

words of the lawgiver. And just so in respect to the Bible. The Bible professes to be a code of laws, coming down to us from the great Lawgiver of the universe, and binding directly on our consciences and hearts. But in order that it may be duly authenticated; may be a rule of life to us here, and of judgment hereafter, we must have the very words of God. A merely human record of his truth and will cannot bind us. We must have a Bible, the whole of which is given by the inspiration of God, or we have no standard to which we may implicitly appeal, or on which to rely.

ARTICLE III.

BAPTISM, A CONSECRATORY RITE.

BY REV. I. E. DWINELL, SALEM, MASS.

There is much confusion in the public mind on the subject of Baptism.

Some, as Neander, regard it as a "sign of the participation in a sanctifying, divine spirit of life;"¹ others, like Kurtz, as a sacrament coexisting with the renewing activity of the Holy Spirit, and hence essential to salvation.² Others, like Olshausen and the Lutherans generally, consider that it "removes . . . the guilt of original sin, but not its dominion, which is first overthrown in regeneration."³ By others, as the Catholics and High Church-Men, the scholastic doctrine of baptismal regeneration is perpetuated. A more common statement, among moderate Evangelical Christians, is, that baptism is a symbol of purification; or a seal either of a devotement to God, or of a covenant with him.

¹ Church History, I. 304.

² See Manual of Sacred History, §§ 188, 189.

³ Commentary on Acts 16: 14, 15, n.

Moreover, the same individuals are not always consistent with themselves in their statements of its use, or object. Persons who have, in their own minds, fully settled the questions connected with the mode and subjects, are sometimes at a loss to know what Baptism itself means, and for what it is designed. Their thoughts float vaguely between a rite of initiation, a seal of consecration, a sign of spiritual cleansing, and a token of the covenant. One is surprised to find in Neander statements looking in directions so different as the following. In his *Life of Christ*,¹ speaking of the practice of this rite by the Apostles, he calls it "the Messianic symbol of *inauguration* . . . in order to separate from the rest such as admitted the Divine calling of Jesus, and attached themselves to him;" and, in his *Planting and Training*,² he says: "In baptism, entrance into communion with Christ appears to have been the essential point." Still more divergent are these statements of Olshausen: "*Βαπτίζω εἰς τινά* signifies," he remarks, "baptism as devolving a thorough obligation; a rite whereby one is pledged;"³ and again, speaking of infant baptism, "We view it as the communication of the higher life of Christ, and consequently as involving the abolition of the dominion of original sin."⁴

Indeed it would seem, that, in discussions on this subject, attention has been more turned to the import of *βαπτίζω* and its derivations, and to historical investigations of the early usage of the church, than to the study of the Nature and Import of the Rite itself. Investigators have left the thing, and lost themselves in its adjuncts. Now, if the precise act covered by the word *βαπτίζω*, and its symbolic import, at the time of the adoption of the term by Christ, could be made out to the satisfaction of all, it is possible that this might not give a clue to the meaning of the *rite*; for Christian baptism is not a simple service, or transaction, but a compound one, having more than the single element covered by that word. There are also the modifying elements,

¹ § 83. For the same idea see "Planting and Training," p. 27.

² Page 101.

³ Com. Matt. 28. 19.

⁴ Com. Acts 16: 14, 15, n.

according to our Saviour,¹ denoted by the words, εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. It is possible that these may, in great measure, cover up and obscure that; and the rite have, as a whole, quite a different character from what one would expect who should make that word alone the key to unlock it.

The historical method can hardly be more conclusive. During the Apostolic and authoritative age of the Church, the narrative of baptisms is too brief and too closely confined to the bare mention of baptismal acts and scenes, to afford any final settlement of the subject; and the voice that comes up from the church, during later and unauthoritative periods, is too various or dubious to furnish any certain evidence of Apostolic usage and belief.

The true method, we believe, is first to determine the import of the Rite. If this can be clearly ascertained, it will afford a guiding light as we pass to the subordinate questions connected with its details and applications.

I. What, then, does Baptism denote? Passing by all minor distinctions and varieties, it will be sufficiently definite for our purpose to remark, that there are two leading theories on this subject: the one makes Purification its central idea; and the other Consecration. We adopt the latter, believing the rite to be, primarily, and predominantly, a *Consecratory* one; the symbol of the devotement of a human being to God — the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

The evidence of this exists, in the first place, in the very language with which the rite of baptism is spoken of in the New Testament. Where anything more than the baptismal act is mentioned — anything revealing the meaning and contents of the ordinance, — it is usually done by the preposition εἰς, followed by a noun in the accusative. In the formula as given by Christ,² it is εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. In other places we have εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.³ We also find a still more pregnant construction, where βαπτίζω is followed immediately by the per-

¹ Matt. 28: 19.

² Ibid.

³ Acts 8: 16 and 19: 5.

son or object, without the use of ὄνομα; as, εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν¹; εἰς Χριστὸν²; εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν³; εἰς ἔν σῶμα⁴; and εἰς τὸ Ἰωάννου βάπτισμα.⁵ Once only⁶ do we find the phrase ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου, in connection with this rite; and once only,⁷ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Now it is generally conceded, among philologists, that the use of "the accusative is to designate the objects upon which any action or quality terminates;"⁸ and that εἰς denotes "direction towards, motion to, on, or into."⁹ Kühner says εἰς corresponds almost entirely with the Latin *in* with the accusative."¹⁰ Prof. Stuart remarks that it "plainly relates to the *whither*; i. e., indicates a meaning appropriate to the accusative case."¹¹ The apparent exception to this use of εἰς—when it is found with the accusative after verbs of rest, instead of ἐν with the dative—is explained by the last writer; Robinson; Liddell and Scott; and Winer, on the ground that a previous *coming into* that place or state is either actually expressed, or implied, in the context. Thus in Luke, 11: 7, τὰ παῖδια μου μετ' ἐμοῦ εἰς τὴν κούβην εἰσίν, the mind of the speaker contemplates his children as *coming to* the bed, as well as being with him *in* it. Winer maintains that εἰς always has, in the New Testament, its distinctive force,—i. e., of denoting a tendency or movement towards an end or object. He says, "it is improbable that the Apostles would use εἰς for ἐν, or vice versa;"¹² and again, "the interchange of εἰς and ἐν is only apparent."¹³

Accordingly, then, the expression εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, in the baptismal formula, points to the Object or End which is implied in the act of baptism; and should be translated by *to* or *unto*. Whatever, therefore, be the *act* covered by βαπτίζω, or whatever *its* symbolic import, the *rite* of baptism, taken as a whole, is an ordinance by which one is set apart *to* a

¹ Rom. 6: 3.² Gal. 3: 27.³ 1 Cor. 10: 2.⁴ Idem 12: 13.⁵ Acts 19: 3.⁶ Idem 10: 18.⁷ Idem 2: 38.⁸ Prof. Torrey. Unpublished Lectures on Greek Syntax.⁹ Robinson, Liddell and Scott; and lexicographers generally.¹⁰ El. Greek Grammar, § 165, 2.¹¹ New Testament Grammar, § 111.¹² Idioms of New Testament, § 54, 5.¹³ Idem § 54, 4.

faith, a service, an end — the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Whatever else it may be, its central idea is that of the consecration of a human being to God. Be the means and the process what they may, the transaction, in its object and scope, is a religious devotement.

As to the import of *ὄνομα* in the formula, we agree with Olshausen that it is equivalent to $\square\zeta$, and “signifies the very essence of God.” We, however, hazard the remark that it is not absolutely periphrastic, but denotes that essence in its objective, rather than subjective, relations; as manifesting itself, rather than remaining in its eternal state.

The view we have taken follows from the exegesis of the sacred narrative, wherever the rite is spoken of with any fulness. The *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, κ. τ. λ.* must refer to the object or end to which one is committed by the baptismal act.

In relation to the two exceptional instances, which have been referred to, and which are all that exist, it may be remarked, that the latter,¹ in which *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι* is used, is not directly inconsistent in meaning with the prevailing usage, though not directing the attention so forcibly to the Object of the baptismal consecration; while the *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* of the former² — in the passage, *προσέταξε τε αὐτοὺς βαπτισθῆναι ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Κυρίου* — is altogether so anomalous, if made to qualify *βαπτισθῆναι*, as to suggest that it really qualifies *προσέταξε*: “He *commanded* them to be baptized, in the name of the Lord.”

But whether this be the true interpretation or not, neither of these instances can be regarded as reversing the obvious meaning of the baptismal formula, and of the general Apostolic usage; and they must be explained *under* that meaning.

The force which we give to *εἰς*, as pointing to the scope and end of the rite, is no novel interpretation. We have already quoted Olshausen’s remark — which is the more valuable, because, though inconsistent with what he says elsewhere, it is wrung out of him by the inexorable force of

¹ Acts 2: 38.

² Idem 10: 48.

this preposition — “that βαπτίζω εἰς τινά signifies baptism as devolving a thorough obligation; a rite whereby one is pledged; and the sublime object to which baptism binds, consists of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.” Dr. Robinson¹ says, that βαπτίζω with εἰς and the accusative of the person means “to baptize or to be baptized *into* any one; i. e., into a profession of faith in any one and sincere obedience to him.” Calvin, after speaking of the Divine side of the covenant made in baptism, adds, passing to the human side: Sacramentum est spiritualis militiæ, quo perpetuum illi obsequium pollicemur . . . Per Baptismum *consecramur Deo*.² Bengel remarks, Crux et Baptismus nos Christo asserit. Relata: redimere, se *addicere*.³

Again, there is further evidence of the consecratory nature of this rite, in the word by which baptism is designated in the Peschito version of the New Testament, and by the Syrian Christians from the time that version was made to the present.

The Peschito version dates back almost to the age of the Apostles; and, as it is in a tongue nearly identical with that used by Christ, and as it was probably made by those who had been taught by his immediate disciples, and who had been thus all but directly imbued with his spirit and views, the estimate which it puts on the rite of baptism cannot be considered unimportant. This estimate is shown in the word by which it designates it. It has been shown by Prof. Stuart,⁴ Augusti,⁵ and Prof. Murdock,⁶ that this word corresponds, in primitive meaning, with the kindred Hebrew word *עמד*; and means *to stand, to stand up, stand firm*, etc. Prof. Murdock, from whose Article we gather most of the facts on which we base this argument, remarks that the Peschito, though there is no poverty of terms in the Syriac language denoting *to immerse, to wash, to pour, or to sprinkle*, never uses any of them in connection with baptism, and

¹ Lex. βαπτίζω. 2. α. γ.

² Gnomon N. T. 1 Cor. 1: 13.

³ Archæologie. B. VII. pp. 310, 311.

⁴ Vol. VII. of this Journal, p. 733 et seq.

⁵ Com. 1 Cor. 1: 13.

⁶ Bib. Repository, 1833, p. 363.

never retains the Greek word βαπτίζω. In all the 73 places in which this word occurs in the Greek Testament, it is uniformly translated by the Syriac verb ܐܡܕܐ (amad.) And there has been no departure from this usage, either by the Syriac Fathers, or their descendants, using any dialect derived from the Syriac. Even the Nestorian Version, made by the American Missionaries, and printed in 1846, everywhere adopts the Peschito usage in the translation of βαπτίζω, when it relates to the rite of baptism.¹

Now, to explain this remarkable usage, Prof. Murdock supposes, that, to the early Syrian Christians, the act of Baptism represented "the idea of *coming to a stand*, or of *taking a public and decisive stand*, on the side of Christianity."² The explanation of Augusti is,³ that baptism was designated by the Syriac *amad*, because it was intimately associated with confirmation; and took its name from that, rather than from anything in its own nature; and hence that it could very well, according to its intent and effect, be called the "*Act of Initiation and Establishment in Christianity.*"

But neither of these explanations satisfies us. There is no evidence, that, at this early age, confirmation so overshadowed baptism as to give it its coloring and a name. This could have occurred only in a later age. It is not till the time of Tertullian that we find baptism complicated and covered with other symbolical customs; and we infer that it was not so burdened till about that time, because Justin Martyr,⁴ who was born near the close of the first century, describes it as very simple. Besides, both of these writers seem to have detached the word denoting the act of baptism from the rest of the formula, and contemplated it

¹ Vol. VII. of this Journal. p. 735.

² Idem. p. 740.

³ His words are: Die Taufe aber, womit in der alten kirche die confirmation verbunden war, konnte, nach Zweck und Wirkung, gar wohl die *Handlung der Einweihung und Befestigung im Christenthume* genannt werden. Es würde also eine metaphorische Benennung seyn, dergleichen diese hielige Handlung so viele hat. Archäologie, B. VII. p. 311.

⁴ See Gieseler, § 53, n. 25.

alone. If they had taken it in connection with that, they would not have been obliged to look for the Object, for which that word denotes *taking a stand*; it would have been furnished to their hand. It is a part of the formula, a part of the essential elements of the rite itself, that that Object be the Father, Son, and Spirit. Hence we suppose that the ancient Syrians adopted this term, because they regarded the act of baptism, not as denoting *taking a stand* on the side of *Christianity*, nor as marking one's *initiation and establishment in it*, but as symbolizing *taking a stand for God* — a consecration to *him*; a solemn devotement to him for time and eternity. As the most important spiritual event in life is at the moment when one's being takes a new direction, changing its aim from self or the world to God, so these early Christians, living on the borders of the Apostolic age, regarded baptism as importing that he who receives it is committed to this new direction; that he is taken out of the worldly community and *stands forth* pledged to God as the end of his being.

If it be objected to this argument that the Syriac preposition, ܒܝܬ, *beth*, by which *eis* is translated, corresponds with the Hebrew ָ, it may be replied that this latter preposition has a wider latitude than *ev*, and sometimes like *eis* denotes tendency. Gesenius appropriates to it a class of meanings, "implying motion quite *to* a place or thing; *to, unto, upon*; and specifies ָ ִקְרָא, to call *to* or *upon*; ָ ִרְאָה, to look *upon* or *at*; and ָ ִשְׁמַע, to listen *to*, — as instances. We suppose that the Syriac *beth*, being the corresponding preposition of a cognate branch of the same Shemitic tongue, may have, and does have this meaning in the formula of baptism. But even if it does not, and if it is translated *in*, what can "stand in the name of God" mean, save to stand on the side of God? In either case, therefore, it must denote taking a stand for him, and be regarded as a rite of formal devotement to him.

Again, the view which we take of this institution, as mainly consecratory in design and import, reduces the different classes of Scriptural baptisms to one general idea and

law; while the theory of purification breaks up their unity in every sense, and throws them into disconnected and hostile groups. The baptism of Christ was not a symbol of purification, and cannot be so understood in any manner or sense; but is it probable that it had not a meaning underlying it, that united it, in some way, with other baptisms? Is it probable that it was a baptism, and yet in no sense one, save in *form*; that it was not in *meaning* one? John's baptism was *εἰς μετάνοιαν*, "unto repentance;"¹ and that its import was not purification is evident from his own disclaimer; "I indeed baptize you with water unto *repentance*; but he that cometh after me . . . shall baptize you with the *Holy Ghost*, and with fire."² But was there no continuity of idea between his and Christian baptism? Again, the Apostle speaks figuratively of the Jews having been "all baptized unto Moses."³ Still more evident is it here, that purification was not the underlying thought.

If, however, in the place of purification we substitute dedication, as the general idea of the rite, all these diverse baptisms fall into unity, and are connected by a common internal bond. Baptism "unto Moses" is dedication to him as a leader; baptism "unto repentance," a solemn setting apart to the doctrines and duties of repentance as taught by John; the baptism of Christ, his public consecration, under the law, and thus *fulfilling all righteousness*, to the work of his ministry; and Christian baptism, consecration to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit⁴ as the end of being.

¹ Matt 3: 11.

² Ibid.

³ 1 Cor. 10: 2.

⁴ The fact that we nowhere, in the Apostolic history, find mention made of each of these Divine Persons in connection with this rite, but only of Christ (as in Acts 8: 16 and 19: 5, where the form is *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Κυρίου Ἰησοῦ*), has led some to suppose that the primitive Christian usage was simply "baptism unto the name of Jesus." Neander inclines to this opinion (*Planting and Training*, p. 27, and *Church History*, I. p. 310). But Olshausen well remarks: "In none of these passages is the object to give a direct description of baptism itself, but merely to signify *the* baptism in the way of nominal distinction. On this account it is not allowable to infer . . . that the express formula . . . was not employed. Such phrases might have been employed merely in order to distinguish baptism, as a Christian ordinance, from that of John" (*Com. Matt.* 28: 19). If, however, a shorter formula were sometimes used, it must have been regarded as epitomiz-

And Jewish Proselyte baptism, which certainly existed soon after Christ, if it did not before, — as it probably did; for it is much easier to account for John's adopting it from the Jews, than for their adopting it from Christians — falls under the same general idea; it being a consecration to the Jewish faith and practice. Thus all baptisms harmonize, and are pervaded by a common general meaning.

And, moreover, unless they have this common import, it is difficult to account for their origin. If the baptismal act be understood to have gained a definite significance, when practised by one party, it is difficult to understand how it should be seized upon by another party, to signify something entirely new and different. It is difficult to see why Christ should submit himself to baptism by John, if he intended the act to have a radically new meaning; and why he should appoint the same rite to his disciples, to convey another radically new meaning. The supposition, that, in all its stages and applications, it is primarily a consecratory rite, at once relieves us from the difficulty. We can see very well, if it was generally understood to signify a religious dedication, how it should still be employed, though the object of the dedication should vary somewhat: how, if Jewish Proselyte baptism were in use in the time of John, and denoted dedication to the belief and observances of the Jews, he would naturally appropriate it to express the consecration required by his own preaching, though careful to mention the new object to which the consecration was to be made — *εἰς μετάνοιαν*, unto the doctrines and duties of repentance; how the same ceremony should be employed with a new object, in setting Christ apart to his work; and how it

ing the fuller one by mentioning the only Person of the Trinity whose divinity was likely to be called in question, and belief in whom was then — as in every age — the turning-point of faith. This Neander maintains: "This shorter baptismal formula contains in itself everything which is further developed in the words used by Christ at the institution of baptism" (Planting and Training, p. 27). Consecration to Christ implies consecration to the Father and the Spirit, though not *vice versa*. In either case, therefore, Christian baptism was, according to the primitive usage, consecration to the Father, Son, and Spirit; expressly, we believe, but if not, impliedly.

should pass over to his followers, though with careful mention of the new sublime End of their consecration. We cannot believe there is not, radically, a unity in all baptisms.

These considerations leave us no doubt that the rite of Christian baptism is primarily and predominantly, a Consecratory one.

But we believe there is also another element belonging to it, though quite secondary and subordinate; an element importing Purification.

There are many passages of Scripture which intimately associate, if they do not almost blend, the act of baptism and spiritual cleansing. "Except a man be born of *water* and of the *Spirit*, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."¹ "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might *sanctify* and *cleanse* it with *washing of water* by the word."² "Arise, and be *baptized*, and *wash away* thy *sins*, calling on the name of the Lord."³ Such expressions indicate, that in some way, in the import of this rite, there is an element denoting *cleansing*. Again, there are places where the word *baptism* is used, without reference to the rite, but metaphorically, referring to the work of the Spirit; or where, if the mind of the writer had the act of baptism in view at first, he soon merges it in spiritual, or metaphorical, baptism. We consider the following to be of this description: "*Baptism* doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the *answer of a good conscience toward God*"⁴). "We are buried with him by *baptism* into *death*"—death to sin—; "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."⁵ That the word should thus be used to represent the Divine work in the heart shows, that, in the mind of the Apostles, it has some special fitness for such use; and hence that it must have somewhere an element of meaning denoting purification.

¹ John 3: 5.

² Eph. 5: 25, 26.

³ Acts 22: 16.

⁴ 1 Pet. 3: 21.

⁵ Rom. 6: 4.

We may in part but cannot wholly account for these two classes of passages on the supposition that the Apostles — who, it should be remembered, living at the beginning of the Christian dispensation, *could* have addressed no other persons, baptized by Christian baptism, than such as had received the rite upon giving evidence of faith, — regarding baptism as the general *accompaniment* of spiritual cleansing, in the case of such persons; as happening to be, for the most part, a parallel though unrelated fact; and as furnishing thus a very good outward index to the spiritual state of those who had received it, — often, by a common figure of speech, referred to it in terms which could be strictly true only of its accompaniment. This does not seem sufficient to explain the frequency and closeness with which the two are associated. It is easier, as well as more in accordance with the demands of exegesis, to suppose that the phraseology in question did not originate from the mere coincidence of baptism and purification, but because there is in the former itself an element of meaning intended to symbolize the latter.

Moreover, it is acknowledged by all, that, as early as the middle of the third century, baptism was very commonly regarded, not only as the symbol of regeneration, but also as actually regenerating. Bunsen states that Cyprian, with others of the African bishops, went so far as to view it as “a washing away of the *universal* sinfulness of human nature.”¹ To account for such a monstrous historical development, we must trace it back to some original germ; and it is not easy to find one, unless somewhere in the primitive import of the rite itself. Some confessed purificatory element in that, however small, must have been the original seed from which such a *Upas* could spring.

Believing, then, that baptism contains an element representing purification as a subordinate and secondary idea, we explain its presence and its relation to the predominating element, in this way: —

The use of water in the Jewish ritual was symbolical of

¹ Hippolytus and his Age, 3. 195.

purification. This is not questioned; and this furnishes us with the import of that part of the rite of baptism which the use of water occupies. Accordingly, while the end of the rite, taken as a whole, is to denote consecration, it has pleased Christ to appoint that an element should be employed, in doing this, which at the same time conveys a meaning of its own, in its limited sphere; a meaning additional, but subordinate; neither inconsistent nor diverting. For, while the rite pledges the individual to God, the water, a single element of the rite, by a beautiful significance of its own, points to the purity implied in such a soul-dedication. While the entire ordinance symbolizes the new direction of one's being, from self and the world to God, this section of it suggests the holiness of the transaction. The two ideas harmonize perfectly; they harmonize in the same way as a part harmonizes with the whole, or rather as a result with the cause. For consecration makes the consecrated object, on the part of him who has set it apart, holy to God; holiness is a part, a resultant idea, of consecration. Now the entire ceremony of baptism covers the idea of the consecration; and the water, that of the holiness. Hence we are not to conceive that this element points to the general cleansing of the heart by the Holy Spirit, but only to the cleansing implied in the transfer to the new end of being. The object of the rite must be regarded as simple, though its elements may be complex. We cannot suppose that it was intended to have two parallel and unrelated meanings — as it would have, if one of its meanings pointed independently to the general cleansing by the Holy Spirit. But as the transaction which the rite denotes has in itself a subordinate element denoting purification, so with perfect fitness the rite has in the water an element corresponding with it and pointing to it.

It must not be overlooked, as confirming this position, that in the Jewish ceremonial, in which water acquired, and from which we learn, its exact significance, it does not denote cleansing by the Spirit of God, or spiritual cleansing generally, but ceremonial cleansing; that cleansing

which attaches to and becomes the new sacred relation in which the person or object stands towards God directly or as represented by his people. Thus symbolic ablution was performed when Aaron and his sons were to be introduced to the priests' office,¹ and ever after, on pain of death, when they or their successors were about to minister at the altar;² when a leper was to be restored to God's people;³ when any one who had acquired ceremonial uncleanness was to be ceremonially cleansed;⁴ and even when inanimate objects, such as "any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack"⁵ had been tainted with ceremonial impurity. Now since we have the import of water from this usage, and since we find by examining that usage that, while water symbolizes purification, it is not the general purification effected by the Holy Spirit, but that which results from the devotement or restoration of the person or object to God in his own person or in that of his people, — we see how we are to understand the use of water when transferred to Christian baptism: that it is designed indeed to denote purification, but only purification as resulting from consecration to God.

This view of the import of baptism has the advantage, we think, of satisfying the demands of exegesis; making many baptisms one baptism; and explaining the historical developments of doctrine on this subject, — while at the same time maintaining the strict simplicity and unity of its design. From this we can readily see, why the Apostles, when speaking with any fulness of the rite of baptism, should bring out the great End of the baptismal consecration; but when speaking of the duty to lead a holy life, and wishing to illustrate or enforce this duty by reference to baptism, should seize only on its minor, purificatory element. Truths, however, or elements of truth, which in inspiration are still held in their real and concrete connection, however much more prominently the one or the other may be brought forward in any place, are very apt, when

¹ Lev. 8: 6.² Ex. 30: 19—21.³ Lev. 14: 8, 9.⁴ See Lev. chap. xii.—xv.⁵ Lev. 11: 32.

delivered over to uninspired men, to be violently and permanently separated; some, according to their peculiarities, or the influences about them, seizing on the one part, and others on the other part, of the related truth, magnifying it, and suppressing or overlooking its fellow. Thus, while the Syriac Christians, who stood almost near enough to the Apostles, in time, to hear them speak, grasped and perpetuated the consecratory nature of this rite; possibly too exclusively; thus showing that in that early age it was altogether the central and predominant one, — the more Western Christians, on the other hand, being brought into closer contact with the superstitions of cultivated Paganism, and the mystic doctrines of the Platonists, naturally betook themselves to the minor element of purification, discarding the grand object of the rite; and this they so built upon with superstition and mysticism, according to the tendency of that age, that they soon reached the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and even of the cleansing of the heart from all sin by the act of baptism alone. By many it was regarded as an *opus operatum*; and there was room for the scoff, flung by the Emperor Julian: "Baptism, which cannot remove leprosy, gout, warts, and other lesser or greater bodily defects, is able to purge away all the sins of the soul!"¹

And in later times, those writers or sections of the Church, whose views have inclined them to mysticism, or to ascribe an inherent virtue to divinely appointed forms, magnify the water above the *βαπτίζω εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*; the subordinate element above the whole rite.

II. This Scriptural view also affords important assistance in determining the proper *Subjects* of baptism — an application of our theme to which we now turn.

Those, who see in this rite only or mainly a reference to purification, are plunged in difficulty, when they approach the question of Infant baptism. If he be a Baptist, he denies the ordinance to this class of persons altogether; but the denial puts him in a false relation to the covenant

¹ Neander, II. 87.

as including his household with himself; wars with the yearnings of the pious, parental heart; and is at variance with the general usage of the Church. If he be an Evangelical Pædo-baptist, he either regards the rite as anticipatory — prophetic of future cleansing, or abandons its strict import altogether, and regards it as merely dedicatory; thus in effect, contemplating it as essentially another ordinance, though bearing the same name. If he be a High Churchman or a Catholic, he maintains his consistency, indeed, but at the expense of holding to the dogma — so entirely unscriptural, and even hostile to the genius of the gospel — that this sacrament of the Church, in and of itself, imparts spiritual cleansing; “insomuch” — in the language of Kurtz,¹ an advocate of this doctrine — “that he who receives the sensible sign, at the same time receives the supersensual gift in, with, and under it.”

But if its meaning be regarded as consecratory, as indicating the dedication of a human soul to God, it has the same fitness, the same significance, when applied to infants, as to adults, — and this without doing violence to the nature and genius of the gospel. The only difference is, that the adult receives the symbol by his own consent and act and faith, while the child receives it by the vicarious consent, act, faith, of the parent, who is at that age, according to the Divine constitution of the family, its representative, in relation to its moral and religious interests. Thus the difficulties connected with this subject, otherwise existing, clear away; and we are enabled to proceed at once, with the whole impulse of the consecratory nature of this rite guiding and bearing us on its bosom, to the propriety and duty of Infant baptism.

In the first place, then, the Christian is required to consecrate all he has to God: his time, substance, means of influence, children. But there is an impassable, infinite distance between the consecration of perishing objects, and of immortal mind. Now, as God has given us a symbol expres-

¹ Manual of Sacred History, § 188, Obs. 1.

sive of this better and higher kind of consecration, is there not a propriety in the Christian applying it to his offspring, to attest the fact that he sets them apart for God? Consecrate them he must; the only question is, whether, having a rite meaning that very thing, he shall refuse to apply it to them, when the Bible furnishes no intimation of such restriction. If it be alleged, that the order, in which our Saviour and the Apostles sometimes speak of faith and repentance in connection with baptism, indicates that they regarded them as its necessary antecedents and conditions, it is sufficient to reply that they were addressing or contemplating *adults*, who, they knew, had not received Christian baptism, and could not receive it sincerely and conscientiously without faith and repentance. Accordingly, standing as they did at the commencement of the christian dispensation, and addressing such unbaptized persons, the order of their message must be the same as any Pædo-baptist at this day might adopt in addressing the heathen: "He that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved;"¹ "*Repent* and be baptized every one of you;"² "If thou *believest* with all thine heart, thou mayest" — be baptized.³

Hence, in the absence of any limitation, it would be an unnatural and violent separation of things intended to be united together, if a christian parent should withhold the consecratory rite from his sublimest consecratory act, especially when that rite is designed to signify this very thing. It is meet that his children — those gifts of God, frail, tender; yet infolding immortal mind, and infinite capabilities of good or evil — should be solemnly and publicly devoted to their Father, and the divinely appointed symbol of such devotement, extended to them. Why should it not; why ought it not?

But there is a profounder consideration enforcing this duty. The family, in the Divine constitution of society, is the social *unit*. A solitary individual is a fraction, a fragment. Nothing short of a family constitutes the human in-

¹ Mark 16: 15.

² Acts 2: 38.

³ Idem, 8: 37.

teger.³ In consequence of this natural, or constitutional unity, it has, in each case, an individuality of its own,— a community of thought, sympathy, purpose, character, which distinguishes it from all other families. The central and predominating influence of the head is interradiated and reflected and diffused through the members; and, to some extent, a common moral, as well as psychological, gleam appears on all. If the head be pious; even if but one parent be a Christian, owing to the unity of the family, its identity undergoes a proportionate, corresponding change, and the other members stand in a different relation to God from the one they otherwise would have held — a truth which the Apostle asserts: “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.*”¹

God recognizes this unity of the family; and deals with families as families, through their responsible centres, or heads. In what is called the Abrahamic covenant, e. g. the transaction was not so much with the detached individual Abraham, as with him as personating and involving a family; and God covenanted with him *and his seed*. And in the New Testament this covenant with families is perpetuated; for each christian parent occupies the same position as Abraham, in this particular; and covenants with God with his arms, as it were, around the whole household. “If ye be Christ’s, then are ye *Abraham’s seed*, and heirs according to the promise;” “For the promise is unto you, and to your *children.*”³

Now, as the family is a unity, as the parent is its representative and responsible head, and as he has taken it with him and consecrated it to God as a whole, so it should receive as a whole — i. e., in all its members, for whom he acts — the consecratory sign. There is an obvious incongruity in dividing up the subjects of a common devotement, by applying the rite, the very meaning of which is devote-

¹ 1 Cor. 7: 14.² Gal. 3: 29.³ Acts 2: 39.

ment, to some of them, and excluding it from others. The unity of the consecratory transaction demands a corresponding unity of the consecratory rite. And the christian parent, the heart of the household, who diffuses the invisible aroma of piety through the group; whose pulses of spiritual life penetrate all its members, and draw it into a certain christian, though in itself unsaving, oneness — acting for his offspring, whose life and welfare are wrapped up and represented in him, should see to it that they, as well as himself, receive the symbol of their common consecration to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

And this — we may remark — we believe to be in accordance with Apostolic usage. The Apostles recognized the unity of the family. This is clear from the statement of Paul that the piety of a single christian parent imparts a relative sanctity to the whole group; and also from the remark to the Jailer, “Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy *house*.”¹ They also practised household baptism; and the presumption, in the case of Lydia,² and the Jailer,³ is, that they did it on the faith of the head of the family. There is no evidence that there were either little children or infants, in either of these families; but whoever were in them — certainly in the former, — were baptized, according to the clear intimation of the narrative, on the faith of the head. In the case of Lydia and her family, she only is spoken of as sharing in the immediate spiritual advantages of the Apostle’s visit. It was *she* “whose heart the Lord opened, that *she* attended unto the things which were spoken by Paul.” But come to the rite of consecration, she was present with her family; and “when she was baptized, and her household” — the narrative proceeds in terms indicating that she regarded them as represented by her and consecrated to God by her faith — “*she* besought us, saying, “If you have judged *me* to be faithful to the Lord, come into *my* house, and abide there. And *she* constrained us.” Now, if these were little children, who were

¹ Acts 16: 31.

² Ibid. 16: 14, 15.

³ Ibid. 16: 30—34.

baptized on the faith of Lydia, we have an example, in the Scriptures, of infant baptism; if they were servants or children partly grown, then the argument for the baptismal consecration of infants becomes so much the stronger from this circumstance. In either case, therefore, we conclude that the Apostles practised household baptism on the faith of the head of the household; and that they taught the disciples that the united consecration of the family should be signalized by a united participation in the consecratory service.

But there is, further, a still more emphatic evidence of this duty, in the relation of baptism to circumcision. It comes out in this way:

The principles of the Divine economy in dealing with man, contained in the Old Testament, are not interrupted by the giving of the New; but flow down into it, though with a more advanced and spiritual development. Their forms may vary, but the principles are vital; they interlace the two sections of the Church; make them continuous, and parts of one system.

By looking back to the Old Testament we ascertain the divinely appointed *relation* which children hold to their pious parents and the covenant with God; that they are included in it with them. The same relation consequently must exist now; this being one of the living principles which cannot drop out of the constitution of the Church.

Moreover, to express this principle, and show that the parent took the child with him into covenant with God and devoted it to Him, the rite of circumcision was instituted under the old economy. That this was its import is evident from the statement of the Lord to Abraham, at the time of its institution, that the Object or End of his Covenant was that *He might be a God unto him, and to his seed after him*; ¹ and that circumcision was "a token" of this covenant. ² As, however, the father represented the family and acted for it, so the sons represented the daughters and acted for them; and hence they only received the rite.

¹ Gen. 17: 7.

Vol. XV. No. 57.

² *Idem*, v. 11.

Now, since a consecratory rite was employed in the Old Testament, to denote the participation of the children in the covenant, and their consequent dedication to God; since the same relation of children to the parents and the covenant exists now; since the former consecrating symbol is, by common consent, regarded as no longer in accordance with the Divine will; and since Christ has appointed a new one, having the same general import, which *is* binding,—the only question is, whether it shall be extended to children, as that was, or be confined to adults. To us there can be no question. The very statement of it, in its connection with the facts, answers it. To suppose the contrary, without any Divine warrant, and thus to deviate, in essential particulars, from the original design and usage of a consecratory rite, would be to take baptism out of its analogies and antecedents, and make a new ordinance of it; to tear it off from the point of its harmonious union with the former dispensation, and thrust it as a foreign and fresh invention into the new,—joining on to nothing kindred; with no preparations demanding it; and in effect throwing the two economies ajar.

If it be objected to this argument, that the Apostle Paul says that Abraham “received the sign of circumcision, *a seal of the righteousness of the faith* which he had yet being uncircumcised;”¹ and that this language points to the purificatory, rather than dedicatory, import of this rite,—we reply: The Apostle is not here speaking of the strict meaning of circumcision; but he adduces the *fact* of Abraham’s circumcision as evidence of previous faith and justification. And so it would be. When Abraham publicly took Jehovah to be his God and the God of his family, and designated this devotement to Him by circumcision, this rite would, indirectly but unmistakably, testify to a previous faith. It would thus be, but in no other sense, “a seal”—token, proof, *σφραγίς*—“of the righteousness of the faith which he had, being yet uncircumcised.”

¹ Rom. 4: 11.

Again, if it be objected that Jewish Christians, for some time after Christ, were both circumcised and baptized, and that this would not seem to indicate that the latter rite was designed to take the place of the former,—it may be remarked, that this very fact indicates that there was not felt, by those Christians, to be any inconsistency in the import of the two; that the fact that circumcision was gradually abandoned by them, and only baptism retained, shows that they came at length to see that the former was superfluous and useless, having all its valuable significance and uses supplied by the latter; and that the Gentile Christians never, to any considerable extent, adopted circumcision, because they regarded baptism as a substitute for it, for them. One of the earliest of those whose writings have come down to us, Justin Martyr, says: “We Gentile Christians have not received that circumcision which is according to the flesh; but that circumcision which is spiritual; and moreover, for we were sinners, we have received this circumcision *in baptism*.”¹ And Chrysostom, nearly two centuries and a half later, though he exalts the purificatory element of baptism above its consecratory import, as was so general in that age, testifies to the fact of its taking the place of the corresponding Jewish rite: “There was pain and trouble in the practice of that Jewish circumcision; but our circumcision, I mean the grace of Baptism, gives cure without pain; and this for infants as well as men.”²

While, then, we are not to look for an abrupt and violent transition from the rite of the law to the rite of the gospel; while in fact we find, for a time, the one sometimes overlapping the other, from ignorance, or weakness, or prudential reasons — as in the circumcision of Timothy,—yet there is sufficient evidence that it was in accordance with the Divine Mind that circumcision should cease, and baptism take the place of it, as the consecratory rite; and hence we infer that, like that, it also should be administered to the children of God’s people.

¹ Quoted by Taylor in “Apostolic Baptism,” p. 74.

² *Ibid.*

III. We have still before us the question of the *Mode* of baptism. We propose remarking upon it, however, only as it stands connected with its import.

Those, who agree with us that consecration is its central and predominant idea, and that infant baptism is binding, will have little hesitation about the propriety of some simpler method than immersion. For, the essential idea of the rite being the consecration of the individual to the Trinity, the mode of using the water to set forth this idea, as God has not intimated his will, at once sinks to a place of secondary and comparatively trivial importance; and sprinkling or effusion is as appropriate and suggestive as immersion, for this purpose. Indeed, it is probable that, had not the Christian Fathers exalted the element of purification in this rite above its central and primary import, they never would have gone to the extreme of *trine* and *nude* immersion, as it is certain many of them did.¹ The excess to which they carried the baptismal act, reveals their wrong notions of its import and use; and, as purification was to be gained by baptism, they held it safe to have enough of it. It is probable also, that such modern writers as Neander and Bunsen never would have taken up the belief, in the confessed absence of any historical evidence to that effect, that immersion was the mode of baptism first practised in the christian church,— unless from their psychological and dogmatic peculiarities, they had been swayed more by the metaphorical references to this rite in the Scriptures, where its indirect purificatory import is referred to, than by those passages where the rite of baptism is itself the subject of remark, and where its import may be gathered directly and unequivocally. Missing the consecratory nature of the rite, exalting a minor and incidental element above its central and primary import, and then seizing on figurative expressions, where this subordinate meaning is alluded to, as the key to the mode of baptism, it is not strange that they should think that immersion was the primitive

¹ "Apostolic Baptism," pp. 158, 165, 179.

method; although they do not regard it as essential or important that modern Christians should adopt it. And, moreover, those Christians who do regard the mode as essential, and consider immersion that mode, and whose denominational existence depends on the maintenance of these views, are in great measure led to this unnatural and unevangelical¹ magnifying of the *form* of a *rite*, by their mistaken estimate of its import and design. Let them see that it is dedicatory, and the charm of immersion over the imagination is broken.

In adhering, therefore, closely to the native import of the institution, we escape the powerful, though it may be unconscious, motive to give an undue prominence to immersion; and are left to consider any mode proper which brings out the idea of the consecration, — especially since neither Christ nor the Apostles have intimated a preference for any particular mode.

The essential thing in this rite we regard to be consecration to the Father, Son, and Spirit by the solemn use of water; the mode being left by Christ, as in the case of the other institutions of the gospel, for the free life of the church to shape and modify, according to her instincts and wants, by the process of a living adaptation. Thus, take the Church itself: Christ instituted a Church; but its form and mode of organization he leaves to human freedom to complete, change, diversify; to join it on to the existing and ever-varying wants of his people, and adapt it to their inner and outer life, as his spirit working in them shall lead them to judge best. Again, Christ evidently intended that his followers should have some mode of worship; but how careful not to prescribe that mode — a liturgy with rigid details and outlines, to embarrass and confine their free life in succeeding ages! Take also the sacrament of the Supper: Christ appointed this for all time; but how flexible and ductile he has left the form!

¹ Bunsen, speaking on this point, says: "They are inclined to attach to their own form a superstitious power, by which the efficacy of a continually renewed faith is thrown into the background." (Hip. and his Age, 3. 208.)

Now, as he has revealed to us its essential characteristics — consecration by the use of water — and as he has been careful to cause that no inspired man should utter a word to indicate the mode, are we to suppose that he designed for baptism alone a hard and unbending form? Is it probable that he would here leap, with a wide bound, from all his analogies, and frame this ordinance alone with iron outlines; and intend it to go down through the centuries, as a harsh, unyielding rigidity; and then leave no record indicating what that mode should be? The conclusion is, to our mind, unavoidable, that the mode was purposely left open; and that any form of the use of water, whether by sprinkling, effusion, or immersion, by which one is consecrated to the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, is, if administered by an authorized person, christian baptism.

ARTICLE IV.

EUSEBIUS AS AN HISTORIAN.

BY LYMAN COLEMAN, D. D., PHILADELPHIA.

Eusebius was a native of Palestine. Of his parentage and early education we are in singular ignorance. The date even of his birth is not well defined; but from certain incidental data in his writings, it appears that he must have been born within the period from A. D. 259 to 270. About the year 315 he was chosen bishop of Caesarea, and continued for twenty-five years the incumbent of this office until his death, A. D. 340.

One of the first of his literary labors was a work on history and chronology, entitled *Chronicon*. In this he undertook to describe the origin and progress of all nations from their rise respectively to the age of Constantine, and to