. Thus Christ here anticipated the doctrine of Baptism, Just as in ch. vi. He anticipated the doctrine which underlies the Holy Communion. From verse 22 we know that Christ was at this time authorizing His disciples to baptize in *water*; the baptism in *water and Spirit* (of which Christ here spoke) could not be till He was glorified.—*Notes on New Test.*, on John iii. 5.

POPE.—It was our Lord Who first connected baptism with the new birth, *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit*; and St. Paul winds up the long strain of Christian teaching in his words to Titus concerning *the laver of regeneration*.—*Christian Theology*, Vol. III., p. 315.

SADLER.—The more carefully and reverently we consider these words of Christ, the more impossible will it be found to escape the conclusion that our Lord here alludes to some deep mystery—far deeper than any which attaches to the ordinary working of the Holy Spirit on the heart in convincing it of sin or of the need of Christ's righteousness.

This mystery, too, must be connected with the application of the element of water. The "water" here must be literal water, for no reason can be assigned

why our Lord should double the difficulty to a sincere inquirer by explaining the single metaphor, being "born again," by a double metaphor being "born of water and of the Spirit."

The "water" here alluded to can be no other than that used in the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism. If this place contained the only allusion throughout the *New Testament* to an evangelical work wrought by God in that Sacrament, then we might have hesitated about the reference to Baptism here: but when we find that in almost every other place where Baptism is mentioned, it is connected with some grace pertaining to salvation, then it is impossible to resist the conclusion that the "water" here is that which God has sanctified to the "mystical washing away of sin."

This place is only one out of twelve or more in which things pertaining to salvation are connected with the initiatory Sacrament. In three places, for instance, Baptism is connected with remission of sins (Acts ii. 38; xxii. 16; Eph. v. 26); in three others with Salvation (Mark xvi. 16; Titus iii. 5; 1 Peter iii. 21); in two with a mystical burial with Christ (Rom. vi. 1-4; Col. ii. 12).

Taking these facts into consideration, it is impossible to resist the conclusion that our Lord in these words alludes to some grace or blessing associated with, or to be expected in, Holy Baptism.—*Church Doctrine —Bible Truth*, pp. 53, 54.

SCHAFF.—In view of the facts that John baptized, that Christ Himself was baptized, that His disciples (iv. 2) baptized in His name, it seems impossible to disconnect *water* from baptism. Calvin's interpretation arose from doctrinal opposition to the R. Catholic over-valuation of the sacrament, which must be guarded against in an

other way.—*Foot Note on John iii. 5, in Lange's Commentary, Vol. III., p. 127.*

SUMMERS.—As baptism initiates a man into the visible church, it is a kind of new birth, and is so styled by our Lord: "Except a man be *born of water* and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." We enter into this world by natural birth: so by a new birth we enter into the new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness. Externally, symbolically, we are born again by water, as baptism brings us into the visible kingdom of God.— *Treatise on Baptism, p. 14.*

SUTCLIFFE.—*Born of water and of the Spirit.* That is, except a man be baptized, and, where there is opportunity, make an open profession of Christ, he cannot be saved.—*Com. on John, iii. 5.*

TERTULLIAN.—For the *law* of baptizing has been *imposed*, and the formula prescribed: "Go," *He* saith, "teach the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit." The comparison with this law of that definition, "Unless a man have been reborn of water and Spirit, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven," has tied faith to the necessity of baptism. Accordingly, all thereafter *who became* believers used to be baptized.—*On Baptism, Chap. XIII., Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. III., p. 676.*

TROLLOPE.—Our Lord's last commission to his disciples was *to make disciples in all nations, baptizing them*: the invitation on the day of Pentecost was *Repent and be baptized*, every one of you: and Christ has promised that

whosoever "*believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.*" Surely then it cannot fairly be doubted that this assurance to Nicodemus, *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, relates to that method of salvation which our Savior commanded, which the apostles applied, and to which is annexed the promise of heaven.—*Analecta Theologica*, John iii. 5, Vol. II., p. 33.

WALL.—There is not any one Christian writer of any antiquity in any language but what understands it of baptism. And if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of water, anymore than born of wood.—*Hist. of Inf. Baptism*, Vol. I., p. 92.

All the ancient Christiana (without the exception of one man) do understand that rule of our Saviour, John iii. 5. *Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be. born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God; of baptism.*

I had occasion in the First Part to bring a great many instances of their sayings: where all that mention that text, from Justin Martyr down to St. Austin, do so apply it: and many more might be brought. Neither did I ever see it otherwise applied in any ancient writer. I believe Calvin was the first that ever denied this place to mean baptism. He gives another interpretation, which he confesses to be new.—*Ibid.*, p. 443.

WEBSTER AND WILKINSON.—Jesus in explanation expands what he had before said; for the word 'again' substituting 'of water and (of) the Spirit,' and for 'see' 'enter into.' Bearing in mind that John's baptism was well known, and that Jesus himself had, by his disciples, probably begun to baptize, it is evident that the word

hudatos must refer to baptism.—*Greek Testament*, Note on John iii. 5.

WESCOTT.—*Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit (or and spirit.)*] The preposition used (*ek*) recalls the phrase "baptize—plunge—in water, in spirit" (Matt. iii. 11), so that the image suggested is that of rising, reborn out of the water and out of that spiritual element, so to speak, to which the water outwardly corresponds. —*Commentary on John*, iii. 5.

WESLEY.—*Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit* —Except he experience that great inward change by the Spirit, and be baptized (wherever baptism can be had) as the outward sign and means of it.—*Notes on New Test.*, John iii. 5.

WHITBY.—That our Lord speaks here of baptismal regeneration, the whole Christian church from the beginning hath always taught, and that with very good reason.—*Com. on New Test.*, John iii. 5.

WILLMARTH. — Christ himself, in his early Judæan ministry, "made and baptized disciples." His preaching at the outset, was of similar purport with that of John. It is natural to suppose that his Baptism (in connection with Repentance and Faith) was, like John's, in order to Remission. We are confirmed in this by our Saviour's words to Nicodemus, who came to him during that early period to learn more fully, no doubt, of the kingdom which Christ and John were preaching. Christ said to him : *Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*, i. e., Baptism and Renewal by the Spirit are the conditions of true citizen-

ship in the kingdom of God on earth. Unquestionably Remission was one of the blessings of that kingdom.— *Baptism and Remission*, in *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1877, p. 309.

WORDSWORTH. — If there are any who doubt whether Christ,—who knew *what He would do* and foresaw, not only His own Institution of the Sacrament of Baptism, but every Baptism that has ever been administered in the Church,—referred to the Holy Sacrament of *Baptism*, let them read the words of *Hooker*, V. lxi., and consider the use made of this Scripture by the Church of England in her Offices for Baptism of Infants and those of riper years. Let it not be objected that our Lord's words cannot refer to Christian Baptism, because that Sacrament was not then instituted, and because they could not then be *understood* by Nicodemus to refer to it. This objection is tantamount to a denial of our Lord's *prophetic* character and office.—*Greek Test.*, Note on John iii. 5.

CHAPTER V.

BAPTIZED FOR REMISSION OF SINS (ACTS II. 38)

ABBOTT. —*For the remission of sins*, is not merely, as Dr. Hackett, "in order to the forgiveness of sins," but *for the putting away of sins*, the entire cleansing the heart from actual sin, as well as the pardon of those that are past.—*Com. on Acts*, ii. 38.

ALEXANDER.—The beneficial end to which all this led was the *remission of sins*. The first Greek noun (*aphesin*), derived from a verb (*aphimi*) which means to *let go*, is applied by Plutarch to divorce, by Demosthenes to legal discharge from the obligation of a bond, by Plato to the emancipation of a slave, and to exemption from punishment, which last is its constant use in the New Testament. The whole phrase, *to (or towards) remission of sins*, describes this as the end to which the question of the multitude had reference, and which therefore must be contemplated also in the answer.—*Commentary on Acts*, ii. 38, Vol. I., p. 85.

ARMITAGE.—Peter offered them salvation through the blood of Jesus for the sin of shedding it, and urged them to leave the wicked hierarchy, and enter the new kingdom by faith and baptism. — *Hist. of the Baptists*, p. 73.

AXTELL.—The preposition *eis* in Acts ii. 38 may be

rendered by several prepositions, or prepositional phrases, as for instance; *unto*, *for*, *in order to*, *with a view to*. The noun which it governs denotes the *object* or *end* toward which the action expressed by the predicate verbs was to be directed; or to state it from the other point of view, the *result* which he would attain who should repent and be baptized.—*Letter to the Author*, Oct. 20, 1893.

BENSON.—*For the remission of sins*—Which you may obtain, through Christ crucified, in this way, and can obtain in no other. Repent of your sins, and they shall not be your ruin; believe in Jesus, and be baptized in that faith, and you shall be justified.—*Com. on the Bible*, on Acts ii. 38.

BICKERSTETH.—*Remission of sins* is a special blessing connected in the holy scriptures with baptism. Thus St. Peter, in his first public address to the Jews, charges them, *Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins*. Acts ii. 38. The address of Ananias to Saul on his conversion, conveys a similar truth: *Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord*. Acts xxii. 16. While the uncleanness of the body is removed by water, the sins of the soul are washed away in a free forgiveness. —*Treatise on Baptism*, pp. 84, 85.

BLOOMFIELD.—In all such cases the preposition denotes *dependence on*, *devotedness to*, and *obedience to*, (as in 1 Cor. x. 2), and should be rendered, not *into*, but *unto*, implying, however, the *into* as referred to the benefits and blessings thereby imparted.—*Greek Test.*, Note on Acts ii. 38.

BONET-MAURY.—Qu. "*What is the literal translation of*

Acts ii. 38, and the design of Baptism as indicated by the prep. eis?" Ans. "*Be baptized every one of you, in (epi) the name of Jesus Christ unto (eis) the remission of your sins,*" i. e. that the sinners who believe give up the world and its pomps and seductions and call on=believe in Christ as the only Savior, get all their sins washed away by the baptism.—*Letter to the Author, May 8, 1893.*

BUTCHER.—The words in *Acts ii. 38 eis aphasin hamartion* occur also in *Matt. xxvi. 28 to aimā . . . to peri pollon ekchunomenon eis aphasin hamartion;* and *Luke iii. 3 kerussan baptisma eis aphasin hamartion.* In each passage the preposition *eis* seems to express the *end towards which the action tends, the result* which it is designed to bring about.

Baptism in the passage of *Acts*, as in *Luke iii. 3*, is spoken of as an act which is at least on the road to forgiveness.

Apart from theological controversy this appears to me the undoubted linguistic force of the word.—*Letter to the Author, Jan. 13, 1894.*

BYWATER.—As far as I can see, the preposition *eis* in *Acts ii. 38* expresses the end or purpose to be attained: compare Moulton's 'Winer,' ed. 3 p. 495 and Thayer's 'Grimm,' p. 185. The translation, I suppose, is 'with a view to the remission of your sins,' or 'to the end that your sins may be remitted.' The form of expression is closely parallel to that in *Acts iii. 19 metanoesate . . . eis to exaleipthenai humon tas hamartias.* i. e. 'Repent, to the end that your sins may be blotted out.'—*Letter to the Author, Dec. 29, 1893.*

CAMERON.—The preposition *eis* in *Acts ii. 38* is evi-

dently used in its final sense, and the phrase is clearly connected with *metanoesate kai baptistheti* [repent and be baptized] as the end to which repentance and baptism in the name of Jesus Christ led. The conviction of sin in the crucifixion of Jesus, who was both Lord and Christ, led the multitude to inquire of the Apostles, "What shall we do?" "Do" for what purpose? Evidently "for the remission of sins" as is shown in the answer of the Apostles. They thought only of the sin against Christ, which, since his advent is the essence of sin ("of sin because they believe not on me"); but the Apostle makes the matter more general,—"remission of sins"—The term *aphesis* [remission], except in the quotation from Isaiah (Luke iv. 18), has but one signification in the N. T. This then was the object contemplated both in the question and the answer and to which *eis* points. Trusting that this hasty note which does not enter into the question of baptism, or of its relation to salvation, or even of the meaning of the expression *epi to onomati* [in the name], is a sufficient answer to your inquiries, I remain yours truly.—*Letter to S. T. Mathews*, March 7, 1876.

CLARKE, ADAM.—*For remission of sins*] *Eis aphasisin hamartion*, In reference to the remission or removal of sins.—*Com. on Acts*, ii. 38.

CRANMER.—In baptism our sins be forgiven us, as saint Peter witnesseth, saying, Let every one of you be baptized for the forgiveness of his sins.—*Catechism*, p. 186.

CYRIL.—Thus spake Peter to the three thousand who came to him; and they the crucifiers of the Lord, when they asked and said, *Men and brethren what shall we do?*

for great is our wound; thou hast turned our thoughts, O Peter, to our fall, in saying, Ye have killed the Prince of life. What salve is there for so great a wound? What cleansing for so great pollution? What salvation for so great a death? to them I say, Peter saith, *Repent, and be baptized each of you in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.* O unspeakable loving-kindness of God! they look not for salvation, and they are vouchsafed the Holy Ghost. Behold the power of Baptism! If any of you hath by blasphemous words crucified Christ; if any of you through ignorance denied Him before men; if any of you, through wicked works, hath led to the doctrines being evil spoken of, let him be of good hope in repenting, for the same grace is also now present.—*Catechetical Lectures*, Lect. III., Para. XV., p. 32.

DILL.—To your question, I reply briefly as follows:—

(1). *Eis*, in its original and strictly local sense, signifies "in-to;" that is, "to a position in." As *eis hudor*, into the water.

(2). Sometimes, the preposition is diverted from its strictly logical sense, and may be applied, not to material objects, but to abstract ideas. The use is then necessarily figurative. Sometimes, however, the analogy is so plain that "into" may still be employed to render it into English; as, "Lead us not into (*eis*) temptation." The substantive then presents a state or condition, "into" which the mind fears or desires to enter.

(3). "To" may be employed, when in strict propriety, "into" is implied; or "unto" may be used as the antiquated synonyme of "to," characteristic of scriptural language: as, "The goodness of God leadeth to (*eis, unto*) repentance."

(4). The entrance "into" a state or condition may be presented to the mind as the purpose or end of our actions. Thus in Rom. iii. 25, *eis endeizin tes dikaiosunes auton*, literally rendered, "into a showing of his righteousness," is freely rendered by an infinitive clause of purpose both in the revised and the common version, "to declare (R. V. to show) his own righteousness."

(5). *Eis* may be employed to express other relations not so easily defined; so that forty-five different renderings have been resorted to in the New Testament.

In reference to the passage referred to, I would not depart from the literal meaning any farther than the usage presented as case (4). I would express the relation implied, by the prepositional phrase "with a view to." Repentance and baptism are plainly expressed, and faith in Jesus Christ is distinctly implied as the conditions on which the sinner may hope to enter "into" that state of freedom from the penalty of sins implied in "the remission of your sins." "For" in the common version, I think, implies this; while "unto," equal to "to," in the revised, does not express the relation with sufficient precision to determine whether to class the usage under case (3) or (4).—*Letter to the Author*, Oct. 18, 1893.

DIODATI.—*In the Name*] not only for a sign of the profession of Christians, but also to participate of his spiritual virtue in the washing away of your sins with which he accomplisheth, and ratifieth the external ceremony of those who are his.—*Annotat.*, on Acts ii. 38.

DITZLER.—No; neither repentance nor baptism is for remission, but conditions precedent to doing that which is for remission.—*Wilkes-Ditzler Debate*, p. 295.

His criticism on the preposition *eis* is the best he ever made, if he did get it from myself. *Eis* is *always prospective*, and *never retrospective*. He never said a better thing in his life, or put a criticism in a better form. The Baptists are all wrong on *eis*—making it retrospective— "*in consequence of.*"—*Ibid.*, p. 307.

DODDRIDGE.—They are not only called here to repent, a submission also to the ordinance of baptism is required of them, in order to the forgiveness of their sins.—*Family Expositor*, Acts ii. 38, Vol. III., p. 27.

D'OOGHE.—In reply to your inquiry I would say that in my judgment the preposition *eis* in the verse referred to expresses the relation of *aim*, or *end* in view, answering the question *eis ti* [for what?], and to be translated by *unto*, *in order to*, *for*. This sense of *eis*, as you doubtless know, is recognized by Liddell and Scott for classical, by Winer for New Testament usage.

I cannot with those give *eis* nearly the same force in the phrase, baptize into the name, but understand it then to be used in the sense of *in reference to*, *in relation to*.—*Letter to It. T. Mathews*, Feb. 12, 1876.

Du VEIL.—*And be baptized*, &c. That is, according to the command of Christ, let every one of you, struck with a real sorrow for his sins, be plunged in water; because that sacred immersion has been instituted by Christ, like a certain signet, diploma, or patent, by which he confirms the remission and utter defacing of their sins to all those who seek to him with an unfeigned faith, as the only Physician of their souls; so that their sins shall never more be remembered or imputed to them.—*Com. on Acts*, ii. 38, p. 58.

FLAGG.—In answer to your enquiry about the force of the preposition *eis* in the passage of the New Testament to which you refer (Acts ii. 38), I should say that it denoted intention or purpose: "*with a view to,*" much as if it had been written "so as to obtain remission of sins." I speak, however, wholly from the standpoint of classic Greek, not being familiar with the changes introduced by the Hellenistic. As to any theological bearing that the subject may have, I am wholly indifferent.—*Letter to E. T. Mathews*, Feb. 15, 1876.

FOSTER.—Without a special examination of the passage in connection with others in which like expressions occur, I should say that the word here has the force of "unto," "in order to," "for the sake of"—indicating a result to be attained, and that it connects the phrase *aphesin hamartion* with *both* the foregoing imperative verbs, alike — grammatically considered — though, on other grounds, I should say, specially with the first, since pardon is nowhere offered on condition of baptism alone, while it is, on that of repentance.—*Letter to It. T. Mathews*, Feb. 23, 1876.

FULLERTON.—*Eis* may be used ... to describe ideal relation when it denotes *aim* or *end* more or less distinctly. In Acts ii. 38 it is probably to be translated into or unto remission of sins, conveying there the idea of *purpose*; *i. e.* the aim or end of baptism, is remission of sins.—*Letter to the Author*, Nov. 3, 1893.

GALE.—Baptism, I grant, is of great necessity; and though I dare fix no limits to the infinite goodness and mercy of God, which I am confident he will give mighty proofs of, in great instances of kindness towards all sin-

cere, though mistaken men; however the gospel rule is, according to the doctrine of the apostle, *to repent, and be baptized, for the remission of sins*. We should be very cautious therefore of making any change in these things, lest we deprive ourselves, through our presumption, of that title to pardon, without which there is no salvation. —*Reflections on Wall's Hist, of Inf. Bap.*, Vol. II., p. 52.

GLOAG.—Baptism in the adult, except in the peculiar case of our Lord, was accompanied by a confession of sin, and was a sign of its remission; hence called baptism in order to the forgiveness of sins (Acts ii. 38).—*Com. on Acts*, xxii. 16, Vol. II., p. 294.

GODET.—*Eis aphasin*—Acts ii. 38 must necessarily design the aim (purpose) of *baptisthenai*. The difficulty is only that, in all the New Testament pardon is granted to Faith and not to Baptism. But here, Baptism is so much the immediate consequence of Faith that the two make one. It is very clear that Baptism without Faith would not insure pardon to those to whom S. Peter is speaking.

According to Rom. vi. 1 seq. the relation between Faith and Baptism is the same as that between death and burial. Death is the condition of burial: faith that of baptism: at least where there is question of adults, of whom St. Paul, Rom. vi., is evidently speaking.—*Letter to the Author*, June 8, 1893.

GOODELL.—In reply to your question with regard to the preposition *eis* in Acts ii. 38 I do not know that I can do better than quote the rendering in Thayer's Lexicon to the New Testament under *eis*, namely, "to obtain the forgiveness of sins." All that the words in themselves

contain is the thought that repentance and baptism aim at, are believed in some way to lead to, *aphesis ton hamartion*, remission or forgiveness of sins. The method of operation, the way in which the *aphesis ton hamartion* results so far as *I* can see, is not any more nearly defined in the passage.—*Letter to the Author*, Sept. 11, 1893.

GOODWIN.—I think *eis* in Acts ii. 38 expresses *purpose* or *tendency* and is rightly translated *for* or *unto* (in the sense of *for*).—*Letter to the Author*, July 27, 1893.

HACKETT. — *In order to the forgiveness of sins* (Matt. xxvi. 28; Luke iii. 3) we connect naturally with both the preceding verbs. This clause states the motive or object which should induce them to repent and be baptized. It enforces the entire exhortation, not one part of it to the exclusion of the other.—*Com. on Acts*, ii. 38, p. 54.

HALLEY.—Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." (*eis aphesin hamartion.*) Acts ii. 38. The syntax is here, if possible, more decided. Not only does the preposition *eis* refer to the future and prospective relation of the remission of sins, but it does so with the same dependence on baptism as on repentance. The signification of *eis* must correspond in its relation to both words, "repent" and "be baptized." In what sense does the apostle use the preposition, when he says, "Repent" "for the remission of sins"? The remission of sins is obviously represented, not as preceding repentance, but as subsequent to it. The preposition has its meaning clearly defined by its relation to the word "repent." Used only *once*, it cannot have two interpreta-

tions thrust upon it. It must connect the remission of sins with both words, "repent" and "be baptized," by one and the same relation. If it be, "repent *for* the remission of sins," it must also be, "be baptized *for* the remission of sins." Let those who deny this, say by what canon of syntax they can construe the passage, so as to obtain the interpretation, Repent *for* the remission of sins, and be baptized *after* their remission.—*Cong. Lectures*, Vol. XV., p. 117.

HAMMOND.—And Peter answered them, that there was now but one possible way left, and that was with true contrition, and acknowledgment of their sin, to hasten out of their infidelity, and with a sincere and thorough change to come as proselytes to Christ, and enter upon Christian profession with a vow of never falling off from it, and so to receive baptism from the apostles, that sacrament, wherein Christ enabled them to bestow, or convey from him, remission of sins to all true penitents.—*Paraphrase*, on Acts ii. 38.

HARKNESS.—In my opinion *eis* in Acts ii. 38 denotes *purpose* and maybe rendered *in order to*, or *for the purpose of receiving*, or as in our English version *for*: *Eis aphasin hamartion* suggests the motive or object contemplated in the action of the two preceding verbs.—*Letter to JJ. T. Mathews*, Feb. 24, 1876.

HARMAN.—In reply to your inquiry respecting *eis* in Acts ii. 38, I would say that *eis* has the force of "for," the object to be obtained, to the end that. I would thus translate the passage: "Repent, and let each one of you be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for (that ye may obtain) the remission of your sins, and ye shall

receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." Repentance and baptism are necessary for the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit. One might bitterly repent without surrendering himself to Christ and entering upon the Christian profession; but this is done in baptism, hence repentance and baptism are both necessary to forgiveness as expressed by Peter.—*Letter to the Author*, Oct. 23, 1893.

HARPER.—In answer to your letter I would say that the preposition *eis* is to be translated "unto" i. e. "in order to secure." The preposition indicates that *remission of sins* is the end to be aimed at in the actions expressed by the predicates *repent* and *be baptized*. The phrase is telic.—*Letter to the Author*, April 22, 1893.

HOGUE.—(1) I should translate *eis* in Acts ii. 38 by "for," i. e., "with a view to." (2) The connection established by *m* between *metanoesate kai baptistheto* (repent and be baptized) I take to be a relation of purpose, as if he had said: *hina aphetosin ai hamartia humon* (to the end that your sins might be forgiven).—*Letter to the Author*, Oct. 28, 1893.

HOVEY.—"*Repent and be baptized every one of you in (or, upon) the name of Jesus Christ, unto the remission (or, forgiveness) of your sins*" Acts ii. 38. Rev. Ver.) Here repentance and baptism are represented as leading to the forgiveness of sins.—*Com. on John, Appendix*, p. 420.

HUNTINGDON.—The preposition *eis* which means *into* in its local and primary signification, means also *with reference to*. In Acts ii. 38 it undoubtedly means, as I am compelled to think, *for the purpose of receiving, in order*

that you may receive &c. It is connected with both of the preceding verbs, not with *be baptized* alone, but with *repent* also,—*repent and be baptized, for* the remission of your sins, *unto*, with *reference* to, this result, namely, the remission, &c.—*Letter to the Author*, April 20, 1893.

LECHLER.—Baptism is not merely a confessional act on the part of man, but also an act of God by which He effects and imparts forgiveness of sin (Acts ii. 38), and with which the gift of the Spirit is connected.—*The Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, Vol. I., p. 277.

MEYER.—*Baptiz.* is only here used with *eipi*; but comp. the analogous expressions, Luke xxi. 8; xxiv. 47; Acts v. 28, 40; Matt. xxiv. 5; al.—*eis* denotes the *object* of the baptism, which is the remission of the guilt contracted in the state before *metanoia*. Comp. xxii. 16; 1 Cor. vi. 11.—Com. *on Acts*, ii. 38, pp. 66, 67.

McLEAN.—It represents to the repenting believer the *remission* or *washing away of his sins* in the blood of Christ. Accordingly, Peter exhorts the convicted Jews, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Ananias, in his address to Paul, expresses this still stronger: "And now, why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." This manner of speaking will appear very extravagant to many now-a-days, who look upon baptism as a mere empty rite or arbitrary precept. To be baptized *for the remission* or *washing away of sins* plainly imports that in baptism the remission of sins is represented as *really conferred* upon the believer. The gospel promise in general is, "that through Christ's name, whosoever believ-

eth in him shall receive remission of sins." Baptism applies this promise, and represents its *actual accomplishment* to an individual believer; assuring him that all his past sins are now as really washed away in the blood of Christ as his body is washed in water.— *Works*, Vol. L, pp. 132, 133.

McCLINTOCK.—In these cases [Matt, xxviii. 19; Rom. vi. 3; 1 Cor. x. 2; xii. 13; Acts ii. 38] *eis* retains its proper significancy, as indicating the *terminus ad quern*, and tropically, that *for* which, or *with a view to* which the thing is done, . . . to be baptized for the remission of sins means to be baptized with a view to receiving this.— *Art. Bap.*, *McClintock & Strong's Cyclop.*, Vol. L, p. 640.

PACKARD.—Your letter of inquiry as to the meaning of *eis* in Acts ii. 38 was handed to me this morning. I do not suppose it is possible to determine from classical or patristic usage a necessary meaning for such a word which can be applied in any new case. It is so frequent a word, has so many various meanings, and expressing only relation depends so entirely on context for its determination, that each case must be decided mainly by itself. Here it seems to be connected with both verbs. With *baptize* alone it has a special New Testament use, as to the meaning of which scholars are somewhat divided. My own impression—to give it for what it is worth—is that I should translate it, if these words occurred in Plato, for instance, *to the end of* remission of sins. It would then make *aphesin hamartion* as an object aimed at or a result attained by the acts denoted by the verbs.—*Letter to E. T. Mathews*, Feb. 12, 1876.

PAINE.—*Eis* in Acts ii. 38 means *in order to* or *with a*

view to the remission of sins, but it is to be connected with both the previous verbs, repent and be baptized.—Letter to the Author, April 15, 1893.

POPE.—We may find many references to the specific blessings which are exhibited and pledged to the believer in his baptism. Foremost is justification or the forgiveness of sins: St. Peter cries, *Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins*; and Ananias to Paul, *Be baptized, and wash away thy sins.*—*Christian Theology*, Vol. III., p. 315.

PROCTOR, J. C.—It is my opinion that *eis* is to be connected with both the predicates and that it denotes an object or end in view. I am inclined to think the phrase, "in the name of Jesus Christ," though grammatically limiting only *baptistheti*, does in thought modify the connection of *eis*, the ideas standing logically in the following order, viz:—Having been shown your ill behavior against the Messiah (vs. 37), put faith in (the name of) Christ on the basis of that faith *repent and (confess) be baptized*, and then be forgiven: *eis* connecting *aphesis* not only with the two predicates separately, but with the whole preceding part of the sentence. I have first and last given a good deal of attention to this point, but cannot yet speak more confidently than I have done above. If you enjoy this study as I do, I congratulate you most cordially. I establish few doctrines as such but the divine word is more and more a sustenance and solace.—*Letter to R. T. Mathews*, March 23, 1876.

PURVES.—I would translate *eis* in Acts ii. 38 by "*unto*" and understand it to express the *object* sought to be at-

tained by baptism. "Remission of sins" is conceived of as that benefit into the enjoyment of which the baptized penitent will come. The preceding "repent" shows that only on the condition of a truly ethical change of mind would the ordinance be efficacious with those to whom the apostle was speaking: nor does this sentence throw any light on the mode of baptism since "*baptistheto*" is used as a technical term. The apostle thus states the necessary precedent (Repent), the act (baptism), the faith *in* which it was to be done (in the name of Jesus Christ) and the end or object to be attained and *unto* which therefore it was done. *Baptizein eis*, denoting the end to be attained or object sought, may be found in Matt. iii. 11; Acts xix. 3; 1 Cor. x. 2,—in each case, of course, with special modifications of the thought.—*Letter to the Author*, Oct. 24, 1893.

SADLER.—Acts ii. 38: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" (to be saved). "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."

So that, in the first Christian sermon ever preached, Remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost, are made to depend upon repentance joined with baptism.—*Church Doctrine—Bible Truth*, p. 56.

SALE.—The preposition *eis* in Acts ii. 38 can only be used in one of two senses: (1) expressing the *purpose* or *object*; (2) expressing the *result* of the act of submitting to "baptism."

"So as to obtain remission of sins" is the nearest translation I can suggest—and this translation will suit either of the above meanings.—*Letter to the Author*, Sept. 14, 1889.

SCHAFF.—He called upon his hearers to repent and be baptized in the name of Jesus, as the founder and head of the heavenly kingdom, that even they, though they had crucified him, the Lord and the Messiah, might receive the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost, whose wonderful workings they saw and heard in the disciples.—*Hist. of the Christ. Church*, Vol. I., pp. 233, 234.

SCOTT, JOHN.—St. Peter exhorts his Converts *to Repent and be Baptized for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost*. From whence it is evident, that *Baptism*, as well as *Repentance*, has a great influence on our *Remission of Sins*, and our *Communication of the Holy Ghost*.—*Works*, Vol. I., p. 447.

SCOTT, THOMAS.—To this the apostle replied, by exhorting them to repent of that, and all their other sins; and openly to avow their firm belief, that Jesus was indeed the Messiah, by being baptized in his name. In thus professing their faith in him, all who truly believed would receive a full remission of their sins for his sake. —*Commentary*, on Acts ii. 38.

SITTERLY.—The preposition *eis* in Acts ii. 38 may be translated "for," "unto," and "in order to." In the clause *eis aphasin hamartion* Peter states the reason or motive that should induce to repentance and baptism, referring not to one but to both verbs preceding. According to Winer 549. c. "*Eis* is here used tropically to denote the purpose or end in view."—*Letter to the Author*, April 20, 1893.

STRONG.—I would say in brief, that in my opinion, *eis*

in Acts ii. 38, can only have its natural and usual *causal* force of *in order to*, as the design and result of the act on the part of those addressed; but observe that the *release* or *pardon* of sin is there predicated upon the two-fold condition of *repentance and baptism*, just as everywhere else in Scripture (e. g. especially on faith (which alone can spring from true repentance) and baptism in our Lord's own declaration, Mark xvi. 16; where it is NOT said *per contra* that he who is not baptized shall be condemned).—*Letter to the Author*, April 15, 1893.

THAYER.—I accept the rendering of the revised version "unto the remission of your sins" (the *eis* expressing the end aimed at and secured by 'repentance and baptism' just previously enjoined).—*Letter to the Author*, May 5, 1893.

TURRENTINE.—I venture to give you my opinion concerning the matter required by you. (1) Translation of *eis* (Acts ii. 38),—*for*, or *unto*; (2) relation expressed,— *object*, or *aim*.—*Letter to the Author*, Oct. 30, 1893.

TYLER.—I shall translate Acts ii. 38 literally thus: *Repent and let every one of you be baptized in (or on) the name of Jesus Christ unto remission of sins*. The preposition *eis* seems to denote the *object* and *end* of the two verbs which precede in the imperative. In other words remission of sins is the *object* and *end* (or *result*) of repentance and baptism. The meaning may perhaps be more definitely and unequivocally expressed thus: Repent and let every one of you be baptized *to the end that* your sins may be forgiven.

The passage does not necessarily imply that repentance and baptism stand in just the same moral, religious,

essential or formal relation to forgiveness, any more than believing and being baptized stand in the same relation to being saved in Mark xvi. 16; or being born of water and of the Spirit stand in the same relation to entering into the kingdom of God in John Hi. 5. The *result* is *fully* realized in each of these cases only when *both* the *outward* and the *inward* conditions are fulfilled. But that the *outward* condition is less *essential* to the result is clearly indicated by its omission in the negative and condemnatory part of Mark xvi. 16. He that believeth not shall be damned.

I do not know that I have met the precise point and object of your inquiries, I have only touched the points of chief interest and importance as they present themselves to my own mind.—*Letter to R. T. Mathews*, Feb. 12, 1876.

WEISS.—Peter promises to those who suffer themselves to be baptized, the forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Spirit (ii. 38).—*Biblical Theology*, Vol. I., p. 187.

WILLMARTH.—It is feared that if we give to *eis* its natural and obvious meaning, undue importance will be ascribed to Baptism, the Atonement will be undervalued, and the work of the Holy Spirit disparaged. Especially is it asserted that here is the vital issue between Baptists and Campbellites. We are gravely told that if we render *eis* in Acts ii. 38 *in order to*, we give up the battle, and must forthwith become Campbellites; whereas if we translate it *on account of*, or *in token of*, it will yet be possible for us to remain Baptists.

Such methods of interpretation are unworthy of Christian scholars. It is our business, simply and honestly, to ascertain the exact meaning of the inspired originals,

as the sacred penman intended to convey it to the mind of the contemporary reader. Away with the question— "What *ought* Peter to have said in the interest of orthodoxy?" The real question is, "What *did* Peter say, and what did he *mean*, when he spoke on the Day of Pentecost, under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit?"

But having entered this *caveat*, as a lawyer might say, it may do no harm to show that dogmatic dangers here exist only in imagination. The natural and obvious interpretation cannot give undue importance to Baptism, for Baptism is here united with Repentance and Faith. It cannot undervalue the Atonement, for Baptism is one resting upon, and deriving all its value from, *the name of* the Lamb of God; and this is distinctly understood by the person baptized, who submits to the rite as a believer in that *name*. It cannot disparage the work of the Spirit, since he alone effectually calls men to Repentance and Faith; and it is *by* (Greek *en*, in, with the influence of) *one Spirit* that *we are all baptized into one body, i. e.*, the Spirit leads the penitent sinner to Baptism and blesses the rite. And as to Campbellism, that specter which haunts many good men and terrifies them into a good deal of bad interpretation, shall we gain anything by maintaining a false translation and allowing the Campbellites to be champions of the true, with the world's scholarship on their side, as against us? Whoever carries the weight of our controversy with the Campbellite *upon the eis* will *break through*—there is no footing there for the evolutions of the theological skater. Shall we never learn that Truth has nothing to fear from a true interpretation of any part of God's word, and nothing to gain from a false one?

The truth will suffer nothing by giving to *eis* its true

signification. When Campbellites translate *in order to* in Acts ii. 38 they translate correctly. Is a translation false because Campbellite endorse it?—*Bapt. and Remission, in Bapt. Quarterly*, July, 1877, pp. 304, 305.

CHAPTER VI.

SALVATION OF CORNELIUS.

BEET.—In Acts x. 47, 48 is recorded the Baptism of some who had already received the Holy Spirit. This proves that the outward rite was needed even for those who had indisputably obtained inward spiritual life.— *Christian Baptism*, p. 18.

CYPRIAN.—Those who have been dipped abroad outside the Church, and have been stained among heretics and schismatics with the taint of profane water, when they come to us and to the Church which is one, ought to be baptized, for the reason that it is a small matter to "lay hands on them that they may receive the Holy Ghost," unless they receive also the baptism of the Church. For then finally can they be fully sanctified, and be the sons of God, if they be born of each sacrament; since it is written, "Except a man be born again of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." For we find also, in the Acts of the Apostles, that this is maintained by the apostles, and kept in the truth of the saving faith, so that when in the house of Cornelius the centurion, the Holy Ghost had descended upon the Gentiles who were there, fervent in the warmth of their faith, and believing in the Lord with their whole heart; and when, filled with the Spirit, they blessed God in divers tongues, still none the less the blessed Apostle Peter, mindful of the divine precept of the Gospel,

commanded that those same men should be baptized who had already been filled with the Holy Spirit, that nothing might seem to be neglected to the observance by the apostolic instruction in all things of the law of the divine precept and Gospel.—*Epistle LXXI.*, § 1, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V., p. 378.

CHAPTER VII.

SAUL'S SALVATION (ACTS XXII. 16).

ALEXANDER.—*Be baptized* is not a passive, as in ii. 38, but the middle voice of the same verb, strictly meaning, *baptize thyself*, or rather, cause thyself to be baptized, or suffer (some one) to baptize thee. The form of the next verb is the same, but cannot be so easily expressed in English, as it has a noun dependent on it. This peculiarity of form is only so far of importance as it shows that Paul was to wash away his own sins in the same sense that he was to baptize himself, i. e. by consenting to receive both from another. As his body was to be baptized by man, so his sins were to be washed away by God.—*Commentary on Acts*, xxii. 16, Vol. II., p. 302.

BEET.—We understand now the startling exhortation of Ananias to Saul of Tarsus recorded in Acts xxii. 16: *Arise and baptize thyself and wash away thy sins*. These words evidently mean, Remove the stain of thy sins by the water of Baptism. Ananias knew that Christ had expressly ordained and commanded the rite; and thus made it a condition of His favour and of the salvation He proclaimed. Therefore, for the repentant persecutor, there was no forgiveness and purification except by formal confession of Christ in Baptism. Now, to our thought, a condition performed in order to attain a result dependent upon it is a means to that end. Consequently, Ananias could speak, and in this passage does

speak, of Baptism as a means of salvation.—*Christian Baptism*, p. 16.

BENSON.—*Be baptized, and wash away thy sins*—Baptism, administered to real penitents, was intended to be both a means and seal of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily, in the primitive church, bestow this on any person till he submitted to baptism.—*Com. on the Bible*, on Acts xxii. 16.

BLOOMFIELD.—Meaning, 'wash away thy sins by baptism, as an ordinance expressive of the washing away of sin.'—*Greek Test.*, Note on Acts xxii. 16, Vol. I., p. 849.

BURKITT.—*Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins*. Here note, That sacraments are not empty, insignificant signs; but God, by his grace and blessing, renders his own ordinances effectual for these great ends for which his wisdom has appointed them: *Be baptized, and wash away thy sins*. As water cleanseth the body, so the blood of Christ, signified by water, washes away the guilt of the soul. Where true faith is, together with the profession of it by baptism, there is salvation promised, Mark xvi. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved*.—*Notes on the New Test.*, on Acts xxii. 16.

CLARKE, ADAM.—*Wash away thy sins, &c.*] Let this washing of thy body represent to thee the washing away of thy sins; and know that this *washing away of sin* can be received only by invoking the name of the Lord. —*Com. on Acts*, xxii. 16.

DODDRIDGE.—Baptism in the adult, except in the very

peculiar instance of our Lord, was a token of confession and humiliation for sin, (on which account it is called the baptism of repentance, Matt. iii. 11; Mark i. 4; Luke iii. 3; Acts xiii. 24; xix. 4 ;) and of a desire to be cleansed from it, as the body was by water cleansed from its pollution; and being administered to such professed penitents, by divine appointment, as a token of favorable regard to them, it was a seal of pardon: nor did God ordinarily give any particular person any public and visible token of pardon till he submitted to baptism.— *Family Expositor*, Acts xxii. 16, Vol. III., p. 327.

HACKETT.— *And wash (bathe) away thy sins.* This clause states a result of the baptism, in language derived from the nature of that ordinance. It answers to *for the remission of sins*, in ii. 38—i. e. submit to the rite in order to be forgiven. In both passages baptism is represented as having this importance or efficacy, because it is the sign of the repentance and faith which are the conditions of salvation.—*Commentary on Acts*, xxii. 16, p. 276.

HAMMOND.—To what purpose therefore should any delay be made of baptizing thee, and admitting thee into the Church, by that seal of the covenant, whereby thou art engaged to forsake, and God to pardon, all thy former sins, (upon condition of a sincere change on thy part) upon which thou mayest join with the Church in performance of all Christian duties of devotion to God? —*Paraphrase*, on Acts xxii. 16.

HOVEY.—"*Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord.*" (Acts xxii. 16.) Of course there is no such thing possible as a literal wash-

ing away of sins. A removal of sins from the soul by bathing the body is absurd. But there is such a thing as forgiveness of sins; and this may be described figuratively as washing them away, so that henceforth the soul may be "clean" from the guilt or stain of sin. Dr. Hackett remarks, "that this clause (*and wash away thy sins*) states a result of the baptism in language derived from the nature of the ordinance. It answers to *unto thee forgiveness of sins*, in ii. 38—i. e., submit to the rite in order to be forgiven. In both passages, baptism is represented as having this importance or efficacy, because it is the sign of repentance and faith, which are the conditions of salvation."—*Commentary on John, Appendix*, p. 420.

JACOBSON.—*Be baptized*] Literally, *have thyself baptized*. See ii. 38. "Baptism was at length his grand absolution, his patent of pardon, his instrument of justification, granted him from above: neither was he justified till he received that divine seal, inasmuch as his sins were upon him till that very time."—*Commentary on Acts*, xxii. Id.

MEYER.—Let thyself be baptized, and thereby *wash away thy sins*. Here, too, baptism is that by means of which the forgiveness of the sins committed in the pre-Christian life takes place.—*Com. on Acts*, xxii. 16, p. 419.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—As washing causeth the spots to disappear, and to be as if they had not been, Isa. i. 18. so does pardoning mercy, or remission of sins, which accompanieth baptism, as in the due receiver, Matth. iii. 11; 1 Peter iii. 21, 22. where true faith is, together with the profession of it by baptism, there is salvation promised, Mark xvi. 16.—*Annotations*, on Acts xxii. 16.

SADLER.—So also in Acts xxii. 16 ("Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins,") the washing away of sin is made to depend upon Baptism as the means in the use of which God first formally imparted it. Ananias, who was sent to St. Paul by the Saviour Himself, does not say, "Believe, and thy sins are forgiven," but he says, "Be baptized, and wash away thy sins." We can scarcely believe that a man who had dim or incorrect views on such a matter as the forgiveness of sin would have been sent to such an one as St. Paul.—*Church Doctrine—Bible Truth*, p. 56.

SCOTT, JOHN.—In Baptism we are said to *wash away our sins, i. e., the guilt* of them, Acts xx. 16. because the Sign of Baptism seals to us on God's Part the *Promise of Forgiveness*. By all which it is evident, that Baptism is a federal Rite in which God and *we* do *seal* and *ratify* to one another each other's *part* of the New Covenant; and it is this *sealing* that makes the Covenant *obliging* to *both* Parties, and gives to each a *Legal Claim* and *Title* to each other's *Promise* and *Engagement*: To *God* it gives a *Legal Title* to ail that *Duty* which *we* promise, and to *MS* it gives a *Legal Title* to all those *Blessings* which *God* promises. So that till such Time as we are *Baptized*, the *New Covenant* is not struck between *God* and *us*, nor have we any *Right* or *Title* to any of the *Blessings promised* in it.—*Works*, Vol. I., p. 447.

WESLEY.—*Be baptized, and wash away thy sins*—Baptism administered to real penitents is both a means and a seal of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily in the primitive church bestow this on any, unless through this means.—*Notes on New Test.*, on Acts xxii. 16.

WILLMARTH.—Ananias divinely sent to Saul of Tarsus, blind, penitent and prayerful, thus instructed him: *And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord.* The washing away refers to Remission; the last clause requires the exercise of faith in Christ.—*Baptism and Remission*, in *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1877, p. 310.

WORDSWORTH.—Even Saul himself, though called from heaven by Jesus Christ, was admitted into the Church by Baptism, by which his sins were washed away. Who can suppose, therefore, that any one may safely neglect that sacrament?—*Greek Test.*, Note on Acts ix. 18.

CHAPTER VIII.

BAPTIZED INTO THE DEATH OF CHRIST (ROM. vi. 3; COL. n. 12).

ALFORD.—*Baptized into Christ Jesus* ('into participation,' of, 'into union with' Christ, in His capacity of spiritual Mastership, Headship and Pattern of conformity) *were baptized into* (introduced by our baptism into a state of conformity with and participation of) *His death?* The apostle refers (1) to the acknowledged fact, in the signification, and perhaps also in the manner of baptism—that it put upon us (Gal. iii. 27) a state of conformity with and participation in Christ;—and (2) that this state involves a death *te hamartia* even as He died *te hamartia* (ver. 10);—the meaning being kept in the back ground, but all the while not lost sight of, that the *benefits of His Death* were likewise made ours by our introduction into the covenant.—*Greek Test.*, Vol. II., Rom. vi. 3, p. 367.

BANNERMAN.—Of course in this passage the Apostle must be held as referring to the Baptism of a believer, in whose case it was a spiritual act of faith embodying itself in the outward ordinance. There are two things which seem plainly enough to be included in this remarkable statement. *In the first place*, the immersion in water of the persons of those who are baptized is set forth as their burial with Christ in His grave because of sin; and their being raised again out of the water is

their resurrection with Christ in His rising again from the dead because of their justification. Their death with Christ was their bearing the penalty of sin, and their resurrection with Christ was their being freed from it, or justified. And *in the second place*, their burial in water, when dying with Christ, was the washing away of the corruptness of the old man beneath the water; and their coming forth from the water in the image of His resurrection was their leaving behind them the old man with his sins, and emerging into newness of life. Their immersion beneath the water, and their emerging again, were the putting off the corruption of nature and rising again into holiness or their sanctification. All this seems to be implied in this statement of the Apostle in regard to a believer's Baptism; and it cannot be doubted that, in accordance with many other passages of Scripture, it makes Baptism in the case of a believer far more than a sign of the initial blessings of justification and regeneration. The Apostle undoubtedly represents the act as a federal one, in which the believer gives himself to God in the way that God has appointed, through faith in Christ for pardon, and through submission to the Spirit for regeneration; and in which these blessings are communicated and confirmed to him.—*The Church of Christ*, Vol. II., pp. 47, 48.

BEET.—To be sharers of the life of Christ is to be sharers of a life which has been separated by death from all contact with sin. And to be *baptized for Christ* is to be *baptized for his death*. They in whom the purpose of baptism is accomplished are sharers with Christ of the result of His own death, viz. complete separation from sin. In this sense they are "dead to sin."—*Com. on Romans*, vi. 4, p. 179.

BLUNT.—To be baptized into the Death of Christ is, *first*, to be so united to Him in some mysterious manner by the use of the Word and Water of Baptism that our nature is changed, "the old man" dying or being put away, and "the new man" being put on: *secondly*, to be made to participate in the benefits of Christ's Death: and *thirdly*, to be made conformable to Christ's Death by the renunciation of that sin on account of which He died, and from the power of which His dying delivered and does deliver us.—*Annotated Bible*, Annot. on Rom. vi.3.

BURTON.—Christ died for all men: i. e. when he died all mankind was supposed to die with him, and so the penalty was paid in the person of Christ: but each man is admitted to his share of this benefit, when he is baptized: he then professes his faith in the death of Christ, and he is said figuratively to die with him at baptism. After which he rises again, and becomes as it were a new creature.—*Greek Testament*, Note on Rom. vi.3.

CALVIN.—*Know ye not, &c.* What he intimated in the last verse—that Christ destroys sin in his people, he proves here by mentioning the effect of baptism, by which we are initiated into his faith; for it is beyond any question, that we put on Christ in baptism, and that we are baptized for this end—that we maybe one with Mm. But Paul takes up another principle—that we are then really united to the body of Christ, when his death brings forth in us its fruit; yea, he teaches us, that this fellowship as to death is what is to be mainly regarded in baptism; for not washing alone is set forth in it, but also the putting to death and the dying of the old man. It

is hence evident, that when we become partakers of the grace of Christ, immediately the efficacy of his death appears.—*Com. on .Romans, vi. B.*

CLARK, SAMUEL.—This is a great Truth, which you ought not to be ignorant of, and which confirms what I say. Gal. iii. 27. Incorporated into, and made Members of Christ's Mystical Body, by Baptism. Engaged by Baptism to a conformity to him in his Death, by dying to Sin, and mortifying our Corruptions; and also were made Partakers of the Benefits thereof.—*Annotations, on Rom. vi. 3.*

DAVENANT.—In respect to Christ; in whom, when we are engrafted by baptism, the benefits of the death of Christ are conferred upon and sealed to us: but by being dead and buried, it is clear that our sins were also dead and buried with him; because *he bare them in his own body*, 1 Peter ii. 24. This is what is urged by the Apostle in Rom. vi. 3, *As many of us as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death*. In looking back, then, to the person of Christ our Head, our sins are rightly said to be indeed dead and buried in baptism as to the body of sin, because we are endowed with this benefit obtained through the death of Christ.—*Exposition of Colossians, ii. 12.*

DIODATI.—*Into Jesus,*] namely by a sacrament that we are Christians, not only by profession, but likewise in spiritual truth receiving the grace of the Spirit, and then cooperating thereunto by faith, voluntary obedience, and newness of life, Gal. iii. 27. *into his,*] to be partakers in the benefit of his death in the remission of sins, and likewise to receive a lively stamp, and likeness of him

who is our head in the mortification of sin.—*Annotat.*, on Rom. vi. 3.

GIFFORD.—To be "*baptized into Christ*" is to be brought by baptism into union with Him: but the original word represents this union in a vivid picture, which we can only reproduce by using some less familiar word,—"*immersed into Christ*," "*immersed into his death*." So the Israelites are said figuratively to have been "*all baptized unto (into) Moses in the cloud and in the sea*," (1 Cor. x. 2), because the result of their passing under the cloud and through the waters was that "they believed the Lord and his servant Moses" (Ex. xiv. 31), and were thus united with Moses as their deliverer whom they trusted, their leader whom they followed, and their mediator in whose covenant they shared. Comp. also 1 Cor. xii. 13; and Gal. iii. 27, in which passages, as here, the union with Christ in baptism is expressly ascribed to all who are baptized, because it is a gift of God bestowed freely on all, though from its very nature dependent on a right use for its continued efficacy.

Christ's death, burial and resurrection being necessary steps in the process by which He unites us to Himself in a new life, to be "*baptized into Christ*" is to be brought into union with His death (v. 3), His burial (v. 4), His resurrection (v. 5).—*Com. on Romans*, vi. 3.

HODGE.—*Baptizein eis* always means *to baptize in reference to*. When it is said that the Hebrews were baptized *unto* Moses, 1 Cor. x. 2; or when the apostle asks the Corinthians, 'Were ye baptized unto the name of Paul?' 1 Cor. i. 13; or when we are said to be baptized unto Christ, the meaning is, they were baptized *in reference to* Moses, Paul, or Christ, *i. e.* to be brought into union

with them, as their disciples, or worshippers, as the case may be. In like manner, in the expression *baptized into his death*, the preposition expresses the design and the result. The meaning therefore is, 'we were baptized in order that we should die with him,' *i. e.* that we should be united to him in his death, and be partakers of its benefits. Thus, "baptism unto repentance," Matt. iii. 11, is baptism in order to repentance; "baptism unto remission of sins," Mark i. 4, that remission of sins may be obtained; "baptized unto one body," 1 Cor. xii. 13, *i. e.* that we might become one body.—*Com. on Romans*, vi. 3.

JORTIN.—By this ceremony of initiation, Christians declared themselves servants of God, and of Christ, and of the Holy Ghost, were reminded that they must cleanse themselves from iniquity, and live a more pure and holy life, and that as they descended into the water and rose up from it, so they must die to sin and rise again to righteousness.—*Sermons*, Vol. IV., pp. 308, 309.

JOWETT.—To be baptized into Christ is to be baptized so as to be one with Christ, or to become a member of Christ by baptism.—*Com. on Rom.*, vi. 2, Vol. II., p. 170.

KNAPP.—"We are, like Christ, buried as dead persons by baptism, and should arise, like him, to a new life"—*i. e.*, by baptism we obtain the assurance of the pardon of sin, on account of the death of Christ; and so, when we are baptized, take upon ourselves the obligation to die to sin in a spiritual manner, as Christ died and was buried bodily, &c. The image is here taken from baptized persons as they were *immersed*, (*buried*,) and as they *emerged*, (*rose again*;) so it was understood by

Chrysostom. Since immersion has been disused, the full significance of this comparison is no longer perceived. So then by baptism we *profess* to receive Christ as our *teacher, Saviour, and Lord*—i. e., we thus bind ourselves to embrace and obey his doctrine, confidently to trust his promises, to expect from him all our spiritual blessedness, and to render him a dutiful obedience. This is what is meant in the New Testament by being *baptized in the name of Christ*.—*Christian Theology*, p. 431.

MACKNIGHT.—*Baptized, eis, into Christ*, that is, implanted into, and made a part of the body of Christ by baptism.—*On the Epistles*, Rom. vi. 3, Vol. I., p. 294.

LANGE.—The phrase *baptizein eis* retains the most direct figurative reference of baptism. It means strictly, to immerse into Christ (Ruckert)—that is, into the fellowship of Christ. The explanation of Meyer, that it never means any thing else than *to baptize in reference to, with relation to*, and that the more specific definitions must arise from the context, fails to do justice to this original meaning. But the baptizing into the full, living fellowship of Christ, is, as the Apostle remarks, a baptism into the fellowship of His death. And there is implied here, according to the idea of a covenant, the Divine adjudication of this saving fellowship on the one hand, and the human obligation for an ethical continuance of the fellowship on the other.—*Com. on Rom.*, vi. 3.

MOBERLY.—"*How shall we.*" God forbid! Did we not die to sin? How then shall we live in it? Surely ye know that when we were baptized into Christ, we were baptized into participation of His death. When we were plunged into the water of Baptism, we were

buried along with Christ, being, with Him, dead to sin, in order that as Christ, by the glorious power of the Father, rose from the dead, so we also, rising out of the baptismal water, wherein we shared His death and burial, should walk, that is, live in a new, that is, holy and regenerate life.—*Com. on Rom.*, vi. 4.

PHILIPPI.—As the death of Christ is the crown and chief element in His redemptive work, baptism above all introduces into union with the death of Christ.— *Com. on Rom.*, vi. 3.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—To be baptized into the death of Christ, is to have fellowship with him in his death, or to have the efficacy of his death sealed up to us; and that is the blessed privilege of as many as are baptized, or planted into Christ: they are not only partakers of the merit of his death for justification, but of the efficacy of his death for mortification.—*Annotations*, on Rom. vi. 3.

SCHAFF.—*Eis ton thanaton* must be closely connected with *baptismatos*, baptism into the death of Christ for the appropriation of its full benefit, viz., the remission of sins and reconciliation with God.—*Note on Rom. vi. 4*, in *Lange's Com.*, Vol. V., p. 202.

SCOTT, JOHN.—The meaning therefore of the above-cited Passage is plainly this: "You cannot be ignorant that when you were Baptized into Jesus Christ, you made a solemn Profession, that you would conform yourselves to his Death, in dying to Sin even as he died for it, so that in your Baptismal Immersion you were representatively buried with him, that so as Christ was

raised from the Dead, so you, in conformity thereto, might live a new regenerate Life; for as we conform to Death in dying to Sin, as we promised to do in our Immersion, we shall be sure to conform to his Resurrection also, in living to Righteousness, as we promised to do in the rising out of the Water again. By which it is evident that Baptism is on our Part a solemn *Engagement* of ourselves to perform the *Conditions* of the New Covenant. And indeed the very Phrase, *Baptized into Jesus Christ*, can import no less than a solemn *resignation* of ourselves to Christ in Baptism.— *Works*, Vol. I., p. 446.

SCOTT, THOMAS.—The baptism of Jews and Gentiles, when converted to Christianity, implied their 'death unto sin and new birth unto righteousness;' their entrance into the church and kingdom of Christ; the washing away of the guilt and pollution of their sins; and their dedication to the service of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in whose name, as the God of their salvation, they were baptized.—*Commentary on Col*, ii. 12.

STIER.—In Rom. vi. when, on the one hand, the Apostle is explaining the symbolism of the rite, and, on the other, emphatically urging the consequent obligation to perfect that which was only begun in baptism, he recognizes and asserts, at the outset, that we have already died and risen again, that we *are* already implanted, because we are baptized. Comp. Col. ii. 12; Gal. iii. 27; Titus iii. 5 in its right exposition, which we cannot here unfold.— *The Words of the Lord Jesus*, Vol. VIII., p. 303.

TROLLOPE.— From a consideration of the privileges conferred in baptism, the apostle turns to the necessity

of personal holiness in order to make salvation sure; and develops the typical nature of that rite, wherein the immersion of the body, in imitation of Christ's death and burial *for sin*, implies an engagement to *die from sin*; and the rising from the water, in imitation of his resurrection, is emblematic of a new life of virtue and holiness.—*Greek Testament*, on Rom. vi. 2-4.

VAUGHAN.— *We were buried with Him, by means of that baptism, into that death. In other words, Our baptism was a sort of funeral; a solemn act of consigning to that death of Christ in which we are made one with Him. And with this object: not that we might remain dead, but that we might rise with Him from death, experience (even in this world) the power of His resurrection, and live the life which we, now live in the flesh as men who have already died and risen again.*— *Notes on Romans*, vi. 4.

WATERLAND.—According to the *ordinary* rule, faith and repentance were to be perfected by *Baptism*, both for the making *regeneration* and the giving a title to salvation, . . . Till Baptism succeeds, the solemn and saving *stipulation* between God and the party does not pass in due form; nor the awful *consecration* of the man to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. He is not yet *buried* with Christ *into death*, nor *planted* in the likeness of his *resurrection*; nor indeed *clothed* with Christ, the baptismal garment. Therefore, in strictness, he is not a *member* of Christ, nor a *child* of God, nor a *citizen* of Christ's kingdom; but an *alien* still, having no *covenant claim* to the Gospel privileges.— *Works*, Vol. VI., pp. 355, 356.

WEBSTER AND WILKINSON.—Baptism assures us that we have participation in the death of Christ. The appeal is

not to a pledge given in baptism to die unto sin, &c., but to the fact shown us in baptism, viz., our own actual state under grace; it testifies that we are changed, have a new life, lose our old life when in Christ. We are in Him caused to pass through a spiritual death unto sin, death of the carnal nature, into a state of life to God. —*Greek Testament*, Note on Rom. vi. 4.

WILLMARTH.—The Epistles, addressed to Christians, are more distinctly doctrinal than the historical narrative of the Acts, yet are intensely practical. They contain many references to Baptism. It is represented as a *burial with Christ* and a *being raised together with him* "to walk in newness of life," which necessitates Remission. We are said to be *baptized INTO (eis) Jesus Christ*, i. e., so as to come to be in Christ.—*Baptism and Remission*, in *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1877, p. 310.

CHAPTER IX.

PAUL NOT SENT TO BAPTIZE (1 COR. i. 17).

ALFORD.—It is evident that this is said in no *derogation* of Baptism, for he did on occasion baptize,—and it would be impossible that he should speak lightly of the ordinance to which he appeals (Rom. vi. 3) as the seal of our union with Christ.—*Greek Test.*, Note on 1 Cor. i. 16, Vol. II., p. 478.

BARNES.—*For Christ sent me not to baptize.* That is, not to baptize as my main business. Baptism was not his principal employment, though he had a commission in common with others to administer the ordinance, and occasionally did it.—*Notes*, on 1 Cor. i. 17.

BEET.—*Not to baptize;* does not mean that Christ forbade him to baptize, but that this was not the purpose for which Christ appeared to him and sent him. *Good-news:* Rom. i. 1, literally, 'not to baptize but to evangelize.' This agrees exactly with Acts ix. 15; xxii. 14; xxvi. It does not imply a mission different from Matt, xxviii. 19: for there baptism is subordinate to making disciples. This verse embodies the great truth that even the most solemn outward forms are secondary to inward spiritual life. But even a second place in the kingdom of God may be of great importance.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, i. 17.

BURKITT.—*Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach*; that is, rather to preach than to *baptize*: this was his great business, his principal work; though baptizing was in his commission.—*Notes on the New Test.*, on 1 Cor. i. 17.

CALVIN.—Two things, however, must be noticed here. The *first* is that the Apostle does not here absolutely deny that he had a command to baptize, for this is applicable to all the Apostles: *Go and baptize*; and he would have acted rashly in baptizing even *one*, had he not been furnished with authority, but simply points out what was the Chief thing in his calling. The *second* thing is that he does not by any means detract here, as some think, from the dignity or utility of the sacrament. For the question here is, not as to the efficacy of baptism, and Paul does not institute this comparison with the view of detracting in any degree from *that*; but because it was given to few to teach, while many could baptize; and farther, as many as could be taught at the same time, while baptism could only be administered to individuals successively, one by one, Paul, who excelled in the gift of teaching, applied himself to the work that was more especially needful for him, and left to others what they could not conveniently accomplish.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, i. 17, p. 72.

FARRAR.—*Sent me not to baptize, but*; that is, according to Semitic idiom, "not so much to baptize, as" (Matt, xxviii. 19). The word "sent" (*apesteilen*) involves the meaning "made me an apostle" (*apostolos*). The primary function of an apostle was "to bear witness" (Mark xvi. 15; Acts i. 8, etc.).—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, i. 17.

HALLEY.—Although Quakers speak with marvelous complacency of the Great apostle to the Gentiles being sent, not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel, yet even St. Paul sometimes baptized; if seldom in Corinth, yet occasionally elsewhere. The Corinthian converts were unquestionably baptized, and many of them, we have no reason to doubt, by the assistants of Paul, and under his direction. The remark, therefore, which we made upon the conduct of our Lord, in not baptizing, will equally apply to the practice of St. Paul. His commission was not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel, and, therefore, he generally left the baptism of the converts to others; yet its administration was sanctioned both by his practice and his authority.—*The Sacraments*, Part I., p. 69.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—Baptism was not his principal work, not the main business for which Paul was sent, it was part of his work, otherwise he would not have baptized Crispus, or Gaius, or 'the household of Stephanas,' but preaching was his principal work. It is very probable that others (besides the apostles) baptized.—*Annotations*, on 1 Cor. i. 17.

SADLER.—But we are reminded that St. Paul was sent by Christ "not to baptize but to preach the gospel;" and that he thanked God that he had "baptized none of the Corinthians save Crispus and Gaius."

This place is gravely cited, as if St. Paul meant to disparage his Master's ordinance, and to set himself above the other Apostles, for whereas Christ gave to them a commission to preach *and* baptize, St. Paul, it is assumed, considered himself called to preach only, *i. e.* to perform the higher act and not the lower.

There is no need to adopt an interpretation so incon-

sistent with St. Paul's regard to the words of his Divine Master, for he himself tells us why he thanked God that he had baptized so few of the Corinthians, which was, "lest any should say that he had baptized in his own name;" lest, that is, he should be thought to have given the least occasion of division in the Corinthian Church.

St. Paul's words and acts are really a testimony to the importance of Baptism, for they teach us that it is the same, and conveys the same benefits, by whomsoever it is administered. He thanks God that he had not baptized simply because the Baptism of *any* minister produced exactly the same effect as his, Baptism being an act of God rather than of men, and so its effect is independent of the Ecclesiastical position of the administrator.—*Church Doctrine—Bible Truth*, p. 386.

TERTULLIAN.—But they roll back *an objection* from *that* apostle himself, in that he said, "For Christ sent me not to baptize;" as if by this argument baptism were done away! For *if so*, why did he baptize Gaius, and Crispus, and the house of Stephanas? However, even if Christ had not sent Aim to baptize, yet He had given *other* apostles the precept to baptize. But these words were written to the Corinthians in regard of the circumstances of that particular time; seeing that schisms and dissensions were agitated among them, while one attributes *everything* to Paul, another to Apollos. For which reason the peace-making apostle, for fear he should seem to claim all *gifts* for himself, says that he had been sent "not to baptize but to preach." For preaching is the prior thing, baptizing the posterior. Therefore the preaching came *first*: but I think baptizing withal was *lawful* to him to whom preaching was. — *On*

Baptism, Chap. XIV., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. III., p. 676.

WEBSTER AND WILKINSON.—As S. Paul did baptize, and as baptism was part of the duty assigned by Christ to the original Apostles (M. xxviii. 19), with whom he claims to rank, it is clear that he seems to say that of two objects of the apostolical, and hence generally of the ministerial commission, baptism is inferior and subordinate to preaching the Gospel. Though the Commission was to 'proclaim the Gospel to every creature' and to 'baptize in the name, &c.,' yet an Apostle might dispense with the personal administration of baptism.—*Greek Testament*, Note on 1 Cor. i. 17.

WILLMARTH.—Paul's thankfulness that he baptized so few at Corinth is *not* an undervaluing of Baptism, though this is a favorite argument of anti-immersionists. He does not deny that he preached Baptism, but only says that he did not there (generally) administer the rite with his own hands. He does not deny that the "Lord sent him to preach" Baptism, but does deny that his great mission was to baptize. It is evident from the narratives of Acts xvi. and xviii. that he did preach Baptism, at Corinth and elsewhere, as a part of the Gospel, and that those who believed under his preaching were immediately baptized. But he preferred, when practicable, that some one else should officiate, just as now an "evangelist" [so called] might, for the best of reasons, prefer that the pastors should do the baptizing, while himself strenuously insisting on Baptism in his preaching. The bearing of this passage on the subject in hand is exactly opposite to the inference drawn from it. It is this: Baptism was such an impor-

tant thing in the view of the early Christians that Paul congratulated himself in having baptized so few at Corinth, lest some should say that he "baptized in his own name"—lest the faith and reverence due to Christ might be "divided"—and a part transferred to the distinguished administrator. How could this have been, if Baptism had been a mere symbol of no vital consequence?—*Baptism and Remission*, in *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1877, pp. 312, 313.

WOODFORD.—"*I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gains*" So St. Peter (Acts x. 48.) "Jesus Himself (St. John iv. 2.) baptized not, but His disciples." St. Paul had full authority to baptize, for he did baptize some (verses 14-16.), but he rarely exercised it. Why? Lest he should give occasion to that very spirit of faction which he is here rebuking, for those who had been baptized by his own hands, might assume to belong to him in an extraordinary degree.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, i. 14.

CHAPTER X.

"WASHED" (1 COR. VI. 11).

BEET.— *You washed yourselves*: close coincidence with Acts xxii. 16, 'Baptize thyself (or, have thyself baptized) and wash away thy sins.' God designs the Christian life to be one of purity, i. e. free from the inward conscious defilement, causing shame, which always accompanies sin. To this life of purity, Baptism, as a public confession of Christ and formal union with his people, was the divinely appointed outward entrance. Only thus, in ordinary cases, could men obtain salvation. Mk. xvi. 16; Acts ii. 38. And the use of water set forth in outward symbol the inward purity which God requires, and is ready to give. Therefore by voluntarily receiving Baptism, not only did the early converts profess their desire for the purity promised in the Gospel, but, by fulfilling the divinely ordained condition, they actually obtained it in proportion to their faith. Consequently, by coming to baptism, they practically *washed themselves from* the stain of their sin. Cf. Tit. iii. 5, 'He saved us by means of the laver of regeneration.'—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, vi. 11.

BURKITT. — *Ye are washed*, sacramentally washed in baptism.—*Notes on the New Test.*, on 1 Cor. vi. 11.

BURTON.—The end of this verse seems to contain an allusion to the form of baptism *in the name &c.* The whole passage alludes to a person being released from

his sins at baptism, and sanctified by the Holy Spirit.— *Greek Test.*, Note on 1 Cor. vi. 11.

CLARKE, ADAM.— *Ye are washed, apelousasthe*; ye have been *baptized* into the Christian faith, and ye have promised in this baptism to put off all filthiness of the flesh and spirit; and the *washing* of your bodies is emblematical of the purification of your souls.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, vi. 11.

FARRAR.—*But ye are washed.* The voice and tense in the original differs from those of the following words. This cannot be accidental. It is better, therefore,, to render, *Bat ye washed away your sins*; i. e. ye, by your baptism, washed away those stains (Acts xxii. 16). The very object of Christ's death had been that he might cleanse his church "by the washing of water by the Word."—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, vi. 11.

KLING.—The term 'wash' points to the defilement incurred by the sins before spoken of, and to the purification effected through the forgiveness obtained in baptism, or the removal of guilt then pledged (Acts xxii. 16).— *Com. on 1 Corinthians*, vi. 11.

LIAS.—*But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye art justified*] The past tense is employed in the original—' ye were washed, sanctified, justified.' The allusion is to baptism, where by a solemn profession the disciple entered into covenant with—and so *put on* (see Gal. iii. 27) Christ. The meaning of *ye were washed* in the Greek is either *ye washed these things from you*, or *ye washed yourselves dean from them*, cf. Acts xxii. 16.—*Notes on 1 Cor.*, vi. 11.

MACKNIGHT.—The Corinthians having been washed with the water of baptism, in token of their having renounced idolatry with all its impurities, they were under the obligation of a solemn vow carefully to study purity of heart and *life*.—*On the Epistles*, 1 Cor. vi. 11, Vol. II., p. 89.

MEYER.—*Ye washed yourselves clean*, namely, by your immersion in the waters of baptism, from the moral defilement of the guilt of your sins (you obtained, through means of baptism, the forgiveness of your sins committed before you became Christians). Comp. xxii. 16. ii. 38; Eph. v. 26; 1 Pet. iii. 21.—*Com. on I Cor.*, vi. 11, pp. 134, 135.

PLUMMER.—The passage in the First Epistle to the Corinthians which, like the one before us, (Eph. v. 26), contrasts the appalling wickedness of unbelievers with the spiritual condition of Christians is scarcely less clear. "And such were some of you: but *ye were washed* (lit. 'ye washed away' your sins), but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God.—*Pastoral Epistles*, p. 287.

PYLE.—To such vices as these, many of you Corinthians were subject in your *heathen* state. But by becoming *Christians*, and being baptized into the faith of the gospel, and by having the endowment of the *Holy Ghost* conferred on you, you were cleansed from the guilt, and received the pardon of them all, and are indispensably obliged for the future to forsake the practice of them.—*Paraphrase*, on 1 Cor. vi. 11.

TROLLOPE.—There is an evident allusion to baptism in

the *name* of Christ, and the sanctification of the Spirit; and the Apostle represents the commission of those sins, renounced at baptism, as inconsistent with the state of grace into which they were then admitted. —*Analecta Theologica*, on 1 Cor. vi. 11, Vol. II., p. 396.

VALPY.—But ye are now washed by baptism from the sins committed in the time of your infidelity, and justified from your former guilt, through the operation of the divine Spirit at the time of baptism.—*Novum Test.*, Note on 1 Cor. vi. 11, Vol. II., p. 390.

WELLS.—And such were some of you: but ye are washed, *i. e.*, *your former sins are washed away or forgiven at your Baptism.*—*Paraphrase*, 1 Cor. vi. 11.

WOODFORD.—"*Ye are washed.*" That is in Holy Baptism.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, vi. 11.

CHAPTER XI.

BAPTIZED UNTO MOSES (1 COR. x. 2).

BEET.—*In the cloud, etc., or, with the cloud:* the material instruments of their baptism. By ranging themselves under *the cloud* and passing through *the sea*, they formally placed themselves in a new relationship to Moses as His followers. They thus openly separated themselves from Egypt, and became the professed people of God. That the position they then took up was analogous to that of Christians, is suggested by the word *baptized*. And the presence of water, in the cloud and sea, made it very appropriate.—*Com. on 1 Cor., on x. 2.*

BROWNE.—The passage of the Red Sea was the first step of the Israelites from the land of their bondage. Before they passed it they were slaves; after they had passed it, they were free, their enemies were overthrown, and they were delivered. Yet it was a passage, not into Canaan, but into the wilderness; deliverance from inevitable bondage, but not deliverance from fighting and toil. They had yet forty years to wander, before the passage of Jordan should lead them into rest. In those forty years' wanderings they had contests, temptations, and dangers. Though saved from Pharaoh, their disobedience and unbelief overthrew most of them in the wilderness; and but few of those, who had passed through the sea, ever reached the home of their inheritance. St. Paul (1 Cor. x. 1-12) sets this before us, as a type of

Christian baptism and Christian life. Baptism is to us a rite ordained for our deliverance—deliverance from sin and the slavery of sin; but it is only our first step in the course of our profession; and if we, like the Israelites, though bathed in the waters and fed from the manna and the rock, yet lust, and murmur, and tempt Christ, and commit idolatry and impurity, we must expect to fall under the power of the serpent, to be destroyed of the destroyer, and never to enter into that promised land, which is nevertheless the inheritance prepared for us of God.—*Expos. of the XXXIX. Art.*, p. 623.

LIAS.—*And were all baptized unto Moses*] The passing through the cloud (Exod. xiv. 19) and the sea was a type of Christian Baptism, in that he who passes through it exchanges a state of bondage for a state of freedom, the hard yoke of a Pharaoh for the fatherly care of God, and this in consequence of his following the guidance of a leader sent by God. The Israelites were baptized '*unto Moses*,' because by passing through the cloud and the sea they had become connected with him, dependent on his commands and guidance.—*Notes on 1 Corinthians*, x. 2.

MEYER.—The type appropriated the subjects to Moses as his; the antitype appropriates them to Christ as His redeemed ones; and in both instances this is done with a view to their salvation, as in the one case from temporal bondage and ruin, so in the other from that which is spiritual and eternal.—*Com. on 1 Cor.*, x. 2, p. 219.

MOBERLY.—Another most eminent type of the deliverance of the Church from sin in baptism was the passage of the Red Sea, and as such it is spoken of by St. Paul

in the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians. "Who is wise," says St. Basil, "and will understand these things? As the sea is, typically, baptism, separating the Israelites from the power of Pharaoh, so this laver separates men from the tyranny of the devil. The sea killed the enemy in itself, and in baptism also our enmity against God dies. The people issued from the sea uninjured, and we come up from the water as living from dead, having been saved by the grace of Him that called us." And St. Augustine, "That people is freed from the Egyptians by Moses; this people is freed from their former life of sins by our Lord Jesus Christ. That people passed through the Red Sea; this through baptism. In the Red Sea die all the enemies of that people; all our sins die in baptism."—*The Great Forty Days*, pp. 107, 108.

ROBERTSON, F. W.—Baptism is a solemn profession of our Christianity: and the passing through the Red Sea was the Israelites' profession of discipleship to Moses: then they passed the Rubicon, the die was cast, and thenceforward there was no return for them. One solemn step had severed them for ever from Egypt: and the cloud guidance which then began, kept the memory of this act before them by a constant witness in all their journeyings. So far then, this is equivalent to baptism, which is discipleship: a sacrament or oath of obedience, the force of which is kept up and recalled by an outward sign.—*Expos. Led. on 1 Cor.*, Lect. XX., p. 154.

VALPY.—The cloud and sea being nothing but water, are well suited to the typical representation of baptism, which is the initiating ceremony both in the Jewish and Christian church. And because the Israelites, by being

hidden from the Egyptians under the cloud, and by passing through the Red Sea, were made to declare their belief in the Lord, and in his servant Moses, Exod. xiv. 31. the Apostle very properly represents them as baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea.—*Novum Test.*, Note on 1 Cor. x. 2, Vol. II., p. 407.

WORDSWORTH.—As the Israelites were not delivered from the Egyptians before they came to the Red Sea, so none can be freed from the pressure of his sins before he comes to the waters of Baptism. And if the Red Sea, the figure of Baptism, had such a virtue as it had, how great is the power of Baptism, of which the Red Sea was a type!—*Greek Test.*, Note on John hi. 5.

CHAPTER XII.

BAPTIZED BY ONE SPIRIT (1 COR. xii. 13).

BEET.—In 1 Corinthians xii. 13 we read: *In one Spirit we all were baptized into one body . . . and all were made to drink one Spirit.* This refers probably to Baptism by water. For we have here no suggestion of any other than the ordinary meaning of the word *baptize*. St. Paul is speaking of the Church which is the *body* of Christ, and of the *Holy Spirit* who is its animating principle. By Baptism, his readers entered the Church and were thus united to the body of Christ. And by faith, of which their Baptism was a confession they obtained (Galatians iii. 2) the gift of the Spirit. Consequently, to St. Paul's thought the outward condition, and the inward Source, of the new life were closely associated: *In one Spirit they were baptized into one body.* Similarly in John iii. 5 we have a birth *of water and Spirit.* So in Acts ii. 38 we read: *Repent and be baptized, each of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.* On the other hand, St. Paul never uses the phrase *baptize with the Holy Spirit*, found in Matthew iii. 11; Mark i. 8; Luke iii. 16; John i. 33; Acts i. 5. If our exposition be correct, we have in 1 Corinthians xii. 13 a definite reference to Baptism as the outward and visible gate into the Church and into the company of those savingly joined to each other and to Christ.—*Christian Baptism*, pp. 18,19.

BLUNT.—*For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body]* Thus the Unity of the Church originates in its sacramental life: its members becoming one, not through any act of mutual consent, agreement, or love, but because God the Holy Spirit has made them one by the life which He has bestowed in Baptism, when He made them "members of Christ." — *Annotated Bible*, 1 Cor. xii. 13.

HAMMOND.—For in baptism being made partakers of the same Spirit we are entered into one body to be fellow members with all Christians, of what quality or sort soever we are.—*Paraphrase*, on 1 Cor. xii. 13.

SADLER.—In 1 Cor. xii. 13, the Fathers and the Divines of the time of the Reformation, without exception, find a reference to water Baptism as the outward and formal means by which the Holy Spirit grafts men into the mystical body of Christ. This text can only mean this, for St. Paul, as the whole context shows, is evidently speaking of a something which pertains to the whole Corinthian church and to every individual of it.—*Church Doctrine—Bible Truth*, p. 59.

VALPY.—*For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body . . . i. e. by being baptized we are all made members of the body of Christ, and united one to another under him the head; this, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, bond or free, we are all one in Christ, who by baptism were admitted into his church.*—*Nov. Test.*, Note on 1 Cor. xii. 13, Vol. II., p. 420.

CHAPTER XIII.

PUT ON CHRIST IN BAPTISM (GAL. III. 27).

BEET.—In complete harmony with Mark xvi. 16 are two other well-known references to Baptism. In Galatians iii. 26, St. Paul declares that his readers *are all sons of God through faith*; and at once supports his words by saying that by their Baptism, which he assumes all have received, they *have put on Christ*, and therefore, like Him, are sons of God. He thus links together Baptism and (see ch. iv. 5) adoption into the family of God. But the Baptism referred to is, as the order of the verses proves, a confession of personal faith.—*Christian Baptism*, p. 17.

BLUNT.—The position of sons of God which has thus been attained has been attained "through the faith" by the putting on of Christ in baptism, and by thus being united with Him Who is the Son of God by nature. Hence the apostle says they are the sons of God "in" Christ Jesus.—*Annotated Bible*, Annot. on Gal. iii. 26.

FAUSSETT.—*Baptized into Christ*—(Rom. vi. 3). *have put on Christ*—*ye did in that very act* of being baptized into Christ, *put on*, or clothe yourselves with, Christ; so the *Greek* expresses. Christ is to you the *toga virilis* (the Roman garment of the full-grown man, assumed when ceasing to be a child). Gataker defines a Christian, "One who has put on Christ." The argument is, By Baptism ye have put on Christ; and, therefore, He, being the

Son of God, ye become sons of adoption, by virtue of His Sonship by generation. This proves that baptism, *where it answers to its ideal*, is not a mere empty sign, but a means of spiritual transference from the state of legal condemnation to that of living union with Christ, and of sonship through Him in relation to God.—*Com. on Gal.*, iii. 27.

HAMMOND.—According to that known rule, that all of what sort soever that have received the faith and are accordingly baptized into it, are made members of Christ. —*Paraphrase*, on Gal. iii. 27.

LUTHER.—This is not done by changing of a garment, or any laws or works, but by a new birth, and by the renewing of the inward man, which is done in baptism, as Paul saith: "All ye that are baptized, have put on Christ." Also: "According to his mercy hath he saved us by the washing of the new birth, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." (Tit. iii. 5.) For, besides that they which are baptized are regenerate and renewed by the Holy Ghost to a heavenly righteousness and to eternal life, there riseth in them also a new light and a new flame; there rise in them new and holy affections, as the fear of God, true faith and assured hope, &c.; there beginneth in them also a new will. And this is to put on Christ truly, and according to the gospel.

Therefore, the righteousness of the law, or of our own works, is not given unto us in baptism; but Christ himself is our garment. Now, Christ is no law, no lawgiver, no work; but a divine and inestimable gift, whom God hath given unto us, that he might be our justifier, our savior, and our redeemer. Wherefore, to be apparelled with Christ according to the gospel, is not to be appar-

elled with the law nor with works, but with an incomparable gift; that is to say, with remission of sins, righteousness, peace, consolation, joy of spirit, salvation, life, and Christ himself.—*Com. on Gal.*, iii. 27, p. 278.

MEYER.—*Eis Christon*] in relation to Christ, so that ye who belong to Christ through baptism become partakers in fellowship of life with Him.—*Com. on Galatians*, iii. 27, p. 156.

SADLER.—The Epistle to the Galatians was written for the express purpose of upholding the sufficiency of Faith; and yet in Baptism is described as the needful supplement to Faith, for in it St. Paul lays down that the baptismal "putting on" of Christ is the proof of our adoption or sonship through Faith. (Gal. iii. 27.) All the Galatian Christians were children of God by Faith because "as many of them as had been baptized into Christ had put on Christ."—*Church Doctrine—Bible Truth*, p. 88.

SCHAFF.—The Greek tenses (aorists) make the two acts simultaneous; in the act and at the time of your baptism ye did clothe yourselves with Christ. 'Into' implies introduction into union with Christ, mystical incorporation in Christ; so also Rom. vi. 3, ('into Christ;' comp. 1 Cor. x. 2. 'into Moses'), and the baptismal formula, Matt, xxviii. 19, 'baptizing into (not in') the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.'—'Did put on Christ' is analogous to the phrase 'to put on the new man' of righteousness and holiness in opposition to the 'old man' of sin which is to be 'put away;' Eph. iv. 22, 24; Col. iii. 9,10. The baptized is surrounded by Christ,

and covered with his merits, as the soldier is surrounded by his equipment.—*Com. on Gal.*, iii. 27.

WILLMARTH.—To be *baptized unto Christ*, as the context seems to indicate direction of mind in the act, the result being stated, *ye have put on Christ*, clothed yourselves with Christ (so to speak), involving the ideas of unity and conformity. And this is mentioned (as the "for" shows) to confirm the preceding statement, "Ye are all sons of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Here, then, Faith and Baptism are united (as elsewhere), and united in their relation to adoption, which results from union with Christ. All this, of course, implies Remission.—*Baptism and Remission*, in *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1877, p. 310.

CHAPTER XIV.

CHURCH CLEANSED BY WASHING (EPH. v. 26, 27).

ALFORD. — By the laver (not '*washing*,' as E. V.: a meaning the word never has) of the water (of which we all know: viz. the *baptismal water*).—*Greek Test.*, Note on Eph. v. 26, Vol. III., p. 137.

BLOOMFIELD.—'That he might [by his Spirit] consecrate it to his service, having cleansed it by the washing of the water (i. e. by that baptism which is the laver of regeneration; see Tit. iii. 5), and through the word, i.e. the Gospel, as the means of their conversion and sanctification.'— *Greek Test.*, Note on Eph. v. 26, Vol. II., p. 404.

BRAUNE.— *With the laver of water*,—unquestionably this means baptism; the readers must have thus understood it.—*Com. on Eph.*, v. 27.

BURKITT.— *Washing of water, by the word*: the word and sacraments are great instrumental means in the hand of Christ, by which he applies the virtue and efficacy of his death, for the sanctifying and cleansing of his church and children.—*Notes on the New Test.*, on Eph. v. 27.

CALVIN.—When Paul says that we are washed by baptism, his meaning is, that God employs it for declaring

to us that we are washed and at the same time performs what it represents.—*Com. on Ephesians*, v. 27.

CLARK, SAMUEL.—Indue all his Members with a principle of holiness. Remove the guilt, filth and power of sin. By Baptism, and the preaching of the Gospel, (which are the outward means of bestowing these Benefits.)—*Annotations*, on Eph. v. 26.

ELLICOTT.—*By the* [well-known] *laver of the water*. The reference to baptism is clear and distinct.—*Com. on Eph.*, v. 26.

HAMMOND.—That he might purify it from all sin, and to that end appointed baptism, therein obliging us to forsake the devil.—*Paraphrase*, on Eph. v. 26.

KNAPP. — This effect of baptism depends upon the Word of God united with baptism; or the divine truths of Christianity and the divine power inherent in and connected with them. Cf. Eph. v. 26, "Christ purifies and sanctifies the members of the church in baptism through the Word"—i. e., the whole gospel system in its full extent, its *precepts* and *promises*. The latter made to us in baptism; and at the same time we pledge ourselves to obey the former, and receive strength so to do. The means, therefore, by which baptism produces these effects, or rather, God through baptism, is, the Word.— *Christian Theology*, p. 432.

LESLIE.—*That he* (Christ) *might sanctify and cleanse it* (the church) *with the washing of water by the word*. Here the washing of water is the means, though the operation and virtue is from the word: and therefore the outward

washing or baptizing (which means the same, as before told, sect. I.) cannot be the same with *the word* in this text.—*Theological Works, Vol. II., p. 89.*

MEYER.—In His sacrificial death, namely, Christ's intention with regard to His future church had this aim, that, after having by baptism brought about for its members the forgiveness of their pre-Christian sins, He would make it partaker of Christian-moral holiness by means of the gospel. That cleansing is the *negative* side of that which Christ contemplated with regard to His church in His death, and this sanctification by means of the gospel constantly influencing the baptized is the *positive* side; the former the *antecedent*, "antecedent," the latter the *consequens*, "consequent;" and both are caused by the *atoning death*, which is the *causa meritoria*, "meritorious cause," of the forgiveness of sins brought about by means of baptism, and the *contents* of the gospel as the word of the cross.—*Com. on Eph., v. 26, p. 512.*

MEYRICK.—"The laver of water" is baptism, which as it is administered to each member of the Church is regarded and represented as administered to the Church in its corporate capacity. There is no reference to ceremonial washings preceding an Eastern marriage, as some have thought. Cf. Acts xxii. 16; Heb. x. 22; Titus iii. 5; 1 Cor. vi. 11.—*Com. on Ephesians, v. 26.*

PLUMMER.—In Eph. v. 26 (the only other passage in the New Testament in which the word "laver" or "bath" or "washing" occurs) the reference to baptism by water is indisputable, for the water is expressly mentioned. "Christ also loved the Church, and gave

Himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, having *cleansed it by washing of water* with the word."—*Pastoral Epistles*, p. 286.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—In baptism in which the external washing represents, seals, and exhibits the internal cleansing both the guilt and defilement of sin by the blood of Christ, Heb. ix. 14; Rev. i. 5.—*Annotations*, on Eph. v. 26.

PYLE.—Nothing can be too lively and perfect an example of love, care, and tenderness, as that wherewith Christ treats the *Church*, his spouse, cleansing and purifying all its members from the guilt of sin, by baptizing them into his holy and pure profession; and by his word and Holy Spirit training them up to such unblemished holiness of life here upon earth, as will terminate in the perfection of virtue, glory and happiness of heaven.—*Paraphrase*, on Eph. v. 25-27.

RIDDLE, M. B.— *With the laver of water*. The reference to baptism is unmistakable.—*Com. on Eph.*, v. 26.

SADLER.—In Eph. v. 26, Christ is said to cleanse the Church in Baptism; for "He gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word." Observe here that Christ is said to have given Himself for the Church, not to cleanse it without, or apart from, ordinances, but to make one ordinance at least efficacious for its cleansing.—*Church Doctrine—Bible Truth*, p. 60.

STUART.—The reader will see in this case, that the idea *of washing* is connected with the idea of *cleansing*, and

that the reference is clearly made to baptism.—*Mode of Christian Baptism*, p. 114.

VALPY.— *That he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word; i. e. that he might by his Spirit consecrate and fit it for his service, having purified by that baptism, which is the laver of regeneration, Titus iii. 5; and purged it from the guilt and pollution of sin, by the word. i. e. the gospel, as the means of their conversion and progressive sanctification.—Nov. Test., Note on Eph. v. 26, Vol. III., p. 53.*

THOROLD.—"*Washing of water.*" Or, the laver of water. Undoubtedly the reference here is to baptism. "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord" (Acts xxii. 16.).—*Com. on Eph.*, v. 26.

CHAPTER XV.

WASHING OF REGENERATION (TITUS III. 5).

ALFORD.—By means of the laver (not *washing*, as E. V.: see the Lexx.: but always a vessel, or pool in which washing takes place. Here the baptismal font.—*Greek Test.*, Note on Tit. iii. 5, Vol. III., p. 424.

BARNES.—The word in itself would naturally be understood as referring to baptism which was regarded as the emblem of washing away sin, or of cleansing from them. I say it was the *emblem*, not the *means* of purifying the soul from sin. If this be the allusion, and it seems probable, then the phrase "washing of regeneration" would mean "the outward washing or baptism which is *the emblem* of regeneration," and which is appointed as one of the ordinances connected with salvation.—*Notes*, on Titus iii. 5.

BEET.—The passage just expounded [Acts xxii. 16.] sheds light upon Titus iii. 5. Long after his own Baptism at Damascus, St. Paul wrote to his Gentile convert, *God saved us by means of the laver (or bath) of the New Birth*. And we have no need to deny a reference here to the rite of Baptism.—*Christian Baptism*, pp. 16, 17.

BLOOMFIELD.—Render: 'by the laver of regeneration;' i. e. (as Bp. Hall explains) 'by the means of those holy ordinances which he hath appointed; and mainly, as

one of them, by the holy sacrament of baptism, which is the laver of our spiritual regeneration.'—*Greek Test.*, Note on Titus iii. 5, Vol. II., p. 562.

BLUNT.—*By the washing of regeneration*] Or, by means of "the bath of regeneration," that is, by means of Baptism. Although the actual word "regeneration" is only used here and in Matt. xix. 28, the same idea, that of being "born again," or "begotten again," or "newly created," occurs frequently in the New Testament, and it is associated with the use of water, or "the bath," by our Blessed Lord Himself in the words, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven."—*Annotated Bible*, on Titus, iii. 5.

BURTON.—*Palingenesias*. This word only occurs twice in the New Testament. In Matt. xix. 28. it means *the resurrection*: it is here evidently coupled with the washing of baptism; at which time the stain of original and actual sin is washed away, and the person is in a manner *born again*: everything which is past is blotted out, and he begins a new life, without being subject to the wrath of God for what is past.—*Greek Test.*, Note on Titus, iii. 5.

CALVIN.—*By the washing of regeneration*. I have no doubt that he alludes, at least, to baptism, and even I will not object to have this passage expounded as relating to baptism; not that salvation is contained in the outward symbol of water, but because baptism seals to us the salvation obtained by Christ.—*Com. on Titus*, iii. 5.

CLARKE, ADAM.—Undoubtedly the apostle here means *baptism*.—*Com. on Titus*, iii. 5.

CYPRIAN.—But what a thing it is, to assert and contend that they who are not born in the Church can be the sons of God! For the blessed apostle sets forth and proves that baptism is that wherein the old man dies and the new man is born, saying, "He saved us by the washing of regeneration."—*Epistle LXXIII.*, § 6, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V., p. 388.

DYKES.—To a convert from heathenism, the bath of baptism marked his formal transition from the old to the new state—the second birth by water (John iii. 5) of which Jesus spake. None the less the real spiritual transition which preceded and was only objectively or formally expressed in baptism was the renewal wrought by the Holy Ghost.—*Com. on Titus*, iii. 5.

FELL.—Two effects of baptism, freeing or cleansing us from sin, both from the guilt and habits of former sins; and bestowing upon us the Holy Spirit.—*On Paul's Epistles*, on Titus iii. 5.

HAMMOND.—Out of his free undeserved mercy toward us, not in respect of, nor by way of return unto, any good action of ours, he rescued and delivered us out of our sinful courses, put us into a state of salvation upon our giving ourselves up in baptism his vowed reformed servants, sealing unto us the pardon of all our sins, and then bestowing his Spirit upon us, to bring forth in us all fruits of new life.—*Paraphrase*, on Titus iii. 5.

HOVEY.—Paul had in mind baptism as representing and confessing the divine change called regeneration. Hence he teaches that men are saved by an outworking,

obedient life, given and preserved by the Holy Spirit.—*Com. on John*, Appendix, p. 422.

HUTHER.—The expression: *to loutron palingenesias*, has been variously interpreted by some expositors, some taking *loutron* as a figurative name for the regeneratio itself, or for the predicatio evangelii, or for the Holy Spirit, or for the abundant imparting of the Spirit. From Eph. v. 26 it is clear that it can mean nothing else than baptism; comp. too, Heb. x. 22; 1 Cor. vi. 11; Acts xxii. 16.—*Com. on Titus*, iii. 5.

JACKSON.—*By the washing.*] rather *laver* or *bath* of regeneration, *i. e.*, baptism, which our 27th Article defines to be "a sign" (an "effectual sign," Art. 25) "of regeneration or new birth."—*Com. on Titus*, iii. 5.

LECHLER.—In these words baptism is unmistakably designated as an actual and operative means of grace, since God delivers souls through it, and makes them partakers of salvation.—*Apost. and Post-Apost. Times*, Vol. II., p. 110.

MACKNIGHT.—*Through the bath of regeneration:* Through *baptism*; called *the bath of regeneration*, not because of any change in the nature of the baptized person is produced by baptism, but because it is an emblem of the purification of his soul from sin. Hence Ananias, in allusion to the emblematical meaning of baptism, said to our apostle, Acts xxii. 16., *Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins.*—*On the Epistles*, Titus iii. 5, Vol. IV., pp. 382, 883.

MEDE.—The Apostle, in the words I have read, paral-

lels the *washing of regeneration*, and *the renewing of the Holy Ghost*, as Type and Counter-type: *God* (saith he) *hath saved us* (that is, brought us into the state of salvation) *by the washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost*: where none, I trow, will deny that he speaks of *Baptism*.—*Works, Disc, on Tit.* iii. 5, p. 62.

PLUMMER.—That "the washing of regeneration," or (as the margin of the R. V. more exactly has it) "the *laver* of regeneration," signifies the Christian rite of baptism, ought to be regarded as beyond dispute.—*Pastoral Epistles*, Titus iii. 5, p. 285.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS.—He hath put us into a state of, and given us a right to eternal salvation. Washing us by regeneration, as in a laver, the pledge and sign of which is baptism.—*Annotations*, Titus iii. 5.

PYLE.—It was the design of this great mercy of God in the gospel revelation, and in receiving them into the happy privileges of the Christian covenant by baptism, and the gracious influences of the Holy Spirit attending their admission into it, to reform them from such a temper.—*Paraphrase*, on Titus iii. 5.

SADLER.—In Titus iii. 5, the "bath of the New Birth" is along with the "renewing of the Holy Ghost" asserted by the Apostle to be the instrument by which God saved us. Nothing can be clearer than the reference to the baptismal bath or font in the original words *dia loutron palingenesai*. How the renewing of the Holy Ghost is connected with Baptism I do not now stop to inquire. What I ask the reader to observe is, that God associates

Baptism with it in the matter of our salvation.—*Church Doctrine—Bible Truth*, p. 56.

SPENCE.—Seeing, then, that God *has* saved us by His own act, independently of any work of ours, we ask, How has he effected this? The words we are considering give the answer to the question. The Greek should be rendered, "by the laver of regeneration," &c., has God put us in a state of salvation. In other words, he has effected this by means of "baptism" (for the laver here can only signify the baptismal font, and is called the laver of regeneration because it is the vessel consecrated to the use of that sacrament), whereby, in its completeness as a sacrament, the new life in Christ is conveyed. Baptism, then, is the means through which we receive the saving grace of Christ.—*Com. on Titus*, iii. 5.

STUART.—The reference, however, although the language is figurative, is, beyond all doubt, to the rite of baptism.—*Mode of Christian Baptism*, p. 114.

SUMMERS.—Baptism is therefore a symbol of "the renewing of the Holy Ghost," with which it is associated by St. Paul, who accordingly calls it, not "regeneration," but, the "washing," or bath, by which it is symbolized. —*Treatise on Baptism*, p. 14.

WATERLAND. — St. Paul in these words has briefly taught us God's method of saving both Jew and Gentile, under the Christian dispensation. He did it, and does it, of free *grace*, and according to the riches of his *pure mercy*; not for or by any righteousness which *we* have done or do by our own *unassisted* abilities, but by the

"washing (or laver) of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost:" that is to say, by the sacrament of Christian *Baptism*, considered in both its *parts*, the outward visible *sign*, which is *water*, and the *inward* thing *signified* and exhibited, *viz.* a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness, therein wrought by the Holy Spirit of God. I interpret the text of *Water-baptism*, as the *ancients* constantly did, and as the rules of true criticism require.— *Works*, Vol. VI., p. 341.

WEBSTER AND WILKINSON.—By means of the laver of regeneration; referring to baptism as an emblem of the purification of the soul from sin. The sacrament of baptism is selected, as being the initiatory rite of discipleship, to represent all the outward means and ordinances, all the hopes and privileges, implied in the condition of discipleship.—*Greek Testament*, Note on Titus iii. 5.

WHITBY.—That the apostle, by "the laver of regeneration," understands that baptism by which Christians, coming then from heathenism, engaged to renounce idolatry, the works of the flesh and of the world, and dedicated themselves to the service of the sacred Trinity, and testified their faith in Christ, cannot reasonably be doubted.—*Com. on the New Test.*, on Titus iii. 5.

WOODFORD.—"*The washing of regeneration.*" We have here a reference to the Sacrament of Baptism (Compare Acts xxii. 16; Eph. v. 26; 1 Peter iii. 21.).—*Com. on Titus*, iii. 5.

WORDSWORTH.—*He saved us.* As far as He is concerned, we are already saved; for He has *done on His part* all

that was requisite for our salvation; and he has given us a good hope of salvation, if we persevere in the state of salvation in which he placed us at our Baptism.

By means of the laver of Regeneration. The merciful God delivered us from our former miseries by means of His only-begotten Son, having freely given us forgiveness of sins in the saving waters of Holy Baptism; and having created us again and formed us anew, and having vouchsafed us the gift of the Holy Ghost, and opened to us the path of Righteousness.—*Greek Test.*, Note on Titus iii. 5.

CHAPTER XVI.

BODIES WASHED (HEB. x. 22).

BROWNE.—In allusion to this doctrine of God's pardoning love, assured to those who come for it in baptism, we find St. Paul mentioning, as one of the requisites for drawing near to God through our great High Priest, that we should have 'our bodies washed with pure water' (Heb. x. 22).—*Exposition of the XXXIX. Art.*, p. 626.

DAVIDSON.—The two conditions which the Apostle reminds his readers that they possess are—hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, that is, a sense of sin removed by the offering of Christ (ix. 9, x. 2 with ix. 14); and bodies washed with pure water. The heart and the body comprehend the whole man, inner and outer. The point lies in the purity of the water, making the body an organ of the inner life equally pure with the life itself. The Author may have had in his mind such passages as Ex. xxix. 21, Lev. viii. 30, according to which priests were sprinkled with blood when dedicated to their office, and Ex. xxix. 4, xxx. 20, xl. 30, where they are said to have been washed with water, and where they are commanded to wash in the laver before entering the sanctuary. To the one corresponds the blood of Christ, and to the other possibly the water of baptism. The rhetorical balance of parts must not be made a doctrinal distinction of effects. Two hindrances to service

presented themselves. The sinfulness of the heart concentrated itself in the conscience and hindered all free service; an evil conscience and a true heart are the opposites of one another. This hindrance was removed by the sprinkling. Defilement adhering to the body, or defilements considered under that aspect, were removed by washing. The language is borrowed from the external operations, and baptism, if it be alluded to, is brought into connection with the body because it was in fact applied to it. The words picture one wholly purified for service, both without and within.—*Com. on Hebrews, x. 22*, pp. 212, 213.

DODDRIDGE.—As the water of purification was to be sprinkled on the Israelites, to cleanse them from any pollutions they might have contracted, so let us see to it that we come, *having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience*, free from all allowed guilt and indulged sin. *And* this is indeed our case, if we are true Christians: our hearts are thus sprinkled by the purifying and cleansing blood of Jesus, as well as *our bodies in baptism washed with pure water*, intended to represent our being cleansed from sin.—*Family Expositor, Paraphrase on Heb. x. 22, Vol. VI.*, pp. 75, 76.

FARRAR.—The meaning is, "with our hearts sprinkled, as it were, with the blood of Christ (xii. 24; ix. 14; 1 Pet. i.2), and so cleansed from a conscience which has become depraved, and our whole beings cleansed in the waters of baptism" Eph. v. 26; Titus iii. 5; 1 Peter iii. 21), just as the Jewish priests were sprinkled with blood (Ex. xxix. 21; Lev. via. 30), and bathed (Ex. xxx. 20; Lev. viii. 6; xvi. 4) before they could enter the Holy Places; "sprinkled . . . washed, once and forever." For

all Christians are priests (Rev. i. 5, 6).—*Early Days of Christ*. (Note), p. 246.

STUART.—That he refers to the rite of baptism here seems hardly to admit of any doubt.—*Mode of Christ. Baptism*, p. 115.

CHAPTER XVII.

BAPTISM SAVES (1 PETER in. 21).

BARNES.—Not the *mere* application of water, for that idea the apostle expressly disclaims, when he says that it involves not "putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." The sense is, that baptism, including all that is properly meant by baptism as a religious rite—that is, baptism administered in connection with true repentance, and true faith in the Lord Jesus, and when it is properly a symbol of the putting away of sin, and of the renewing influences of the Holy Spirit, and an act of unreserved dedication to God—now saves us. ... It may be said to save us, not as the meritorious cause, but as the indispensable condition of salvation.—*Notes*, on 1 Peter iii. 21.

BEET.—In a passage otherwise very difficult we read, *water, which as an antitype now saveth you, even Baptism*: 1 Peter iii. 21. These words present no difficulty. For in all human language we may, leaving out of sight the first cause, attribute a result to its instrumental or proximate cause. If, as we have seen, Baptism is a condition, and in this sense an instrument, of salvation, St. Peter could rightly say, as he here says, *Baptism saveth you*.—*Christian Baptism*, p. 19.

BENSON.—Baptism which consists in the answer of a

good conscience towards God, and which is the antitype or thing which was signified by Noah's preservation in the ark, now saves us as effectually as the ark preserved Noah from destruction from the flood.—*Com. on 1 Peter*, iii. 21.

BLOOMFIELD.—Meaning, 'The antitype to which thing (namely, what *corresponds to*, and was *figured by* the preservation of Noah and his family in the ark) doth now save *us*, through the resurrection of Christ, as the ark did *them*; [I mean] baptism which is not merely the putting away the filth of the flesh [by material water], but the answer of a good conscience toward God.' . . . Baptism is, I apprehend, here compared, not as a *second type* to the first, but as the antitype, the true spiritual deliverance; for this is expressly said to be the *effect* of baptism. Agreeably to this view, Estius ably paraphrases as follows: 'which water, in the thing signified by that type or figure, meaning its very antitype which is baptism, doth now in the time of the new covenant, save us with spiritual salvation, just as that water preserved from a corporeal destruction those who were in the ark.'—*Greek Test.*, on 1 Peter iii. 21, Vol. II., p. 719.

BURKITT.—Observe here, The type and the antitype, the ark and baptism; their salvation from the deluge, by the ark, prefigureth our salvation from God's wrath by baptism. As all that were without the ark perished, and all within the ark were saved; so all that are engrafted into Christ by faith, whereof baptism is a seal, are saved, whilst the unbelieving and unbaptized part of the world perish. Baptism is such a means of spiritual salvation now, as the ark was of Noah's and his family's temporal salvation then: *the like figure whereunto*

baptism now saveth us.—Notes on the New Test., on 1 Pet iii. 21.

BURTON.—*To which thing, viz.* the saving of these eight persons. He was led to this mention of the flood by speaking of the goodness of Christ, and his anxiety for sinners: this is exemplified by his having tried to work upon the antediluvians by the preaching of Noah: and S. Peter having said, that only eight persons were saved, who listened to this preaching of Christ, and committed themselves to the water, he takes occasion to observe, that so baptism will save us, if we listen to the preaching of Christ, and keep our consciences clear, as Noah and his family.—*Greek Testament, Note on 1 Pet. iii. 21.*

CALVIN.—It has already been said that the design of this case is to shew that we ought not to be led away by wicked examples from the fear of God, and the right way of salvation, and to mix with the world. This is made evident in baptism, in which we are buried with Christ, so that being dead to the world, and to the flesh we may live to God. On this account he says that our baptism is an antitype (*antitupon*) to the baptism of Noah, not that Noah's baptism was the first pattern, and ours an inferior figure. . . . As Noah there obtained life through death, when in the ark, he was enclosed not otherwise than as it were in the grave, and when the whole world perished, he was preserved together with his small family; so at this day, the death which it sets forth in baptism, is to us an entrance into life, nor can salvation be hoped for, except we be separated from the world.—*Com. on 1 Peter, iii. 21.*

COOK.—*The like figure whereunto]* This rendering ex-

presses the general sense, but does not accurately represent the statement in the Greek. It may be rendered, "which also saves you now, as baptism being antitypical." That is, "water which saved those who listened to the preaching of Noah now in baptism, which is the antitype of that water, is the means or instrument of your salvation." The same water which drowned those who disobeyed Noah, saved those who entered into the ark; so also baptismal water, which potentially drowns and destroys the old man, or our sinful nature, saves all who are brought into, and remain in, the true ark with Christ.—*Com. on 1 Peter*, iii. 21.

HOVEY.—We are satisfied with neither the Common nor the Revised Version of the text. It may, however, be translated as follows: *Which also now saveth you in its antitype—baptism (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the earnest request of a good conscience unto God), through the resurrection of Jesus Christ.* We give to the word (*eperotema*) variously translated *answer, inquiry, seeking, earnest seeking, requirement, the meaning request, or earnest request*, because the verb (*erotao*) signifies to ask a question, or to ask a favor—i. e., *to question, or to request*, and because the compound verb appears also to have both these senses, though slightly modified in use. Hence, the noun (*eperotema*), which sometimes means a question asked, or a demand made, may naturally signify a *request made*. Grimm proposes to add another definition, namely, *strong desire*; because a feeling of desire is implied in the notions of interrogating or demanding, But the form of the noun points rather to a request made than to the feeling which might lead to making it. Now we have seen that "calling on his name," or prayer, is associated by Ananias with baptism, while "forgive-

ness of sins" is represented by Peter as a result of the beginning of spiritual life, signified by baptism. But in this passage, baptism itself is spoken of as an embodied request or prayer unto God. And what can be truer than this, if it is a symbol of repentance, that is to say, of a change of mind and heart, if it is a sign and figure of entering into a new life? Is not the first motion of faith a beginning of actual trust in God, through Christ, for the forgiveness of sins? And is not this trust an implicit and earnest request for that forgiveness? Baptism, therefore, saves, because it stands for and means genuine reliance, for the first time, upon the mercy of God in Christ, and, indeed, an earnest request for pardon: it expresses the act of the soul in turning to God, committing itself to God, and seeking his grace.—*Com. on John*, Appendix, p. 421.

KACHLER.—The interpretation [of 1 Peter iii. 21.] is given by *on sarkos* etc. The likeness consists in the reference to a divine judgment, and the divine transformation of the instrument of judgment into an instrument of salvation for those who through obedience of faith accept the grace.—*Letter to the Author*, April 20, 1893.

KNAPP.—1 Pet. iii. 21. It is said concerning baptism, that it delivers or frees us from the punishment of our sins, (*sozei*;) not, however, as an *external washing*, but inasmuch as we pledge ourselves in this rite, and are assisted by it, to maintain a good conscience, and inasmuch as it is the means by which we receive and appropriate to ourselves the gracious promise of the forgiveness of sins through Christ.—*Christian Theology*, p. 430.

MACKNIGHT.—The baptism, which consists in the an-

swer of a good conscience towards God, and which is the *antitype* or thing which was signified by the deluge, now saves us as effectually as the water of the deluge preserved Noah by bearing up the ark.—Here it is proper to observe, that Noah gave the answer of a good conscience towards God, by entering into the ark, in the firm belief that God, according to his promise, would preserve him and his family, by that very water which he knew was to destroy all the rest of mankind.—*Baptism*, understanding thereby the answer of a good conscience, *now saveth us also through the resurrection of Jesus Christ*; because if Christ had not risen, being an impostor, he could not have saved any one. But, by his resurrection from the dead being demonstrated to be the Son of God, he is able to save all who believe on him.—*On the Epistles*, 1 Peter iii. 21, Vol. V., pp. 484, 485.

MOBERLY. — The first of these was the deliverance of Noah and his family in the ark, "wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water; the like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth now save us." For the flood was "the baptism of the world, whereby its former iniquity was purged," and "the little ship exhibited a figure of the Church, which is the sea (that is, in the world) is tossed about by the waves (that is, by persecutions and trials)." "For as the waters of the flood drowned the ungodly, as a heap of filthiness washed them away, them and their sins together, as one, being inseparable: and upon the same waters the ark floating preserved Noah; thus the waters of baptism are intended as a deluge to drown sin, and save the believer, who by faith is separated both from the world and from his sin: so it sinks and he is saved."—*The Great Forty Days*, pp. 106, 107.

PYLE.—Now our *baptism* is the same to us, as the *ark* was to Noah, and his family, viz. a means of our salvation from sin and eternal death, as the *ark* saved them from *the flood*. For Christian *baptism* is not a mere external *ceremony* of washing and cleansing the *body*; but its nature and advantage lies in its being a solemn *engagement* on *our* part, to dedicate ourselves to the service of Christ; and the *promise* of eternal life on God's part, on condition of our performing that engagement.—*Paraphrase*, on 1 Peter iii. 21, 22.

SADLER.—The last place is 1 Peter iii. 21; "The like figure whereunto," [*i. e.*, to the salvation of the ancient Church by water in the ark] "even Baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

The assertion "Baptism doth now save," taken in connection with the limiting clause, "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience towards God," means, of course, that Baptism saves only when received in repentance and faith; for no man can give the "answer of a good conscience towards God" except he repents and believes.

We gather, then, from this place, if it has any consistent meaning, that the believing adult is saved, *not before*, but *in* Baptism. God has some wise reason for linking the communication of Salvation with Baptism; so that, if we adhere to the teaching of the Spirit, we cannot account the believing catechumen saved before Baptism.

The limitation, "not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience," shows that the Apostle recognized that God ordained Baptism for the salvation of those whom man in his presumption

declares to have already received salvation, because they already believe. The Apostle, on the contrary, asserts that those who can return the answer of a good conscience towards God are saved in Baptism by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, *i. e.*, they receive the grace of His risen life in Baptism.—*Church Doctrine—Bible Truth*, pp. 60, 61.

SUTCLIFFE.—We are not saved by the putting away of corporal defilement, but by being buried with Christ by baptism unto death, and by rising with him to newness of life.—*Com. on 1 Peter*, iii. 21.

WATSON.—It is thus that we see how St. Peter preserves the correspondence between the act of Noah in preparing the ark as an act of faith by which he was justified, and the act of submitting to Christian baptism, which is also obviously an act of faith, in order to the remission of sins or the obtaining a good conscience before God. This is further strengthened by his immediately adding, "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ:" a clause which our translators, by the use of a parenthesis, connect with "baptism doth also now save us;" so that their meaning is, we are saved by baptism through the resurrection of Jesus Christ; and as he "rose again for our justification," this sufficiently shows the true sense of the apostle, who, by "our being saved," clearly means our being justified by faith.

This text, however, needs no parenthesis; and the true sense may be thus expressed: "The antitype to which water of the flood, baptism, doth now save us, not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but that which intently seeks a good conscience towards God, through faith in the resurrection of Jesus Christ." But, however

a particular word may be disposed of, the whole passage can only be consistently taken to teach us that baptism is the outward sign of our entrance into God's covenant of mercy; and that when it is an act of true faith, it becomes an instrument of salvation, like that act of faith in Noah by which, when moved with fear, he "prepared an ark to the saving of his house," and survived the destruction of an unbelieving world.—*Theological Institutes*, Vol. IV., pp. 409, 410.

WILLMARTH.—One more example from the Epistles must not be passed by, written by the same inspired teacher who directed the inquirers on the Day of Pentecost. *Which [water] in an antitype, baptism, doth now save us also (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh [i. e., not a ceremonial lustration for ceremonial defilement] but the requirement of a good conscience toward God [here repentance is necessarily implied]) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.* This last can be only as we are "baptized upon the name" of the Risen One, and so faith also is assumed. In this remarkable passage it is positively asserted that, in some sense, *baptism saves us*; and in that same sense it must, of course, be related to the Remission of our sins. — *Baptism and Remission*, in *Baptist Quarterly*, July, 1877, p. 311.

CHAPTER XVIII.

TESTIMONY OF THE "FATHERS."

BARNABAS.—Let us further inquire whether the Lord took any care to foreshadow the water [of baptism] and the cross. Concerning the water, indeed, it is written, in reference to the Israelites, that they should not receive that baptism which leads to the remission of sins, but should procure another for themselves. The prophet therefore declares, "Be astonished, O heaven, and let the earth tremble at this, because this people hath committed two great evils: they have forsaken me, a living fountain, and have hewn out for themselves broken cisterns. Is my holy hill Zion a desolate rock? For ye shall be as the fledglings of a bird, which fly away when the net is removed." And again saith the prophet, "I will go before thee and make level the mountains, and will break the brazen gates, and bruise in pieces the iron bars; and I will give thee the secret, hidden, invisible treasures, that they may know that I am the Lord God." And "He shall dwell in a lofty cave of the strong rock." Furthermore, what saith He in reference to the Son? "His water is sure; ye shall see the King in His glory, and your soul shall meditate on the fear of the Lord." And again He saith in another prophet, "The man who doeth these things shall be like a tree by the courses of waters, which shall yield its fruit in due season; and his leaf shall not fade, and all that he doeth shall prosper. Not so are the ungodly, not so, but even as chaff, which

the wind sweeps away from the face of the earth. Therefore the ungodly shall not stand in judgment, nor sinners in the counsel of the just; for the Lord knoweth the way of the righteous, but the way of the ungodly shall perish." Mark how he has described at once both the water and the cross. For these words imply, Blessed are they who, placing their trust in the cross, have gone down into the water; for, says He, they shall receive their reward in due time: then He declares, I will recompense them. But now He saith, "Their leaves shall not fade." This meaneth that every word which proceedeth out of your mouth in faith and love shall tend to bring conversion and hope to many. Again, another prophet saith, "And the land of Jacob shall be extolled above every land." This meaneth the vessel of His Spirit, which He shall glorify. Further, what says He? "And there was a river flowing on the right, and from it arose beautiful trees; and whosoever shall eat of them shall live forever." This meaneth, that we indeed descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up, bearing fruit in our heart, having the fear [of God] and trust in Jesus in our Spirit. "And whosoever shall eat of these shall live forever." This meaneth: Whosoever, He declares, shall hear thee speaking, and believe, shall live forever.—*Epistle, Chap. XL, Ante-Nicene Fathers, Vol. I., p. 144.*

CYPRIAN.—For as I myself was held in bonds by the innumerable errors of my previous life, from which I did not believe that I could by possibility be delivered, so I was disposed to acquiesce in my clinging vices, and because I despaired of better things, I used to indulge my sins as if they were actually parts of me, and indigenious to me. But after that, by the help of the water of new

birth, the stain of former years had been washed away, and a light from above, serene and pure, had been infused into my reconciled heart,—after that, by the agency of the Spirit breathed from heaven, a second birth hath restored me to a new man;—then, in a wondrous manner, doubtful things at once began to assure themselves to me, hidden things to be revealed, dark things to be enlightened, what before had seemed difficult began to suggest a means of accomplishment, what had been thought impossible, to be capable of being achieved; so that I was • enabled to acknowledge that what previously, being born of the flesh, had been living in the practice of sins, was of the earth earthly, but had now begun to be of God, and was animated by the Spirit of holiness.—*Epistle I.*, § 4, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V., p. 276.

HERMAS.—And I said to him, "I should like to continue my questions." "Speak on," said he. And I said, "I heard, sir, some teachers maintain that there is no other repentance than that which takes place, when we descend into the water and receive the remission of our former sins." He said to me, "That was sound doctrine which you heard, for that is really the case."—*Commandments*, B. II., Com. IV., C. III., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. II., p. 22.

The seal, then, is the water: they descend into the water dead, and they arise alive. And to them, accordingly, was this seal preached, and they made use of it that they might enter into the kingdom of God.—*Similitudes*, B. III., Sun. IX., C. XVI., *ibid.*, p. 49.

HIPPOLYTUS.—Do you see, beloved, how the prophet spake before time of the purifying power of baptism? For he who comes down in faith to the laver of regener-

ation, and renounces the devil, and joins himself to Christ; who denies the enemy, and makes confession that Christ is God; who puts off the bondage, and puts on adoption,—he comes up from the baptism brilliant as the sun, flashing forth the beams of righteousness, and, which is indeed the chief thing, he returns a son of God and joint-heir with Christ.—*Disc, on the Holy Theophany*, § 10, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V., p. 237.

IRENÆUS.—He also bare witness to them that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, the Judge of quick and dead, into whom he did also command them to be baptized for the remission of sins.—*Against Heresies*, Book III., Chap. XII., § 7, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., p. 433.

TERTULLIAN.—Thus, too, in *our* case, the unction runs carnally, (*i. e.* on the body,) but profits spiritually; in the same way as the *act* of baptism itself too is carnal, in that we are plunged in water, *but* the *effect* spiritual, in that we are freed from sins.—*On Baptism*, Chap. VII., *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. III., p. 672.

CHAPTER XIX.

TESTIMONY OF THEOLOGIANS.

BAXTER, RICHARD.—And thus it is certain that all truly baptized persons are in a state of salvation; that is, all that sincerely consent to the baptismal covenant when they profess consent by baptism (but not hypocrites). And in this sense all the ancient pastors of the churches did concur that baptism did wash away sin, and put the baptized into a present right to life eternal; as he that examineth their writings will perceive; not the outward washing and words alone, but when the inward and outward parts concur, or when by true faith and repentance, the receiver hath right to the covenant of God. In this sense it is no unfit language to imitate the Fathers, and to say that the truly baptized are in a state of justification, adoption, and salvation.— *Works*, Vol. V., p. 324.

BICKERSTETH.—Baptism is the sign, the means, and the pledge of this forgiveness, and a real help to assure our souls of it. The outward washing of water does not cleanse the soul. Christ only, by his own blood, washes away our sins (Rev. i. 5); and the Holy Ghost applying this, or, to use the figure of scripture, sprinkling his blood on the conscience, purges it (John xvi. 14, 15; Heb. ix. 14; xii. 24), and makes it pure and clean before God. In baptism this is, by the direction of God, brought before us, and represented to us for the confirmation of our faith; and also, through this, as a divinely-

appointed means, forgiveness is assured to our faith. It is a personal individual application of the general proclamation of God's love, enabling the believer to feel and say, *We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins*, according to the riches of his grace.— *Treatise on Baptism*, p. 85.

BONET-MAURY.—According to the oldest testimonies about baptism, i. e. Paul's sayings in 1 Cor. i. 13-16; vi. 11; x. 2; xii. 13; Gal. iii. 27; Rom. vi. 3; and Peter's in Acts ii. 38,39; 1 Peter iii. 21; I believe that *baptizen eis to onoma Christon* had already in that early period a mystical meaning; i. e. "to be washed of all his sins and be introduced, as a new and pure being, in Christ's covenant by the immersion in water, accompanied with the sacramental prayer." In other words, there was, from the first days of the apostolic age, a sacred rite of introduction in[to] the Christian society, called "Baptism." —*Letter to the Author*, May 8, 1893.

BURNETT.—Baptism is a federal admission into Christianity, in which, on God's part, all the blessings of the gospel are made over to the baptized; and, on the other hand, the person baptized takes on him, by a solemn profession and vow, to observe and adhere to the whole Christian religion.—*Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles*, p. 363.

CALVIN.—It is his will that all who have believed be baptized for remission of sins. Hence those who have thought that baptism is nothing else than the badge and mark by which we profess religion before men, in the same way soldiers attest their profession by bearing the insignia of their commander, have not attended to what

was the principal thing in baptism; and that is, that we are to receive it in connection with the promise, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," (Mark xvi. 16.)—*Institutes*, Vol. III., p. 328.

CRAPS.—Those who say they "can be saved without baptism" should consider on what *evidence* they found such an opinion. The "Author of eternal salvation" has said, "He that believeth and *is* baptized shall be saved." But has he ever said, He that believeth and is *not* baptized shall be saved? None who *refuse* to be baptized have a *scriptural warrant* to expect salvation. *The scriptures offer no such premium on disobedience to divine commands.* "Blessed are they that *do his commandments*, that they may have right to the tree of life, and may enter in through the gates into the city." "Not every one that saith unto me Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that *doeth the will of* my Father which is in heaven." As baptism is commanded by God, as the scriptures promise salvation to those who *do the will of God*—and declare that none but such "shall enter into the kingdom of heaven"—is it not *presumption* to suppose we can be saved if we *wilfully* neglect baptism? It is to suppose that God's law of salvation is too strict to be enforced—that he will lax his requirements—make a compromise with the sinner—alter the word that has gone out of his lips—and forfeit his honor in saving the disobedient! Be not deceived. He who hears the sayings of Christ and *does them not, builds on the sand.*—*A Concise View of Christian Baptism*, p. 11.

FULLER.—The immersion of the body in *water*, which is a purifying element, contains a profession of our faith

in Christ, through the shedding of whose blood we are cleansed from all sin. Hence, baptism in the name of Christ is said to be *for the remission of sins*. Not that there is any virtue in the element, whatever be the quantity; nor in the ceremony, though of Divine appointment: but it contains a *sign* of the way in which we must be saved. Sin is washed away in baptism in the same sense as Christ's flesh is eaten, and his blood drank, in the Lord's supper: the sign, when rightly used, leads to the thing signified.— *Works*, Vol. III., p. 341.

GALE.—The Scriptures assure us, baptism was instituted by Christ, and was, and ought to be, administered, *for the forgiveness of sins*; and therefore men ought to be very careful how they neglect that ordinance.—*Reflections on Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bap.*, Vol. II., p. 245.

HALL, ROBERT.—I embrace without hesitation the affirmative side, and assert that in the apostolic age, baptism *was* necessary to salvation.— *Works*, Vol. II., p. 286.

HODGE.—Paul says we put on Christ in baptism (Gal. iii. 2). When a man receives the Gospel with a true faith, he receives the blessings which the Gospel promises; when he receives baptism in the exercise of faith, he receives the benefits of which baptism is the sign and seal. Unless the recipient of this sacrament be insincere, baptism is an act of faith, it is an act in which and by which he receives and appropriates the offered benefits of the redemption of Christ. And, therefore, to baptism may be properly attributed all that in the Scriptures is attributed to faith. Baptism washes away sin (Acts xxii. 16);

it unites to Christ and makes us the sons of God (Gal. iii. 26, 27); we are therein buried with Christ (Rom. vi. 3); it is (according to one interpretation of Titus iii. 5) the washing of regeneration. But all this is said on the assumption that it is what it purports to be, an act of faith. The Gospel of our salvation is, to those who believe not, a savour of death unto death. . . . Baptism, without faith, is without effect. Such being the case, it is plain that baptism is as truly a means of grace as the Word. It conveys truth to the mind; it confirms the promise of God; and it is the means in the hands of the Spirit of conveying to believers the benefits of redemption. Hence it is a grievous mistake and a great sin to neglect or undervalue it. — *Systematic Theology*, Vol. III., pp. 589, 590.

HOOKE.—They draw very near unto this error, who fixing wholly their minds on the known necessity of faith imagine that nothing but faith is necessary for the attainment of all grace. Yet it is a brand of belief that sacraments are in their place no less required than belief itself. For when our Lord and Savior promiseth eternal life, is it any otherwise than as he promised restitution of health unto Naaman the Syrian, namely with this condition, 'Wash and be clean?' or, as to them which were stung by serpents, health by beholding the brazen serpent? If Christ himself which giveth salvation do require baptism, it is not for us that look for salvation to sound and examine him, whether unbaptized men may be saved, but seriously to do that which is required, and religiously to fear the danger which may grow by the want thereof. Had Christ only declared his will to have all men baptized, and not acquainted us with any cause why baptism is necessary, our ignorance in

the reason of that he enjoineeth might perhaps have hindered somewhat the forwardness of our obedience thereunto; whereas now being taught that baptism is necessary to take away sin, how have we the fear of God in our hearts if care of delivering men's souls from sin do not move us to use all means for their baptism.— *Works*, Vol. II., pp. 267, 268.

JACOB.—The forgiveness of sins, the gift of the Holy Spirit, fellowship with the Church of Christ,—are spoken of as the direct results of the believer's baptism. Thus we read, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii. 38); "Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins" (Acts xxii. 16); "By one Spirit we are all baptized into one body" (1 Cor. xii. 13). And we find the whole summed by St. Peter in one bold assertion, "That baptism doth save us" (1 Peter iii. 21).—*Ecclesiastical Polity of the N. Test.*, p. 256.

JONES.—Baptism represents to the repenting believer, the remission, or washing away of his sins in the blood of Christ. The gospel declares in general, that "through Christ's name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." Acts x. 43. Baptism applies this promise, and represents its actual accomplishment to an individual believer; assuring him, that if his faith correspond with that which is held forth in the ordinance, all his past sins are as really washed away in the blood of Christ as his body is washed in water. Hence Peter on the day of Pentecost addressed the convicted Jews, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." Acts ii. 38. And the

address of Ananias to Saul of Tarsus was, if possible, still more emphatical, "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," ch. xx. 16. This kind of language must appear very extravagant to many in the present day who regard baptism as a mere external ceremony, but that only proves how much many professed Christians of the present day have lost sight of the original import of the ordinance.—*Bible Cyclop., Art. Baptism.*

LESLIE.—As necessary as the waters of Jordan were to the cleansing of Naaman, so necessary are the waters of baptism to the cleansing of our souls. None dare say that God could not have cleansed Naaman otherwise; but God having, by his prophet, appointed that means, if Naaman had neglected it, he had not otherwise been cured: how much more, when God has appointed the means of baptism, by his Son, if we neglect it, shall we be saved without it? *He that despised Moses's law died without mercy; of how much sorer punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the institution of the Son of God, and counted it an unholy thing, doing despite to it, inventing contemptible names for it, and ridiculing the administration of it?*—*Theological Works, Vol. VII., p. 91.*

LIMBORCH.—Baptism is that rite or ceremony of the New Covenant, whereby the faithful by immersion into water, as by a sacred pledge, are assured of the favor of God, remission of sins and eternal life; and by which they engage themselves to an amendment of life, and an obedience to the divine commands.—*Comp. System of Divinity, Vol. II., p. 733.*

MCCLINTOCK.—In these cases [Matt, xxviii. 19; Rom. vi. 3; 1 Cor. x. 2; xii. 13; Acts ii. 38] *eis* retains its proper significancy, as indicating the *terminus ad quern*, and tropically, that *for* which, or *with a view to* which the thing is done, modified according as this is a person or a thing. Thus to be baptized for Moses, means to be baptized with a view to following or being subject to the rule of Moses; to be baptized for Christ means to be baptized with a view to becoming a true follower of Christ; to be baptized for his death means to be baptized with a view to the enjoyment of the benefits of his death; to be baptized for the remission of sins means to be baptized with a view to receiving this; to be baptized for the name of any one means to be baptized with a view to the realization of all that the meaning of this name implies, etc.—*Art. Bap., McClintock & Strong's Cyclop., Vol. I., p. 640.*

MOBERLY.—From the day of the descent of the Holy Ghost to give the power to those to whom these sacred words had given the right of baptizing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, when there were added unto them by baptism about three thousand souls, to this sacred washing is attributed the forgiveness of sin, the partaking of the death and resurrection of Christ, the new birth, the salvation, the sanctification of Christian people. (Acts xxii. 16; ii. 38, 39; Rom. vi. 3, 4; Col. ii. 12; 1 Pet. iii. 21; Eph. v. 26; Heb. x. 22; Titus iii. 5).—*The Great Forty Days*, pp. 112, 113.

NEANDER.—In Baptism, entrance into communion with Christ appears to have been the essential point; thus persons were united to the spiritual body of Christ and received into communion of the redeemed, the church of

Christ; Gal. iii. 27; 1 Cor. xii. 13. Hence baptism, according to its characteristic marks, was designated a baptism into Christ, into the name of Christ, as the acknowledgment of Christ Jesus as the Messiah was the original article of faith in the apostolical church.—*Planting and Training*, Vol. I., p. 161.

O'DONNOGHUE.—"To those who rightly do receive it (as all do not), it signifies how they are ingrafted into the body of Christ (1 Cor. xii. 13.), as by a seal be assured from God, that their sins be pardoned and forgiven (Acts ii. 38.), and themselves adopted for the children of God (Tit. iii. 5.), confirmed in the faith (Mark xvi. 16.), and do increase in grace, by virtue of prayer unto God." (Acts ii. 41, 42.)—*Exposition of the XXXIX Articles*, p. 230.

PEARSON.—It is certain, that "forgiveness of sins" was promised to all who were baptized in the name of Christ; and it cannot be doubted but all persons who did perform all things necessary to the receiving the ordinance of baptism, did also receive the benefits of that ordinance, which is "remission of sins." (Mark i. 4.) And St. Peter made this the exhortation of his first sermon, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins." (Acts ii. 38.)—*Exposition of the Creed*, p. 566.

POPE.—St. Paul speaks of *one Lord, one faith, one baptism*: this gives the last of the three a very prominent place; as it not only makes it the badge of Christian profession, but also seems to embrace in one word all the blessings of Christianity, not otherwise mentioned. In fact, the privileges of the covenant are supposed to

be sealed, obsigned, imparted to true believers in connection with their baptism. This ordinance is never made the sole instrument on the part of God, nor ever the sole condition on the part of man; but it is invariably the seal of the transaction between God and the believer as in the presence of the Church. Blessings may be bestowed before the sealing transaction; and still larger blessings follow it; but in any case they are all, according to the rule, certainly sealed over and pledged to the baptized believer as one of the congregation. — *Christian Theology*, Vol. III., p. 316.

STORK AND FLATT.—Whosoever knowingly and wilfully rejects baptism treats with indifference a precept of the most exalted Messenger of God, (John iii. 31,) yea, of the Lord himself, (Matt, xxviii. 18,) and is guilty of a much greater crime than those were who rejected the baptism of John, which had also been commanded by God. John i. 33; Luke iii. 2. And how can the despisers of baptism expect to meet the approbation of the Lord, when he himself, although he did not need baptism, so highly honored the invitation of John as to be baptized by him, amid the most evident tokens of divine favor?—*Biblical Theology*, p. 215.

TULLOCH.—It deserves to be further noticed how entirely moral is the character of Clement's teaching as to more special doctrines. There is in his writings no trace of the Sacerdotalism which before this even can be traced in the epistles of Ignatius, and which was already developing itself under the influence of Roman conceptions in the North African mind, as the writings of Cyprian

were, ere long, abundantly show. The sacraments with him are not ritual, but moral acts. Baptism, *preceded by instruction and faith*, is the new birth of the soul. He hesitates not to call it *regeneration*, because the later notions which have been mixed up with the rite as applied to infants, did not occur to his mind. As the deliberate act of the adult catechumen, who had long been preparing himself for solemn initiation into the church, it was, in the highest sense, a new birth—a transaction in which all old things of heathenism passed away, and all things became new.—*Good Words*, 1861, p. 616.

WESLEY.—And the virtue of this free gift, the merits of Christ's life and death are applied to us in baptism. "He gave himself for the church, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word;" Eph. v. 25, 26; namely, in baptism, the ordinary instrument of our justification. Agreeably to this, our church, prays in the baptismal office, that the person to be baptized may be "washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and, being delivered from God's wrath, receive remission of sins, and enjoy the everlasting benediction of his heavenly washing."—*Treatise on Baptism*, in *Doctrinal Tracts*, p. 247.

WILLMARTH.—I. *The Relation of Baptism to Remission is not that of an Emblem or a Profession of an assured fact regarded as already accomplished.*

II. *The Relation of Baptism to Remission is not that of a single, specific and invariable Condition, on which Remission absolutely depends.*

III. *The Relation of Baptism to Remission is this: Baptism is the third of three Gospel Requirements or Conditions, to which, jointly is annexed the Promise of Remission. The*

others are Repentance and Faith, which Baptism is designed to express, embody and consummate.—Baptism and Remission, in Baptist Quarterly, July, 1877, pp. 318, 319.

PART FOURTH.

APPENDIX.

CHAPTER I.

SPRINKLE MANY NATIONS (ISA. LII. 15).

BARNES, ALBERT.—If the word used here means "to sprinkle," it is used in one of the following significations: (1) To sprinkle *with blood* in allusion to the Levitical rite of sprinkling the blood of the sacrifice, meaning that in that way sin would be expiated and removed (Lev. xiv. 51; xvi. 14; Heb. ix. 19; x. 22); or (2) by an allusion to the custom of sprinkling with water as emblematic of purity, or cleansing (Num. viii. 7; xiv. 18; Ezek. xxxvi. 25). If used in the former sense, it means that the Redeemer would make expiation for sin, and that his blood of purifying would be sprinkled on the nations. If in the latter, as is most probable, then it means that he would purify them, as objects were cleansed by the sprinkling of water. In *either* sense it means substantially the same thing—that the Redeemer would *purify*, or *cleanse* many nations, i. e. from their sins, and make them holy. Still there is a difficulty in the passage which does not seem to be solved. This difficulty has been expressed by Taylor (Concord.): "It seems here to have a peculiar meaning, which is not exactly collected from the other places where this word is used. The *antithesis* points to *regard, esteem, admiration*. 'So shall he sprinkle, engage the esteem and admiration of many nations.' But how to deduce this from the sense of the word I know not." It was to meet this (440)

difficulty that Martini, Rosenmüller, and Gesenius, propose the sense of leaping, exulting, filling with joy, from the Arabic. But that signification does not accord with the uniform Hebrew usage, and probably the sense of *purifying* is to be retained. It may be remarked that whichever of the above senses is assigned, it furnishes no *argument* for the practice of sprinkling in baptism. It refers to the fact of his purifying, or cleansing of the nations, and not to the ordinance of Christian baptism; nor should it be used as an argument in reference to the mode in which that should be administered.—*Notes on Isaiah*, lii. 15, Vol. II., p. 264.

BENSON, JOSEPH.—*As many as were astonished at thee* —At thee, O my servant; were struck with wonder at his glorious endowments, at the excellence and power of his doctrine, and his miraculous works, or rather, at his humiliation. *His visage was so marred*, etc.—Christ in respect of his birth, breeding, manner of life, and outward condition in the world, was obscure and contemptible, and therefore said to be *a worm, and no man, a reproach of men, and despised of the people*, Ps. xxii. 6, being exposed to all manner of affronts, indignities, and contumelies, from day to day. His countenance also was so marred with frequent watchings, fastings, and troubles, that he was thought to be nearly fifty years old when he was but thirty, John viii. 57, and was further disfigured when he was buffeted, smitten on the cheek, spit upon, and crowned with thorns, and met with other cruel and spiteful usages. *So*, etc.—His exaltation shall be answerable to his humiliation; *shall he sprinkle many nations*—1st, With his blood, which is called *the Wood of sprinkling*, Heb. xii. 24, that is, he shall *justify* them by his *blood*, as it follows, chap. liii. 1,

which act is frequently expressed by *washing*, as Ps. li. 2, 7; Ezek. xvi. 9; Rev. i. 5. Or, 2d, With his *word* or *doctrine*; which, being often compared to rain, or water, chap. Iv. 10, 11; Ps. lxxii. 6, may be said to be *sprinkled*, as it is said to be dropped, Deut xxxii. 2; Ezek. xx. 46; xxi. 2. This sense seems to be favored by the following words. Or, 3d, With his *Spirit*, represented under the emblem of sprinkling water, Ezek xxxvi. 25, 27; and frequently compared to water in the Scriptures, and, in the days of the Messiah, to be poured out on all flesh, Joel ii. 28, and particularly promised to such as should *thirst* for it, and believers in Christ, John vii. 87, 38; Rev. xxi. 6; xxii. 17. *Kings shall shut their mouths at him*— Shall be silent before him, out of profound humility, reverence, and admiration of his wisdom, and eager desire to hear and receive counsels and oracles from his mouth; *for that which had not been told them shall they see*—They shall hear from his mouth many excellent doctrines, which will be new and strange to them. And particularly that comfortable doctrine of the salvation of the Gentiles, which was not only new to them, but strange and incredible to the Jews themselves.—*Commentary on the Bible*, Isaiah lii. 14, 15, Vol. III., pp. 258, 259.

BOX, G. H.—So shall many nations do homage, before him kings shall be speechless; for what had never been told them they see; and what had never been heard of they contemplate.—*Commentary on Isaiah*, lii. 15, p. 268.

DELITZSCH, FRANZ.—The verb *nazah* signifies primarily to *leap* or *spring*; hence *kizzah*, with the causative meaning to *sprinkle*. The *kal* combines the intransitive and transitive meanings of the word "spirt," and is used in the former sense in ch. lxxii. 3, to signify the

springing up or spouting up of any liquid scattered about in drops. The Arabic *naza* shows that this verb may also be applied to the springing or leaping of living beings, caused by excess of emotion, and accordingly we follow the majority of the commentators in adopting the rendering *exsilire faciet*. The fact that the whole nations are the object, and not merely individuals, proves nothing to the contrary, as Hab. iii. 6 clearly shows. The reference to their leaping up in amazement (LXX. *thaumasontai*); and the verb denotes less an external than an internal movement. They will tremble with astonishment within themselves (cf. *pachadu veragezu* in Jer. xxxiii. 9), being electrified, as it were, by the surprising change that has taken place in the servant of Jehovah. The reason why kings "shut their mouths at him" is expressly stated, viz., what was never related they see, and what was never heard of they perceive; i. e. it was something going far beyond all that had ever been reported to them outside the world of nations, or come to their knowledge within it.—*Biblical Commentaries on the Prophecies of Isaiah*, lii. 15, Vol. II., pp. 308, 309.

LEESER, ISAAC.—Just as many as were astonished at thee, so greatly was his countenance marred more than any (other) man's, and his form more than (that of) the sons of men,—thus will he cause many nations to jump up in (astonishment): at him will kings shut their mouth; for what had not been told unto them shall they see, and what they had never heard shall they understand.—*Translation of the Holy Scriptures*, Isa. lii. 14, 15.

NAGELSBACH, CARL WILHELM EDUARD.—The most satisfactory explanation is the one now approved by most expositors. . . . "He will make spring up,"

which springing up is taken either as the expression of joy or of astonishment, surprise, or of reverence, and is construed in antithesis to *shamemu aleika*, verse 14. Also Stier, Delitzsch, V. Fr. CEhler share this view. I side with them because I know nothing better. The thought in itself, indeed, seems to me suitable.—*The Prophet Isaiah*, lii. 15, page 571.

RAWLINSON, GEORGE.—*So shall he sprinkle many nations.* The Septuagint has, "So shall many nations marvel at him;" and this translation is followed by Gesenius and Ewald. Mr. Cheyne thinks that the present Hebrew text is corrupt, and suggests that a verb was used antithetical to "astonied" of verse 14, expressing "joyful surprise." It is certainly hard to see how the idea of "sprinkling," even if it can mean "purifying," comes in here.—*Commentary on Isaiah*, lii. 15, Vol. II, p. 281, in Pulpit Commentary.

SEPTUAGINT VERSION.—As many as shall be amazed at thee, so shall thy face be without glory from men, and thy glory shall not be honored by the sons of men. Thus shall many nations wonder at him; and kings shall keep their mouths shut; for they to whom no report was brought concerning him, shall see; and they who had not heard shall consider.—*Isaiah lii. 15.*

SKINNER, JOHN.—The only rendering at all compatible with the ceremonial use of the word would be that of the Targ.: "So shall he scatter many nations," where the nations are actually, by a most unnatural metaphor, compared to spirting drops of water. To reach a satisfactory sense it is only necessary to assume that the Hebrew verb had a wider range of meaning than is represented in the N. T. It might be causative of a verb

(found in Arabic) meaning to "spring" or "leap," just as the English "sprinkle" is perhaps etymologically the causative of "spring." We may thus render with E. V. marg. *so will he startle many nations*, i. e. "cause them to spring" in surprise, or (better) "cause them to rise up suddenly" in reverential admiration. Cf. ch. xlix. 7; Job xxix. 8 ("The aged arose and stood up").—*The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, lii. 15, Vol. II, p. 122.

SMITH, GEORGE ADAM.—As they that were astonished at thee were many, so shall the nations he startles be many; kings shall shut their mouths at him, for that which was not told them they see, and that which they have heard not they have to consider,—viz., the triumph and influence to which the servant was consciously led through suffering.—*Commentary on Isaiah*, lii. 15. Vol. II, p. 347.

WHEEDON, DANIEL DENISON.—*So shall he sprinkle many nations*. And this shall be the greater wonder (Septuagint) to many. That is, he shall rain his grace of purification upon them. Reacting mercy shall close the mouths of kings from uttering scorn at him, lowly though he be, deformed by sufferings though he appear. For in even this, men shall discern more beauty and glory than ever prophetic words had revealed. By very reason of immaculate purity thus discovered, and of truth, goodness, and saving power, they shall see in him greatness in all dimensions far beyond the conceptions which prophetic words had shaped for them.—*Commentary on the Old Testament*, Isaiah lii. 15, p. 571.

WADE, G. W.—*Shall sprinkle*. This rendering (which is supported by the Vulgate *asperget*, as well as by Theodotion's version and Aquilla's version, *rantisei*) must, if

retained, be understood figuratively in the sense *shall purify*, viz., by his life-blood (cf. the usage in Lev. xiv. 6, 7). But the construction here is not that ordinarily employed with the verb *sprinkle* (see lxxii. 3; Lev, xvi. 19; Num. xix. 18. where the literal translation is *sprinkle* (or spirt) liquid *upon* an object, *not besprinkle* an object *with*, liquid), and the rendering is against the parallelism. Hence (if the text is sound) the best translation is that of the margin, *so shall he startle* (i. e. surprise) *many nations*. But the LXX. has *thaumasontai ethne polla ep auto*, whence More would substitute *many nations shall tremble*, . . . and Cheyne, *shall make obeisance*.—*The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, Hi. 15, pp. 337, 338.

CHAPTER II.

SPRINKLE CLEAN WATER (EZEK. xxxvi. 25).

BENSON, JOSEPH.—*I will sprinkle clean water upon you* —The expression here alludes to those legal purifications which were made by sprinkling water upon the unclean persons, see Num. viii. 7; xix. 13.—*Commentary on Ezekiel, xxxvi. 25.*

COWLES, HENRY.—The conception of cleansing by sprinkling clean water comes from the Mosaic ceremonial system. See especially Num. xix. 17, and also Ps. li. 9. The former passage—the case of a man rendered unclean by contact with a dead body—is forcibly translated by Hengstenburg, thus: "And they take for the unclean from the ashes of the burnt-sin offering and put thereon living water in a vessel, and they take hyssop, and a clean man dips it in the water, sprinkles the tent and all the vessels and the souls which are there, and the clean sprinkles it upon the unclean and sanctifies him." In every age and among all nations, water is both the prime agent for cleansing, and the first and main symbol to denote it. Hence it is used here with equal beauty, fitness, and force of the moral cleansing which the Lord was to effect in the hearts of his people. As looking to the case (then present) of the Jewish exiles in Chaldea, to be restored to Canaan, it makes prominent the filthiness and abominations of idolatry. From these the Lord would effectually cleanse them. This became a great historic fact. The nation as such were cured of idolatry, at least during several generations. But this promise is good against all the filthiness and all the

abominations of human hearts. The gracious promise of the Lord covers all.—*Notes on Ezekiel and Daniel*, Ezek. xxxvi. 25, p. 204.

CURREY, G.—Ezekiel the priest has in view the purifying rites prescribed by the law—such as the purification of the unclean by sprinkling water in which the ashes of the heifer of purification had been steeped (Num. xix. 17); the cleansing of the Levites in order to the consecration of the service of the sanctuary (Num. viii. 5-22); the purification of uncleanness arising from the touch of a dead body by the water of separation (Num. xix. 11-22).—*Commentary on Ezekiel*, xxxvi. 25.

DAVIDSON, ANDREW BRUCE.—Dogmatically, sprinkling with clean water might seem merely to express the idea of the forgiveness of past sins. The figure is taken from the washings by which ceremonial defilement was removed, and the figure is part of the idea. By their relation to the idols and service of them the people contracted uncleanness. And when the kind of service which this was is considered, the debasing forms which it took, and the immoralities which accompanied it or formed part of it (Hos. iv. 13, 14), the depth of defilement will be understood and the strong figure of verse 17 will not appear to be strong.—*The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, xxxvi. 25, p. 263.

FAUSSET, ANDREW ROBERT.—*Sprinkle . . . water*—phraseology taken from the law: "the water of separation" used in the "purification from sin" of those unclean—viz., the water taken from a running stream and mixed with the ashes of a heifer, and sprinkled with a hyssop on the unclean (Num. xix. 9-18); the thing signi-

fied being the cleansing blood of Christ sprinkled on the conscience and heart.—*Commentary on Ezekiel*, xxxvi. 25.

GARDINER, P.—*Sprinkle clean water*. (Compare Heb. ix. 13; x. 22.) Ezekiel, the priest, here refers to those manifold purifications of the law (e. g., Num. viii. 7; xix 9, 17; Lev. xiv. 5-7, 9, etc.) which were performed by means of water; yet he refers to these as a whole, in their symbolical signification, rather than to any one of them in particular. He speaks primarily of the cleansing from idolatry and such gross outward sins, and he treats of the people collectively, yet this purification, as the following verses show, must necessarily extend much farther, and be applied to them individually.— *Commentary on Ezekiel*, xxxvi. 25.

KEIL, CARL FRIEDRICH.—Forasmuch as Israelites had despaired in the midst of their wretchedness through unbelief, it was necessary that Jehovah should sanctify his great name in their sight as well. The great name of Jehovah is his almighty exaltation above all gods (cf. Mal. i. 11, 12). The first thing that Jehovah does for the sanctification of his name is to bring back Israel from its dispersion into its own land (ver. 24; compare ch. xi. 17; xx. 41, 42); and then follows the purifying of Israel from its sins. The figurative expression, "to sprinkle with clean water," is taken from the lustrations prescribed by the law, more particularly the purifying from defilement from the dead by sprinkling with water prepared from the ashes of a red heifer (Num. xix. 17-19; compare Ps. lvi. 9).—*Commentary on Ezekiel*, xxxvi. 25, Vol. II., p. 110.

SCHRODER, WILHELM JULIUS.—The immediate sense of our verse is: That Jehovah leads back Israel from ex-

ile into their own land, and consecrates them there to be a people, since the punishment, so characteristic for the sin that occasioned it, is shown to be removed by the bringing of them again into their own land; the forgiveness of sin thereby already proclaimed at once evinces and manifests itself as purification of the people, and the people (as in point of fact took place after the exile) put from them their old life, especially their idolatry. (Ch. xi. 18; xviii. 31.)—*Commentary on Ezekiel*, xxxvi. 25, p. 341.

SKINNER, JOHN.—The first step is the removal of the impurities contracted by past transgressions. This is represented under the figure of sprinkling with clean water, suggested by the ablutions or lustrations which are so common in the Levitical ritual. The truth symbolized is the forgiveness of sins, the act of grace which takes away the effect of moral uncleanness as a great barrier to fellowship with God.—*The Book of Ezekiel*, xxxvi. 25, pp. 336, 337.

CHAPTER III.

IMMERSION THE ORIGINAL PRACTICE.

CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA.—The most ancient form usually employed was unquestionably immersion. This is not only evident from the writings of the Fathers and the early rituals of both the Latin and Oriental churches, but it can also be gathered from the Epistles of St. Paul, 'who speaks of baptism as a bath (Ep" h. v. 26; Rom. vi. 4; Titus Hi. 5). In the Latin Church, immersion seems to have prevailed until the twelfth century. After that time it is found in some places even as late as the sixteenth century. Infusion and aspersion, however, were growing common in the thirteenth century and gradually prevailed in the Western Church. The Oriental Churches have retained immersion, though not always in the sense of plunging the candidate's entire body below the water.—*Article Baptism*, Vol. II., pp. 261, 262.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS STANDARD ENCYCLOPEDIA.—It is, however, indisputable that at a very early period the ordinary mode of baptism was by immersion, in order whereto baptisteries began to be erected in the*third century, perhaps in the second century, and the sexes were usually baptized apart.—*Article Baptism*, Vol. III., p. 174.

HASTINGS' BIBLE DICTIONARY.—The rite is nowhere described in detail; but the element was always water,

and the mode of using it was commonly immersion. The symbolism of the ordinance required this. It was an act of purification; and hence the need of water. A death to sin was expressed by the plunge beneath the water, and rising again to a life of righteousness by the return to light and air; and hence the appropriateness of immersion. Water is mentioned in Acts viii. 38; x. 47; Eph. v. 26; Heb. x. 22; and there is no mention of any other element. Immersion is implied in Rom. vi. 4; Col. ii. 12. —*Article Baptism, Vol. I., p. 243.*

NELSON'S ENCYCLOPEDIA —There is little doubt that the original practice was immersion (Matt. iii. 6, 16; Acts viii. 38), but it is equally undeniable that sprinkling or affusion was sometimes substituted at a very early period.—*Article Baptism, Vol. L, p. 571.*

CHAPTER IV.

BURIED IN BAPTISM (ROM. vi. 3, 4; COL. II. 12).

ABBOT, T. K.—We have the same figure in Rom. vi. 3,4, which may almost be regarded as a commentary on this passage. The figure was naturally suggested by the immersion in baptism, which St. Paul interprets as symbolical of burial, the emersion similarly symbolizing the rising again to newness of life.—*Commentary on Colossians*, ii. 12, p. 251.

DENNEY, JAMES.—Therefore we were buried with him (in the act of immersion) through that baptism into his death—burial being regarded as the natural consequence of death, and a kind of seal set to its reality.—*Commentary on Romans*, vi. 4.

SANDY, WILLIAM.—Surely you do not need reminding that all of us who were immersed or baptized, as our Christian phrase runs, "*into Christ*," i. e. into the closest allegiance and adhesion to Him, were so immersed or baptized into a special relation to His *death*. I mean that the Christian, at his baptism, not only professes obedience to Christ, but enters into a relation to Him so intimate that it may be described as actual union. Now this union, taken in connection with the peculiar symbolism of Baptism, implies a great deal more. That symbolism recalls to us with great vividness the redeeming acts of Christ—His Death, Burial, and Resurrection. And our union with Christ involves that we shall

repeat those acts, in such sense as we may, i. e, in a moral and spiritual sense, in our own persons.

When we descended into the baptismal water, that meant that we died with Christ—to sin. When the water closed over our heads, that meant that we lay buried with Him, in proof that our death to sin, like his death, was real. But this carries with it the third step in the process. As Christ was raised from among the dead by the majestic exercise of Divine power, so we also must from henceforth conduct ourselves as men in whom has been implanted a new principle of life.—*Commentary on Romans*, vi. 3, 4, p. 154.

CHAPTER V.

BORN OF WATER (JOHN III. 5).

GRAVES, JOHN R.—"Brother Graves: I wrote you some time ago about a sermon I heard on John 3: 5. It was Brother Vaughn that preached it. He says that you and he argued the subject, and he convinced you, but you would not own it. He also says that you will never write on the subject. I differ with him. I hope you will, and that soon. His theory makes two births from above. He says that 'born of water' is the actual cleansing by the blood of Christ. Then would it not amount to this: 'Except a man be born of the blood of Christ and the Spirit?' etc. I am truly sorry and astonished that he should take such a position. May you live long to defend the truth, is my prayer." (Mrs. Matilda T. Holy, Woodstock, Ga., October 15, 1886.)

Remarks.—If Brother Vaughn convinced us that "born of water" refers to anything but the baptism of one previously born of the Spirit, we never *knew* it, and we would have owned it to him and to our readers. It means nothing else, and no Baptist that we ever heard or read of ever believed otherwise until A. Campbell frightened them away from an interpretation that is sustained by the consensus of all scholars of all denominations in all ages.—*The Tennessee Baptist*, October 30, 1886, p. 5.

HOSS, ELIJAH EMBREE.—The agent by whose active interference the regeneration of a man is accomplished is

the Holy Spirit. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "Born of water" is water baptism, and "born of the Spirit" is regeneration. The former is the outward symbol of the latter. By the one men are initiated into the visible kingdom of God; by the other, into the invisible kingdom. Either may take place without the other. But those who would enter the kingdom both in its visible and invisible form must be born of both the water and of the Spirit.—*Christian Advocate*, February 8, 1900, p. 1.

JACOBUS, MELANCTHON WILLIAMS.—*Of water and of the Spirit*. Baptism was the outward sign of embracing this religion of Christ, the act of public profession, as adults were addressed.—*Notes on the Gospels*, on John iii. 5.

LOFTON, GEORGE AUGUSTUS.—Nicodemus knew of John's baptism and its rejection by the Jewish rulers; and it is possible that baptism was suggested in the conversation. Hence, Jesus includes the birth of water with the birth of the Spirit, the outward as well as the inward, as essential to visible entrance into God's kingdom, which every one must spiritually "see" before visibly entering by "water."—*Lofton-Smith Discussion*, p. 52.

TIGERT, JOHN JAMES.—Nicodemus was familiar with baptism—proselyte Jewish baptism and John's baptism—hence our Lord addressed him: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.) Unless he is born of water, that is, baptized, he cannot enter into the outward and visible kingdom, which is the church.—*Systematic Theology*, Vol. II., p. 855

CHAPTER VI.

NO SCRIPTURAL WARRANT FOR INFANT BAPTISM.

BARTLET, JAMES VERNON.—Infant baptism is not an apostolic usage. It is not only that there is no trace of it in the first century; but the very idea of baptism then universal, namely as a rite of faith's self-consecration (often outwardly ratified by manifestations of the Spirit), is inconsistent therewith.—*Apostolic Age*, p. 472.

BEECHER, HENRY WARD.—There are a great many who say, "Is infant baptism found in Scripture?" No; I do not find it there. "Then what do you practice it for?" Because I have a mind to—authority enough, if it is good. . . . The truth is, that the source which is authoritative is human nature, as it testifies under the overruling providence of God. The revelation of God in each generation, through the actual developments of human nature, is His inspired testimony to mankind.—*Homiletic Monthly*, July, 1881, pp. 566, 567.

BEYSCHLAG, WILLIBALD.—Baptism was originally, of course, in the name of Jesus (Acts ii. 38; viii. 16; x. 48; xix. 5), and it was only administered to adults; all that has been read into Acts of Apostles about baptism of children is pure fancy.—*New Testament Theology*, Vol. I., p. 319.

There is no mention in his [Paul's] writings, or any part of the New Testament, of the baptism of children. —*Ibid.*, Vol. II., p. 236.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS STANDARD ENCYCLOPEDIA.— It is admitted, on all hands, that at a very early period in the history of the church, baptism was administered to infants. The earliest direct evidence claimed is from Irenæus, in the second century.—*Article Baptism*, Vol. III., p. 174.

HASTINGS' BIBLE DICTIONARY.—The New Testament contains no explicit reference to the baptism of infants or young children.—*Article Baptism*, p. 84.

ILLUSTRATED BIBLE DICTIONARY.—That infants as well as adults were baptized is not expressly mentioned in the New Testament.—*Article Baptism*, p. 90.

STANDARD BIBLE DICTIONARY.—We have no record in the New Testament of the baptism of infants.—*Article Baptism*, p. 85.

CHAPTER VII.

A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF "DIP," "POUR," "SPRINKLE," AND "WASH" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. DEFINITION OF GREEK WORDS USED IN THE FOLLOWING TABLES.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT.

Apolouo, to wash off, to clean, to wash oneself.
Aponipto, to wash off, to wash off from oneself, to wash clean.
Apopluno, to wash well, wash away, to wash away.
Ballo, (1) to throw; (2) to throw, cast, hurl; (3) to fall, tumble.
Baptismos, see page 31.
Baptizo, see page 31.
Bapto, see page 31.
Brecho, to wet, to rain, to send rain.
Ekcheo, (1) to pour out (properly of fluids); (2) to pour out, i. e. to empty a vessel.
Ekchuno, collateral form of *ekcheo*.
Embapto, to dip in.
Epicheo, (1) to pour over, (2) to pour in.
Katacheo, (1) to pour down upon, pour over; (2) to pour or shower down upon.
Kerannumi, (1) to mix, mingle; (2) generally, to mix or compound.
Louo, (1) to wash, properly to wash the body; (2) to bathe.
Loutron, (1) a bath, bathing place; (2) water for bathing or washing.
Nipto, to wash the hands or feet, to wash off.

Pluno, to wash, clean, to wash off.
Proschusis, a pouring upon, sprinkling.
Rantismos, a sprinkling.
Rantizo, to be sprinkled.

THAYER.

Apolouo, to wash off or away.
Aponipto, to wash off, to wash one's self off, to wash off for one's self.
Apopluno, to wash off.

Ballo, of fluids, to pour, to pour in, to pour out.
Baptismos, see page 37.
Baptizo, see page 37.
Bapto, see page 37.
Brecho, to moisten, wet, water.

Ekcheo, to pour out, to bestow or distribute largely.
Ekchuno, to pour out.
Embapto, to dip in. *Epicheo*, to pour upon.

Katacheo, to pour down upon; pour over, pour upon.
Kerannumi, (1) to mix, mingle; (2) to mix wine and water; (3) to pour out for drinking.

Louo, to bathe, wash, to wash one's self.
Loutron, a bathing, bath.
Nipto, to wash, to wash one's self.
Pluno, to wash.

Proschusis, a pouring or sprinkling upon, affusion.
Rantismos, a sprinkling (purification) .
Rantizo, to sprinkle, to cleanse by sprinkling.

COMPARATIVE TABLES.

| | GREEK. | ENGLISH TRANSLATION. | | |
|-----------|-------------------------|---|---|--|
| DIP..... | βάπτω (baptō) | { Luke 16: 24, "dip the tip of his finger." John 13: 26, "I have dipped it." Rev. 19: 13, "vesture dipped* in blood." | | |
| | | { Matt. 26: 23, "he that dippeth his hand with me." Mark 14: 20, "dippeth with me in the dish." John 13: 26, "when he had dipped the sop." | | |
| POUR..... | βάλλω (ballō) | { Matt. 26: 12, "she hath poured this ointment." John 13: 5, "poureth water into a basin." | | |
| | ἐκχέω (ekcheō) | { John 2: 15, "poured out the changers' money." Acts 2: 17, "I will pour out of my Spirit." Acts 2: 18, "I will pour out in those days." Rev. 16: 1, "pour out the vials of the wrath." Rev. 16: 2, "poured out his vial upon the earth." Rev. 16: 3, "poured out his vial upon the sea." Rev. 16: 4, "poured out his vial upon the rivers." Rev. 16: 8, "poured out his vial upon the sun." Rev. 16: 10, "poured out his vial upon the seat." Rev. 16: 12, "poured out his vial." Rev. 16: 17, "poured out his vial into the air." | | |
| | | ἐκχύνω (ekchunō) | Acts 10: 45, "was poured out the gift." | |
| | | ἐπιχέω (epicheō) | Luke 10: 34, "pouring in oil and wine." | |
| | | καταχέω (katacheō) | { Matt. 26: 7, "poured it on his head." Mark 14: 3, "poured it on his head." | |
| | | | κεράννυμι (kerannumi) | Rev. 14: 10, "which is poured out without mixture." |
| | | SPRINKLE. | πρόσχυσις (proschusis) | Heb. 11: 28, "the sprinkling of blood." |
| | | | ῥαντισμός (rantismos) | { Heb. 12: 24, "the blood of sprinkling." 1 Pet. 1: 2, "sprinkling of the blood." |
| | | | | ῥαντίζω (rantizō) |

*The American Revised Version has: "And he is arrayed in a garment sprinkled with blood." The word *sprinkled* is a translation of the Greek word *ραντίζω* (*rantizō*). See text, in "The New Testament in the Original Greek," by Westcott and Hort; and "Thayer's Greek-English Lexicon."

| GREEK. | ENGLISH TRANSLATION. |
|---|---|
| ἀποπλύνω (<i>apoplunō</i>) | Luke 5: 2, "fishermen . . . were <i>washing</i> their nets." |
| ἀπολούω (<i>apoulouō</i>) | { Acts 22: 16, "be baptized, and <i>wash</i> away thy sins." 1 Cor. 6: 11, "but ye are <i>washed</i> ." |
| ἀπονίπτω (<i>aponiptō</i>) | Matt. 27: 24, "he took water, and <i>washed</i> his hands." |
| βαπτισμός (<i>baptismos</i>) | { Mark 7: 4, " <i>washing</i> of cups and pots." Mark 7: 8, " <i>washing</i> of pots and cups." Heb. 9: 10, "meats and drinks and divers <i>washings</i> ." |
| βαπτίζω (<i>baptizō</i>) | { Mark 7: 4, "except they <i>wash</i> , they eat not." Luke 11: 38, "marveled that he had not first <i>washed</i> ." |
| βρέχω (<i>brechō</i>) | { Luke 7: 38, "began to <i>wash</i> his feet with tears." Luke 7: 44, "she hath <i>washed</i> my feet with tears." |
| λούω (<i>louō</i>) | { John 13: 10, "he that is <i>washed</i> needeth not." Acts 9: 37, "when they had <i>washed</i> , they laid her." Acts 16: 33, "he took them . . and <i>washed</i> their stripes." Heb. 10: 22, "our bodies <i>washed</i> with pure water." 2 Pet. 2: 22, "the sow that was <i>washed</i> to wallowing." Rev. 1: 5, "unto him that loved us and <i>washed</i> us." |
| λουτρόν (<i>loutron</i>) | { Eph. 5: 26, "cleanse it with the <i>washing</i> of water." Titus 3: 5, "by the <i>washing</i> of regeneration." |
| νίπτω (<i>niptō</i>) | { Matt. 6: 17, "and <i>wash</i> thy face." Matt. 15: 2, "for they <i>wash</i> not their hands when they eat." Mark 7: 3, "except they <i>wash</i> their hands oft, eat not." John 9: 7, "go, <i>wash</i> in the pool of Siloam." John 9: 7, "he went his way therefore, and <i>washed</i> ." John 9: 11, "go to the pool of Siloam, and <i>wash</i> ." John 9: 11, "I went and <i>washed</i> , and I received sight." John 9: 15, "I <i>washed</i> , and do see." John 13: 5, "began to <i>wash</i> the disciples' feet." John 13: 6, "Lord, dost thou <i>wash</i> my feet?" John 13: 8, "thou shalt never <i>wash</i> my feet." John 13: 8, "if I <i>wash</i> thee not, thou hast no part." John 13: 10, "save to <i>wash</i> his feet." John 13: 12, "after he had <i>washed</i> their feet." John 13: 14, "if I . . . have <i>washed</i> your feet." John 13: 14, "ye also ought to <i>wash</i> one another's feet." 1 Tim. 5: 10, "if she have <i>washed</i> the saints' feet." |
| πλύνω (<i>plunō</i>) | Rev. 7: 14, "have <i>washed</i> their robes." |

NOTE. Special attention is called to the fact that the American Revised Version differs from the King James Version, in the passages quoted, in the following particulars: In Mark 7: 8, it omits "as the *washing* of pots and cups: and many other such like things ye do;" in Luke 7: 38, it translates βρέχω (*brechō*) by "*wet*," and in verse 44 by "*wetted*," instead of by "*wash*" and "*washed*;" in John 13: 10, it has "he that is *bathed*," instead of "he that is *washed*;" in Rev. 1: 5, it has "*loosed* us from our sins," instead of "*washed* us from our sins;" and in Rev. 14: 10, it has "*which is prepared* unmixed," instead of "*which is poured* out without mixture."

RESULTS OF THE EXAMINATION.

1. In the New Testament there is no record of the sprinkling of unmixed water.
2. The only provision for sprinkling in the New Testament is the "sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ."
3. Water of separation, blood mingled with water, and blood are the only materials said to be sprinkled.
4. In no case whatever is *baptízō* or *baptw* translated by pouring or sprinkling.
5. While the New Testament speaks of the pouring of oil, ointment, water, oil and wine, the Holy Spirit, the wine of God's wrath, and vials of wrath, it says nothing about the pouring of water on any person for any purpose whatever.
6. After this careful and critical examination of the New Testament in Greek and English, I conclude that there is not a single case of the pouring or sprinkling of unmixed water on any person or object for any *religious* purpose whatever.

PART FIFTH.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF AUTHORS QUOTED.

NOTE.—The various divisions of the Presbyterian Churches in Scotland are referred to as *Scotch Presbyterian*, the Reformed Churches, of the Continent of Europe as *Presbyterian*, and the Protestant Churches, of Germany, as *Lutheran* (*McClintock & Strong's Cyclopaedia*, Vol. V., p. 573; *ibid.*, Vol. VIII., pp. 515, 997). Only such works of an author are mentioned as have been quoted.

ABBOT, THOMAS KINGSMILL, Church of England. (1829—.) Professor of Biblical Greek at Trinity College, Dublin, Ireland, 1875-1888; and of Hebrew in the same, 1879-1900. *Commentary on Ephesians and Colossians*, in *International Critical Commentary*, New York, 1905.

ABBOTT, LYMAN. Congregationalist. (1835—.) Pastor Plymouth Church, New York (succeeding Henry Ward Beecher), 1888-1899; associate editor with Beecher of the *Christian Union*; and editor in chief of *The Outlook* since 1893. *Commentary on the Gospels and Acts*, four volumes, New York, 1875-1879.

AITKEN, W. HAY M. H., Church of England. (1841—.) Canon Residentiary of Norwich Cathedral since 1900, and General Superintendent of the Church Parochial Mission Society since 1876. *Newness of Life*, London, 1878.

ALEXANDER, JOSEPH ADDISON, Presbyterian. (1809-1860.) Professor of Theology in Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. "He was a man of great learning, and his exegetical works have gained for him a great reputation in Europe as well as in America." *The Acts of the Apostles Explained*, two volumes, London, 1852.

ALEXANDER, WILLIAM LINDSAY, Congregationalist. (1804-1884.) Professor of Theology in the Congregational College, Edinburgh, Scotland, and a member of the Old Testament Revision Company. *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Ralph Wardlaw*, second edition, Edinburgh, 1856.

ALFORD, HENRY, Church of England. (1810-1871.) He was one of the most variously accomplished clergymen of his day. Largely instrumental in advancing the cause of Revision, and was one of the original members of the Revision Company. Pounded and edited *The Contemporary Review*, 1866-1870. *Greek New Testament*, new edition, four volumes, London, 1880-1884.

ALZOG, JOHN BAPTIST, German Roman Catholic. (1808-1878.) Professor of Theology in the University of Freiburg, and an eminent church historian. *Manual of Universal Church History*, four volumes, Dublin, 1879-1882.

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS. Author not known, and date uncertain. *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VII., Buffalo, 1886.

ARMITAGE, THOMAS, Baptist. (1819-1896.) He was President of the American Bible Union, 1856-1875. Of him the Baptist Encyclopedia says: "Dr. Armitage is a scholarly man, full of information, with a powerful intellect; one of the greatest preachers in the United States; regarded by many as the foremost man in the American pulpit." *A History of the Baptists*, New York, 1886.

ATHANASIUS, Patriarch of Alexandria. (296-373.) Said to be "the greatest man in the early church," and that "he must be classed among the greatest of Christian theologians." *Select Treatises in Controversy with the Arians*, translated by J. H. Newman, two parts, Oxford, 1844.

AXTELL, SETH J., Baptist. Professor of the Greek Language and Literature, Kalamazoo College, Michigan. *Letter to the Author*. October 20, 1893.

BAGSTER, SAMUEL, the great English publisher. (1772-1851.) He employed one of the first scholars in England to edit his *Analytical Greek* (N. T.) *Lexicon*, London (no date).

BANNERMAN, JAMES, Scotch Presbyterian. Late Professor of Apologetics and Pastoral Theology in New College, Edinburgh. *The Church of Christ*, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1878.

BARCLAY, ROBERT, an English Quaker. (1648-1690.) He was an eminent scholar, and as such has a high reputation. *An Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, eighth edition, London, 1780.

BARLOW, THOMAS, Church of England. (1607-1691.) Bishop of Lincoln. *Letter*, in *Danver's Treatise on Baptism*, London, 1674.

BARNABAS, "Apostolic Father." Supposed to have been an Alexandrian Jew; but until recently thought to be the Barnabas mentioned in the New Testament, but this has been disproved. *The Epistle of Barnabas, Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., Buffalo, 1885. The majority of competent critics agree in assigning it to the first quarter of the second century.

BARNES, ALBERT, Presbyterian. (1798-1870.) One of the most prominent theologians of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. *Notes on the New Testament*, London (no date); *Notes on Isaiah*, two volumes, New York, 1860.

BARROW, ISAAC, Church of England. (1630-1677.) "One of the greatest of the great Anglican divines and preachers of the Caroline period." *Theological Works*, eight volumes, Oxford, 1830.

BARTLET, JAMES VERNON, English Congregationalist. (1863—.) He has been Professor of Church History in Mansfield (England) College since 1900. *The Apostolic Age*, New York, 1901.

BASS, J. H., an English lexicographer. *Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament*, London, 1848.

BATES, WILLIAM, Church of England. Fellow Lecturer and Hebrew Lecturer of Christ's College, Cambridge. *College Lectures on Christian Antiquities*, London, 1845.

BAUR, FERDINAND CHRISTIAN, the greatest of modern German Rationalists. (1792-1860.) Professor of Evangelical Theology in the University of Tübingen, and founder of the so-called "Tübingen school of theology." *Paul, His Life and Work*, two volumes, London, 1875.

BAXTER, RICHARD, Presbyterian. (1615-1691.) "The chief of Protestant schoolmen," and "was one of the most successful preachers and pastors" that England has produced. *Practical Works*, edited by William Orme, twenty-three volumes, London, 1830; *Disputations of the Right to Sacraments*, second edition, London, 1658.

BEECHER, HENRY WARD, Congregationalist. (1813-1887.) He was pastor of Plymouth Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., 1847-1887, and attained the distinction of being the most popular and widely

known preacher in America. *Homiletic Monthly*, New York, July, 1881.

BECON, THOMAS, Church of England. (1511-1563.) Chaplain to Archbishop Cranmer. *Catechism*, Cambridge, 1844.

BEET, JOSEPH AGAR, Wesleyan Methodist. (1840—.) One of the finest scholars the Wesleyan Methodist Church has produced. He was Professor of Systematic Theology in the Wesleyan Theological College, Richmond, England, 1885-1905; and is a member of the Board of Studies in Theology in the University of London. *Commentary on Romans*, seventh edition, London, 1890; *Commentary on 1 Corinthians*, London, 1882; *A Treatise on Christian Baptism*, London, 1888.

BENECKE, WILLIAM, a learned German commentator. *Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans*, London, 1854.

BENGEL, JOHANN ALBRECHT, German Lutheran. (1687-1752.) He was a man "of profound critical judgment, extensive learning, and solid piety." *Gnomon*, five volumes, Edinburgh, 1863.

BENHAM, WILLIAM, see *Dictionary of Religion*.

BENNETT, CHARLES WESLEY, Methodist. (1828-1891.) Professor of Historical Theology in the Garrett Biblical Institute (Methodist), Evanston, Ill. *Christian Archeology*, edited by Bishop J. P. Hurst and G. R. Crooks, New York, 1891.

BENSON, JOSEPH, Methodist. (1748-1821.) He was one of the most eminent of the early Methodist ministers in England. *Commentary on the Bible* (published by the English Wesleyan Conference), eighth edition, six volumes, London (no date).

BEYSCHLAG, WILLIBALD, German Lutheran. (1823-1900.) Professor of Theology in the University of Halle. *Letter to the Author*, April 22, 1893; *New Testament Theology* (translated by Neil Buchanan), two volumes, Edinburgh, 1895.

BEZA, THEODORE, Presbyterian. (1519-1605.) One of the most eminent and learned of the Reformers. Friend and coadjutor of Calvin. *Annotations ad Novum Testamentum*, Geneva, 1582.

BICKERSTETH, EDWARD, Church of England. (1814-1892.) Dean of Lichfield, 1875-1892. He was a member of the New Testament Revision Company. *Treatise on Baptism*, London, 1840; *Commentary on Mark*, in *Pulpit Commentary*.

BINGHAM, JOSEPH, Church of England. (1668-1723.) "One of the most learned and laborious divines the Church of England has ever produced." *Origines Ecclesiasticæ*, or *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, nine volumes, London, 1843.

BLAIKIE, WILLIAM GARDEN, Scotch Presbyterian. (1820-1899.) Professor of Theology in New College, Edinburgh, 1868-1897. *Modern Cyclopedia*, eight volumes, Edinburgh, 1888-1890.

BLEDSE, ALBERT TAYLOR, Methodist. (1809-1877.) He was one of the most candid writers that the Methodist Episcopal Church has produced. *Southern Review*, Vols. XIV. and XV., April and July, St. Louis, 1874.

BLISS, GEORGE R., Baptist. (1816-[?]) Professor of Biblical Literature and Theology in Crozier Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa. *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke*, Philadelphia (no date).

BLOOMFIELD, SAMUEL THOMAS, Church of England. (1790-1869.) An eminent scholar and critic. *A Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament*, London, 1840; *The Greek Testament, with English Notes*, two volumes, London, 1855.

BLUNT, JOHN HENRY, Church of England. (1823-1884.) "An industrious and useful literary worker." *Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology*, new edition, London, 1891; *Annotated Bible*, new edition, three volumes, London, 1890.

BONET-MAURY, AMY GASTON, French Protestant. (1842—.) Vice Dean of the Protestant School of Divinity, Paris, France, since 1870. *Letter to the Author*, May 8, 1893; *Letter to Di Christian*, in *Immersion*, Louisville, Ky., 1891.

BONWETSCH, GOTTLIEB NATHANEL, German Presbyterian (1848—.) Professor of Church History in Dorpat University, 1883-1891, and in the University of Gottingen since 1891. *Letter to the Author*. April 20, 1893.

BOSSUET, JACQUES BENIQUE, French Roman Catholic. (1627-1704.) Bishop of Condom and Meaux, and Privy Counselor of Louis XIV. His "intellect was undoubtedly one of the grandest which ever adorned the Roman Church." *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*, translated from the French, second edition, two volumes, Dublin, 1836.

BOSTON, THOMAS, Scotch Presbyterian. (1676-1732.) His "writings are eminently popular in Scotland and also among the Presbyterians of England." *Works*, twelve volumes, London, 1852.

BOWER, ARCHIBALD, Church of England. (1686-1766.) *History of the Popes*, seven volumes, London, 1750-1766. This is the most copious *History of the Popes* that has ever appeared in English.

BOX, G. H., Church of England. Formerly scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, and sometime Hebrew Master at Merchant Taylor's School, London. *The Book of Isaiah*, with introductions, critical notes, and explanations, New York, 1909.

BOYS, JOHN, Church of England. (1571-1625.) Dean of Canterbury, and had a great reputation as a preacher and a scholar. *An Exposition of the Dominical Epistles and Gospels*, London, 1638.

BRANDE'S CYCLOPEDIA, edited by W. T. Brande, of Her Majesty's Mint, New York, 1864.

BRETSCHNEIDER, KARL GOTTLIEB, a German lexicographer. (1776-1848.) *A Manual Greek-Latin Lexicon of the Books of the New Testament*, Leipsic, 1829.

BROOKE, ROBERT (LORD), Church of England. (1554-1628.) An English poet and miscellaneous writer of much note. *A Discourse Opening the Nature of that Episcopacy which is Exercised in England*, London, 1641.

BROWN, DAVID, Scotch Presbyterian. (1803-1897.) Professor of Apologetics, Church History, and Exegesis of the Gospels in Free Church College, Aberdeen, 1857-1887; Moderator of the General Assembly of the Free Church in 1885; and a member of the New Testament Revision Company. *Commentary on the Gospels, Acts, and Romans*, in *Jameson, Fausset, and Brown's Commentary on the Old and New Testaments*. Six volumes, Philadelphia (no date).

BROWN, JOHN, Scotch Presbyterian. (1784-1858.) "One of the most eminent of modern Scottish divines." *Discourses and Sayings of Our Lord Jesus Christ*, three volumes, Edinburgh, 1850.

BROWNE, EDWARD HAROLD, Church of England. (1811-1891.)

Bishop of Winchester, 1873-1890, and was a member of the Old Testament Company of Revisers. *An Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles*, fifth edition, London, 1860.

BULLINGER, ETHELBERT WILLIAM, Church of England. (1837—.) Vicar of Saint Stephens, Walthamstow, England, 1874-1888; and incumbent of Brunswick Chapel, Upper Berkley Street, London. 1891-1894. A *Critical Lexicon and Concordance to the English and Greek Testament*, London, 1878.

BUNSEN, CHRISTIAN KARL JOSIAS, German Lutheran. (1791-1860.) A great scholar, and by his untiring zeal in literary fields has produced many valuable works. *Christianity and Mankind*, seven volumes, London, 1854.

BURKITT, WILLIAM, Church of England. (1650-1703.) Late Vicar and Lecturer of Dedham, in Essex; "a pious and learned divine." *Expository Notes on the New Testament*, two volumes, London, 1840.

BURNETT, GILBERT, Church of England. (1643-1715.) Bishop of Salisbury. "He was a man of great learning." *An Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles*, new edition, London, 1850.

BURTON, EDWARD, Church of England. (1794-1836.) Professor of Divinity at Oxford. He "was a most untiring student, and his writings are of decided value both in theology and church history." *Greek New Testament, with English Notes*, two volumes, Oxford, 1831.

BUTCHER, SAMUEL HENRY, Scotch Presbyterian. (1850-1910.) Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh, 1882-1903; member of the Scottish Universities Commission, 1889-1896; member of the Royal Commission on University Education in Ireland, 1901; member of the British Parliament, 1906-1910. *Letter to the Author*, January 13, 1894.

BYWATER, INGRAHAM, Church of England. (1840—.) Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford, 1893-1908. *Letter to the Author*, December 29, 1893.

CAJETAN, THOMAS DI VIO, Roman Catholic. (1469-1534.) In 1517 Leo X. made him cardinal, and also his legate in Germany to bring Luther back to the obedience of the Holy See. *Opera Omnia*, five volumes, Lyons, 1639.

CALVIN, JOHN, founder of the Presbyterian Church. (1509-1564.) *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, three volumes, Edinburgh, 1845-1846; *Commentary on Romans*, Edinburgh, 1849; *Commentary on Acts*, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1844.

CAMERON, HENRY CLAY, Presbyterian. (1827-1906.) Professor of Greek in Princeton University, Princeton, N. J., 1855-1902; and Emeritus Professor, 1902-1906. *Letter to R. T. Mathews*, February 12, 1876.

CAMPBELL, GEORGE, Scotch Presbyterian. (1719-1796.) Principal of Marischal College, and as a scholar and biblical critic had no superior in his time. *Lectures on Systematic Theology and Pulpit Eloquence*, London, 1840; *Translation of the Four Gospels, with Preliminary Dissertation and Notes*, new edition, two volumes, London, 1834.

CANDLISH, JAMES S., Scotch Presbyterian. Professor of Systematic Theology in the Free Church College, Glasgow. *The Christian Sacraments*, Edinburgh (no date).

CARR, A., Church of England. Late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. *The Gospel According to Matthew, with Notes*, Cambridge, 1881.

CASAUBON, ISAAC, French Protestant. (1559-1614.) "One of the most learned men of his own or of any other age." *Annotations on the New Testament*, in *Critici Sacri*.

CATHOLIC DICTIONARY, by William E. Addis, Secular Priest, Sometime Fellow of the Royal University of Ireland, and Thomas Arnold, Fellow of the same university; third edition, revised; London, 1885.

CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA, edited by Charles G. Herberman, Edward A. Pace, Conde B. Palen, Thomas J. Shahan, John J. Wynne, assisted by numerous collaborators; fifteen volumes; New York (no date). The article on *Baptism* in this encyclopedia was written by William H. W. Fanning, Professor of Church History and Common Law in St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

CAVE, WILLIAM, Church of England. (1637-1713.) "For extent and variety of learning he stands high among the scholars of his time." *Primitive Christianity*, new edition, Oxford, 1840.

CHALMERS, THOMAS, Scotch Presbyterian. (1780-1847.) "In

1828 he was appointed to the Chair of Theology in the College of Edinburgh—the summit of ecclesiastical elevation and influence in the National Establishment." In this post he continued till the disruption in 1843, when he took the lead in establishing the Free Church of Scotland. *Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans*, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1856.

CHAMBERS' ENCYCLOPEDIA, new edition, ten volumes, London, 1888-1892.

CHRISTIAN CYCLOPEDIA, edited by James Gardner, enlarged edition, London, 1877.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND, *Certain Sermons or Homilies*, appointed to be read in the churches, in the time of the late Queen Elizabeth, of famous memory, Oxford, 1832.

CHRYSOSTOM, JOHN, "Greek Father." (347-407.) Patriarch of Constantinople. "Was the greatest commentator and preacher of the Greek Church, which reveres him above all fathers." *Homilies on John*, two volumes, Oxford, 1848-1852; *Homilies on I Corinthians*, two volumes, Oxford, 1839; *Homilies on Romans*, Oxford, 1877.

CHURTON AND JONES, both members of the Church of England. Edward Churton (1800-1874), Archdeacon of Cleveland and Prebendary of York. William B. Jones (1822-1897), Lord Bishop of St. David's. *New Testament, with Explanatory Notes*, two volumes, London, 1869.

CLARK, SAMUEL, Church of England. (1626-1701.) He was "an exceedingly learned man." *Annotations on the Holy Bible*, London, 1690.

CLARKE, ADAM, English Wesleyan Methodist. (1760-1832.) "A distinguished divine, antiquarian, and Oriental scholar." *Commentary on the New Testament*, two volumes, London, 1836.

CLARKE, SAMUEL, Church of England. (1675-1729.) Chaplain to Queen Anne, and an eminent divine and philologist. *An Exposition of the Church Catechism*, London, 1729; *A Paraphrase on the Four Evangelists*, London, 1722.

CLARKE, WILLIAM NEWTON, Baptist. (1841—.) Professor of New Testament interpretation in the Baptist Theological College, Toronto, Canada, 1883-1887; Professor of Christian Theology,

1890-1908, and of Ethics and Apologetics, since 1908, in Colgate University. *Commentary on Marie*, Philadelphia (no date).

COLEMAN, LYMAN, Presbyterian. (1796-1882.) He was "eminent in solid abilities, in accurate scholarship, in stores of accumulated learning, and in extended usefulness." *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, London (no date).

COLKNSO, JOHN W., Church of England. (1814-1883.) Bishop of Natal, South Africa. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans*, Cambridge, 1861.

COLERIDGE, SAMUEL T., the great English poet. (1772-1834.) "As a metaphysical theologian, his influence upon his own age, and especially upon its younger men of genius, was greater than that of any other Englishman." *Aids to Reflection*, London, 1884.

COMBER, THOMAS, Church of England. (1644-1699.) Dean of Durham. *Companion to the Temple*, seven volumes, Oxford, 1841.

CONCISE CYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE, by Elias Benjamin Sanford, M.A., New York, 1891.

CONSTANTINE, ROBERT. (1502-1605.) Professor of Physics and Belles-Lettres at Caen (France) University. His knowledge of Greek was very extensive, as his learned works fully evince, especially his *Greek-Latin Lexicon*, Basil, 1562.

CONYBEARE AND HOWSON, both members of the Church of England. W. J. Conybeare (1815-1857), late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. John S. Howson (1816-1885), Dean of Chester. *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, two volumes, new edition, London, 1862.

COOK, FREDERIC CHARLES, Church of England. (1804-1889.) He was a learned biblical scholar and a remarkable linguist, acquainted, it is said, with fifty-two languages. He was Chaplain Ordinary to Queen Victoria, editor of the *Bible (Speaker's in England) Commentary*, ten volumes, New York, 1871-1882. He wrote in this series on *Mark*, *Luke*, and *1 Peter*.

COWLES, HENRY, Congregationalist. (1803-1881.) Professor of Latin and Greek in Oberlin College, Oberlin, Ohio, 1835-1838; Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Polity in the same college, 1838-1848; and editor of the *Oberlin Evangelist*, 1848-1862.

Ezekiel and Daniel, with Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, New York, 1871.

COX, HOMERSHAM, Church of England. Judge of County Courts, London. *The First Century of Christianity*, London, 1886.

COXE, ARTHUR CLEVELAND, Episcopalian. (1818-1896.) Bishop of Western New York. *Letter to Dr. Christian*, in *Immersion*; and *Notes* in his edition of the *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, seven volumes, Buffalo, 1885-1886.

CRANMER, THOMAS, Church of England. (1489-1555.) Archbishop of Canterbury, and one of the greatest of the English Reformers. *Catechism*, Oxford, 1829.

CRAPS, JOHN, a very learned English Baptist. *A Concise View of Baptism*, thirteenth edition, London (no date).

CREMER, HERMANN, German Lutheran. (1834-1903.) Professor of Systematic Theology at Greifswald, 1870-1903. *Biblico-Theological Lexicon of the New Testament Greek*, eighth edition, Edinburgh, 1886. "It is hardly possible to exaggerate the value of this work to the student of the Greek Testament."

CUNNINGHAM, JOHN, Scotch Presbyterian. (1819-1893.) In 1886 he was chosen Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. *The Growth of the Church*, being the *Croall Lectures for 1886*, London, 1886.

CUNNINGHAM, WILLIAM, Scotch Presbyterian. (1805-1861.) Principal of New College, Edinburgh. *Historical Theology*, second edition, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1864.

CURREY, GEORGE, Church of England. (1816-1885.) Master of Charterhouse, London, 1871-1885. *Commentary on Ezekiel*, in *Bible Commentary*, ten volumes, New York, 1884-1888.

CYPRIAN, "Latin Father." (200-258.) Bishop of Carthage. *Epistles and Treatises*, *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V., Buffalo, 1886.

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, "Greek Father." (315-386.) Archbishop of Jerusalem. *Catechetical Lectures*, Oxford, 1838.

DAILLÉ, JEAN, French Presbyterian. (1594-1670.) "One of the most learned theologians of his age." *Exposition of St. Paul's*

Epistle to the Colossians (published by the Presbyterian Board of Publication), Philadelphia (no date).

DALE, ROBERT WILLIAM, English Congregationalist. (1829-1895.) He had fine scholarship, strong thought, and a lofty character. A *Manual of Congregational Principles*, London, 1889.

DAVENANT, JOHN, Church of England. (1572-1641.) Bishop of Salisbury, and "one of the four divines sent to the Synod of Dort by James I." *An Exposition of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Colossians*, two volumes, London, 1831.

DAVIDSON, ANDREW BRUCE, Scotch Presbyterian. (1840-1902.) Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis in New College, Edinburgh, 1863-1902; and a member of the Old Testament Revision Company. *Notes on Hebrews*. Edinburgh, 1882; *Commentary on Ezekiel*, Cambridge, 1892.

DAWSON, JOHN, Lexicographer. *A Greek-English Lexicon to the New Testament*, new edition, London (no date).

DELITZSCH, FRANZ, German Lutheran. (1813-1890.) He is universally regarded as the greatest German exegete of his day. In connection with Keil, he issued the best commentary on the Old Testament that has been produced in Germany. *Commentary on the Prophecies of Isaiah*, translated from the German by James Martin, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1872.

DENNEY, JAMES, Scotch Presbyterian. (1856—.) He has been Professor of New Testament Language, Literature, and Theology in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, since 1897. *Commentary on Romans*, in *Expositor's Greek Testament*, five volumes, New York, 1900-1910.

DENS, PETER, Belgian Roman Catholic. (1690-1775.) President of the College of Malines, Belgium, for forty years. *Theologia Moralis et Dogmatica*. new edition, eight volumes, Dublin, 1832.

DICTIONARY OF RELIGION, by William Benham, Church of England, London, 1887.

DILL, THOMAS J., Professor of Greek in Howard College (Baptist), East Lake (near Birmingham), Ala. *Letter to the Author*, October 18, 1893.

DIODATI, JOHN, Presbyterian (Italian). (1576-1649.) Professor

of Theology in the University of Geneva, Switzerland. "He published an Italian translation of the Bible in 1607, which is still considered one of the best in that language." *Pious Annotations upon the Holy Bible*, London, 1643.

DITZLER, JACOB, Methodist. (1831—.) Said to be the greatest debater that the Methodist Church has produced. *Graves-Ditzler Debate*, Memphis, Tenn., 1876; *Wilkes-Ditzler Debate*, Lexington, Ky., 1871.

DODDRIDGE, PHILIP, English Congregationalist. (1702-1751.) "Seldom has there been a more laborious life than that of Doddridge. As a commentator and theologian, he deserves the praise of industry and purity of aim." *Family Expositor*, six volumes, London, 1821.

DODS, MARCUS, Scotch Presbyterian. (1834-1909.) Church Professor of New Testament Theology in New College, Edinburgh, since 1889, and Principal 1907-1909. *The Gospel of St. John*, in *Expositor's Bible*, two volumes, London, 1891.

DÖLLINGER, J. J. IGNATIUS, Old Catholic. (1799-1890.) Late Professor of Church History in the University of Bonn, Germany. "The greatest Catholic writer of this century." *The First Age of Christianity and the Church*, third edition, two volumes, London, 1877; *History of the Church*, four volumes, London, 1840-1842.

DONNEGAN, JAMES, an English Lexicographer. *Greek and English Lexicon* (classical), fourth edition, London, 1846. In its day this lexicon was very popular in England and America.

D'OUGE, MARTIN LUTHER, Baptist. (1839—.) Since 1873 he has been Professor of Greek Language and Literature in the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.; member of the Managing Committee of the American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece, since 1883 (Director, 1886-1887); and President of the American Philological Association, 1884. *Letter to R. T. Mathews*, February 12, 1876.

DORNER, ISAAC AUGUST, German Lutheran. (1809-1884.) Professor of Theology in the University at Bonn. "One of the greatest modern divines and teachers of Germany." *A System of Christian Doctrine*, four volumes, Edinburgh, 1890.

DUNBAR, GEORGE, Scotch Presbyterian. (1774-1851.) Professor in the university of Edinburgh. *Greek and English Lexicon*, Edinburgh, 1840.

DUVEIL, CHARLES MARIA, Baptist. Born of Jewish parents in France, and died in London about 1700. He had a special taste for investigating every subject brought to his attention. His literary attainments were so remarkable and his mental powers so great that he attained great influence as a scholar. *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, London, 1851.

DWIGHT, TIMOTHY, Congregationalist. (1752-1817.) President of Yale College, 1787-1817. *Theology Explained and Defended*, five volumes, London, 1827.

DYKES, JAMES OSWALD, English Presbyterian. (1835—.) Principal and Barbour Professor of Divinity in the English Presbyterian College, London. *Commentary on Titus*, in *Schaff's Popular Commentary on the New Testament*, four volumes, Edinburgh, 1879-1881

EBRARD, J. H. A., German Presbyterian. (1818-1888.) Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. *The Gospel History*, Edinburgh, 1876.

EDERSHEIM, ALFRED, Church of England. (1825-1889.) He was a brilliant writer. *Life and Times of Jesus*, two volumes, London, 1883.

EDINBURGH ENCYCLOPEDIA, conducted by Sir David Brewster, with the assistance of gentlemen eminent in science and literature; eighteen volumes; Edinburgh, 1830.

EDINBURGH REVIEW, the first of the great critical periodicals which form a distinguishing feature of the literature of the nineteenth century, was started in 1802, and published in Edinburgh, Scotland.

EDWARDS, JOHN, Church of England. (1637-1716.) Sometime Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge. *An Enquiry into Four Remarkable Texts*, Cambridge, 1692.

EDWARDS, THOMAS CHARLES, Welsh Calvinistic Methodist. (1837-1900.) Principal of the Theological College, Bala, North Wales, 1891-1900 *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, London, 1885.

ELLICOTT, CHARLES JOHN, Church of England. (1819-1905.) In 1863 he was consecrated Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and on the division of the See in 1897 he became Bishop of Gloucester, resigning his diocese in 1904. He was Chairman of the British New Testament Company of Revisers, 1870-1881. *Critical and Grammatical Commentary on Ephesians*, London, 1859.

ENCYCLOPEDIA AMERICANA, edited by Francis Leiber, assisted by E. Wigglesworth, new edition, thirteen volumes, Philadelphia, 1839-1840.

ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA, ninth edition, twenty-four volumes, Edinburgh, 1875-1889. The greatest of the great encyclopedias.

ENCYCLOPEDIA METROPOLITANA, edited by Edward Snedley, Hugh James Rose, and Henry John Rose, twenty-five volumes, London, 1845.

ENCYCLOPEDIA PERTHENSIS, twenty-three volumes, Perth, 1816.

ENGLISH ENCYCLOPEDIA, *Arts and Sciences*; or a Fourth. Division of the, conducted by Charles Knight, eight volumes, London, 1866.

ERASMUS, DESIDERIUS, Dutch Roman Catholic. (1465-1536.) Bible translator. Head of a movement in the interest of a reformation of ecclesiastical abuses which prepared the way for the Protestant Reformation. *Annotations in Novum Testamentum*, Basil, 1540.

ESTIUS, D. GUILLEMO, Roman Catholic. (1542-1613.) Chancellor of the University of Douay, France, and an eminent theologian. *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles*, Paris, 1661.

EVANS, THOMAS S., Church of England. (1816-1889.) Canon Residentiary of Durham and Professor of Greek and Classical Literature in the University of Durham. *Commentary on 1 Corinthians*, in *Bible Commentary*, New York, 1883.

EWALD, HERMAN AUGUST PAUL, German Lutheran. (1857—.) Professor of Dogmatic Theology and New Testament Exegesis in the Erlangen University since 1894. *Life of Jesus Christ*, Cambridge, 1865.

EWING, GREVILLE, Scotch Congregationalist. (1767-1841.) Tutor of the Congregational Seminary, Glasgow. *A Greek and English Lexicon* (classical and scriptural), third edition, Glasgow, 1827.

FAIBBURN, PATRICK, Scotch Presbyterian. (1805-1874.) Professor of Divinity in the Free Church College, Glasgow, 1856-1874. *imperial Dictionary*, two volumes, London, 1866.

FARRAR, FREDERIC WILLIAM, Church of England. (1831-1903.) Dean of Canterbury, 1895-1903. *Life and Works of St. Paul*, London, 1883; *Commentary on 1 Corinthians*, in *Pulpit Commentary*, London, 1883; *Early Days of Christianity*, New York, 1883.

FAUSSET, ANDREW ROBERT, Church of England. (1821-[?]). Since 1859 he has been rector of St. Cuthbert's, York, and has been Canon of York Minster since 1885. *Commentary on 1 Corinthians-Revelation*, in *Jameson, Fausset, and Brown's Commentary on Old and New Testaments*, six volumes, Philadelphia (no date).

FELL, JOHN, Church of England. (1625-1686.) Bishop of Oxford and Vice Chancellor of the University. *Paraphrase and Annotations on All St. Paul's Epistles*, third edition, London, 1702.

FINDLAY, GEORGE GILLANDERS, English Methodist. (1849—.) Tutor in New Testament Exegesis and Classics at the Headingley Branch of the Wesleyan Theological Institution since 1881. *Commentary on Colossians*, in *Pulpit Commentary*, London, 1886.

FISHER, GEORGE PARK, Congregationalist. (1827-1909.) He was Professor of Divinity and College Preacher in Yale University, 1854-1861, and Professor of Church History in Yale Divinity School, 1861-1901. *History of the Christian Church*, London, 1887; *The Beginnings of Christianity*, New York, 1887.

FLAGG, ISAAC, educator. (1843—.) Professor of Greek in Cornell University, Ithica, N. Y., 1871-1888; Associate Professor of Greek, 1899-1909; and Emeritus Professor since 1909, University of California. *Letter to R. T. Mathews*, February 15, 1876.

FOSTER, JOHN B., Baptist. Professor of the Greek Language and Literature, Colby University, Waterville, Maine. *Letter to R. T. Mathews*, February 23, 1876.

FOWLER, EDWARD, Church of England. (1632-1714.) Bishop of Gloucester. *The Design of Christianity*, published in *Watson's Tracts*, Vol. VI., London, 1791.

FRENCH, DANIEL, Roman Catholic. Celebrated English barrister (lawyer). *The Hammersmith Protestant Discussion* (held 1839), London, 1884. This debate was held with the eminent Scotch Presbyterian, John Gunning.

FRITH, JOHN, an English reformer and martyr. (1503-1533.) "He was an excellent scholar." (*Writings*, in *The Fathers of the English Church*, Vol. I., London, 1807.

FULLER, ANDREW, English Baptist. (1754-1815.) "Perhaps the most eminent and influential of Baptist theologians." *Complete Works*, edited by Joseph Belcher, three volumes, Philadelphia (no date).

FULLERTON, KEMPLER, Presbyterian. Professor of Hebrew and Greek Scriptures in Lane Theological Seminary, Cincinnati, Ohio. *Letter to the Author*, November 3, 1893.

FUNK AND WAGNALLS STANDARD ENCYCLOPEDIA OF THE WORLD'S KNOWLEDGE, twenty-five volumes, New York, 1912.

GALE, JOHN, English Baptist. (1680-1721.) He was a very learned controversialist and a most eminent preacher. *Reflections on "Wall's History of Infant Baptism*, in Vol. II. of *Wall's History*, etc., London, 1862.

GARDINER, FREDERIC, Protestant Episcopal. (1822-1889.) Professor of Old Testament and Christian Evidences at Berkley Divinity School, Middleton, Conn., 1869-1882; and Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament in the same institution, 1882-1889. *Commentary on Ezekiel*, in *Ellicott's Bible Commentary for English Readers*, eight volumes, New York (no date).

GATAKER, THOMAS, English Presbyterian. (1574-1654.) A member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and said to be "the most celebrated divine of the assembly." *Adversaria Miscellanea*, London, 1659.

GEIKIE, JOHN CUNNINGHAM, Church of England. (1824-1906.) Vicar of St. Mary's Barnstaple, 1883-1885; and Vicar of St. Martin-at-Place, Norwich, 1885-1890. *Life and Words of Christ*, London, 1885.

GIBBONS, JAMES, Roman Catholic. (1834—.) Cardinal Archbishop of Baltimore, and Chancellor of the Catholic University

of America, Washington, D. C. *The Faith of Our Fathers*, New York, 1879.

GIESLER, J. K. L., German Lutheran. (1793-1854.) One of the greatest modern church historians. *Ecclesiastical History*, five volumes, Edinburgh, 1854-1856.

GIFFORD, E. H., Church of England. Rector of Much Haddon, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. *Commentary on Romans*, in *Bible (Speaker's in England) Commentary*, New York, 1883.

GLOAG, PATON J., Scotch Presbyterian. (1823-1906.) Professor of Biblical Criticism, Aberdeen University, 1896-1899; and Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, 1889. *Commentary on Acts*, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1870.

GLOBE ENCYCLOPEDIA, edited by John M. Ross, LL.D., Boston, 1876.

GODET, FREDERIC, Swiss Presbyterian. (1812-1900.) Professor of Exegetical and Critical Theology in Neuchâtel, 1873-1887. *Commentary on Luke*, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1875; *Commentary on Romans*, New York, 1883; *Letter to the Author*, June 8, 1893.

GOODELL, THOMAS DWIGHT, Congregationalist. (1854—.) Professor of Greek Language and Literature in Yale University since 1893; and Professor of Greek Language and Literature in the American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece, 1894-1895. *Letter to the Author*, September 11, 1893.

GOODWIN, THOMAS, English Congregationalist. (1600-1679.) A member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. *Works*, twelve volumes, Edinburgh, 1861-1866.

GOODWIN, WILLIAM WATSON, a very distinguished scholar and educator. (1831—.) Professor of Greek Literature, Harvard University, 1860-1901; Professor Emeritus, 1901; First Director of the American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece, 1882-1883; Overseer of Harvard, 1903-1909. He is the author of several very valuable text-books on the Greek language. *Letter to the Author*, July 27, 1893.

GOULBURN, EDWARD M., Church of England. (1818-1897.) Dean

of Norwich, 1866-1889. *Doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body; or, Bampton Lectures for 1850*, Oxford, 1850.

GRAVES, JOHN R., Baptist. (1820-1893.) He wielded a wider influence in his day than any other Baptist in the South. At a session of the Georgia Baptist Convention, Joseph E. Brown, then Governor of Georgia, in a speech before the convention upon the obligations of Baptists to give to the world a pure Bible literature, said: "There is one man who has done more than any fifty men now living to enable the Baptists of America to know their own history and their own principles, and to make the world know them, and that man is the brother on my right [bowing to Dr. Graves, who was present.]" (*Cathcart's Baptist Encyclopedia*, p. 468.) *Tennessee Baptist*, 1846-1889.

GREENE, THOMAS SHELDON, Church of England. A great critical scholar. *The Twofold New Testament*, London (no date).

GREENFIELD, WILLIAM, Church of England. (1799-1831.) He was a celebrated linguist, and editor of foreign versions to the British and Foreign Bible Society. *Greek Lexicon to the New Testament*, Philadelphia (no date).

GREGORY, GEORGE, Church of England. (1754-1808.) *History of the Christian Church*, Cincinnati, 1832. This edition of Dr. Gregory's church history was revised and edited by Martin Ruter, of the Methodist Church, who was in succession President of several Methodist theological colleges.

GREGORY THAUMATURGUS, "Greek Father." (205-270.) Bishop of Neo-Caesarea. *Four Homilies*, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VI., Buffalo, 1886.

GRIFFITH, THOMAS, Church of England. Prebendary of St. Paul's. *Studies in the Life of the Divine Master*, London, 1885.

GRIMM, KARL LUDWIG WILLIBALD, German Lutheran. (1807-1891.) Privy Ecclesiastical Counselor of the University of Jena, 1871-1888. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*, translated from the German, Edinburgh, 1890. Of this work Bishop Westcott says: "This is the best New Testament Greek Lexicon. It is a treasury of the results of exact scholarship."

GROTIUS, HUGO, Dutch Arminian. (1583-1645.) "One of the

most illustrious men in literature, politics, and theology." *Annotations on the New Testament*, two volumes, Amsterdam, 1679.

GROVES, JOHN. *Greek and English Dictionary* (classical and New Testament), Boston, 1841.

GUERICKE, HEINRICH ERNEST FERDINAND, German Lutheran. (1803-1878.) Professor of Theology in the University of Halle. *Manual of Church History*, Andover, 1881.

GURNEY, JOHN JOSEPH, English Quaker. (1788-1847.) Eminent scholar and theological writer. *Observations on the Distinguishing Views and Practices of the Society of Friends*, new edition, Norwich, 1842.

HACKETT, HORATIO BALCH, Baptist. (1808-1875.) He was Professor of Biblical Literature and Interpretation in Newton Theological Institution, 1841-1868; Professor of Biblical Literature and New Testament Exegesis, 1870-1875. He was one of the greatest scholars the Baptist Church has produced. *Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, new edition, revised and greatly enlarged, Andover, 1879.

HAGENBACH, K. R., Swiss Lutheran. (1801-1874.) Professor of Theology in Basle University. *History of Christian Doctrines*, three volumes, Edinburgh, 1882.

HAHN, PHILIP MATHAUS, German Lutheran. (1739-1790.) He was a famous theologian. *Works*, quoted in *Stier's Words of the Lord Jesus*, Edinburgh, 1873.

HALL, JOSEPH, Church of England. (1574-1656.) Bishop of Norwich. For his depth of thought and eloquence of language he has been called "the Christian Seneca." *Works*, ten volumes, London, 1808.

HALL, ROBERT, English Baptist. (1764-1831.) Of him Cathcart, in his Baptist Encyclopedia, says: "He was the greatest preacher that ever used the English tongue, and his works will be read while the language of Britain is spoken." *Works*, six volumes, London, 1853.

HALLEY, ROBERT, English Congregationalist. (1796-1876.) Principal of New College, Manchester, and a distinguished scholar. *The Sacraments*, two parts, London, 1854, 1855.

HAMMOND, HENRY, Church of England. (1605-1660.) Chaplain to Charles I. "He was a man of great learning, as well in the classics and general philology as in doctrinal and school divinity, and possessed great natural ability." *Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament*, London, 1779; *Works*, four volumes, London, 1684.

HANNA, WILLIAM, Scotch Presbyterian. (1808-1882.) The author of several valuable works, among which is *The Forty Days After Our Lord's Resurrection*, sixth edition, Edinburgh, 1870.

HARNACK, ADOLF, German Lutheran. (1851—.) Professor of Church History at the University of Berlin. Of him the *Standard Encyclopedia* says: "His industry, erudition, and historical insight have secured him a world-wide reputation, and he is by far the greatest living writer on theological subjects." *Letter to Dr. Christian*, in *Immersion*, Louisville, 1891.

HARKNESS, ALBERT, Baptist. (1822-1907.) Professor of Greek in Brown University, Providence, R. I., 1855-1907. One of the organizers of the American School of Classical Studies, Athens, Greece. His text-books in Latin and Greek are very numerous, and the best known works of the kind in this country. *Letter to R. T. Mathews*, February 26, 1876.

HARMAN, HENRY M., Methodist. Professor of Greek and Hebrew in Dickinson College (Methodist), Carlisle, Pa. *Letter to the Author*, October 23, 1893.

HARPER, WILLIAM RAINEY, Baptist. (1856-1906.) President of Chicago University, 1891-1906. *Letter to the Author*, April 22, 1893.

HARRIS, SAMUEL, Congregationalist. (1814-1899.) Dwight Professor of Systematic Theology in Yale Theological Seminary, New Haven, Conn., 1871-1896. *Letter to the Author*, April 6, 1893.

HASTINGS, JAMES, Scotch Presbyterian. (1860—.) Editor of *The Expository Times*. *A Dictionary of the Bible*, dealing with the Language, Literature, and Contents, five volumes, New York, 1908, 1909. *One Volume Dictionary of the Bible*, New York, 1909.

HAUSRATH, ADOLPH, German Presbyterian. (1837—.) Professor of Theology in the University of Heidelberg since 1871. *A History of the New Testament Times*, two volumes, London, 1878, 1880.

HAYDOCK, GEORGE LEO, Roman Catholic. (1774-1849.) *Notes on the Douay Bible*, Manchester, 1813. These Notes come to us indorsed by Pope Pius VI., and hence they come with authority from the head of the Roman Catholic Church.

HEDERICUS, BENJAMIN, a very learned German lexicographer. (1675-1748.) *Graecum Lexicon Manuale*, London, 1816.

HEFELE, KARL JOSEPH, German Roman Catholic. (1809-1893.) Bishop of Rottenberg. "His great work, and one of the greatest books in modern times, is his *History of the Councils of the Church*," Edinburgh, 1871.

HERMAS, "Apostolic Father." *The Pastor*, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. II., Buffalo, 1885. This document was very popular in the early church; composed, probably, about 170 A.D.

HEY, JOHN, Church of England. (1734-1815.) Norris Professor of Greek, Cambridge. One of the learned men of his day. *Lectures in Divinity*, delivered in the University of Cambridge, four volumes, Cambridge, 1822.

HILL, GEORGE, Scotch Presbyterian. (1748-1819.) "Chaplain to the king of Scotland, and Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and was long an ornament to the Church of Scotland." *Lectures in Divinity*, three volumes, Edinburgh, 1825.

HILGENFELD, ADOLF, German Presbyterian. (1823-1907.) Professor of Theology in the University of Jena, 1890-1907. *Letter to Dr. Christian*, in *Immersion*, Louisville, 1891.

HIPPOLYTUS, "Greek Father." Date of birth not known; died about 239. "He was a bishop, and passed the greater part of his life in Rome and its vicinity." *Refutation of All Heresies*, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. V., Buffalo, 1886.

HOADLEY, BENJAMIN, Church of England. (1676-1761.) Bishop of Winchester and Chancellor of the Diocese of Winchester, and Chaplain to George I. *Works*, three volumes, London, 1773.

HODGE, CHARLES, Presbyterian. (1797-1878.) Professor of Exegetic, Didactic, and Polemic Theology in the Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. "As a writer on theological, ethical, and ecclesiastical subjects, Dr. Hodge was easily at the head of all his contemporaries, and the distinguishing grace of his writings was their exquisite clearness." *Commentary on Romans*, new edi-

tion, Edinburgh, 1875; *Systematic Theology*, three volumes, New York (no date).

HOGUE, ADDISON. (1849—.) Corcoran Professor of Greek in Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Va., since 1893. *Letter to the Author*, October 28, 1893.

HOLE, MATTHEW, Church of England. (1640-1730.) A man of great learning. *Practical Discourses on the Liturgy of the Church of England*, four volumes, London, 1837.

HOLSTEN, KARL CHRISTIAN JOHN, German Lutheran. (1825-1897.) Professor of New Testament Theology in the University of Heidelberg, 1876-1897. *Letter to the Author*, April 19, 1893.

HOLTZMAN, HEINRICH JULIUS, German Lutheran. (1832—.) Professor of Theology in the University at Strassburg, 1876-1897. *Letter to Dr. Christian*, in *Immersion*, Louisville, 1891.

HOOK, WALTER FARQUHAR, Church of England. (1798-1875.) Dean of Chichester, 1859-1875. *Church Dictionary*, twelfth edition, London, 1877.

HOOKER, RICHARD, Church of England. (1533-1600.) One of the most eminent divines in the history of the Church of England. *Works*, three volumes, London, 1888.

HOPKINS, EZEKIEL, Church of England. (1633-1690.) Bishop of Raphoe. *Works*, four volumes, London, 1809.

Hoss, ELIJAH EMBREE, Methodist. (1849—.) He occupied the Chair of Church History in Vanderbilt University for five years; editor of the *Christian Advocate* (Nashville, Tenn.), 1890-1902; and was elected bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, May 22, 1902. *Christian Advocate*, 1902.

HOVEY, ALVAH, Baptist. (1820-1903.) President of Newton Theological Institution, Newton Center, Mass. He was also Professor of Theology in the same institution. Editor of *An American Commentary on the New Testament*, in which series he wrote the *Commentary on John*, Philadelphia (no date).

HUNTINGTON, DDONIRAM JUDSON, Baptist. (1818-1905.) Professor of Greek Language and Literature in the Columbian University (Baptist), Washington, D. C. *Letter to the Author*, April 20, 1893.

HUTHER, J. E., German Lutheran. (1807-1880.) A learned theologian. He wrote the *Commentary on the Epistles of Timothy and Titus*, in *Meyer's Commentary on the New Testament*, New York, 1884-1890.

ILLUSTRATED BIBLE DICTIONARY, edited by William C. Piercy, New York, 1908.

INTERNATIONAL CYCLOPEDIA, edited by H. T. Peck, fifteen volumes, New York, 1892.

IRENÆUS, "Greek Father." (120-202.) Bishop of Lyons in France. *Against Heresies and Fragments*, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., Buffalo, 1885.

JACKSON, JOHN, Church of England. (1811-1885.) Late Lord Bishop of London. *Commentary on Titus*, in *Bible (Speaker's in England) Commentary*, New York, 1883.

JACOB, G. A., Church of England. (1807-[?]). Has been head master of several of the leading schools in England, among others Christ's Hospital (School). *Ecclesiastical Polity of the New Testament*, London, 1872. Some of the Episcopal theological seminaries of the United States of America have adopted this work as a text-book.

JACOBI, JUSTUS LUDWIG, German Lutheran. (1815-1888.) Professor in Berlin University. *Article on Baptism*, in *Kitto's Cyclopedia*, two volumes, New York, 1882. This article is especially indorsed by Neander.

JACOBSON, WILLIAM, Church of England. (1803-1884.) Late Lord Bishop of Chester. *Commentary on Acts*, in *Bible (Speaker's in England) Commentary*, New York, 1883.

JACOBUS, MELANCTHON WILLIAMS, Presbyterian. (1816-1876.) Professor of Oriental and Biblical Literature in the Western Theological Seminary, Allegheny, Pa., 1851-1876. He stood in the front of biblical scholars of his age. *Notes on the Gospels*, four volumes, New York, 1848-1859.

JASPIS, G. S., German Lutheran. (1766-1823.) He distinguished himself as a writer of Biblical literature. *Latin Translation of the Apostolical Epistles*, Leipsic, 1821.

JOHNSON, SAMUEL, Church of England. (1709-1784.) One of

the most distinguished literary men of the eighteenth century. Founder of English lexicography. *Boswell's Life of Johnson*, six volumes, Oxford, 1887.

JONES, JOHN, Welsh Unitarian. (1766-1827.) Was the first English philologist who taught Greek by the medium of the English instead of the Latin. *The Tyro's Greek and English Lexicon*, London, 1825.

JONES, WILLIAM, Baptist. (1762-1846.) He was a writer of great industry, conscientiousness, and ability. *Biblical Cyclopaedia*, two volumes, London, 1816.

JORTIN, JOHN, Church of England. (1698-1770.) Archdeacon of London. *Sermons on Different Subjects*, four volumes, London, 1777.

JOWETT, BENJAMIN, Church of England. (1817-1893.) Master of Balliol College, and Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford. *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans, with Notes and Dissertations*, two volumes, London, 1855.

JUSTIN MARTYR, "Greek Father." (110-165.) His writings are among the most important that have come down to us from the second century. *Apologies*, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. I., Buffalo, 1885.

KÄCHLER, CARL MARTIN AUGUST, German Lutheran. (1835—.) Professor of Systematic Theology and New Testament Exegesis in the University of Halle since 1879. *Letter to the Author*, April 20, 1893.

KEANE, JOHN JOSEPH, Roman Catholic. (1839—.) He was appointed Archbishop of the See of Dubuque, Iowa, July 24, 1900. *Letter to Dr. Christian*, in *Immersion*, Louisville, Ky., 1891.

KEIL, CARL FREDERICK, German Lutheran. (1807-1888.) Professor of Old and New Testament Exegesis and Oriental Languages in Dorpat University, 1833-1858. *Biblical Commentary on the Prophecies of Ezekiel*, translated from the German by James Martin, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1885.

KEBLE, JOHN, Church of England. (1792-1866.) He is noted as the leader of the original band of Oxford scholars and divines

who began the so-called "Puseyite" movement in the English Church. *Village Sermons on the Baptismal Service*, Oxford, 1869

KEIM, KARL THEODOR, German Lutheran. (1825-1878.) Of the Tübingen school, and one of the most prominent theologians of Germany. *The History of Jesus of Nazara*, six volumes, London, 1873-1883.

KENRICK, FRANCIS PATRICK, Roman Catholic. (1797-1863.) Archbishop of Baltimore, and regarded as one of the most learned men and theologians of his creed in America. *Treatise on Baptism, Philadelphia*, 1843.

KENNEDY, BENJAMIN HALL, Church of England. (1804-1889.) Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge, and a member of the New Testament Company of Bible Revisers. *Occasional Sermons*, London, 1877.

KLING, CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH, German Lutheran. (1800-1861.) Professor of Theology in Bonn University. *Commentary on I Corinthians*, in *Lange's Commentary*, New York, 1871.

KNAPP, GEORGE CHRISTIAN, German Presbyterian. (1753-1825.) Professor of Theology in the University of Halle. *Lectures on Christian Theology*, translated by Leonard Wood, London (no date).

KRUMMACHER, FRIEDRICH ADOLF, German Lutheran. (1767-1845.) Court Preacher and Church Superintendent. *Cornelius the Centurion*, London, 1839.

KUINOEL, C. T., German Lutheran. (1768-1841.) Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic. *Commentarius in Libros Novi Testamenti Historicus*, four volumes, Leipsic, 1825.

KURTZ, JOHANN HEINRICH, German Lutheran. (1809-1890.) Great church historian. *Church History*, three volumes, London, 1888.

LAMPE, F. A., German Presbyterian. (1683-1729.) One of the most prominent theologians in the Reformed Church. *Commentary on John*, three volumes, Amsterdam, 1724, 1725.

LANGE, JOHANN PETER, German Lutheran. (1802-1884.) One of the most prominent theologians of the nineteenth century. *A Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical Commentary on the New Testament*, in connection with a number of European divines,

edited by Dr. Schaff, ten volumes, New York, 1871-1874. In this series Lange wrote the *Commentary on Matthew, Mark, John, Romans*, etc.

LANGEN, JOSEPH, Old Catholic. (1837-1901.) Professor of Theology in Bonn University, Germany. *Letter to the Author*, April 19, 1893.

A LAPIDE, CORNELIUS, Roman Catholic. (1566-1637.) Professor of Hebrew and Scripture in Rome. *The Great Commentary upon the Gospels*, translated by Mossman, six volumes, London, 1889.

LECHLER, GOTTHARD VICTOR, German Lutheran. (1811-1888.) Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic. *Apostolic and Post-Apostolic Times*, Edinburgh, 1886.

LE CLERC, JOHN, Arminian (1657-1736.) Professor of Church History in Amsterdam. *Harmony of the Evangelists*, London, 1701.

LEESER, ISAAC, Jewish Rabbi. (1806-1868.) Author, translator, editor, and publisher; pioneer of the Jewish pulpit in the United States, and founder of the Jewish press of America. *The Twenty-Four Books of the Holy Scriptures, Carefully Translated According to the Massoretic Text, after the Best Jewish Authorities*, Cincinnati and Chicago, 1894. This translation is an "Authorized Version" for the Jews of America.

LEIGH, EDWARD, English Presbyterian. (1602-1671.) He was a member of the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and held the office of Parliamentary General. *Critica Sacra*, fourth edition, London, 1662.

LEIGHTON, ROBERT, Church of England. (1611-1684.) Archbishop of Glasgow. *Commentary on 1 Peter*, two parts, London, 1870.

LESLIE, CHARLES, Church of England. (1650-1722.) Dr. Johnson said of him "He was a reasoner, and a reasoner who was not to be reasoned against." *Theological Works*, seven volumes, Oxford, 1832.

LEWIN, THOMAS, Church of England. (1805-1877.) M.A., F.S.A. of Trinity College, Oxford, and of Lincoln's Inn. Barrister at law (lawyer). *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, fourth revised edition, two volumes, London, 1878.

LIAS, JOHN JAMES, Church of England. (1834—.) Vicar of Saint Edwards, Cambridge, 1880-1892; Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Llandaff, 1887-1900; and Rector of East Bergholt, 1892-1903. *First Epistle to the Corinthians, with Notes*, Cambridge, 1888.

LIDDELL AND SCOTT, both of the Church of England. Henry George Liddell (1811-1898), Vice Chancellor of the University of Oxford, and Dean of Christ Church, Oxford. Robert Scott (1811-1887), Dean of Rochester, Master of Balliol College, Oxford, and member of the New Testament Company of Revisers. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, eighth edition, New York, 1897.

LIDDON, HENRY PARRY, Church of England. (1829-1890.) He was one of the greatest preachers that the Church of England has produced. *Divinity of Our Lord*, being the *Hampton Lectures for 1866*, second edition, London, 1868.

LIGHTFOOT, JOHN, English Presbyterian. (1602-1675.) "He sat in the Westminster Assembly of Divines," and is one of the greatest Hebrew scholars in history. *Whole Works*, edited by Pittman, thirteen volumes, London, 1822-1825.

LIGHTFOOT, JOSEPH BARBER, Church of England. (1828-1889.) Lord Bishop of Durham. One of the original members of the New Testament Company of Revisers. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians*, eighth edition, London, 1886.

LIMBORCH, PHILIP, Dutch Arminian. (1633-1712.) Professor of Divinity at Amsterdam, and was one of the most distinguished of the Arminian theologians. *Complete System; or, Body of Divinity*, two volumes, London, 1702.

LINDSAY, THOMAS M., Scotch Presbyterian. (1843—.) Appointed to the Chair of Church History in Free Church College, Glasgow, in 1872, which he still holds. *The Acts of the Apostles, with Notes*, Edinburgh (no date).

LINGARD, JOHN, Roman Catholic. (1771-1851.) "One of the most eminent of modern historians." *History and Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church*, two volumes, London, 1858.

LOCKE, JOHN, Church of England. (1632-1704.) "He is the most notable of modern English philosophers." *Works*, London, 1751.

LOFTON, GEORGE AUGUSTUS, Baptist. (1839—.) He has been the pastor of the Central Baptist Church, Nashville, Tenn., for more than twenty-five years, and is one of the strongest and most influential preachers among the Baptists. *Lofton-Smith Discussion*, Nashville, Tenn., 1912.

LONDON ENCYCLOPEDIA, twenty-two volumes, London, 1829. LONDON REVIEW, June, 1776.

LUMBY, J. R., Church of England. (1831-1895.) Member of the Old Testament Company of Revisers, and Professor of Divinity, Cambridge. *The Acts of the Apostles, with Introduction and Notes*, Cambridge, 1882.

LUTHER, MARTIN, the great German reformer. (1483-1546.) *Primary Works*, translated by Wace and Bucheim, London, 1883; *Commentary on Galatians*, new edition, London, 1875; *Opera Omnia*, seven volumes, Wittenberg, 1545-1547.

LUTZ, JOHN LUDWIG SAMUEL, German Lutheran. (1785-1844.) A distinguished theologian, historian, and biographer. In *Stier's Words of the Lord Jesus*, Edinburgh, 1873.

MACEVILLY, JOHN, Irish Roman Catholic. (1817-[?].) Archbishop of Tuam. *Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul and of the Catholic Epistles*, third edition, two volumes, Dublin, 1875; *An Exposition of the Gospels*, Dublin, 1877. Indorsed by Pope Pius IX. and Pope Leo XIII.

MACKNIGHT, JAMES, Scotch Presbyterian. (1721-800.) For a time he was Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. *A New Translation of all the Apostolical Epistles, with a Commentary and Notes*, new edition, six volumes, London, 1821. Of this production Home says: "It is a work of theological labor not often paralleled."

MACLEAR, GEORGE FREDERICK, Church of England. (1833-1902.) Warden of St. Augustine College, Canterbury. *Gospel According to St. Mark, with Maps, Notes, etc.*, Cambridge, 1882.

MALDONATUS, JOHN, Roman Catholic. (1534-1583.) He was a celebrated Jesuit, whose exegetical lectures in Paris were not only attended by Catholics, but by Protestants. *A Commentary on the Holy Gospels*, four volumes, London, 1888.

MALTBY, EDWARD, Church of England. (1770-1859.) Bishop of Durham. *Greek Gradus, or Political Lexicon of the Greek Language*, London, 1840.

MANIFOLD CYCLOPEDIA, ALDEN'S, in twenty-nine volumes, New York, 1887-1891.

MANTON, THOMAS, English Presbyterian. (1620-1677.) One of the most eminent of the Puritan divines of the seventeenth century. *Complete Works*, twenty-two volumes, London, 1869.

MARSHALL, WALTER, Church of England. (1638-1680.) Fellow of New College, Oxford; afterwards Fellow of Winchester College. *Gospel Mystery of Sanctification*, third edition, Edinburgh, 1887.

MARTYR, PETER, Presbyterian. (1500-1562.) Professor of Theology in the University of Zurich, Switzerland, and one of the most learned writers of the Reformed Church. *An Oration Concerning the Resurrection of Christ*, subjoined to *The Common Places*, London, 1754.

MAURICE, JOHN FREDERICK DENISON, Church of England. (1805-1872.) For many years Professor of Divinity in King's College, London. *The Kingdom of Christ*, two volumes, London, 1842.

MCCARTHY, DANIEL, Irish Catholic. Vice President of Maynooth College, and Professor of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew in the same. *The Gospel of St. Matthew, with Notes*, Dublin, 1887. Indorsed by Cardinal Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin.

McCLINTOCK AND STRONG'S CYCLOPEDIA, twelve Volumes, New York, 1883-1887. John McClintock, Methodist. (1814-1870.) President of Drew Theological Seminary. Wrote the article on *Baptism* for the *Cyclopedia*. See *Strong, James*.

MCLEAN, ARCHIBALD, Scotch Baptist. (1733-1812.) Of him Dr. Armitage, in his *History of the Baptists*, says: "Although he was not the first Baptist in Scotland, in point of time, yet his labors and writings exerted so much influence that in this respect he may be called the founder of the Baptists there." *Works*, six volumes, Edinburgh, 1811.

MEDE, JOSEPH, Church of England. (1586-1638.) His biographer, Dr. Worthington, says: "He was a profoundly learned

man, and in every part of his works the talents of a sound and learned divine are eminently conspicuous." (*Works*, 1677.)

MELANCTHON, PHILIP, German reformer. (1497-1547.) The learned friend and noted associate of Luther in the German Reformation. He exerted an influence second only to that of Luther. *Opera Omnia*, Wittenberg, 1580.

MEYER, HEINRICH AUGUST WILHELM, German Lutheran. (1800-1873.) "The prince of modern exegetes." *Commentary on the New Testament*, eleven volumes, New York, 1884-1890.

MEYRICK, FREDERICK, Church of England. (1827-1906.) Rector of Blickling, Norfolk, 1868-1905; and Examining Chaplain to Bishop of Lincoln (Christopher Wordsworth), 1868-1885. *Commentary on Ephesians*, in *Bible (Speaker's in England) Commentary*, New York, 1883.

MILMAN, HENRY HART, Church of England. (1791-1868.) Dean of St. Paul's. "One of the most popular church historians in English or any other language." *History of Christianity*, three volumes, London, 1840.

MILTON, JOHN, English Congregationalist. (1608-1674.) He must be placed "among the brightest glories of the rich and varied literature of England." Dryden says: "In splendor of conception and in majesty of language he is without a peer." *A Treatise on Christian Doctrine*, Cambridge, 1825.

MOBERLY, GEORGE, Church of England. (1803-1885.) Bishop of Salisbury, and a member of the New Testament Revision Company. *The Sayings of the Great Forty Days*, London, 1890; *Commentary on Romans*, in *New Testament, with a Brief Commentary*, London, 1875.

MONTHLY REVIEW, Vol. LXX., London, May, 1784. This is the first of the great English periodicals that attempted anything like criticism. It was begun in 1749.

MORELL, THOMAS, Church of England. (1703-1784.) Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, and an eminent classical scholar, lexicographer, and critic. *Manual Greek Lexicon*, London, 1831.

MORISON, JAMES, Evangelical Union (Presbyterian). (1816-1893.) He was Principal of Evangelical Hall, Glasgow, and Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the same, 1843-1893. Head

of the Evangelical Union party, which, split off from the United Presbyterians in 1843. *Commentary on Mark*, London, 1887.

MOSHEIM, JOHANN LORENTZ VON, German Lutheran. (1694-1755.) Chancellor of the University of Gottingen, and Professor of Theology. He was not only the most learned theologian in the Lutheran Church, but was one of the first German authors and scholars of his day. *Ecclesiastical History* (Maclaine's translation), Cincinnati, 1869.

MOULE, HANDLEY CARR GLYN, Church of England. (1841—.) Principal of Ridley Hall, Cambridge, 1881-1899; Honorary Chaplain to Queen Victoria, 1898-1901; and Bishop of Durham since 1901. *Epistle of Paul to the Romans, with Introduction and Notes*, Cambridge, 1882.

MOZLEY, JAMES BOWLING, Church of England. (1813-1878.) He was Regius Professor of Divinity in Oxford University, 1871-1878; and one of the greatest thinkers of his day. *A Review of the Baptismal Controversy*, London, 1883.

NAGELSBACH, CARL WILHELM EDWARD, German Lutheran. ([?]-1880.) Doctor of Philosophy and of Theology, and pastor of church, Bayreuth, Prussia. *Commentary on Isaiah*, in *Lange's Commentary on the Holy Scriptures*, New York, 1884.

NEANDER, JOHANN AUGUST WILHELM, German Lutheran. (1789-1850.) Professor of Church History in Berlin University. He is unanimously conceded to be by far the greatest of ecclesiastical historians, and is surnamed "the father of modern church history." *General History of the Christian Religion and Church* (Torrey's translation), nine volumes, Edinburgh, 1851; *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church*, two volumes, London, 1864.

NELSON'S ENCYCLOPEDIA, edited by Frank Moore Colby and George Sanderman; revised, 1907, by Nelson's editorial staff; twelve volumes; New York, 1907.

NEW ENCYCLOPEDIA, edited by George Ripley and Charles A. Dana, sixteen volumes, New York, 1857-1863.

NEWCOME, WILLIAM, Church of England. (1729-1800.) Bishop of Armaugh. "Counted as one of the most learned divines of the eighteenth century." *An Attempt Toward Revising Our English*

Translation of the Greek Scriptures, with Notes, two volumes, Dublin, 1796.

NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY, English Roman Catholic. (1801-1890.) "On May 12, 1879, Pope Leo XIII. created him a cardinal deacon on the Holy Roman Church." *Parochial and Plain Sermons*, new edition, eight volumes, London, 1885.

NICHOLSON, WILLIAM, Church of England. (1599-1672.) Bishop of Gloucester. *Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England*, Oxford, 1842.

NORMS, J. P., Church of England. (1823-1891.) Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Manchester. *Notes on the New Testament*, two volumes, London, 1880.

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW, a Free Church (Presbyterian) magazine. Vol. XVII., Edinburgh, 1852.

NORTON, ANDREW, Unitarian. (1786-1875.) Said to have been "one of the ablest theologians and most accomplished critics" of his day. He stood at the head of the Unitarian movement of this country. *A Translation of the Gospels, with Notes*, two volumes, Cambridge, 1882.

O'DONNOOHUE, H. C., Church of England. Of St. John's College, Cambridge. *Exposition of the Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*, London, 1816.

OLSHAUSEN, HERMANN, German Lutheran. (1796-1839.) Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. *Commentary on the New Testament*, seven volumes, Edinburgh, 1860.

ORIGEN, "Greek Father." (185-254.) "He was the greatest scholar of his age, and the most gifted." "His commentaries," says Dr. Schaff, "cover almost all the books of the Old and New Testament, and contain vast wealth of original and profound suggestions, with the most arbitrary allegorical and mythical fancies. But we have them only in parts as translated by Jerome and Rufinus, with *many unscrupulous retrenchments and additions*, which perplex and are apt to perplex investigators." *Commentaria*, two volumes, Rouen, 1668.

ORNSBY, ROBERT, Roman Catholic. (1820-1889.) Professor of Greek and Latin Literature in the Catholic University of Ireland

Greek Testament, with Notes, Dublin, 1860. These *Notes* are especially approved by Cardinal Cullen.

PACKARD, D. R., Professor of Greek in Yale University, New Haven, Conn. *Letter to R. T. Mathews*, February 12, 1876.

PAINE, LEVI LEONARD, Congregationalist. (1832-1902.) Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Bangor Theological Seminary, Bangor, Maine, 1871-1902. *Letter to the Author*, April 15, 1893.

PARKHURST, JOHN, Church of England. (1728-1797.) He was a noted scholar, possessing "great integrity and firmness of character." *Greek and English Lexicon to the New Testament*, fifth edition, London, 1809.

PEARSON, JOHN, Church of England. (1612-1797.) Bishop of Chester. He was probably the ablest scholar and systematic theologian in the English Church in the seventeenth century. *An Exposition of the Creed*, new edition, London, 1845. This book is used as a text-book in the universities, and is regarded as one of the principal standards of appeal on doctrinal questions in the Church of England.

PENNY ENCYCLOPEDIA, of the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge, twenty-seven volumes, London, 1833-1843.

PHILIPPI, FRIEDRICH ADOLPH, German Lutheran. (1809-1882.) Professor of Dogmatic and Moral Theology in the University of Dorpat, Russia, 1841-1851; and Professor of New Testament Exegesis in the University of Rostock, 1851-1882. *Commentary on Romans*, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1878.

PICKERING, JOHN, lexicographer. (1777-1846.) *A Comprehensive Lexicon of the Greek Language*, new edition, revised and corrected, Philadelphia, 1883.

PICONIO, BERNARDINE, Roman Catholic. (1533-1609.) *An Exposition of the Epistles of St. Paul*, translated and edited by A. H. Pickard, three volumes, London, 1888.

PICTET, BENEDICT, Swiss Presbyterian. (1655-1724.) He succeeded Francis Turretin as Professor of Theology in the University of Geneva, where he obtained great celebrity. *Christian Theology*, translated by F. Reyroux, London, 1834.

PLUMMER, ALFRED, Church of England. (1841—.) Master of

University College, Durham, 1874-1902; and Sub-Warden of the University of Durham, 1896-1902. *The Gospel According to Saint John, with Notes*, Cambridge, 1886; *Pastoral Epistles*, in *Expositor's Bible*, London, 1889.

PLUMPTRE, EDWARD HAYES, Church of England. (1821-1891.) Dean of Wells, 1881-1891, and a member of the Old Testament Company of Revisers, 1870-1874. *Commentary on Matthew, Mark, Luke, and Acts*, in *Ellicott's Commentary for English Readers*.

POOLE'S CONTINUATORS. *Annotations upon the Holy Bible, by Certain Judicious and Learned [Presbyterian] Divines* [in Continuation of Matthew Poole's Commentary], four volumes, Edinburgh, 1801.

POPE, WILLIAM BURT, English Methodist. (1822-1903.) Professor of Theology in Didsbury College, Manchester, 1867-1903. *A Compendium of Christian Theology*, second edition, three volumes, London, 1880.

POPULAR ENCYCLOPEDIA, seven volumes, new edition, Glasgow, 1883.

POTTER, HENRY CODMAN, Episcopalian. (1835-1908.) Bishop of New York, 1887-1903. *Letter to Dr. Christian*, in *Immersion*, Louisville, Ky., 1891.

PRENTISS, GEORGE LEWIS, Presbyterian. (1816-1903.) Professor of Pastoral Theology, Church Polity, and Mission Work in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, 1873-1896. *Letter to the Author*, October 31, 1893.

PRESSENSE, EDMOND DE, French Protestant. (1824-1891.) Schaff says "he was an able scholar," and a most brilliant and thoroughly reliable historian. *The Early fears of Christianity*, London, 1869.

PROCTOR, FRANCIS, Church of England. Vicar of Wilton, Norfolk; formerly Fellow of St. Catherine's College, Cambridge. *History of the Book of Common Prayer*, thirteenth edition, London, 1876.

PROCTOR, J. C., Professor of Greek in Dartmouth College, Hanover, N. H. *Letter to R. T. Mathews*, March 23, 1876.

PURVER, ANTHONY, Quaker. (1702-1777.) He was a preacher of great note for his remarkable literary attainments, especially

of his exegetical knowledge. *Translation of the Old and New Testaments, with Notes*, two volumes, London, 1764.

PURVES, GEORGE TYBOUT, Presbyterian. (1852-1901.) Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis in Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J., 1892-1900. *Letter to the Author*, October 24, 1893.

PUSEY, EDWARD BOUVERIE, Church of England. (1800-1882.) Regius Professor of Hebrew (1828-1882), and head of the Tractarian Movement at Oxford. *Tracts for the Times*, Nos. 67, 68, 69; *Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism*, London, 1836.

PYLE, THOMAS, Church of England. (1674-1757.) He is greatly admired in England for the superiority of his scholarship. *Paraphrase on Acts and Epistles*, two volumes, London, 1795.

QUARTERLY REVIEW, Vol. XCV., London, 1854.

RAWLINSON, GEORGE, Church of England. (1812-1902.) Camden Professor of Ancient History, Oxford University, 1861-1889. *Commentary on Isaiah*, in *Pulpit Commentary*, two volumes, New York (no date).

RAYMOND, MINER, Methodist. (1811-1897.) Professor of Systematic Theology in Garrett Biblical Institute (Methodist), Evans-ton, Ill., 1864-1897. *Letter to the Author*, October 25, 1893.

REES' ENCYCLOPEDIA, edited by Abraham Rees, English Presbyterian. (1743-1825.) Thirty-five volumes, London, 1819.

REEVES, WILLIAM, Church of England. (1668-1726.) Vicar of St. Mary's, Reading. *Apologies of Justin Martyr*, two volumes, London, 1716.

RELIGIOUS REVIEW OF REVIEWS, Vol. I., London, 1891.

RENAN, JOSEPH ERNEST, French infidel. (1823-1892.) He was a brilliant writer. *The Life of Jesus*, London, 1871.

REUSS, EDUARD GUILLAUM, German Presbyterian. (1804-1891.) Professor of Theology in the Protestant Seminary, Strassburg, Germany. *Christian Theology*, two volumes, London, 1872.

RIDDLE, JOSEPH ESMOND, Church of England. (1804-1859.) He was the author of many useful educational and religious works, the best known of which is his Latin-English Dictionary. *A Manual of Christian Antiquities*, London, 1839.

RIDDLE, MATTHEW BROWN, Congregationalist. (1836—.) Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Hartford Theological Seminary, 1871-1887; and in Western Theological Seminary since 1887. Member of the American New Testament Committee, and for years one of the editors of the American Standard Edition of the Revised Version; and a member of the committee for revising proof texts of Westminster standards. *Commentary on Ephesians and Colossians, in Schaff's Popular Commentary on the New Testament*, four volumes, Edinburgh, 1879-1883.

RIDGELEY, THOMAS, English Congregationalist. (1667-1734.) Professor of Divinity in the Independent Academy, London. *A Body of Divinity*, new edition, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1844.

ROBERTSON, FREDERICK; WILLIAM, Church of England. (1816-1853.) One of the greatest preachers which the English Church has produced. *Expository Lectures on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians*, London, 1872.

ROBERTSON, JAMES CRAIGIE, Church of England. (1813-1882.) Professor of Church History in King's College, London, 1864-1874. *History of the Christian Church*, two volumes, London, 1858. Of this work Dr. Schaff says that it "is the best, as it is the latest, general church history written by an Episcopalian. It deserves praise for its candor."

ROBINSON, EDWARD, Presbyterian. (1794-1863.) "He is the most distinguished biblical theologian whom America has brought forth, and one of the most distinguished of the nineteenth century." *Greek and English Lexicon of the New Testament*, new edition, London, 1839.

ROBSON, CHARLES, *Greek Lexicon to the New Testament*, London, 1840.

ROSENMULLER, JOHANN GEORGE, German Lutheran. (1736-1815.) Professor of Theology in the University of Leipsic, 1785-1815. *Scholia in Novum Testamentum*, five volumes, Nuremburg, 1815.

SADLER, M. P., Church of England. (1819-1895.) Rector of Honiton and Prebendary of Wells. He was a very learned English commentator. *Church Doctrine—Bible Truth*, London, 1891.

SALE, G. S., Presbyterian. Professor of Greek in the Otago University, Dunedin, New Zealand. *Letter to the Author*, September 14, 1889.

SANDAY, WILLIAM, Church of England. (1843—.) Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, since 1895. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, eleventh edition, New York, 1906.

SAURIN, JAMES, French Presbyterian. (1677-1730.) The most eloquent preacher of French Protestantism. *Sermons*, six volumes, London, 1824.

SCAPULA, JOHN, a very learned French lexicographer. (1540-1615.) *Greek-Latin Lexicon*, London, 1820.

SCHAFF-HERZOG ENCYCLOPEDIA, third edition, four volumes. New York, 1891.

SCHAFF, PHILIP, Presbyterian. (1819-1893.) Late Professor of Church History, Union Theological Seminary, New York; President of the American Company of New Testament Revisers, and one of the greatest scholars of the age. *History of the Christian Church*, four volumes, New York, 1886, 1887; *Notes*, in his edition of *Lange's Commentary*; *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, New York, 1890.

SCHLEUSNER, JOHN FRIEDRICH, German Lutheran. (1756-1831.) Professor of Theology in the University of Wittenberg. *A New Greek-Latin Lexicon of the New Testament*, Glasgow, 1824.

SCHMIDT, CHRISTIAN FRIEDRICH, German Lutheran. (1741-1778.) Professor of Theology in the University of Wittenberg, 1826-1852. *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1870.

SCHREVELIUS, CORNELIUS, Dutch Presbyterian. (1615-1664.) *Greek and English Lexicon*, translated from the Latin, and edited by J. R. Major, eighth edition, London, 1853. This Lexicon has been more extensively used than almost any other work of the kind.

SCHRODER, WILHELM JULIUS, German Lutheran. ([?]-1876.) He was a man of great learning and ability; minister of the Reformed Church at Elberfeld, Russia, 1847-1876. *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel, Theologically and Homiletically Expounded*, in *Lange's Commentary*, New York (no date).

SCOTT, JOHN, Church of England. (1638-1694.) He was a man of much learning. *Works*, two volumes, London, 1718.

SCOTT, THOMAS. Church of England. (1747-1821.) *The Holy Bible, with Explanatory Notes*, six volumes, London, 1861. "This work," says McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia, "has rendered him one of the most influential divines of the present day."

SECKER, THOMAS, Church of England. (1693-1768.) Archbishop of Canterbury. *Works*, four volumes, Edinburgh, 1792.

SEMISCH, CHARLES, German Lutheran. (1810-[?]). Professor in the University of Berlin. *Justin Martyr: His Life, and Writings, and Opinions*, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1843.

SEPTUAGINT VERSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT, with an English translation, and with various readings and critical notes. London and New York, 1896. This version was made in Alexandria, Egypt, about 280 years B.C., and became one of the chief instruments for the preparation for and propagation of Christianity.

SITTERLY, CHARLES FREMONT, Methodist. (1861—.) Professor of Greek and of English Bible, 1892-1894; and of Biblical Literature and English Bible since 1895 in Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J. *Letter to the Author*, April 20, 1893.

SKINNER, JOHN, English Presbyterian. (1851—.) Since 1890 he has been Professor of Hebrew and Apologetics in Westminster College (the Theological College of the Presbyterian Church of England), Cambridge, England. *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, with Introduction and Notes*, two volumes, Cambridge, 1902.

SMITH, GEORGE ADAM, Scotch Presbyterian. (1856—.) Professor of Old Testament Language, Literature, and Theology in the United Free Church College, Glasgow, 1892-1909; and Principal of Aberdeen University since 1909. *Commentary on Isaiah*, two volumes, New York, 1888-1890.

SMITH, JAMES, Cumberland Presbyterian. In 1835 he was stated clerk of the Cumberland Presbyterian General Assembly. *History of the Christian Church*. Nashville, 1835.

SMITH, PHILIP, Congregationalist. (1817-1885.) *History of the Christian Church*, London, 1882. Philip Schaff says of this work: "It is a skillful and useful manual for students."

SOPHOCLES, E. A., a native Greek. (1807-1883.) For thirty-eight years Professor of Greek in Harvard University. *Greek*

Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (from B.C. 146 to A.D. 1100), New York, 1888.

SPENCE, HENRY DONALD MAURICE, Church of England. (1836—.) Dean of Gloucester since 1886; and editor of the *Pulpit Commentary. Commentary on Titus*, in *Ellicott's Commentary*, London, 1859.

STACKHOUSE, THOMAS, Church of England. (1680-1733.) Vicar in Benham, in Berkshire. *History of the Bible*, six volumes, Edinburgh, 1764.

STANDARD BIBLE DICTIONARY, by Melancthon W. Jacobus, Edward E. Nourse, and Andrew C. Zenos, New York, 1909.

STANHOPE, GEORGE, Church of England. (1660-1728.) Dean of Canterbury, and Chaplain to King William and Queen Mary, and filled the same post under Queen Anne. *Paraphrase upon the Epistles and Gospels*, London, 1775.

STANLEY, ARTHUR PENRHYN, Church of England. (1815-1881.) The greatest and most distinguished among all the Westminster deans of ancient or modern times. *The Epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians, with Notes*, London, 1865; Article on *Baptism*, in *The Nineteenth Century Review*, October, 1879; *Lectures on the Eastern Church*, New York, 1884.

STAPFERUS, JOHN FREDERICK, Swiss Presbyterian. (1718-1775.) A gifted theologian. *Institutiones, Theologicae, Polemicae Universae*, five volumes, Zurich, 1752.

STEITZ, GEORGE E., German Lutheran. (1810-1879.) "He was a man of rare and accurate learning and sound judgment." Article on *Baptism*, in *Schaff-Herzog Cyclopedia*.

STEPHANUS, HENRY, French lexicographer. (1528-1598.) He was well educated, and considered not only to be the most learned of his learned family, but also the best Greek scholar of his era. *Thesaurus Graecae Linguae*, eight volumes, London, 1816-1825.

STIER, RUDOLF EWALD, German Lutheran. (1800-1862.) An eminent commentator. *The Words of the Lord Jesus*, eight volumes, Edinburgh, 1873.

STIFFLER, JAMES MADISON, Baptist. (1839-1902.) Professor of New Testament Exegesis in Crozier Theological Seminary. *The Baptist (S. S.) Teacher*, Philadelphia, June 27, 1888.

STILLINGFLEET, EDWARD, Church of England. (1635-1699.) Bishop of Worcester. *Irenicum*, London, 1662.

STOCKIUS, CHRISTIAN, German Lutheran. (1672-1733.) He has a high reputation as an Oriental scholar. *A Clavis of the Sacred Language of the New Testament*, Jena, 1725.

STOKES, GEORGE THOMAS, Church of England. (1843-1898.) Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, 1883-1898; and Canon of St. Patrick's, Dublin, Ireland, 1893-1898. *Acts of the Apostles*, Vol. I. (in *The Expositor's Bible*), London, 1891.

STORR AND FLATT, both German Lutherans. T. C. Storr (1746-1805.) Carl Christian Flatt (1772-1843). As writers they both rank among the first scholars of Germany. *Biblical Theology*, translated by Schmucker, London (no date).

STRAUSS, DAVID FRIEDRICH, the notorious German Rationalist (1808-1874.) *The Life of Jesus Critically Examined*, three volumes, London, 1846.

STRONG, JAMES, Methodist. (1822-1894.) Professor of Exegetical Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. "As an author," says Dr. Mendenhall, editor of the *Methodist Review*, New York, "Dr. Strong is distinguished; as a professor, he is, marked as a master; as a thinker, his name is on the roll of earth's original inquirers; as a scholar, he is in repute as an authority." With McClintock, edited *Cyclopedia*. *Letter to the Author*, April 15, 1893.

STUART, MOSES, Congregationalism (1780-1852.) Professor of Sacred Literature in Andover Theological Seminary, and called "the father of biblical literature in America." *Critical History and Defense of the Old Testament Canon*, London, 1849; *Is the Mode of Christian Baptism Prescribed in the New Testament?* Memphis, Tenn. (no date).

STUDENTS' ENCYCLOPEDIA, by eminent specialists, six volumes, London, 1883.

SUMMERS, THOMAS OSMOND, Methodist. (1812-1882.) "He was a man of encyclopedic information and of untiring diligence," and is regarded as an authority in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South. *Treatise on Baptism*, Nashville, Tenn., 1856.

SUTCLIFFE, JOSEPH. English Methodist. ([?]-1856.) "In biblical scholarship he especially excelled." *Commentary on the Old and New Testaments*, two volumes, London, 1838.

TALMAGE. T. DEWITT, Presbyterian. (1832-1902.) During his later years his sermons were printed simultaneously in three thousand six hundred different journals, reaching, it is estimated, over thirty million readers weekly. *From the Manger to the Throne*, Philadelphia, 1880.

TAYLOR, JEREMY, Church of England. (1613-1667.) Bishop of Down and Conner. Called "the Chrysostom of English theology, but in brilliancy of imagination surpassing his Greek antitype." *Whole Works*, ten volumes, London, 1852.

TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES, a writing discovered at Constantinople, in 1873, by Bryennios. Author unknown; date uncertain, variously stated as being all the way from A.D. 80 to the fifth century. In *Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. VII., Buffalo, 1886.

TERTULLIAN, "the founder of Latin Christianity." (145-220.) *Writings*, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers*. Vols. III., IV., Buffalo, 1885.

THAYER, JOSEPH HENRY, Congregationalist. (1828-1901.) Professor of New Testament Criticism and Interpretation in the Theological Department of Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., and a member of the American New Testament Revision Company. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. New York, 1887. *Letter to the Author*. May 5, 1893.

THOLUOK, FRIEDRICH AUGUST GOTTGOTREU, German Lutheran. (1799-1877.) Professor of Theology in Halle University. One of the greatest divines that Germany has produced. The *New York Observer* thus announced his death to its readers: "The greatest theological light of Germany has just been extinguished." *Commentary on Romans*, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1842.

THOMPSON, W. M., Presbyterian. (1806-1894.) Missionary in Syria and Palestine, under A. B. C. F. M. and Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. *The Land and the Book*, London, 1860.

THOROLD, A. W., Church of England. (1825-1895.) Bishop of Winchester. *Commentary on Ephesians and Colossians*, in *New Testament, with a Brief Commentary by Various Authors*. London, 1875.

TIGERT, JOHN JAMES, Methodist. (1856-1906.) Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; and professor in Vanderbilt University. *Systematic Theology*, two volumes, Nashville, Tenn., 1888.

TILLOTSON, JOHN, Church of England. (1630-1694.) Archbishop of Canterbury. *Works*, twelve volumes, London, 1743.

TOMLINE, GEORGE, Church of England. (1750-1827.) Bishop of Winchester. *Elements of Christian Theology*, two volumes, London, 1818.

TRAPP, JOHN, English Presbyterian. (1601-1669.) "Trapp," says Spurgeon, "is my especial companion and treasure. O, rare John Trapp!" *Commentary on the New Testament*, London, 1868.

TRAPP, JOSEPH, Church of England. (1679-1747.) Lecturer of St. Martins-in-the-Fields. *Explanatory Notes upon the Four Gospels*, Oxford, 1775.

TROLLOPE, WILLIAM, Church of England. (1798-1863.) Of Pembroke College, Cambridge. *Analecta Theologica*, two volumes, London, 1835; *The New Testament in Greek, with English Notes*, London, 1860.

TRUMBULL, HENRY CLAY, Congregationalist. (1830-1903.) Editor of the Sunday School Times, 1875-1903. *Sunday School Times*, August 6, 1887.

TULLOCH, JOHN, Scotch Presbyterian. (1823-1885.) Principal of St. Mary's College, St. Andrew's University. *The Christian School, and Christian Worship of the Second Century*; and *Alexandria and Its Christian School*, in *Good Words* for 1861.

TURRENTINE, S. B., Methodist. Professor of Hebrew and Greek in Trinity College (Methodist), Durham, N. C. *Letter to the Author*, October 30, 1893.

TURRETIN, FRANCIS, Swiss Presbyterian. (1623-1687.) Professor of Theology in Geneva. *Institutio Theologia*, three volumes, Rheims, 1696; *De Satisfactiones Christi Disputationes*, Rheims, 1696.

TYLER, W. S. (1816—.) Has been Professor of Greek in Amherst (Mass.) College for sixty years. *Letter to R. T. Mathews*, February 12, 1876.

TYNDALE, WILLIAM. Great English Reformer. (1484-1536.) "It was he who first translated the Bible out of Hebrew and Greek into English, and to whom we are indebted for so many excellencies in our English version." *Writings*, in *The Fathers of the English Church*, eight volumes, London, 1807.

USHER, JAMES, Church of Ireland. (1581-1656.) Archbishop of Armaugh, and Primate of Ireland. *Body of Divinity*, London, 1841.

VALPY, EDWARD. Church of England. (1764-1832.) Rector of Twaite and Vicar of St. Mary's, Walsham, Norfolk. *The Greek New Testament, with English Notes*. three volumes, London, 1826.

VAN OOSTERZEE, J. J., Dutch Presbyterian. (1817-1882.) Professor of Theology at Utrecht, Holland. "In learning, eloquence, and piety, he ranked with the greatest divines of his age." *Practical Theology*, London, 1878; *Christian Dogmatics*, London, 1886; *Commentary on Luke*, in *Lange's Commentary*.

VAUGHAN, C. J., Church of England. (1816-1897.) Dean of Llandaff, and a member of the New Testament Revision Company. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, with Notes*. third edition, London, 1870.

VENEMA, HERMANN, Dutch Presbyterian. (1697-1787.) Professor of Theology and University Preacher at Franeker, Holland. *Institulones Historiae Ecclesae*, seven volumes, Lugd. Bat., 1777-1783. Dr. Schaff calls this work "very learned."

VINCENT, MARVIN RICHARDSON. Presbyterian. (1834—.) Baldwin Professor of New Testament Criticism, Union Theological Seminary, New York, since 1888. *Word Studies in the New Testament*, three volumes, New York, 1889, 1890.

WADDINGTON, GEORGE. Church of England. (1793-1869.) Dean of Durham. *History of the Church from the Earliest Ages to the Reformation*. London, 1835.

WADE, G. W., Church of England. Senior Tutor of St. David's College, Lampeter. *The Book of the Prophet Isaiah*, with Introduction and Notes, New York and London (no date).

WALL, WILLIAM. Church of England. (1646-1728.) Vicar of Shoreham, Kent. *History of Infant Baptism, together with Mr.*

Gale's Reflections, two volumes, Oxford, 1862. For this work the clergy of the lower house assembled in convocation passed a vote, "that the thanks of this house be given to Mr. Wall for the *learned and excellent book* he hath lately written concerning infant baptism."

WATERLAND, DANIEL, Church of England. (1683-1740.) Archdeacon of Middlesex. *Works*, ten volumes, Oxford, 1823. His *Works* are high authority in England.

WATSON, RICHARD, English Methodist. (1781-1833.) *Works*. thirteen volumes, London, 1865; *Theological Institutes*, four volumes, London, 1877. Of this work McClintock and Strong's Cyclopeda says: "His Institutes, though not the legal, have been the moral and scientific standard of Methodist doctrine. . . . It can never be superseded."

WEBSTER AND WILKINSON, both of the Church of England. William Webster was Assistant Master in King's College School. William F. Wilkinson, Theological Tutor of Cheltenham College. *Greek Testament, with Notes*, two volumes, London, 1855-1861.

WEISS, BERNHARD, German Lutheran. (1827—.) Professor of Theology in Berlin University. *Life of Christ*, three volumes, Edinburgh, 1883; *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, two volumes, Edinburgh, 1882, 1883.

WELLFORD, G., Church of England. Curate of Bray Berks. *Short Examination and Defense of Certain Expressions in the Baptismal Service*, Maidenhead, 1853.

WELLS, EDWARD, Church of England. (1665-1727.) One of the learned English scholars of his day. *A Help for the More Easy and Clear Understanding of the Holy Scriptures*, seven volumes, Oxford, 1715-1728.

WESTCOTT, B. F., Church of England. (1825-1905.) Bishop of Durham, and a member of the New Testament Revision Company. *Commentary on John*, in *Bible (Speaker's in England) Commentary*, New York, 1883.

WESLEY, JOHN, the founder of Methodism. (1703-1791.) *The New Testament, with Explanatory Notes*, Wakefield, 1872; *Treatise on Baptism*, in *Doctrinal Tracts*, New York, 1836. These tracts were published by order of the General Conference of the

Methodist Episcopal Church; hence this Treatise comes to us indorsed by the Methodist Episcopal Church, through her General Conference.

WHEATLEY, CHARLES, Church of England. Vicar of Brentz Furneux in Hertfordshire. *A Rational Illustration of the Common Prayer*, Oxford, 1839.

WHEDON, DANIEL DENISON, Methodist. (1808-1885.) Editor of the *Methodist Quarterly Review*, 1856-1884. Of him McClintock and Strong's Cyclopaedia says: "He was noted for his incisive, vigorous style, both as preacher and writer, and was remarkably powerful in controversy." *Commentary on the Old Testament*, eight volumes, New York, 1889-1907.

WHITBY, DANIEL, Church of England. (1638-1726.) A very learned commentator. *Commentary on the New Testament*, in *Patrick, Lowth, Arnold, Whitby, and Lawman's Commentary on the Scripture*, four volumes, London, 1847.

WHITEFIELD, GEORGE, English Methodist. (1714-1770.) He was the founder of the Calvinistic branch of Methodism. *Sermons on Important Subjects*, London, 1867

WHYTE, ALEXANDER, Scotch Presbyterian. (1837—.) Minister of St George's Free Church, Edinburgh, since 1870. *Commentary on the Shorter Catechism*, Edinburgh (no date).

WILLMARTH, JAMES W., Baptist (1835—) As to Mr. Willmarth's standing among the Baptists, William Cathcart, in his voluminous Baptist Encyclopedia, says: "He is a writer of great power and uses a prolific pen His articles on 'The Future Life' and 'Baptism and Remission,' in the Baptist Quarterly, showed much originality, and produced a profound impression upon cultured men of God. . . . His position on any subject is very decided; he knows nothing of half-heartedness; his thoughts are as transparent as a sunbeam. He shuns no responsibility in defending any truth" He was editor of the *Advanced Quarterly* and other publications on the International Sunday School Lessons of the American Baptist Publication Society, 1882-1883; Moderator of the West New Jersey and of the Philadelphia Associations; member of the Board of American Baptist Publication Society, and Chairman of its Committee of Publication; and a Trustee of Crozier Theological Seminary. *Baptism*

and Remission, in *Baptist Quarterly*, Philadelphia, July, 1877. In response to an inquiry by T. B. Thompson, as to whether he had or had not repudiated the views set forth in the Quarterly article, he said, under date of March 8, 1911: "The general position taken in that article I have maintained for the last third of a century and still maintain. I do not see how it can be overthrown if we follow the New Testament."

WILSON, DANIEL, Church of England. (1778-1858.) Bishop of Calcutta, and Metropolitan of India. *Expository Lectures on St. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians*, London, 1845.

WITSIUS, HERMANN. Dutch Presbyterian. (1636-1708.) Professor of Divinity in the Universities of Franeker, Utrecht, and Leyden. *Economy of the Covenants*, three volumes, London, 1775.

WOLFIUS, J. C., German Lutheran. (1683-1739.) One of the most learned expositors of his time. *Curae Philologicae, et Criticae*, five volumes, Basil, 1741.

WOODFORD, JAMES R., Church of England. (1820-1885.) Bishop of Ely. *Commentary on 1 Corinthians*, in *New Testament, with a Brief Commentary by Various Authors*, London, 1875.

WORDSWORTH, CHRISTOPHER. (1807-1885.) Church of England. The very learned Bishop of Lincoln. *New Testament in Greek, with Introductions and Notes*, new edition, two volumes, London, 1874.

WRIGHT, M., *Greek and English Lexicon*, London (no date).

WYCLIFFE, JOHN, "the morning star of the Reformation." (1314-1384.) *Select English Works*, three volumes, Oxford, 1871.

ZELL'S CYCLOPEDIA, four volumes, Philadelphia, 1883.

ZWINGLI, ULRIC, the prime mover in the Reformation in Switzerland, nearly as much as Luther in Germany. (1484-1531.) *Opera*, eight volumes, Zurich, 1828-1842

INDEX TO AUTHORS QUOTED.

- Abbott, 117, 120, 124, 255, 270, 272, 275, 339.
Aitken, 126.
Alexander (J. A.), 339, 362.
Alexander (W. L.), 231.
Alford, 83, 106, 127, 169, 236, 320, 368, 379, 399, 404.
Alzog, 48.
Apostolic Constitutions, 58, 127, 320.
Armitage, 305, 339.
Athanasius. 257.
Axtell, 339.
- Bagster, 25.
Bannerman, 127, 237, 257, 368
Barclay, 66, 223, 238.
Barlow, 238.
Barnabas, 58, 424.
Barnes, 106, 128, 258, 314, 320, 379, 404, 415
Barrow, 66, 258, 314, 320.
Bass, 25.
Bates, 67.
Baur, 128.
Baxter, 67, 128, 239, 259, 428.
Becon, 128.
Beet, 129, 239, 273, 279, 294, 314, 321, 360, 362, 369, 379, 385, 389, 393, 395, 404, 415.
Benecke, 129.
Bengel, 106.
Benham, 187, 217.
Bennett, 67, 129, 240.
- Benson, 129, 315, 321, 340, 363, 415.
Beyschlag, 68, 223, 240, 276, 281.
Beza, 68, 113.
Bickersteth, 305, 315, 340, 428
Bingham, 48, 130.
Blaikie's Encyclopædia, 39.
Bledsoe, 241, 259, 286, 287, 288, 292, 294.
Bliss, 305.
Bloomfield, 26, 95, 107, 120, 124, 130, 175, 259, 321, 340, 363, 399, 404, 416.
Blunt, 93, 95, 100, 120, 191, 217, 273, 276, 290, 321, 370, 394, 405.
Bonet-Maury, 68, 191, 234, 340, 429.
Bonwetsch, 233, 241.
Bossuet, 48, 96, 192.
Boston, 68, 241, 260.
Bower, 50.
Boys, 83, 130, 322.
Brande's Cyclopaedia, 39.
Braune, 399.
Bretschneider, 26.
Brooke, 223.
Brown (J.), 107.
Browne (E. H.), 242, 309, 322, 389, 412.
Bullinger, 27.
Bunsen, 61, 187, 192, 242, 292.
Burkitt, 121, 131, 170, 306, 316, 363, 380, 385, 399, 416.
Burnett, 131, 192, 242, 255, 260, 429.

- Burton, 316, 370, 385, 405, 417.
 Butcher, 341.
 Bywater, 341.
- Cajetan, 96, 132.
 Calvin, 68, 91, 121, 242, 260, 370, 380,
 399, 405, 417, 429.
 Cameron, 341.
 Campbell, 69, 100, 107.
 Candlish, 69, 132, 192, 261.
 Carr, 101.
 Casaubon, 83, 101.
 Catholic Dictionary, 193.
 Cave, 132, 299.
 Chalmers, 133.
 Chambers' Encyclopædia, 40.
 Christian Cyclopaedia, 102.
 Chrysostom, 59, 134, 176.
 Church of England, 134.
 Churton and Jones, 134.
 Clark (S.), 176, 371, 400.
 Clarke (A.), 108, 134, 261, 316, 323, 342,
 363, 386, 405.
 Clarke (S.), 135, 323.
 Clarke (W. N.), 306, 316.
 Coleman, 69, 187, 193.
 Colenso, 135.
 Coleridge, 224, 276.
 Comber, 70, 135, 323.
 Concise Cyclopædia, 41.
 Constantine, 27.
 Cook, 102, 417.
 Conybeare and Howson, 50, 135.
 Cox (H.), 50, 63, 121, 194, 323.
 Coxe (A. C.), 60, 62, 70, 194.
 Cranmer, 136, 342.
 Craps, 430.
 Cremer, 27.
 Cunningham (J.), 70, 117, 136, 194, 295.
 Cunningham (W.), 298.
- Cyprian, 59, 285, 323, 360, 406, 425.
 Cyril of Jerusalem, 102, 137, 324, 342.
- Daille, 137.
 Dale, 324.
 Davenant, 138, 371.
 Davidson, 179, 412.
 Dawson, 27.
 Dens, 70.
 Dill, 343.
 Diodati, 84, 108, 138, 344, 371.
 Ditzler, 234, 344.
 Doddridge, 91, 108, 121, 138, 262, 345,
 363, 413.
 Dods, 324.
 Döllinger, 51, 113, 138, 242.
 D'Ooge, 345.
 Donnegan, 27.
 Dorner, 138.
 Dunbar, 28.
 Du Veil, 345.
 Dwight, 242, 262, 325.
 Dykes, 406.
- Ebrard, 84.
 Edersheim, 93, 96.
 Edinburgh Review, 183.
 Edinburgh Encyclopædia, 41, 187, 196.
 Edwards (J.), 139, 176.
 Edwards (T. C.), 170, 281.
 Ellicott, 400.
 Encyclopædia Americana, 39, 188.
 Encyclopædia Britannica, 40, 218.
 Encyclopædia Metropolitana, 44, 197.
 Encyclopædia Perthensis, 44, 198.
 English Encyclopedia, 42.
 Erasmus, Estius, 139.
 Evans, 170.
 Ewald, 84, 139, 306.

- Ewing, 28.
 Fairburn, 219.
 Farrar, 140, 281, 380, 386, 413.
 Faussett, 140, 170, 178, 395.
 Fell, 140, 406.
 Findlay, 140.
 Fisher, 61, 70, 198, 242, 299.
 Flagg, 346.
 Foster, 346.
 Fowler, 141.
 French, 243.
 Frith, 71, 141.
 Fuller, 430.
 Fullerton, 346.

 Gale, 346, 431.
 Gataker, 142, 170.
 Geikie, 89, 94, 97.
 Gibbons, 71, 199.
 Giesler, 199.
 Gifford, 142, 372.
 Gloag, 347.
 Globe Encyclopædia, 42.
 Godet, 71, 142, 220, 224, 243, 307, 347.
 Goodell, 347.
 Goodwin (T.), 143.
 Goodwin (W. W.), 71, 348.
 Goulburn, 143.
 Green, 29, 113.
 Greenfield, 29.
 Gregory, 51.
 Gregory (Thaumaturgus), 60.
 Griffith, 85.
 Grimm, 29, 263.
 Grotius, 85, 92, 114, 144, 171.
 Groves, 30.
 Guericke, 51, 300.
 Gurney, 179.

 Hackett, 348, 364.
 Hagenbach, 199, 291, 300.

 Hahn, 243.
 Hall (J.), 144.
 Hall (R.), 431.
 Halley, 71, 117, 224, 326, 348, 381.
 Hammond, 90, 114, 145, 181, 225, 270,
 280, 307, 349, 364, 394, 396, 400,
 406.
 Hanna, 71, 244.
 Harkness, 349.
 Harman, 349.
 Harper, 350.
 Harris, 72.
 Hausrath, 90.
 Haydock, 86, 145.
 Hedericus, 30.
 Hefele, 199.
 Hennas, 62, 426.
 Hey, 63, 145, 244.
 Hill, 146, 309.
 Hilgenfeld, 200.
 Hippolytus, 61, 426.
 Hoadley, 146.
 Hodge, 372, 431.
 Hogue, 350.
 Hole, 147.
 Holsten, 72, 234, 244.
 Holtzmann, 72, 200.
 Hook, 58, 200.
 Hooker, 326, 432.
 Hopkins, 102, 178.
 Hovey, 327, 350, 364, 406, 418.
 Huntingdon, 350.
 Huther, 407.

 International Cyclopaedia, 42.
 Irenæus, 62, 287, 327, 42.

 Jackson, 407.
 Jacob, 72, 245, 302, 433.
 Jacobi, 246, 277, 302.
 Jacobson, 365.

- Jaspis, 147.
 Johnson, 200.
 Jones (J.), 31.
 Jones (W.), 433.
 Jortin, 373.
 Jowett, 147, 373.
 Justin Martyr, 62, 288, 327.
- Kächler, 246, 419.
 Keane, 72.
 Keble, 148.
 Keim, 86, 97.
 Kenrick, 72, 87, 201, 226, 263, 303.
 Kennedy, 293.
 Kling, 171, 281, 386.
 Knapp, 73, 149, 201, 246, 291 310, 328,
 373, 400, 419.
 Krummacher, 124.
 Kurtz, 51, 202.
- Lampe, 92
 Lange, 91, 103, 149, 328, 374.
 Langen, 73, 226, 247.
 a Lapide, 108.
 Lechler, 103, 123, 149, 351, 407
 Le Clerc 94.
 Leigh, 31.
 Leighton, 181.
 Leslie, 263, 328, 400, 434.
 Lewin, 177.
 Lias, 386, 390.
 Liddell and Scott, 31.
 Liddon, 150.
 Lightfoot (J.) 87, 92, 108, 202, 329.
 Lightfoot (J. B.), 150.
 Limborch, 73, 226, 247, 270, 273, 277,
 434.
 Lindsay, 122.
 Lingard, 52.
 Locke 150.
 London Encyclopædia, 43
- London Review, 184.
 Lumby, 274.
 Luther, 73, 151, 396. Lutz, 248, 263.
- MacEvilly 87, 152, 171, 263.
 Macknight, 152, 172, 178, 179, 181, 182,
 280, 329, 374, 387, 407, 419.
 Maclear, 114.
 Maldonatus, 109.
 Maltby, 32
 Manifold Cyclopaedia, 43.
 Manton, 152.
 Marshall, 153.
 Martyr (Peter), 153.
 Maurice, 74.
 McCarthy, 97.
 McClintock, 352, 435.
 McClintock and Strong Cyclopaedia, 204.
 McLean, 331, 351.
 Mede, 204, 407.
 Melancthon, 74.
 Meyer, 87, 98, 103, 115, 124, 153, 172,
 220, 248, 264, 274, 282, 317, 330,
 351, 365, 387, 390, 397, 401.
 Meyrick, 401.
 Milman, 52, 204.
 Milton, 75, 115, 227, 255, 271.
 Moberly, 75, 154, 317, 332, 374, 390,
 420, 435.
 Monthly Review, 184.
 Morell, 32.
 Morison, 75, 109.
 Mosheim, 52, 300.
 Moule, 75, 154, 248, 331.
 Mozley, 227, 249.
- Neander, 53, 103, 204, 280, 293, 295,
 301, 303, 435.
 New American Cyclopaedia, 44.
 Newcombe, 154
 Newman, 228, 249.

- Nicholson, 155, 332.
 Norris, 155, 318, 333.
 North British Review, 249, 282, 301.
 Norton, 104.

 O'Donnoghue, 75 249, 436
 Olshausen, 92, 155, 172, 256, 264, 275,
 280, 283.
 Origen, 291.
 Ornsby, 155.

 Packard, 352.
 Paine, 76, 249, 352.
 Parkhurst, 32, 264.
 Pearson, 436.
 Penny Encyclopædia, 44.
 Philippi, 375.
 Picketing, 33.
 Piconio, 156.
 Pictet 76, 156.
 Plummer, 76, 92, 158, 387, 401, 408.
 Plumptre, 88, 104, 115, 118, 122, 123.
 Poole's Continuator, 76, 91, 110, 122,
 156, 256, 265, 365, 375 381, 402,
 408.
 Popular Encyclopædia, 45.
 Pope, 156, 333, 353, 436.
 Potter, 76
 Prentiss, 249.
 Pressense, 53, 221, 230 250, 275, 278,
 280.
 Proctor (F.), 54.
 Proctor (J. C.), 353.
 Purver, 77.
 Purves, 353.
 Pusey, 157.
 Pyle, 104, 157, 387, 402, 408, 421.

 Quarterly Review, 185.

 Raymond, 250.

 Rees' Encyclopædia, 46, 205.
 Reeves, 63.
 Religious Review of Reviews, 186.
 Renan, 88.
 Reuss, 88.
 Riddle (J. K.), 55, 77, 188, 206
 Riddle (M. B.), 158, 402.
 Ridgely, 265.
 Robertson (F. W.), 172, 391.
 Robertson (J. C.), 55.
 Robinson, 33, 266.
 Robson, 34.
 Rosenmüller, 88, 158.

 Sadler, 333, 354, 366, 381, 394, 397,
 402, 408, 421.
 Sale, 354
 Saurin, 159.
 Scapula. 34.
 Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia, 46.
 Schaff, 55, 119, 159, 188, 207, 301, 334,
 355, 375, 397.
 Schleusner, 34.
 Schmidt, 250.
 Schrevelius, 35.
 Scott (J.), 160, 355, 366, 375.
 Scott (T.), 110, 266, 310, 355, 376
 Seeker, 160.
 Semisch, 291.
 Sitterly, 355.
 Smith (J.), 55.
 Smith (P.), 55, 208.
 Sophocles, 35.
 Spence, 409.
 Stackhouse 56, 189.
 Stanhope, 160.
 Stanley, 56, 189, 208, 250, 283.
 Stapferus, 77, 252.
 Steitz, 252.
 Stephanus, 36.
 Stier, 161, 376.

- Stiffler, 311.
 Stillfleet, 211, 252.
 Stockius, 36.
 Stokes, 77, 211.
 Storr and Flatt, 78, 311, 437.
 Strauss, 89.
 Strong, 355.
 Stuart, 64, 79, 110, 173, 211, 221, 230, 252, 402, 409, 414.
 Students' Encyclopædia, 47.
 Summers, 79, 335, 409.
 Sutcliffe, 89, 110, 161, 181, 335, 422.
- Talmage, 98.
 Taylor, 161, 212.
 Teaching of the XII. Apostles, 64.
 Tertullian, 64, 293, 335, 382, 427.
 Thayer, 37, 230, 252, 356.
 Tholuck, 162.
 Thompson, 122.
 Thorold, 162, 403.
 Tillotson, 104, 162.
 Tomline, 80, 163, 253.
 Trapp (John), 111.
 Trapp (Joseph), 111.
 Trollope, 111, 115, 163, 335, 376, 387
 Trumbull, 80.
 Tulloch, 253, 437.
 Turretin, 80, 123, 163, 173, 212.
 Turrentine, 356.
 Tyler, 356.
 Tyndale, 164.
- Usher, 80
- Valpy, 89, 111, 116, 164, 267, 271, 318, 388, 391, 394, 403.
 Van Oosterzee, 81, 105, 111, 178, 213.
 Vaughan, 377.
 Venema, 81, 116, 119, 189.
 Vincent, 164.
- Waddington, 57.
- Wall, 57, 164, 190, 213, 336.
 Waterland, 253, 377, 409.
 Watson, 111, 267, 422.
 Webster and Wilkinson, 164, 174, 268, 307, 336, 377, 383, 410.
 Weiss, 89, 91, 119, 165, 222, 357.
 Wellford, 253.
 Wells, 165, 388.
 Wescott, 94, 165, 337.
 Wesley, 166, 304, 337, 366, 438.
 Wheatley, 166.
 Whitby, 93, 99, 112, 166, 174, 268, 319, 337, 410.
 Whitefield, 167.
 Whyte, 82.
 Willmarth, 308, 312, 319, 337, 357, 367, 378, 383, 398, 423, 438.
 Wilson (D.), 167.
 Wilson, 81, 278.
 Witsius, 82, 89, 112, 167, 175, 254.
 Wolfius, 167.
 Woodford, 384, 388, 410.
 Wordsworth, 112, 168, 338, 367, 392, 410.
 Wright, 38.
 Wycliffe, 168.
 Zell's Encyclopædia, 47, 216.
 Zwingli, 169.

INDEX TO APPENDIX.

- Abbot, T. K., 453.
- Bartlet, James Vernon, 457.
Beecher, Henry Ward, 457.
Benson, Joseph, 441, 447.
Beyschlag, Willibald, 457.
Box, G. H., 442.
- Catholic Encyclopedia, 451.
Comparative tables, 460.
Cowles, Henry, 447.
Currey, G., 448.
- Davidson, Andrew Bruce, 448.
Delitzsch, Franz, 442.
Denney, James, 453.
- Fausset, Andrew Robert, 449.
Funk and Wagnalls Standard
Encyclopedia, 451, 458.
- Gardiner, F., 449.
Graves, John R., 455.
- Hastings' Bible Dictionary, 458.
Hoss, Elijah Embree, 455.
- Illustrated Bible Dictionary, 458.
- Jacobus, Melancthon Williams, 456.
- Keil, Card Frederich, 449.
- Leeser, Isaac, 443.
Lofton, George Augustus, 456.
- Nagelsbach, Carl Eduard, 443.
Nelson's Encyclopedia, 452.
- Rawlinson, George, 444.
- Sanday, William, 453.
Schroder, Wilhelm Julius, 449.
Septuagint Version, 444.
Skinner, John, 444, 450.
Smith, George Adam, 445.
Standard Bible Dictionary, 458.
- Tables, comparative, 460.
Tigert, John James, 456.
- Wade, G W., 445.
Whedon, Daniel Denison, 445.