

Baptism in the Apostolic Age

BY

THOS. CARY JOHNSON, D. D., LL. D.

*Author of Life of R. L. Dabney, D. D., Life of B. M. Palmer, D. D.,
John Calvin and the Geneva Reformation. Introduction to the
Study of Christian Missions, etc., etc.*

RICHMOND, VA.

PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION.

1912



GIFT

AUG 31 1938

Virginia

BV
811
.J6

195283

PUBLISHED AT THE REQUEST OF
STUDENTS OF THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
OF THE SESSION OF
1911-1912 AND PREVIOUS SESSIONS.

COPYRIGHT 1912 BY
THOMAS CARY JOHNSON.

DEDICATED TO
THE SCORES OF STUDENTS OF UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
OF THE SESSION OF
1911-1912 AND OF PREVIOUS SESSIONS
WHO HAVE ASKED THE PUBLICATION OF THESE LECTURES.

**PRINTED BY
RICHMOND PRESS, INC.
RICHMOND, VA.**

Baptism in the Apostolic Age

In discussing this subject, we shall deal: first, with the significance of baptism; second, with the authority for the use of the rite; third, with the mode of baptism; and, fourth, with the subjects of baptism. With the first two of these topics we shall deal briefly. To the latter two of the topics we shall give somewhat fuller consideration.

I. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF BAPTISM.

First.—Ritual baptism is a teaching ordinance.

The great commission makes it clear that baptism is a teaching ordinance. Our Lord said, "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all nations." He then added two explanatory clauses. The first of these "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This clause does not enjoin a mere concomitant of discipling, but a part of discipling. Baptism is thus shown to be a teaching ordinance.

From other scriptures we learn that it teaches several truths of fundamental importance—teaches these truths symbolically.

1. We learn that baptism is symbolical of regeneration by the Holy Ghost. This we are clearly taught in such scriptures as Titus 3:5, "He saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." This scripture may be paraphrased fairly, as follows: "He saved us by the washing of regeneration, even by the renewing of the Holy Ghost," the conjunction *καὶ* *and*, here being

epexegetical, or explanatory. He saved us by spiritual renewal, the apostle says; but he speaks of this spiritual renewal, in the first of these clauses, in the terms of ritual baptism. He thus shows, so far, the import of ritual baptism—shows that it symbolizes spiritual baptism, or regeneration.

Again, early in the conversation with Nicodemus, of which we have record in the third chapter of John's Gospel, our Lord said, "Except a man be born afresh, he cannot see the kingdom of God," and, when Nicodemus expressed his amazement at the idea of the new birth, our Lord explained *from what*, and *from whom*, a man had to be born afresh. He said, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except a man be born of water and of the Spirit"—except a man be born of water, the token and outward symbol of the Spirit, and of the Spirit — "he cannot see the kingdom of God." John the Baptist had contrasted his baptism, which was with water only, with the baptism with the Holy Ghost with which the Messiah should baptize. Jesus, here, brings together baptism with water and baptism with the Holy Ghost, in the relation of outward sign and symbol, and spiritual agency symbolized. The outward symbol, cleansing with water is significant of spiritual cleansing by the purifying power of the Holy Ghost.

Other scriptures of similar import might be cited. They show that, among the truths designed to be taught by this ordinance, is that of spiritual renewal. The rite signifies to candidates and witnesses the great and necessary work—regeneration by the Holy Ghost. It does not signify that the spiritual change is to be wrought by its administration in virtue of any physical nexus between the external element and the invisible grace. In the baptism of adults, the rite is symbolical of the regeneration already believed

to be accomplished, as in the cases of Cornelius and his household and of the apostle Paul. In the baptism of children, it is symbolical of work to be done by the Holy Ghost, if the conditions of the covenant between the parents and the God of the covenant shall be kept.

The time when the Holy Ghost's work is done, is not indicated in the rite; but that he does such work and must do it in order to any man's salvation, is a great truth proclaimed every time this ordinance is intelligently administered.

2. Baptism is, also, significant of the remission of sins—the forgiveness of our sins—and our adoption into the family of God.

Baptism holds forth to our view justification considered in its effects in us. It holds up the sweetness, grace, and preciousness of pardon and adoption wrought out and applied to the individual. Thus, in Titus 3:7, the object of the renewal shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior, and symbolized in baptism, is said to be, that we may be justified by His grace, that is, that our sins may be forgiven for Christ's sake, that we may receive pardon; and that we may be made "his according to the promise of eternal life"—that we may be adopted into the family of God.

This teaching of Titus 3:7, about the significance of baptism is supported by the plainer teaching of other scriptures: One of Peter's exhortations on the day of Pentecost was, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins" (Acts 2:38).

Renewal changes the character, baptism symbolizes that change; but renewal looks to remission of sins before the bar of God's justice and our adoption into the family of God. Hence, as the scriptures widely teach, baptism with

water speaks not only of renewal but of our justification — forgiveness and adoption into the family of God, which is intended in renewal.

In like manner, we read, in Gal. 3:26, 27: "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Here spiritual baptism is represented as the procuring cause of the putting on of Christ, and of spiritual sonship. This is set forth, therefore, in symbol, in ritual baptism. Justification by the blood of Christ and adoption into the family of God are great truths which the rite of baptism is designed to impress upon all who witness it.

Not only does ritual baptism symbolize spiritual renewal, justification and adoption, it sets forth other precious truths correlated to these.

3. Ritual baptism is significant of the union of the worthy candidate with our Lord Jesus Christ, as a member of that mystical body, of which Christ is the head and all of his own members.

Christ died for his own. He sheds the grace of renewal on his own. They constitute with him one body, in the end. When any one is baptized with the spiritual baptism which he sheds forth abundantly, he is thereby engrafted into Christ's body. Ritual baptism, the outward token of the inward spiritual baptism, is intended to set forth this truth also. Hence, we read (Rom. 6:3) of "baptism into Jesus Christ;" and (1 Cor. 6:15) of our "bodies" as the members of Christ.

Second.—Ritual baptism is a seal of the covenant of grace.

That this is true, is taught in many scriptures. For example, in Rom. 4:11, we read, "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which

he had being yet uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed to them also." Circumcision in this passage is made a seal of the righteousness of faith; and to certify that Abraham was justified by faith; that the doctrine and privileges of the righteousness of faith were to be perpetuated among his seed by the operation of God's covenant with him (Gen. 17:1-14); and that all who believed were to be counted children of Abraham, and personally interested in the righteousness by which he was justified. Baptism occupies that place in the Christian church which was occupied by circumcision in the Abrahamic church.

This substitution of baptism in the place of circumcision seems clearly taught in Col. 2:11, 12: "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: 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." In this passage spiritual baptism and spiritual circumcision are identical. The rites themselves, therefore, are identical in significance. Baptism, then, in the present dispensation, just as circumcision in the former dispensation, is made the seal of the benefits of the covenant of grace, which includes remission of sins by the blood of Christ, regeneration and sanctification by the Spirit of Christ, adoption and resurrection unto everlasting life.

In applying to you this simple rite God pledges to you the bestowal of greater blessings than those already bestowed upon you.

Third.—Ritual Baptism is a profession on the part of the baptized that they have given up unto God, and a pledge that through Jesus Christ they will walk in newness of life.

In baptism we profess to have become disciples of Christ, and pledge ourselves to live for Christ. In the last great commission the apostles were enjoined to make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Now, the distinctive mark of the Christian disciple was his devotion to God—his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, and walking in newness of life. Those thus devoted and their children, and only they, were to be baptized, as we learn from other scriptures. By baptism the disciples were to be thus separated unto God from the world.

The same truth is taught in Tit. 3:2, ff. Paul writes there of spiritual baptism indeed; but ritual baptism is designed to set forth what spiritual baptism does for us. He incidentally teaches us of ritual baptism therefore. He teaches that, through spiritual baptism, old things pass away; that those who were disobedient, deceived, serving divers lusts, living in malice and envy, begin to live for God. Paul writes in Rom. 6:3, 4, of spiritual baptism, again, "Know ye not that so many of us, as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? 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." Water baptism symbolizes the spiritual baptism of which Paul writes. Hence it is certain that one of the great lessons of the ordinance is, "The sinner's giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life."

To recapitulate: Ritual baptism is a teaching ordinance, setting forth with great power, efficacious cleansing of sin's power and pollution by the Holy Ghost, meritorious cleansing from the guilt of sin by the blood of Christ, and ingrafting into the body of Christ through the agency of the Holy Ghost who dwells in Christ in all fulness and in the believer in measure. It sets forth the whole covenant of grace in its subjective aspects and seals our partaking of the benefits of that covenant. It is the Christian's solemn oath of faithfulness as a soldier of Jesus Christ.

It presupposes regeneration by the Spirit, justification on the grounds of Christ's righteousness, conversion, or repentance and faith, on the part of adults baptized.

II. THE AUTHORITY FOR THE USE OF THE RITE.

The rite of baptism was solemnly enjoined by our Lord Jesus Christ, and is of universal and perpetual obligation. This is taught in Matt. 28:19, 20. In this passage he expressly enjoins the discipling—baptizing and teaching—of all nations, a command that can never be fully complied with till all individuals of all nations shall have been baptized and taught. He as clearly, teaches, by implication, that the work enjoined is a protracted one—a work co-terminous with the present dispensation—for he promises: "And, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world."

The observance of the rite was a constant characteristic of the Apostolic church. We hear Peter preaching, "Repent and be baptized;" we read that, when Philip preached the word in Samaria, "Those who believed were baptized, both men and women;" that, when he preached unto the man of Ethopia, the man said, "Here is water, what doth hinder

me to be baptized?" We read that, when Peter saw the Spirit descend on Cornelius and his household, "he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord," that Paul was baptized on his conversion; and that he baptized the jailer as soon as he had made a profession of religion, etc., etc.

Its reception is not necessary to salvation; but as it was enjoined by Christ, it cannot be despised except at the cost of rebellion against one of our Lord's expressed commands.

III. THE MODE OF BAPTISM.

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

His great literary skill and large capacity for labor were not controlled by a correspondingly deep insight into his subject, nor by logical powers of the highest order. Moreover, instead of making first hand investigations, he was too much given to the reproduction of other men's views. For this reason the informed reader never accepts Dr. Schaff's inferences, or conclusions, until he has examined the evidence by which they are supported, and ascertained the sufficiency of the evidence taken alone, or along with other which may be brought into connection with it.

Not all of his readers are informed as to Dr. Schaff's limitations. Some of them are in danger of being misled by frequent passages in his works. Some of them are in danger of being misled by what he says touching the mode of Baptism (see *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I, pp. 468, ff).

He there says:

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

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

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

copious pouring rather, was practised at an early day with sick and dying persons, and probably with children and others, where total or partial immersion was impracticable. Some writers suppose that this was the case even in the first baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost; for Jerusalem was poorly supplied with water and private baths; the Kedron is a small creek and dry in summer; but there are a number of pools and cisterns there. Hellenistic usage allows to the relevant expressions sometimes the wider sense of washing, bathing, sprinkling, and ceremonial cleansing.³ Unquestionably, immersion expresses the idea of baptism, as a purification and renovation of the whole man, more completely than pouring or sprinkling; but it is not in keeping with the genius of the Gospel to limit the operation of the Holy Spirit by the quantity or the quality of the water or the mode of its application. Water is absolutely necessary to baptism, as an appropriate symbol of the purifying and regenerating energy of the Holy Spirit; but whether the water be in large quantity or small, cold or warm, fresh or salt, from

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

river, cistern or spring, is relatively immaterial, and cannot affect the validity of the ordinance."

This is the whole account of the mode of baptism given by Dr. Schaff in his great History of the Christian Church. (We have been careful to present the foot notes as well as the statements in the body of the text). It is superficial, hasty, incorrect and calculated to mislead every careless and poorly informed reader.

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

Let us observe, in the outset, that if the original meaning of βαπτίζω were *to dip*⁴ and that only; if, according to its *etymology* and its *classic usage*, it never meant anything else than *to put under water and draw out again*, that would not ground a strong inference that Christian baptism was by immersion; and for three reasons. (1) When a language becomes a vehicle of revealed religion, some words must change their meanings. It is a familiar fact that our missionaries to-day among peoples who have not been considerably affected by a knowledge of the one true religion, can find no words exactly fitted for the conveyance of many Christian conceptions, and that they are under necessity to change the meanings of certain words. For instance, how hard it is for our missionaries in China to convey to the Chinese mind the proper notion of God. The Chinese have no word in their language which suits exactly. The missionaries must tell the Chinese of the true God. They

(⁴) For convenience we shall use the word "*dip*" in this discussion of putting into or under the water and taking out again.

must tell about him in a language and with words that the Chinese understand; they must tell in the Chinaman's own tongue. So they take the word which comes nearest. They fill it with a new meaning; and put it to a new and lofty use. How silly would it be for the Chinese scholars of a thousand years hence to deduce the conception of the true God from the original meaning of the term adopted now by translators.

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

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

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

We condemn this course. We say, indeed, that it is fair to conclude that the Chinese word *God*, which is used, is chosen because it has some meaning or other which suited in part; but that our doctor will be able to get little good

out of the study of the heathen Chinese use of the term. He is to ascertain the real meaning of the term as used by present translators, by a study of the connections in which *they* use it. And so we say of the words βαπτίζειν and βαπτισμός. Their meaning in the classic Greek is of next to no significance in this debate. When a man becomes a child of God he undergoes a great change; and when a language is impressed to convey the Gospel of our blessed Lord it also is metamorphosed. We must study the words as thus newly used to ascertain their meanings as applied to their new and high purposes. We care little for their old significations.

(2) Even where the occasion of change would not seem to have been so urgent, words which primarily denoted a specific form or mode have, in the course of time, lost all reference to their primary, etymological and historical import. A very scholarly and able contemporary writer asserts that nothing is more common in living language than such a change in the meaning of words. He says: "To *manufacture*, for instance, originally meant *to make 'by the hand'*; but now a very large proportion of *manufactured articles* are no longer *'hand made,'* but on the contrary, and in contradistinction, are made by machinery. Originally it was vessels *only with 'sails' that 'sailed,'* but now we constantly read and speak of the *sailing* of steamboats, although in many cases they have actually no *'sail'* at all, and they cannot *sail* in the primary acceptation of the term. Originally it was at the sound or *'blast'* of the trumpet that heralds described the armorial ensigns of those who entered the tournament lists; it was thus (compare the German *blasen*) that they *blazoned*; their description was *'blazed' abroad* over the whole assembled multitude. But now nothing in the world is done more quietly than the *blazoning*

of coats of arms; and yet they continue to be *blazoned*. In fact, *coats of arms*, so called, are no longer 'coats' at all; just as the great majority of '*spinsters*' no longer *spin*. There are, too, other *hypocrites* besides those who are found on the boards of a theatre, though a *hypocrite* originally was a *stage player who answered from under a mask*. So a *villain* was originally just a *villager*; a *pagan* was simply a *countryman*; a scandal was a stick in a trap. And to come back to the very word in dispute, the root verb from which it springs, though primarily meaning *to dip* (?) came also to mean *to dye*, in whatsoever way the dyeing was effected. And as a matter of philological fact, the word *baptize* itself is now by the great majority of people who use it all over the world, used to denote the performance of a purificatory rite, without the least atom of reference *in their use of it*, to its primary import of *immersion*. If the term is now employed in this way, is it inconceivable that it should have been *formerly* thus employed? If not, is it inconceivable that we should have to push back the reference of the '*formerly*' to the very time of the New Testament?''⁵

(3) Add to this Dr. Schaff's concession, already quoted, that "Hellenistic usage allows to the relevant expressions sometimes the wider sense of washing, bathing, sprinkling and ceremonial cleansing." (II Kings, 5:14; Luke 11:38; Mark 7:4; Heb. 6:2; 9:10.) "The '*divers baptisms*' in Heb. 9:10 probably include all the ceremonial purifications of the Jews, whether by bathing, or washing, or sprinkling." We see the inference from the original meaning of the words βαπτίζω and βαπτισμός is worth next to nothing. Words may merge all reference to their primary meaning. These words have done so in much of their use; and had done this,

⁵ See Morison on Mark VII. 4.

as the Hellenistic usage shows, prior to the day of Pentecost. Hence the original meaning of the Greek βαπτίζω and βαπτισμός becomes of very small moment.⁶

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

⁶ Dr. Broadus's effort to abrogate the force of this point would command some respect, were it not clear that βαπτίζω and βαπτισμός have actually changed their meanings in Apostolic usage, as Dr. Schaff says (see quotations from him already given); *i. e.*, were he fighting a mere theory and not a fact. But it is to be remarked that he understates, perhaps unconsciously, and misstates the scope of the argument, and hence, perhaps also, cites few illustrations and those not the strongest. Moreover, when we have advanced beyond our present supposition as to the classic meaning of the word, which is a mere supposition, and have set forth its rich and varied usage in classic Greek, we shall find that it is not employed in an "entirely different sense in sacred from what it had in classical use." And we shall find that all Dr. Broadus's war on this argument amounts, in his own pelucid terms, "to just nothing." See *Immersion Essential to Baptism*, p. 43, ff.

But the original meaning of βαπτίζω was not to dip, *in the sense of putting into or under the water and taking out again*. The Rev. Dr. T. J. Conant was a scholar of recognized ability. He undertook researches on this subject at the request of the American (Baptist) Bible Union. He stated the results of his investigation as follows: "The word βαπτίζω, during the whole existence of the Greek as a spoken language, had a perfectly defined and unvarying import. In its literal use, it meant, as has been shown, to put entirely into or under a liquid, or other penetrable substance, generally water, so that the object was wholly covered by the enclosing element. By analogy, it expressed *the coming into a new state of life or experience*, in which one was, as it were, inclosed and swallowed up, so that temporarily or permanently, he belonged wholly to it."⁷ He says again, "The word *immerse*, as well as its synonyms, *immerge*, etc., expresses the full import of the Greek word βαπτίζω. The idea of emersion is not included in the meaning of the Greek word. It means, simply, to put in or under water (or other substance) without determining whether the object immersed sinks to the bottom, or floats in the liquid, or is immediately taken out. This is determined not by the word itself, but by the nature of the case, and by the design of the act in each particular case. A living being, put under water without intending to drown him, is of course to be immediately withdrawn from it; and this is to be understood, wherever the word is used with reference to such a case. But the Greek word is also used where a living being is put under

⁷"The Meaning and Use of βαπτίζω, Philologically and Historically investigated for the American Bible Union. By T. J. Conant, D. D." p. 158.

water for the purpose of drowning, and, of course, is left to perish in the immersing element."⁸

Concerning these statements let us notice: 1st. It is conceded that βαπτίζω does not mean to dip, *i. e.* to put into or under and withdraw again, and claimed, that when taken in its literal import, it means, "to immerse," or "immerge," "to put into or under water" "without determining whether the object immersed sinks to the bottom, or floats in the liquid, or is immediately taken out." In the words of another Baptist scholar, the "whole function" of βαπτίζω "is fulfilled with the act of submersion." By baptism, the subject is, according to this conception, put under the water and left there. Hence, if our Baptist brethren argued truly from this "literal import" of the term; and if they acted in accord with the conclusion ~~thus~~ reached, they would drown a vast number. In executing the last great commission: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," they would go and submerge them; and the weak, whether weak on account of sickness or age, would drown. The great commission makes no command, either directly or by implication, for the rescue of those put into jeopardy in this way. 2d. According to this teaching the emblem—ritual baptism—seems quite inadequate as an emblem of that of which Immersionists say it is the emblem.

Dr. Carson says: "The immersion of the whole body is essential to baptism, not because nothing but immersion can be an emblem of purification, but because immersion is the thing commanded, and because that, without immer-

⁸ "The Meaning and Use of βαπτίζω," *ut supra*, p. 88.

sion, there is no emblem of *death, burial and resurrection* which are in the emblem equally with purification.”⁹

Now observe, that if Dr. Carson had had any Biblical grounds for holding that burial and *resurrection* must be in the emblem, then he might argue for immersion as he does; for he held that βαπτίζω meant *to dip*, though he confessed: “I have *all* the lexicographers and commentators against me.”¹⁰ But not so those who see, as every honest scholar must see now, that βαπτίζω does not mean “*dip*” at all, though it may mean submerge. There is certainly nothing in *submergence* emblematical of *resurrection*. Nor can our Baptist friends read it in. This emblem has no resurrection in it, whether or not it be true that “without immersion there is no emblem of death, burial and resurrection.” Logically, Dr. Conant and those who agree with him must see in the rite of baptism no reference to resurrection. This utter lack of harmony between sign and thing signified is damning.

3d. There is a word, and it occurs in the New Testament writings, which might have been used of the rite of baptism, had it been *dipping*. But the inspired teachers did not use this word when speaking of the ordinance of Christian baptism. They do not seem to have been immersionists. Therefore, instead of using βάπτω, *to dip*, when speaking of the rite of baptism, they used βαπτίζω, which had several meanings as used in the Hellenistic Greek; but never meant “*to dip*.” βάπτω would have suited Immersionists. Listen to these uses of the word in the New Testament: “Send Lazarus, that he may *dip* (βάπτω) the tip of his finger in water and cool my

⁹ Dr. Carson: *Baptism, its Modes and Subjects*; page 381.

¹⁰ Dr. Carson: *Baptism, its Modes and Subjects*, page 55.

tongue."¹¹ "He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it; and when he had dipped the sop he gave it to Judas Iscariot."¹² "And he was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood."¹³ This word would have suited the Immersionist exactly. It would have suited so well that Dr. Carson wishes to take its meaning and affirm it of βαπτίζω, a word which the Apostles preferred though it did not mean *dip*—to put into the water and take out again, at all. Some protagonists of immersion say that the Apostles chose the word βαπτίζω in preference to βάπτω, on account of "its greater length, weight and dignity of form." This is a very poor reason. What would we think of men who claimed to be teachers with a message of vast importance, if they should throw away a word whose meaning suited exactly, and choose instead a word of doubtful import, and not only so, but wanting in an essential feature to carry the meaning intended, because, forsooth, it was of "greater length, weight and dignity of form?" Sam Jones would call such men pompous old "windbags," and Sam Jones would be right so far. The Apostle Peter would more properly describe them as speaking "great swelling words of vanity." But poor Peter! he would hit himself. The burden of his preaching was sometimes: "Repent and be baptized," (βαπτισθήτω).¹⁴

¹¹ Luke 16:24.

¹² John 13:26.

¹³ Revelations 19:13.

¹⁴ Dr. Broadus tries to break the force of this point by showing that βαπτίζω is sometimes equivalent to βάπτω. The best proof he can find is Plutarch *Alex. 67*, where Plutarch represents the soldiers of Alexander as on one occasion dipping (baptizing) wine with cups from huge wine jars and mixing bowls. But apparently Dr. Broadus fails to notice that it is the wine that is said to have been baptized,

4th. The admissions of Dr. Conant about the meaning of βαπτίζω include one of great importance. After giving what he regarded as its meaning in its literal import, he said: By analogy it expressed "the coming into a new state of life or existence." This is true, and here, no doubt, is found the real reason for choosing this word to name the rite of initiation into the kingdom of God. The process which makes a man a child of God, brings him into a "new state of life or existence." And the rite emblematical of the spiritual transaction should be called by a word expressing such a change.¹⁵

We see, now, that the meaning assigned to the word βαπτίζω by the most competent Baptist scholars as its literal import, makes the rite of baptism leave the subject under

dipped, not the cups, which word is in the instrumental dative. The thing that is baptized, what is done with it? We leave our Baptist Brethren to explain. Was it introduced into a new sphere? In Dr. Broadus' own happy words his effort here is "simply amusing." See *Immersion Essential to Baptism*, page 40.

¹⁵If we understand Dr. Broadus (see *Immersion Essential to Christian Baptism*, pp. 19, 20) he would thrust always into the derived meaning of βαπτίζω, viz.: "The coming into a new state of life or existence," the idea of submersion. For example, when a man is said to be *baptized* with wine, that is, intoxicated, he would thrust in the idea of his submergence into wine. But if so the Greek would represent the man as *drowned* in wine. There had to be a complete severance of the secondary from the primal import before the phrase could become a convenient one to set forth the state of the intoxicated, who actually puts the wine into himself and thus was introduced into another kind of existence. We, with Dr. Broadus, hold that "we are not at liberty to assign to a word a new meaning quite different from its primary and established meaning until we find a passage which requires it." But we hold also that having found such a passage we must assign the word a "new meaning." We find some such passages in the New Testament. See the concessions of Schaff already quoted.

the water without a command, either expressed or implied, to take him out, we see that this fact shears immersion as an emblem of the feature of resurrection, and so cuts across Baptist teaching. We see that the inspired writers refused to use a word *βάπτειν*, which would have conveyed the idea of *dipping*, immersion in the sense in which our Baptist friends really hold it; and that they used another word; and that, by reason of a secondary meaning which it had—one which it had “by analogy,” viz.: “Coming into a new state of life or existence,”—it was likely to be seized upon and used to name the rite of initiation into the Church, no matter what the precise mode in which the rite should be administered. We have also seen that *βαπτίζειν* is one of a class of words which has merged its reference to its primary import and that it had done so prior to the time of the Apostolic Age, in many cases, as Schaff even admits.

Let us now have the truth positively about it. We have found no juster statement of it than that given by Dr. Baird.¹⁶ He says: “Its primary meaning, as used by them (Greeks), was,—to bring into the state of mersion. This meaning had no respect to the mode of action, whether by putting the subject under the fluid, pouring it over him, or in whatever manner. In other words, it expressed not *immersion*, but *mersion*—not the mode of inducing the state, but the state induced,—that of being embosomed in the mersing element. From this primary signification was derived a secondary use of the word. As anything that is mersed is in the possession and control of the mersing element, the word was hence used to express the establishing of a complete possession and controlling influence. As we say that a man is drowned,—immersed,—overwhelmed, in

¹⁶S. J. Baird: “The Great Baptizer,” p. 154, 155.

business, in trouble, in drunkenness, or in sleep; having in these expressions no reference whatever to the mode in which the described condition was brought about; so the Greeks used the verb βαπτίζω. They spoke of men as baptized with grief, with passion, with business cares. An intoxicated person was 'baptized with wine,' etc. In such use of the word, the essential idea is that of the action of a pervasive potency by which the subject is brought and held in a new state or condition."

Dr. Baird continues: "Now, here was the very word required to designate the Mosaic rites of purifying. Of dip-pings and immersions Israel had none; and, if these had been found in their ritual, the verbs, βάπτω, *to dip*, and Κατάβω, *to plunge into, to immerse*, and the nouns βαφή and Κατάβωσις, *a dipping, an immersion*, were at hand and specific in meaning. But they did want words to express that potency by which the unclean were, in the words of Dr. Conant, introduced into "a new state of life,"—a state of ritual cleanness, typical of the spiritual newness of life in Christ Jesus, which God's people receive, by the baptism of the Spirit. To express the working of that change, they appropriated the word βαπτίζω, *to baptize*; that is, to cleanse, to purify. Then, to give names to the rite by which that change was accomplished, they formed from it the two sacred words βαπτισμός and βάπτισμα, words wholly unknown to classic Greek literature. They are as to etymology and meaning identical. By grammarians, the termination *μός*, is said generally to indicate the act signified by the verb, while *μα* indicates its effect. But the rule is neither absolute nor universal, and the sacred writers do not maintain the distinction. By them βάπτισμα is used alike to signify the act of baptizing and the effect, the new state produced by it. In their writings the distinction

seems to consist in the employment of *baptismos* generically, as designating divers kinds of purifying rites; while *baptisma* is specifically applied to the baptism of John and Christ. It is found in no other writings of that or preceding ages. Outside of the Scriptures, *baptismos* occurs in the works of Josephus, who thus designates John's baptism (Antiquities of the Jews, XVIII, vi. 2.)¹⁷

So much for the Greek uses of the word. We have seen that in classic use it meant to bring into a state of mersion without indicating anything as to the mode in which the mersion was accomplished; that secondarily it meant to bring into a changed condition without indicating at all how the change was brought about.

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

1. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews says: "In which were offered both gifts and sacrifices that could not as touching the conscience, make the worshiper perfect, *being* only with meats and drinks, and divers *baptismoi* carnal ordinances, imposed until a time of reformation."¹⁸ He here distributes the whole Levitical system under two categories, one of which is "meats and drinks" and the other is "divers baptisms." The baptisms of which he speaks were baptisms of men and not of things, since they were "righteousness of the flesh (v. 10)" which could not purge the conscience (v. 9 and 14). He can refer only to the sprinklings and the self-performed washings of the Levitical ritual. There were no other rites in the Levitical

¹⁷ S. J. Baird: "The Great Baptizer," 156;

¹⁸ Hebrews 9:9-10.

system in which water was used, or to which the name baptism could be applied with any show of reason. Of these, the sprinklings were vastly more important and hence must have been chosen in contrasting the Levitical and Christian dispensations. But even if this were not granted, the self-performed washings were also by affusion, hence a rite, or rites, of which the mode was affusion is here called by the inspired author of the Hebrews, *baptisms*.

The student will remark that Dr. Schaff, in common with other scholars who maintain immersion, expressly admits that "divers baptisms" in this passage probably include "all the ceremonial purifications of the Jews, whether by bathing, or washing, or sprinkling." Take this admission which is necessitated by the facts in the case, in connection with another statement equally certain, that the Old Testament provides for no ritual purification of a man by immersion anywhere, and it is clear that, so far, we have affusion as the mode in which the rite referred to by *baptismos*, is represented.¹⁹

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

That dipped is an improper translation here may be argued from the instructions of Elisha, who told him to go and *rahatz*, wash by applying water to his person. "~~And~~

~~And he said unto him, Wash seven times, and thy flesh shall come again, and thou shalt be clean.~~

These rahatzed I thee with water, yea

Broadus passes this text in silence. See his book.

*I showered thoroughly (Shataphul) My blood
 from thee, English (Lev. 16:9)*

The water used in accomplishing ritual cleanness in a Hebrew might be more or less, but it was always water applied. That affusion is a washing, is taught in Gen. 43:31 and Deut. 21:6, still more plainly; so also in Ex. 30:19; in connection with II Kings, 3:11. But Elisha had sent to Naaman, saying, Go and *wash* (*rahatz*)

Again, that dipped is an improper translation is to be inferred from the Hebrew word *Tabal*, which was here rendered in the Septuagint by βαπτίζω. Its fundamental meaning "appears to be contact by touch, a contact which may be of the slightest and most superficial kind, as when the priest was directed to dip the finger of his right hand in a few drops of oil held in the palm of his left (Lev. 14:15, 16), and when those who bore the ark dipped the soles of their feet in the brim of the Jordan and the water instantly fled away (Josh. 3:13, 15). Again, it is used to describe the staining or smearing of Joseph's coat with the blood of the kid (Gen. 37:31), "when the Septuagint translates it by μόλω, *to soil*, to stain, to smear. Moreover, the Chaldee equivalent of this word is used in Dan. 4:33 and 5:21, where the rendering into English is, "his body *was wet* with the dew of heaven." This variety of meaning gives ample scope for the inference that *tabal* here is used as synonymous with *rahatz*, which Elisha used in his order. This inference is confirmed to a certainty by the assertion that Naaman baptized, or had himself baptized (βαπτίζω, *tabal*) seven times "according to the saying of the man of God." The man of God had told him to *rahatz*, to wash himself by the application of water. Hence we infer that the mode in which Naaman baptized himself was by affusion.

This position might be confirmed by a great number of other arguments: For example, by one from the Jewish mode of purifying, which was never by immersion in case of persons; and especially by those from the Jewish mode of purifying lepers who had been healed; and by one from the relation which the Prophet Elisha sustained to the Sinaitic covenant.²⁰

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

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

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

4. In Judith 12:5-8, this chaste widow is said to have baptized *at* (ἐν) a fountain in (ἐν) the camp of Holofernes.

²⁰These and other arguments may be seen elaborated with great skill in "The Great Baptizer," pp. 167, ff.

These washings were self-imposed washings of tradition. If they involved immersion they would not greatly concern us, seeing that they are the ordinances of men. But both the language and the circumstances are strongly against the idea of immersion. She baptized herself *at* a fountain. Would a rude and licentious soldiery allow a beautiful young woman to baptize herself in the fountain? Her washings at this fountain can have extended no further than to hands, forearms, feet and ankles.²¹

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

6. In the New Testament, in Mark vii. 3, 4; Lu. xi. 38; John ii. 6; Hebrews ix. 9, 10, the Jewish ritual purifications are described by the term *baptism*. In every case it was by affusion. That this is true has been unanswerably argued, as follows: "1. From the Levitical law which describes various washings and sprinklings, but not one immersion of a man's person for purification. 2. From well-known antique habits still prevalent in the East, which limited the washings to the hands and feet, and performed them by affusion. Compare 2 Kings iii. 11; Exod. xxx. 21. 3. From comparison of the two passages, Mark vii. 4,

²¹Dr. Broadus disposes of this point a little too easily, by saying that as Judith lives in a heathen tent and eats the food of the heathen, she "goes at midnight with her maid into a ravine and immerses herself." See p. 54, *Ibid.*

and Lu. xi. 38 with John ii. 6. These water-pots were too narrow and too small (holding about two bushels) to receive a person's body, and were such as were borne on the shoulders of female servants.²² 4. From the great improbability that the Jews would immerse all over so often, or that they could. 5. From the fact that they are declared to have practiced, not only these baptisms of their persons, but of their utensils and massive couches—Numb. 19:17, 18. It is simply preposterous that these should have been immersed as often as ceremonially defiled.

Last, the Levitical law, which these Jews professed to ob-

²²Dr. Broadus, in trying to meet this point, declares that the view of the passage which we maintain represents Mark as guilty of "a waste of words, a very empty tautology." "One would suppose that the Jews would wash before eating after returning from the market, if they wash before eating even when they have *not* been to market." Sic Broadus (see p. 50).

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

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

serve with such strictness, rendered an immersion impossible anywhere but in a deep running stream, or living pool, or a fountain. For if anything ceremonially unclean went into a vessel of standing water, no matter whether large or small, the water was thereby defiled, and the vessel and all other water put into that vessel and all persons who got into it. See Levit. xi. 32, 36."²³

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

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

²³Dabney's Theology, pp. 776-777.

purified were by affusion, we learn that by historic association the word βαπτισμα would carry with it to Jewish Christians the idea of baptism by affusion and never that of immersion where the subject was a person.

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

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

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

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

That John baptized by affusion may be shown from the fact that his baptism was no novelty to the Jews; from John's relation to the Sinaitic covenant; from the character

in which he announced Christ; from the indecency of the rite of immersion as it must have been practiced by John, if practiced at all, and from the great numbers resorting to him for baptism.

1. John's baptism was no novelty. It was a rite with which the people were familiar. When the Pharisees sent certain men to John, "They asked him, and said unto him, Why baptisest thou, then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet" (John 1:25). They have no question as to the form, nature, significance or divine authority of the rite. They inquire simply as to his authority to summon the nation to baptism, since he is neither "that Christ" nor "Elias," nor "that Prophet." They say, by the clearest implication, that they would consider it entirely proper for Elias, or the Christ, or that Prophet, to baptize the people. But in the Old Testament Scriptures, which spoke of the coming of Elias, and the Christ, or that Prophet, the only baptisms or purifications of persons were by affusion—pouring or sprinkling. Nor do we know of any historical evidence of performance of baptisms in any other mode among the Jews of this early day.

2. Again, if we consider John's relation to the Sinaitic covenant it becomes difficult to infer that his baptism could have been other than by affusion. Like Elijah of old, John had come to warn and testify in behalf the broken Sinaitic covenant. He was the last great prophet of the Old Dispensation. In that dispensation the only baptisms of persons had been by affusion. It is most natural, therefore, to think that John's baptism was by affusion. John was a minister of the Levitical law, which was itself in all its requirements, a testimony to the covenant. That law knew nothing of the immersion of persons. Shall we suppose that John, the minister of this law, the vindicator of the

covenant, turned his back upon the forms sanctioned in the Old Testament and seized upon a form invented by the scribes of his day? Such is the hard supposition into which *immersionism* would drive us; but there is no valid historical evidence that the scribes of John's day had any such mode of baptism; and, if they had, was John a friend and admirer of their traditions? Would he turn from the divine injunctions and replace them by one of their traditions without a word of attempted justification?

3. From the character in which he announced Christ. He announced Christ not in the character of humiliation and death, but in that of exaltation and royalty, as he appeared the covenant King of Israel at Sinai and as he is enthroned at the right hand of majesty on high, pouring out grace upon his people and the fire of justice on his enemies. He said, "I indeed baptize you with water; * * * He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire. Whose fan is his hand and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into his garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Matt. 3:11 12. These words not only show the aspect in which John presented Christ, but teach also that his baptism meant not the burial of the Lord Jesus, but *the baptism of the Spirit dispensed by Him*. "I baptize you with water; * * * but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Immersion would have been utterly inharmonious with such a presentation of Christ and such a conception of the meaning of baptism.

4. From the indecency of the practice of immersion by John under his peculiar circumstances. He had neither waterproof suit nor "immersion robes." The Jews who were baptized by him had none; and their ordinary clothing was of such a sort that their immersion would have

resulted in indecent exposure. A Jew of John's day wore two garments,—a sleeveless shirt reaching to the knee, and a second garment of the same shape reaching to the ankles. Over these he might wrap one or more shawls. There was little difference in the shape of the garments of men and women. In preparing for active exercise they drew up their skirts knee high and fastened them with a girdle at the loins. That with such clothing and such numbers as flocked about John, the immersionist theory would have resulted in wholesale indecent exposure, needs no arguing. Nor need we say that such indecency is out of keeping with both Old and New Testament religion.

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

On this we remark: 1st. The Hottentot used to go, throughout his life, with a dress which Europeans consider indecent. It was "*novel*" to the Hottentot, too, to hear that his dress was indecent. 2d. Dr. Broadus will hardly say that there is as little liability to exposure in descending from a carriage as in receiving immersion. 3d. There is a vast deal of indecent exposure at our seaside resorts. That does not make immersion decent. 4th. The people crowding on John's baptism were peculiarly ill-dressed for the reception of such a rite.

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

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

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

Dr. Baird has entered into calculations with the following result: "If we suppose John to have stood in the water three hours a day, during the six months of his ministry, and to have administered the rite at the rate of one a minute, during the entire time, the total results of such miraculous labors and endurance would have been about thirty-two thousand seven hundred and sixty persons baptized. * * * * Without the intervention of a miracle—and John did no miracles—even this was impossible."⁴

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

⁴S. J. Baird: "The Great Baptizer."

Thus we see that the facts, that John's baptism was recognized by his contemporary countrymen as a rite likely to be employed by Christ and his forerunner, that John was the representative and vindicator of the Sinaitic covenant, that he presented Christ in his estate of exaltation, make it *certain* that John's baptism was by affusion, and that this position is further confirmed by the indecency of the immersionist supposition and the inability of John to do the work on their theory. John's baptism was by affusion, therefore.

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

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

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

Let us take them up in their order:

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

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

Immersionists picture the Israelites as marching "through that long and fearful night with the double wall of water rolled up on each side, and the column of fleecy cloud stretching its enshrouding folds above them * * * It was in this * * * * that they were baptized into their allegiance to the great Law-giver and Leader."²⁶

This picture is unhistorical. The Israelites were under the cloud, but that was prior to their entering the sea and marching through the sea. "The Angel of God which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them. And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these; so that the one came not near the other all night. And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea * * * * and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground." Exodus 14:19-22.

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

Paul's teaching in this point is that the cloud and the sea did for Israel of old, in reference to Moses, that which baptism does for the Christian in reference to Christ. The passage through the sea and the guidance and protection of the cloud separated them unto Moses, put them under obligations to be disciples of Moses just as Christian

²⁶See Review of Dale's *Classic Baptism in the Baptist Quarterly*, 1869. Page 143.

baptism separates the Christian to Christ. He has not in mind the mode of baptism, but its consequences, the change of heart which follows spiritual baptism, and the obedience of life. He goes on to say that with many of the Israelites "he was not well pleased, for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples to the intent that we should not lust after evil things as they also lusted" (vv. 5-6).

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

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

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

This comparison is found in I Pet. 3:18-20. "For Christ hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us unto God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit. By which also he went and preached to the spirits in prison; which sometimes were disobedient, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us."

Our Baptist friends seem to argue that, since there was plenty of water in the region wherein Noah and his family were saved, they were saved by immersion, seeing they are said to have been saved by water. But it is to be observed,

first, that the historical account in Genesis is silent as to any immersion of Noah and his family. The rest of the world is plainly declared to have been immersed. The salvation of Noah and his house consisted in their not being immersed in the same way. Yet Noah and his house were saved by a baptism typical of that which saves us (see v. 21, "doth now also save us"). As the waters of the deluge brought destruction to the old world, but life to Noah and his house, so the baptism of the spirit brings death to the old man, but life to the new man, through union with Christ, participation in the power of his resurrection.

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

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

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

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

This comparison is found in Titus 3:4-7. "After that the kindness and love of God our Saviour toward man appeared,

not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly, through Jesus Christ our Saviour; that being justified by his grace, we might be made heirs, according to the hope of eternal life."

The "washing" which Paul had in mind was never in a basin, as the immersionist supposes. It was not by immersion, but by the application of water to the person. We support this position by the following facts: (1) There is no historic evidence that the ancient Greeks, prior to the time of their adoption of Roman customs, used bath tubs in which they could stand, sit, or lie, as in a bath tub of to-day. They did have a vessel in which the bather might sit while water was poured over him. They had a laver (λουτήρ, or λουτήριον) beside which a man might stand and wash, having the water dipped out and poured over his person. (2) There is no historic evidence that the Hebrews had bath tubs suitable for immersing. And it is natural to suppose that Paul borrows his imagery from one of these sources. (3) In classic Greek λούτρον (the word here rendered washing) "does not mean a *laver*, but *water* for washing, and the *washing* accomplished by it; and that with intimate reference to its affusion on the person."⁶ (4) The testimony of Hellenistic Greek is that it has the same meaning in it. "He that is baptized for the dead, and again toucheth the dead, what availeth his washing" (λούτρον) (Ecclesiasticus 34:25). Paul writes that Christ gave himself for the church, "that he might cleanse it, purifying it with *the washing* (τῷ λούτρῳ) of water." This cannot mean "purifying it with the laver," that is, with the

⁶Baird: "The Great Baptizer, p. 327.

bath tub, not washing; "or in the laver," since such a rendering cannot be given an instrumental dative.

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

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

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

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

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

These two passages contain the whole evidence that the form of baptism represents the burial of the Lord Jesus

Christ. They therefore deserve consideration which otherwise they would not merit.

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

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

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

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

In order to get at Paul's meaning in Romans 6:3-4, we must read the context. He says (vv. 1-11), "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid. How shall we, that died to sin, (or for sin), live any longer therein? Or, (to put the matter more clearly) know ye not that as many as were baptized into Christ (Jesus) were baptized into his death? Therefore we were entombed with him through the baptism unto his death, that, like as Christ was raised from among the dead through the Father's glory, so we also may walk in newness of life. For if we have been engrafted together in the likeness of his death, then all the more also in the likeness of his resurrection. Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be

destroyed, that we might no longer serve sin. Now, if we died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live with him. * * * * * For in that he died, he died to sin (or for sin) once, but in that he liveth, he liveth to (or for God). Likewise reckon ye also yourselves to be dead indeed unto sin (or for sin), but living to God (or for God) in Jesus Christ!"

Paul meets in these words one of the most common and plausible, but ill-founded, objections to the doctrine of justification by faith, viz.: "that it allows men to live in sin that grace may abound." It arises from ignorance of the doctrine in question and of the nature and means of sanctification. It is so preposterous in the eyes of the enlightened believer that Paul deals with it rather by exclamations at its absurdity than with logical arguments. The main idea of this passage is that such is the nature of the believer's union with Christ that his living in sin is not merely an inconsistency, but a contradiction in terms, as much so as speaking of a live dead man or a good bad one. Union with Christ being the only source of holiness, cannot be the source of sin. In verse 1 the apostle presents the objection. In verse 2 he declares it to be unfounded, and exclaims at its absurdity.²⁷ In verses 3-4 he exhibits the true nature and design of christianity as adapted and intended to produce newness of life. It is to be particularly remarked that he is talking of christianity in the heart of the believer (the real christian). "Shall we who died for sin live any longer in it?" Or, if this is not clear, "know ye not that all we who were baptized *into Christ* Jesus were baptized into his death?" Here Paul does not say "baptized into the name of Christ." That sort of baptism—

²⁷See Hodge in Commentary *in loco*.

baptism into the name of Christ— ritual baptism—unites to the visible church; but baptism into Christ, real baptism, unites to the body of Christ, as Paul teaches in Gal. 3:27: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." It is the spiritual baptism, therefore, of which Paul speaks in Rom. 6:3. He says, "know ye not that all who were baptized *into Jesus Christ* were baptized into his death." "I said a moment ago," he seems to say, "how shall we who died to sin live in it?" Now we who were baptized into Christ were baptized into his death, into the benefits of his death. If we were baptized into *him*, our vicar, we were baptized into his death, a vicarious death and for us. He died for sin; we died in him, our vicar, for sin; and (v. 4) since he is our vicar in death it is that he may be in life. Therefore, we were entombed with him by *the* baptism into his death, that like as Christ was raised up from the dead * * * so also we should walk in newness of life." Notice that in verse 4 the baptism referred to is the baptism mentioned in verse 3. There is a reference only to *baptism* into Christ. There is not even a faint allusion to the ritual baptism by water.²⁸ The passage teaches nothing as to mode.

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

"The burial of which the Apostle speaks is spiritual as well as is the baptism. The two are in no sense identical; but the one is, by the Apostle, distinctly and sharply discriminated from the other. The baptism is the primary cause of which the burial is *one*, and but one, of the results.

²⁸The student must study the rest of the passage for himself. Enough has been done to show that there is no need of an assumption of a reference to ritual baptism.

The baptism is the shedding upon us of the Holy Spirit of life in Christ Jesus. The burial is the putting away and obliterating the old man out of our lives. It follows that in any parallel figurative or ritual system, each one of these spiritual realities must have its own analogue, as distinctly defined and discriminated, each from the other, as are the realities which they are designed to represent. And in fact, such is the figurative system of the Scriptures, which represent one by the outpouring of water and the other by the burial of the dead. To interpret, therefore, a ritual *baptism* as symbolic of the spiritual *burial*, is as incongruous to the Scriptural conception, as would be the employment of the burial of the dead to represent the outpouring upon us of the spirit of life. And to understand the Apostle, by the expression, "buried by the baptism," to mean directly the spiritual phenomenon which the phrase designates, and at the same time to convey an allusion to a ritual *baptism* as being a symbol of the *burial*, is an absurdity which does violence to the whole conception, to the destruction of its propriety and significance. For not only are the two thus sharply discriminated by Paul, but he attributes to each its own relations and predicates, and assigns to each its own place in the scheme of grace and in the argument which he states. To neglect, therefore, the distinction and confound them together, as is done by the Baptist interpretation, destroys the whole logical force and sequence of the argument, and dissolves the connection between the premises and conclusions."²⁹

(3) The Apostle speaks not of immersion but burial, entombment. Hence if any one be still disposed to think that we have here an allusion to ritual baptism he has, yet,

²⁹ Baird. The Great Baptizer, pp. 369, 370.

no ground for inferring that such baptism was by immersion.

συνετάφημεν, "We were buried." "We were entombed (v. 4)." This word has no reference to the rite of baptism, because the burial spoken of is not in water, but in a sepulchre. *θάπτω* signifies, *to pay the last dues to a corpse*; and so at first to burn it, "then as the ashes were usually inurned and put under the ground, *to bury, inter, entomb.*" Compare Liddell and Scott, *sub voce*. "Burial and baptism are totally diverse ideas and have nothing in common. In order to baptize the element of water must come into *contact* with the body baptized; but in a burial, the surrounding element of earth comes into no contact at all with the body buried. The corpse is carefully protected from the earth in which it is laid. Entombment, consequently, is not the emblem of baptism, but of death. Entombment would be even a more inappropriate term by which to describe the rite of baptism, than would "ingrafting," which follows as another emblem of the believer's union with Christ, and which has never been associated by commentators with the rite of baptism."³⁰

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

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

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

³⁰Shedd: Com. on Rom. *in loco*.



Dr. Schaff argues for immersion in the Apostolic Church, in the *fourth* place, "from the general custom of the ancient church, which prevails in the East to this day." In describing the form of baptism employed in the period 100 to 312, Dr. Schaff says that it was by immersion; and describes it as follows: "The immersion consisted in thrice dipping the head of the candidate who stood nude in the water. Single immersion seems to have been introduced by Eunomius about 360, but was condemned on pain of degradation, yet it reappeared afterward in Spain, and Pope Gregory I. declared both forms valid, the trine immersion as setting forth the Trinity, the single immersion the Unity of the Godhead. The Eastern Church, however, still adheres strictly to trine immersion. Baptism by *pouring* water from a shell or vessel or from a hand on the head of the candidate while he stood knee-deep or waist-deep in the water, occurs also and was probably considered equivalent to immersion. But baptism by *aspersion* or *sprinkling* was exceptional and applied only to infirm or sick persons; hence called *clinical* baptism. The validity of this baptism was even doubted by many in the third century; and Cyprian wrote in its defence, taking the ground that the mode of application of water was a matter of minor importance provided that faith was present in the recipients and ministrant. According to ecclesiastical law, at least, it incapacitated for clerical office."¹¹

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

¹¹Schaff: Hist. of Christian Church, vol. ii, pp. 248.

Church. Hence, immersion *was* the mode of the Apostolic Church.

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

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

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

hands, that the soul may be enlightened by the spirit."²² From the writings of Cyprian it may be learned that in his time, perhaps before, exorcism of the devil was made a part of the rite of baptism. It was regularly made so by conciliar action in 256 A. D. Very early also the candidates were nude while being baptized.

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

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

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

The polity of the church was changed in the same period almost universally. Our Baptist brethren say that the polity of the Apostolic Church had been Congregationalist.

²² W. D. Killen: *History of Ancient Christianity*. pp. 480-481. Scribner's. New York. 1869. Comp. Schaff, *History of the Christian Church*, ii. p. 251.

We say it had been Presbyterian in the Apostolic Age. But by 250 A. D., it was Episcopal generally—thoroughgoing Episcopal and the High Church type, too, in some quarters. All admit this.

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

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

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

The two greatest teachers after the death of John and before 313, were Tertullian and Cyprian of North Africa. Tertullian was a brilliant and scholarly lawyer, but erratic and always more of a lawyer than a true theologian in his theological works. Cyprian was a civilian of high rank, and possessed some literary skill. He was busy during the ten or eleven years of his life after he became a Christian in the administration of his bishopric and in writing. His teachings spring, therefore, from many sources other than

the Scriptures. The bishops and elders of the Church of this period were in the main pious and consecrated men, but poor teachers of the truth, for the simple reason that they had no large acquaintance with it. They were ignorant.

The Church of this age had also unusually strong tendencies toward the adulterations of the Gospel. It was essentially a missionary church on missionary ground, and all churches in foreign mission fields will mingle elements of old faiths with the new, unless they are exceptionally well guided. The ancient church, unlike the missionary Church of China, for example, had no guidance from without; and the elements from which it was composed made it the breeder and nursery of departures. Its members were Jews or Gentiles. The Gentiles had been devotees of one or more of a multitude of religions. They were of the lower, middle classes for the most part, people with little or no education. In cases where scholars became Christians they were often sowers of error by reason of the false beliefs which they had not thrown off, but had brought with them into the Church.

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

So between the high plane of the Apostolic teaching and the teaching of the fathers of the subsequent age there was a vast fall. The fathers are not competent to witness as to

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

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

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

But it may be asked: Why did it throw away the biblical rite for immersion, if such was the case? We do not believe

that this question is impossible of at least partial answer. But we would remind the student that men's motives for a given course of conduct are often most obscure. In many cases we know not the motives of the suicide. Nevertheless, we are able to say, Yesterday he was alive and apparently a happy man. This morning he was found dead by suicide. We know that he took his life. We don't know why. And the fact that we do not know why in nowise diminishes our certainty that he killed himself.

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

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

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

(1) The Church ran rapidly into sacramentalism, as we have shown. Sacramentalism in its early stages, among a simple people who have not yet developed scholastic leaders, calls for an abundant use of the material element to which is tied the invisible grace. It is supposed that there must be a free and large use of the symbol in order to a

copious infusion of grace. Cyprian of Carthage actually combatted this idea in his day: "In the saving sacrament," says he, "the contagion of sin is not washed away just in the same way as is the filth of the skin and body in the ordinary ablution of the flesh, so that there should be need of saltpetre and other appliances, and a bath and a pool in which the poor body may be washed and cleansed * * * It is apparent that the sprinkling of water has like force with the saving washing, and that when this is done in the Church, when the faith both of giver and receiver is entire, all holds good and is consummated and perfected by the power of the Lord, and the truth of faith."²³

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

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

The student may strengthen this argument indefinitely for himself. *Consult the teaching of the twelve Apostles, Chap. vii.*

⁽²³⁾ Epist. lxxvi. p. 321, quoted in Killen; *Ancient Christianity*, pp. 479, 480.

(2) Work-righteousness began to crop into the Church immediately on the death of the Apostles. Merit was discovered in everything that the believer did; and many things were invented for him to do that his merit might be increased.

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

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

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

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

The degraded Ancient Church was trying to improve on God's plans in many particulars; that it baptized generally by immersion proves only and simply that in its eyes im-

mersion was better than sprinkling; not that it was the mode of the Apostolic Church.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Scriptures, then, make baptism signify, cleansing by the Holy Ghost. The Scriptures also represent this cleansing Spirit as "descending," as "falling," or "poured." This representation is universal in Scripture. There is not an instance to the contrary. Illustrations of this method of representation may be seen in Acts ii:2-4: "And suddenly there came a sound *from heaven* as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting," etc., ii:15-18: "For these are not drunken as ye suppose, seeing it is but the third hour of the day. But

this is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: And it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will *pour out* my Spirit upon all flesh * * * And on my servants and on my handmaidens I will *pour out* in those days of my Spirit," etc.³⁴ "Therefore being by the right hand of God

³⁴Dr. Broadus tries to obviate the force of this point as follows: "But what is the sense of maintaining that when two symbols or images represent the same thing they must therefore be the same image or symbol? What was predicted as a baptism is afterwards described as a pouring. Well, if I say a man is bathed in pleasure, and presently speak of him as drinking from the cup of pleasure, would any one argue that the action of bathing is the same as drinking from a cup? Peter quotes the prophet as using the image of pouring, while our Lord had used the image of baptism; therefore pouring and baptism are the same thing. Christ is called a lamb, and is also called a shepherd; therefore a lamb and a shepherd is the same thing." P. 57 *Ibid.*

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

2. It may be foolish to say that "a lamb and a shepherd is the same thing," because the Scriptures call Christ a lamb and also a shepherd. We quite agree that it is. Christ has many functions; he may be called by as many names corresponding thereto: That grounds no right of saying that the functions are identical. But Dr. Broadus seems confused; we are not here concerned with diverse functions of a being, but with one operation of a being to which two terms are applied. The operation is that of the Holy Spirit on the hearts of men whereby they are renewed and enabled to lead spiritual lives. This one operation is now called a *baptizing*, and now a "*pouring out*," "*shedding forth*," etc. Suppose these words are figurative, yet if there be any justice in language, they must have a common meaning. The one interprets the other. There can be no dubiety about the meaning of "*pouring out*," "*shedding forth*." Hence the common meaning is clear.

exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath *shed forth* this, which ye now see and hear 2:33." "While Peter yet spake these words the Holy Ghost *fell on* all them which heard the word. And they of the circumcision which believed, were astonished, as many as came with Peter, because that on the Gentiles also was *poured out* the gift of the Holy Ghost. * * * And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord" (10:44, 45, 48).

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

It is thus seen that these texts, which teach that the

grace of regeneration symbolized in baptism is *shed forth*, not only ground a strong argument from analogy that water should be sprinkled or poured in baptism, but contain other evidence, as seen in the case of Acts x:44-48, that baptism was by affusion.

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

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

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

(3) From the Divine design of baptism as a rite for the Church in every clime and among all classes. In many countries water is inconveniently scarce for immersionists. In extensive regions it is frozen up for half the year. Many persons are too frail to undergo the physical risk of immersion. This being true, it is highly improbable that a religion

which places so little stress on forms which has rites so few and simple, should have one so burdensome, indecent and dangerous to multitudes to whom it is the Church's duty to carry the Gospel.

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

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

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

This conception which the affusionist may frame of the transaction, is probable in every way, and it satisfies fully the demands of the text. But it is not necessary for the advocate of affusion to grant even that the Master stood in the water while being baptized. The prepositions, *in* and *in*, here rendered *in*, or into, and *out of*, "are in innumerable instances used to express motion toward, unto,

and from, *e.g.*, Acts xxvi:14; xxvii:34, 40." Some affusionists would say, that probably "Jesus only went to the water, was baptized and immediately on going up from it, saw the," etc.

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

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

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

(b) There are texts which suggest other modes than immersion: Acts xviii:8; Tit. iii:5; Heb. x:22; taken in connection with Ezek. xxxvi:25; Mark vii:4, 8; Luke, xi:38-40; Heb. ix:10. This has been developed in another connection.

(c) Texts which exclude immersion: Acts ii:41; ix:18; x:47-48; xvi.15, 32-33. The baptism of the three thousand in Jerusalem on the Day of Pentecost; the baptism of Paul,—“standing up, be baptized” bade Ananias, (Acts

³⁸The student will recall that we have identified John's baptism and Christian baptism.

xxii:16); and "standing up, he was baptized" (Acts ix:18); the baptism of Cornelius; the baptism of the jailor at Philippi,—all exclude the idea of immersion. In every one of these cases baptism was administered on the spot, just where the convert received the Gospel. There is nothing said of rivers, abundant water. "Vast numbers, individuals and families were baptized wherever they happened to be at the moment—in their houses, or prisons, or gathering place."

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

THE SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

In the Apostolic Age not only adult believers but their infant children were baptized. That such was the case appears from the following amongst a great mass of facts, all of which point to the same conclusion:

First.—The Christian Church is identical with the Abrahamic, notwithstanding a difference of form. Children were members of the Abrahamic Church and received the sign and seal of membership therein. Children were members of the Christian Church and received the sign and seal of membership therein.

The New Testament represents the Christian Church not as something new but as something which had existed throughout the preceding dispensation. For instance, the New Testament says of Moses, "This is he, that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the Mount Sina, and with our fathers; who received the lively oracles to give unto us" (Acts 7:38). The New Testament represents the Church of God under the form of an olive tree, and says to Gentile Christians, "If some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree, boast not against the branches. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded but fear. * * * For if thou were cut out of the olive tree which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree: how much

more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted into their own olive tree (Rom. 11:17-20, 24). The New Testament says, "Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after; but Christ as a Son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end" (Heb. 3:5, 6). In these and other such passages the New Testament identifies the Church as one and the same institution in the time of Moses and the time of Christ, in the time of Stephen and the time of Paul. Paul is at particular pains to show (see Gal. iii. and Rom. 4:13-17, *et al*) that the Abrahamic covenant underlies the New Testament Church, and that the covenant promises made to Abraham and to his seed are being fulfilled to the Church in its Christian form. The Church of the Apostolic Age, then, was essentially the Church of Abraham's time and of Moses's time, according to New Testament teaching.

Children were members of the Abrahamic Church (see Gen. 17:1-14). They became members by divine ordering. The adults in that Church were not left to decide the ecclesiastical status of their children. God made the covenant between Himself and Abraham and Abraham's seed after him in their generations, "for an everlasting covenant to be a God" unto him and his seed after him. God ordered that at a certain age there should be given to the male children the sign and seal of the covenant, saying, "He that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations." Children were members of the Church in the time of Abraham and during the Mosaic dispensation, and received the sign and seal of their covenant privileges as such. Now, this right to church membership and to the sign and seal of its privileges has

never been repealed, so far as the New Testament record shows. Therefore, under the New Testament the children of church members were entitled to be regarded as church members and to receive the sign and seal of church privileges—were church members and received the rite of baptism, the sign and seal of church membership in this dispensation.

Anti-pædobaptists make much ado about the silence of the New Testament with reference to any express command to baptize infants. That silence is easily explained by recalling the facts that the children of church members were universally regarded as members of the Church, that they had received the rite of circumcision in token of their church membership in the old dispensation, and that that rite is substituted (see the following pages) in the new dispensation by baptism. But the brethren referred to, can afford illy to say anything about New Testament silence on this point. Their use of the word *silence*, suggests another New Testament silence disastrous to their contention. This point is eloquently presented by Dr. John M. Mason, in his "Church of God," as follows:

"To insist that we shall produce, from the New Testament, a precept directly instituting the church membership of infants, is to make a demand with which we are under no obligations to comply. Such a precept was not necessary. The relation which we are inquiring into had been instituted long before; it had subsisted without one moment's interruption for more than nineteen centuries. During this great lapse of ages it had enlisted on its side, in addition to its divine original, the most irrefragable prejudices of antiquity, the most confirmed national habit, and the fastidious jealousy of prerogative. In this state of its prevalence was the evangelical dispensation announced.

If the same relation of infants to the Church was to continue under the New Testament form, nothing is more easy than to assign the reason why it was not instituted anew. The principle was undisputed; it was acted upon as a principle which the change of dispensation did not touch, and consequently, a new institution was superfluous. The silence of the New Testament on this head, is altogether in favor of those who maintain that the union of parents with the Church of God, includes their children also. But on the supposition that this principle was to operate no longer; that the common interests of children with their parents in God's covenant was to cease; the silence of the New Testament is one of the most inexplicable things which ever tortured the ingenuity of man. If there is any point of external privilege which ought to have been settled with the most definite precision, one would imagine that this is the point. But we are taught to believe, that a constitution which is engrafted upon a principle that penetrates the essence of human society; which coincides with the genius of every other divine constitution respecting man; which is incorporated with his animal, his intellectual, and his moral character; which is interwoven with every ligament and fibre of his, shall be torn away; and yet the statute book of the kingdom in which this severity originates, shall contain no warrant for executing it, nor a syllable to soothe the anguish which it has inflicted. Is it thus that God deals with his people? Does this look like His wonted condescension to their infirmities? Does it bear the character of that loving kindness and tender mercy which belong to Him who "knows their frame and remembers that they are dust?"

"When the economy of Moses was to be superseded by that of Jesus Christ, he prepared the way in the most

gradual and gentle manner; he showed them from their own Scriptures, that he had done only what he had intended and predicted from the beginning; he set before their eyes a comparative view of the two dispensations, to satisfy them that they had lost nothing, but had gained much by the exchange. * * * But when he touched them in the point of most exquisite sensibility—when he passed a sword through their soul by cutting off their children, unable to distinguish between good and evil, from all the interest which they once had in his Church, the heavy mandate is preceded by no warning, is accompanied with no comfort; it is followed by nothing to replace the privation; is not even supported by a single reason. The thing is done in the most summary manner, and the order is not so much as entered into the rule of faith. The believing mother hears that the son of her womb is shut out from the covenant of her God, but hears not why? Is this the ordinance of him who, as a father pitieth his children, so pities them that fear him? It cannot be!

“Conceding, then, to the opposers of our children’s claim as members of the Christian Church, all that they ask with regard to the silence of the New Testament, that very concession works their ruin. If their views are correct, it could not have been thus silent. Out of their own mouths we draw their conviction; and cast them in the judgment by the very evidence which they offer in their vindication.

“The case is now reversed. Instead of our producing from the New Testament such a warrant for the privilege of our infant seed, as they require, we turn the tables upon them, and insist, that *they* shall produce Scriptural proof of God’s having *annulled the constitution under which we assert our right*. Till they do this our cause is invincible. He once granted to his church the right for which we con-

tend; and nothing but his own act can take it away. We want to see the act of *abrogation*; we must see it in the *New Testament*; for there it is, if it is at all. Point it out, and we have done. Till then we shall rejoice in the consolation of calling upon God as our God, and the God of our seed."

Second.—*Christ vindicated the right of little children to membership in the Church. Thence their right to baptism is inferred.*

In Mark 10:13-14, we read: "And they brought young children to him that he should touch them: and his disciples rebuked those that brought them. But when Jesus saw it, he was much displeased, and said unto them, Suffer little children to come unto me, forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God." (Compare Matt. 19:13-15; Luke 18:15-17.) In this passage our Lord teaches that the children of church members are members of the visible Church. He says, "*For of such is the kingdom of God.*" The Saviour does not say, "Of persons like little children in disposition is the kingdom of God." If he means that, he means much more, and he is careful to show that he intends more. He does not use *τοιούτων* alone; he uses the article with *τοιούτων*; he says, *τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων*. The grammarian Winer, says, *that "*τοιούτος* is joined to a noun without an article when *such, any such, of this sort*, is meant;" and that, "when, on the other hand, a particular object is pointed out, as *such a* or *of such a sort*, the noun naturally takes the article. That is, he teaches that the descriptive demonstrative, *τοιούτος*, when accompanied by the article, not only summons before the mind a class of a given kind, but points to an individual of that kind. This is exactly what the phrase does. We have examined every case of the use of the article with this demonstrative, found in the New Testament and have learned that in every instance the

writer intends not only to describe a class but to point out representatives of it.

To cite a few instances: In Acts 22:22, the mob around the temple, on occasion of Paul's arrest by the centurion, are said to have given him audience, until he had told of God's having sent him unto the Gentiles; but to have, then "lifted up their voices and said, "Away with *such* a fellow." The mob was not in a mood to talk of men of a certain class in a general way; while expressing its abhorrence of the class, it would point definitely at an example of the type. It said away with τῶν τοιούτων away with all such fellows; away with *him*. He is an example. In 2 Cor. 2:6, 7, Paul is speaking of a man who had been excommunicated by the Corinthian church. He says, "Sufficient to such a man, τῷ τοιούτῳ, is this punishment which was inflicted of many. So that contrariwise ye ought rather to forgive him, and to comfort him, lest perhaps *such an one*, τὸ τοιούτος, should be swallowed up with over-much sorrow." The Corinthian offender himself, as well as men of his sort, was to be comforted. Paul indicates that fact clearly. He uses the article with the demonstrative; and not the demonstrative alone which, as usage shows, might denote all he wishes, but would not unmistakably do so. In 2 Cor. 11:13, Paul says of the deceitful self-styled apostles who were opposing him, "For such are false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ." He does not wish merely to say that all such as were *like* his individual enemies just referred to, in aim, spirit, and claim, were false apostles, but to assert as well that these very individuals were false apostles. He does not say τοιούτοι γάρ, which might have been understood definitely enough, but says, οἱ γὰρ τοιούτοι affirms definitely that those very individuals are false apostles. Again, in 2 Cor. 12:2,

3, Paul says, "I knew a man in Christ * * * *such an one* caught up to the third heaven. And I knew such a man * * *." Now, Paul did not wish to leave the possibility of the impression that he had known merely a man with certain attributes common to a class—a man whose particular attributes he knew not. He wished to make the unmistakable impression that he was himself the individual of the remarkable class known. He says τὸν τοιοῦτον used the article with the adjective.

And so it is in every case of the article with τοιοῦτος in the New Testament. In every case an example of the class spoken of is pointed out. By the use of the article, the writer definitely points out examples of the class. And we are not aware that any deny this truth save in connection with those texts which speak of children as members of the church. There is no reason for denying the truth in connection with those texts, save such as is grounded in prejudice and misconception. When, in our passage from Mark, Jesus says, "For of such, τῶν γὰρ τοιούτων, is the kingdom of God," he means to say not only that others like these are in the kingdom of God, but that "these children are members of the kingdom of God; here are examples of members of that kingdom."

Old Richard Baxter makes no senile remark in saying that, "The Saviour does not mean *of persons like little children in disposition*, otherwise, he might have taken up lambs or doves and blessed them, and said, Of such is the kingdom of God." And this falls in with the argument just made and believed to be irrefutable from the usage of τοιοῦτος with the article. There is no reasonable ground of denial. The children of the Jews in the time of Christ were members of the kingdom of God.

If we ask, What is *the kingdom of God* in which these children have right to a place, the answer must be the visible church. We cannot say the invisible church, because only an occasional infant, so far as appears, is sanctified from the womb; and very many children of believers grow up into Godless men and women. They are not members of the invisible church. Again, it will hardly be maintained that children are said by him here to be members of his rule as God of providence merely. The phrase, "kingdom of God" is rarely used in the gospels of the mere providential rule of Christ, if it be so used at all. It is difficult, moreover, to vindicate Christ's indignation against the disciples for standing between the children and himself, if he contemplated them as mere representatives of his kingdom of providence. Christ received dominion over the universe at his resurrection (Eph. 1:20-22; 1 Cor. 15:27). It does not appear that the apostles should have been held responsible for a knowledge of the providential rule of Christ over the world at this time. Why should Christ have been indignant with them for interposing between these children and himself as God of providence when, as yet, the universal rule had not been committed to him, and when the very doctrine of that rule had not been clearly revealed?

But if the "kingdom of God" here, cannot denote the invisible church, nor the rule of Christ in providence, it can only denote the visible church. Christ says, then, in this passage, "For of such is the visible church."

Notwithstanding the plainness of this teaching, some have said that the words immediately following Mark 10:14, viz.: "Whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall not enter therein," show that Christ did not have in mind at all the relation of infants to the

kingdom of God, but that he was setting forth the qualities of mind and heart which must characterize every inrant into the kingdom of God. This is silly. In verse 14, Christ had in mind, supremely, the relation of infants to the kingdom of God. He was defending the rights of the children against the disciples and instructing the disciples as to the relation of the children to the kingdom of God. In the next verse he does proceed to teach the disciples that all who enter the perfected kingdom of God must have child-like humility. But he was always teaching practical, personal lessons from historical incidents; he does so here. In this passage the context does not make for the view that the lesson of humility to the disciples was uppermost in Jesus's mind. The teaching as to the rights of the children was first; then as an apparent afterthought came the practical lesson to the apostles. We must allow for progress and life in the teaching of Jesus--grant him the right of moving from a central truth to a suggested practical application here, as in other cases we should recognize his right to move from a specific case to the general truth.

The objection considered is invalid. The careful forms of speech used in the passage show that Christ asserts the right of children whose parents were in the church—the children he spoke of were Jewish children—to church membership themselves.

Now, if the children of church members, as the children whom the disciples would have kept away from Christ were, being the children of Jews, are members of the Church, then they would seem to be entitled to baptism which is the initiatory sign and seal of the privileges of the covenant since the time of Christ.

Third.—Christ seems, by implication, to commission the early Church to baptize the children of believers.

In Matt. 28:19, our Lord exhorts, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

In order to the proper interpretation of any passage of Scripture, a most important rule of interpretation requires us to put ourselves, as far as possible, in the place of those who were teaching and those who were hearing. Indeed, it is often impossible to get the true meaning of a secular historian, orator, or poet, without taking into view the time and place in which he lived, the laws and customs of the people with which he had to do. Now the great commission was given by one born a Jew, brought up amongst Jews and thoroughly acquainted with all their customs, and with the divine oracles with which they had been blessed. This commission was also addressed to Jews.

The Jews were given to making proselytes from the heathen to their religion. When the proselytes were received into Judaism, they were treated according to Jewish law—were circumcised, *parents and children*. Now, suppose God had before Christ's time commissioned twelve Jews to go and make proselytes of all nations, and circumcise and baptize them and had not said a word about the children, these twelve Jews would certainly have thought that the children as well as their proselyted parents were to be circumcised and baptized. If baptism had been substituted at this date for circumcision, it is plain that these twelve Jews would have understood that they were to baptize the children of all the proselytes they should win. Again, if Christ had said in the great commission, "Go ye, and make proselytes of all nations, circumcising them," etc., no one can doubt that his disciples would have understood that the children of the proselytes won, should be circumcised.

More generally, the disciples had always been accustomed to the association of parents and children in the covenants. Parents and children had been associated in the Adamic covenant, in the Noachic covenant, in the Abrahamic covenant, in the Mosaic covenant. The only natural interpretation of the commission in the absence of an inhibition of baptizing the children, was that Christ meant that the children of those won to belief and baptized, should also, be baptized.

Now, are we to forget that Christ had, in teaching the twelve that children of church members were *of the visible church*—of the kingdom of God—done not a little to confirm them in this interpretation of the great commission?

Fourth.—*Peter's understanding of the great commission was, apparently, that those commissioned were to baptize the children of believers as well as the believers themselves.*

On the day of Pentecost the apostles set up the Gospel dispensation and published the terms of admission to the Church in that dispensation. If the children, thitherto embraced in the church, were to be cast out, we should expect it to be done then and expect some record of it. There is not, however, any such record. Peter, in his first exhortation to Christian baptism, includes children with their parents. He says, "Repent and be baptized, everyone of you, in the name of Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost; for the promise is unto you, and to *your children*" (Acts 2:38, 39). Why did the apostle make this mention of the children of those whom he addressed, if they were not to receive baptism? He was talking to Jews and Jewish proselytes, who would understand him to be inviting them to bring their children along with them to baptism. They would take the *promise to them and to their children* to be either the promise made

to Abraham, in which Jehovah promised to be a God to him and to his seed after him (Gen. 17:5), or the promise of the outpouring by the prophet Joel, which was to the covenant people, including their children. One chock full of anti-pædobaptist prejud'ce may easily misconstrue these words; but one taking into view the past history of Peter as a Jew, and the past history of those whom he addressed, can not fail to see that the awakened and repentant people about the Apostle would naturally and certainly understand him to be inviting them to come and bring their children with them that all might be baptized. Both he and they had been used to child membership in the Church, and to circumcision in token of that membership. Moreover, the great commission, and our Lord's vindication of the right of children to church membership, would help to determine Peter's meaning, so far as these teachings of our Lord were then known.

Fifth.—The New Testament records the baptism of several entire families. That there were children, under the age of responsibility, in some of these families is highly probable.

There are seven individuals named and specified in book of Acts as having received baptism, and only seven. In no less than four cases out of these seven we are told that their whole houses were also baptized. Thus Cornelius and his house (Acts 10:2, 44, 48), Lydia and her house (Acts 16:15), the Philippian jailor and his house (Acts 16:33), and Crispus and his house (Acts 18:8). If four out of seven is a fair average of the baptism of whole houses in the Apostolic Age, in proportion to the baptism of adults, then for every seven thousand baptisms of adults, there were four thousand baptisms of whole houses. We do not affirm that such was the average; but that it seems most probable; and that if the sacred writer was an anti-pædobaptist his language

is so astonishingly careless as to be positively misleading. His language exactly suits the mouth of a man who believes in infant church-membership and infant baptism. He speaks of an *oikos*, a family, a cluster of one lineage, a social unit, as having been baptized. He represents Peter, and Paul and others as baptizing these clusters—represents them as practicing child-baptism, as certainly as there were young children in any of these homes.

How very improbable it is that there were no children in any of the "houses" baptized by the apostles. Go along any residence street, how rarely will one find four families out of seven in not one of which is a child beneath the age of responsibility.

When we learn that Paul baptized "the house of Stephanas" (1 Cor. 1:14), we are able to add one more to the list of individuals named as baptized, after Christ instituted the ordinance and commissioned his disciples to use the rite. At the same time, we are able to add one more to the houses recorded as baptized, we are able to ask, is it probable that in no one of five houses out of eight there were young children? This is a consideration of great probable weight in favor of infant baptism.

It is objected, indeed, that children, if any belonged to these houses, could not have been baptized. The objectors say that Scripture elsewhere teaches that one must believe before it is proper to baptize him. They point to Mark 16:16, among other texts, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned," as teaching that faith must precede baptism. This objection is silly. It is founded on gross misapprehension of the Scripture passages to which the objectors refer. Those passages do not set forth the conditions of infant baptism. If they do, they teach infant damnation.

Infants can't believe. But we are not ready to hold of the infant, "He that believeth not shall be damned." This Scripture does not expressly set forth faith as the condition of the baptism of adults even. Scriptures elsewhere do. But this Scripture sets forth the condition of *salvation* of adults. It makes that condition to be faith (and baptism). The Scriptures present no barriers to infant baptism—to infant church-membership, in the way of exercise of rational Christian graces. No Scripture stands in the way of our believing that children of the baptized houses were received into the church.

Sixth.—Paul teaches that the children of believers belong to the church, and by implication, that they should be baptized. (See 1 Cor. 7:14.)

The great Richard Baxter speaks of 1 Cor. 7:14, as "That full plain text, against which men do wilfully cavil in vain, as if they were sorry that God speaks so plainly." In the newly formed church in Corinth many perplexing questions had arisen. Among others, the question as to whether a believer should continue to abide in the marriage relation with an unbelieving partner. Paul answered, that the believer should not despise such a relation, but should abide in it if the unbeliever would permit; and then added, "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband: *else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.*" Here he asserts as an admitted and received fact, that the children of one believer are *holy, i. e.*, are church-members. Paul's teaching in these words may be paraphrased as follows: "The children of these mixed marriages are universally recognized as holy, that is, belonging to the church. If this be correct, which no one disputes, the maintenance of the marriage relation must be consistent with living a

Christian life. The unbelieving must be sanctified by the believing partner. Otherwise your children would be unclean, that is, born out of the pale of the church."

This text teaches plainly, indeed, that the children of believers were recognized as of right, church-members by the Apostles, that they were *holy*. It teaches that in cases where only one of the parents was a believer the children were holy; and, of course, in cases where both the parents were believers. But a widely prevailing ignorance as to the meaning of the term holy and certain ingenious misinterpretations have rendered this Scripture's clear teaching, forceless with great multitudes.

1. Some have said that Paul here asserts that the children of believers are morally holy; that he teaches that they have that spiritual rectitude which constitutes so large a part of salvation; that such children are saints, members of the invisible church, of the innermost kingdom of God. But this can't be true. It is against fact. Among the children of believers there are many whose lives show only too plainly that they have not moral holiness. Many Elis and Davids have mourned over reprobate sons. Scripture, too, is equally against the interpretation now disputed. It represents all men as by nature the children of wrath, and as standing in need of regeneration by the spirit of God, in order to see God's kingdom.

2. Some, on the other hand, hold that Paul here means by the holiness which he predicates of the children of a believer *legitimacy*; that he means to say that the children of a believer, even though he be married to an unbeliever, are *legitimate*. This is nugatory and made simply to obviate the true interpretation. Marriage is an ordinance of natural religion. It is not a sacred thing in the sense that it belongs in any peculiar way to the church. The marital tie was

established for man as man, and not for man regarded as an object of redemption. It was established in Eden. It obtained before the church of the redeemed did; and after the church was instituted, the marriage relation was valid not only between members of the church, but between man and woman outside of the church. Nor could a valid marriage between two pagans be rendered illegitimate by one of the couple's subsequently professing Christianity. It is worse than empty to say of such a couple, that "the unbelieving husband is *legitimated* by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is legitimated by the husband; else were your children illegitimate, but now are they legitimate. It is worse than empty, we say, for it makes by implication the charge that marriage among unbelievers is illegitimate.

Moreover, the term *holy*, *hagios* and its Hebrew equivalents, occur in the Scriptures nearly six hundred times and never once in the sense of bare *legitimacy*, unless in this passage. Nor is the word *hagidzo* or its equivalent *hagidzo*, in the classic Greek, known, as far as we can discover, ever to have the meaning of bare *legitimacy*. Hence it appears that the common usage of the word as well as the demands of the immediate context force us to cast this interpretation aside. Paul did not mean to say, "Else were your children illegitimate, but now are they legitimate."

The common and true exposition represents Paul as affirming that the children of believers are separated to God as His peculiar people, Israel, were separated to Him, and as His church of the present is separated to Him. Holy was a term whose usage and significations were familiar to the Corinthian Christians. They knew that, frequently both in the Old Testament and in the New, it "expresses the state of a person or thing specially separated to the service of God, and in which, by reason of that separation, he

acquires a peculiar property."⁶ God himself uses the word with this signification, e. g., in Lev. 20:26, "*Ye shall be holy unto me, for I the Lord your God am holy, and have severed you from other people that ye should be mine.*" "This severing was effected by his covenant with them. They were "holy" because they belonged to his church which he had erected to put his name and his glory there."⁷ The term "*holy, hagios*" occurs abundantly in this sense. The "saints" are said to have been "persecuted"; to have received "contributions;" they were "greeted." The children of believers are here called saints; spoken of as members of the visible church.

"Unclean" as contrasted with "holy" denoted anything not separated to God's service; not regarded as appropriated to God. Paul denies that children who have one believing parent are unclean. He asserts that they are God's by special appropriation. He even represents it as *universally admitted* that the children who have only one believing parent are to be numbered among the people of God. Of course, if children who have only one believing parent are thus holy, much more are those both of whose parents were believers.

There can be no reasonable doubt as to the correctness of this interpretation. The nugatory or positively false teachings derived through the other interpretations, as well as the usage of the word and the demands of the context shut us up to the view that the Apostle teaches in our text that the children of believers belong to the Christian community—have a formally recognized connection with that community, are church-members.

⁶Winer (Thayer): New Testament Grammar, p. 111.

⁷Mason: Church of God, vol. iv. p. 119, of works.

"The only plausible objection to this view is, that if the terms "holy" and "unclean" have the meaning asserted for them, then the word sanctified must have the same extent of meaning; and if so the unbelieving partner to the marriage relation must become a member of the church in consequence of the church-membership of the other partner."²⁸

In response, we freely grant that in the absence of other Scriptures teaching the contrary, we might be forced by this passage to the view, that unbelievers marrying church-members thereby become church-members; but there are scriptures forbidding the view. "The covenant of God never founded the privilege of church-membership upon the mere fact of inter-marriage with his people; but it did found it expressly upon the fact of being born of them."²⁹ Further, by a positive statute adults were not to be admitted into the church except upon profession of faith. Paul's language, therefore, in the passage under discussion, must be interpreted alongside this statute. The believing partner does sanctify the unbelieving. That is affirmed. But the unbeliever is not thereby made of right a church-member. The unbelieving partner is sanctified as regards his children by the believing. Though the arguments against the right to church-membership on the part of a child, one of whose parents is a believer and the other an unbeliever seem just as strong as those in favor of his church membership, God graciously determines to the side of mercy. He says, in the cases of such, the children shall be treated as the children of believers. The unbelieving partner shall be regarded as sanctified by the believing. It is plain that the Christian

²⁸Peck: Ecclesiology, p. 45.

²⁹Peck: Ecclesiology, p. 45.

people of Paul's day were certain about the right of the children. In order to steady perplexed believers married to unbelievers, and pondering as to whether consistently with their Christian profession they could continue to live in marital relations with them, he seized upon the recognized ecclesiastical standing of children of mixed marriages and inferred a kind of sanctification of the unbeliever by the believer, at least with reference to all the children that should be born to such a union.

The children then of believing Corinthians were church-members. If the children of believing Corinthians, then the children of all believers. This needs no argument. There was nothing exceptional in the case of Corinth, wherefore children of believers there should have been members if not elsewhere. If they were church-members then they had a right to the sign and seal of the covenant privileges.

Seventh.—Baptism is a substitute for circumcision as a seal of the ecclesiastical covenant. As the one was applied to the children of believers so should the other be.

This is argued from the coincidence in the purpose and meaning of the two ordinances. Each put a mark on its subject as belonging to that society which God has set apart for himself, each signifies and seals that great change in the sinner whereby, being justified by faith, he passes from condemnation into acceptance with God (Rom. 4:11; 6:3; Acts 2:38; Col. 2:11-14), which doctrines of pardon and acceptance are exhibited in that society alone which, under the name of his church, God hath consecrated to himself, and of which he hath appointed the circumcised and the baptized to be esteemed members. Each represents and is a means of obtaining that real purity which is effected by the spirit of Christ, and is the characteristic of all those members of His church who are justified by faith

in His blood (Deut. 10:10; 30:6; Acts 7:51; Rom. 6:4; Col. 2:11-14). Baptism and circumcision answer, then, the same ends. The one has been done away as the form of the seal of the covenant, and the other has come into its place, if the covenant have now any seal.

Again, from the Scriptural manner of representing circumcision and baptism, where they are spoken of together, it is argued that baptism has come into the place of circumcision as the seal of the covenant and should be applied at least as widely. For example, in Col. 2:11-14, it is apparent: (1) that both baptism and circumcision are represented as signs of spiritual mercies; (2) that both are represented as signs of regeneration and communion with Christ as the source of spiritual life; (3) that these rites are employed to denote the same thing—the believer's sanctification by union with Christ. The one serves exactly the same office as the other. One has been taken, the other instituted in its place. As the one was applied to children, it is a natural inference that the other should be applied to children also.*

Eighth.—The New Testament represents the penalty for unbelief, in the Messiah, on the part of Jews, to be excommunication from the people of God—from the visible church; and, if it admits, no right of infant church-membership, and infant baptism in consequence, it represents believing parents as suffering the same penalty in their children.

In the course of his sermon, in the temple, of which we have an account in the third chapter of Acts, Peter repeated certain words of Moses (see Deut. 18:15-19), and applied them to the New Testament dispensation: "Every soul

*For a fuller statement of this argument see Peck: Ecclesiology, pp. 40, 41; and Mason: Works, vol. ii. pp. 327-329.

which will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people" (Acts 3:23). The people referred to, is "not of the nation of the Jews; for they were the rebels that were to perish from among the people, a people who were to continue in the divine protection; not the elect; for God never 'cast away His people whom He foreknew,' and they who committed this crime never belonged to the elect—never were among them. If neither the Jewish people nor the elect, it could be no other than that people whom he owns as His, and who are called by the collective name of the *church*." This passage occurring in Moses and in Acts is a proof of the unity of the visible church and its perpetuity in the two dispensations. And it makes the assertion that for unbelief in Christ members of that church shall be destroyed from the visible church. By destruction is meant, in this passage, "not temporal death, for that penalty was never ordained for the sin of unbelief in the Messiah; not exclusion from the Jewish nation, for this effect did not take place"; and if it had taken place, it would have proven a blessing rather than a curse. It must mean exclusion from the communion of the visible church. This is its technical sense in the Old Testament (see Ex. 12:15, 19; Lev. 7:20-27). "The execution of this threatening involved the casting out of the children of those on whom it was executed."

The teaching of Acts 3:23 is, then, that men should be cast out of the church for unbelief in our Lord—that they and their children should be cast out for their unbelief. But if it be held that the New Testament allows no right of membership to infants of believers, then it remorselessly follows that the children of believing Jews were cast out of the church with the introduction of the new dispensation, and that even believing Jews suffered in their children the very

infliction denounced against those who should not believe in the Messiah.

We would not believe this in the absence of the New Testament teaching which we have, as to the valid right of church-membership on the part of infants of believers. It is out of harmony with the gracious liberty of the new dispensation. And, be it said with all reverence, it would seem like an unmerciful retrogression in the self-manifestation of God. Moreover, we know the Jews would have struggled against the deprivations of their children of the privileges of the church. But this brings us to our next point.

Ninth.—The silence of Jewish Christians over the abrogation of the covenanted church rights of their children would be inexplicable were the anti-paedobaptist supposition true.

The Jewish Christians were for the most part very conservative. How they fought to retain circumcision! It is a well-known fact that the rights of their children were very dear to them. Would they have given them up without remonstrance? The best mothers and fathers of Israel would naturally prize church-membership for their children most. Yet there is not the least evidence of any disturbance over the abrogation of their right of it. There are no battle scars of a fight for a prized right; there is no echo of a wail for something torn irretrievably away. These people, tenacious of all their customs, gave up such a precious one as this without a sigh! The very apostles slow to make changes, yet made this one without recording it! The people turbulent in defense of all to which they were attached, yet surrendered this one to which they were married without an effort!

Who can believe they were deprived of their privilege? Who can believe that every believing Jew suffered in his

children the penalty pronounced against the unbelieving for his unbelief and yet made no outcry? The struggle that would have attended such a deprivation would have been so inwrought with Apostolic church history that there would have been no writing of the latter without the former. Christian parents can have suffered in no such way. There can have been no such penalty on Christian believers. The children of believers were still regarded as of the church.

Tenth.—The universal testimony of the Church from the death of the last apostle till far on in the Middle Ages is in support of infant baptism as an apostolical institution.

The Greek church, the ~~American~~ ^{Armenian} church, the Nestorian church, the Syrian Christians of St. Thomas, the Abyssinian church, the Waldenses, and learned men of all early churches either assert, or acquiesce, in the view that the custom of infant baptism was of apostolic origin.

As this argument anticipates what your early further reading of church history will enable you to verify, citations are omitted in this discussion. It is an inerasable fact that the universal and uncontradicted tradition, beginning back close to the Apostolic Age, and running far down into the Middle Ages, represents infant baptism as of apostolic origin. This tradition is not without some worth. We happen to know a youth who knows what sort of a house his great-great-grandfather built for himself, though that house was built over a hundred and forty years ago and torn down before it was his privilege to look on it. He has heard of its thick puncheon doors with gunholes above them. He also knows the peculiarities of the great-great-grandfather's religious faith, having talked with one who had talked with his grandfather and great-grandfather about these things. Origen and Tertullian and Irenæus had a

Armenian

much better opportunity to learn about whether infant baptism *was* of apostolic origin.

We have seen that the identity of the Christian with the Abrahamic Church, which the Scriptures teach, shows in the absence of a repeal of the ancient privilege of infant church-membership, that children of believers are of right members of the Christian Church; that Christ vindicated the right of infants of believers to church-membership, and, therefore, to the token and seal of it; that in the great commission Christ appears to instruct his disciples to baptise the children of believers; that Peter seems to have understood so the great commission; that the New Testament records the baptism of several whole houses, and implies that many whole houses were baptized, of which it would be a violent supposition that children were in none of them; that Paul plainly teaches that children of believers belong to the church, and, by implication, should be baptized in token thereof; that baptism substitutes in the new dispensation the circumcision of the old dispensation, and should be applied as widely, to say the least; that believers, in the new dispensation, are suffering the infliction denounced against unbelievers in Christ, so far as their children are concerned, if the anti-pædobaptist hypothesis be fact; that the silence of Jewish Christian parents over the deprivation of their children of a place in the church is inexplicable, if the Baptist supposition accord with fact; and that the early, universal, tradition of the church, is that infant baptism is of apostolical origin.

In conclusion, we would further remind him that if our study has made only probable that children have a right to membership he is till morally bound to treat them as having that right. Probability in the moral sphere always grounds

obligation to act according to the probability. If New Testament teaching could make it appear merely probable that the children of believers are church-members, all Christians would be under obligation to act accordingly. But we have more than probable evidence. We have clear Scripture teaching. We must, therefore, treat children of believers as having a right to a place in the church. And as baptism is the initial rite, we must baptize them. All admit that if children have a right to church-membership they have a right to baptism.

THE IMPORT OF INFANT BAPTISM.

Ritual baptism signifies that those who receive it are the subjects of moral pollution, and need that spiritual cleansing which is effected by the Holy Spirit. When adult believers receive baptism they express, in its reception, their belief that they were by nature defiled with sin, but that in their judgment, they have been quickened by the Spirit of God unto spiritual life. They also express their desire for growth in grace and their determination to seek after it by the use of the appointed means. When the adult believer presents his children for baptism, he expresses his belief that they are morally polluted, and must be born of the spirit in order to admittance into the kingdom of God, he expresses his desire that they may experience this spiritual renovation and his solemn determination to try to promote it by faithful attention to all the duties of Christian parents.

Infant baptism can be properly administered only, therefore, in cases where the parents, or guardians, undertake to train their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Only persons who themselves make a solemn and credible profession of the true religion, therefore, are competent to present children for baptism. The part of the parent in presenting his children for baptism is a most important one. In administering the rite, this should never be forgotten.

ALDERMAN LIBRARY

The return of this book is due on the date indicated below

DUE	DUE
AUG 29 1952	
MAY 27 1964	
MAY 26 1965	
1-5-85	
1-17-96	
5-10-96	

Usually books are lent out for two weeks, but there are exceptions and the borrower should note carefully the date stamped above. Fines are charged for over-due books at the rate of five cents a day; for reserved books there are special rates and regulations. Books must be presented at the desk if renewal is desired.

10/11/60

UX 000 844 609



