

The age-long struggle of love with sin is expressed and manifested in the Cross of Calvary and reproduced in the individual experience of those who are "crucified with Christ."

And so we might watch Him pass from His Passion to the Resurrection "power of an endless life"—to His Ascension or withdrawal from the physical "that He might fill (or interpenetrate) all things" and so come nearer to all, and then think of Him as no longer chained to form, no longer external to us, but seeking entrance from within and manifesting Himself to us, and in us, and through us.

Thus the Life of Christ becomes clothed to us with new and living power. It is no longer mere ancient history, but the revelation of present and eternal truth.

"And warm, sweet, tender, even yet
A present help is He;
And Faith has still its Olivet
And Love its Galilee."

H. ERSKINE HILL.

THE CAREFULNESS OF LUKE.

II. PETER'S CONVERSION.

THE account of St. Peter's vision at Joppa (Acts x., xi.) has been treated by most commentators slightly and scantily. There are difficulties in regard to its position, besides greater difficulties in its exposition. On the one hand, it has hardly been placed in relation to its antecedents; on the other, we have so few materials for judging of its consequences, so far as the history of the Acts records them, that the critical nature of the turning-point in St. Peter's life marked by the vision is considerably obscured for us. We do not easily obtain the impression that the vision marks a kind of "conversion" in the Apostle. It seems to occur near the end of his active life.

Let us endeavour to place ourselves in St. Peter's position as marked by St. Luke, remembering that Luke-Acts is one work rather than two companion works.¹ His readers would remember that he had recorded of Simon that his call had come in the Lord's words, uttered some two or three years before, "Launch out into the deep . . . from henceforth thou shalt catch men"; that he had been named Peter, and chosen to be of the Twelve, among whom he was mentioned first; that he had witnessed miracles of the Lord, and was one of the three selected disciples; that he had made the great confession at Caesarea Philippi, "Thou art the Christ of God," and been present at the Transfiguration; that he had said, "Behold we have left our own belongings and followed thee"; that he had been sent to prepare the Passover; that at the Table his *conversion* had been foretold (Luke xxii. 32); that he had denied his Lord; that he had "risen up and ran to the tomb, and looked in and seen the fine linen cere-clothes (*τὰ ὀθόνια*, see below) left alone, and had gone home wondering at that which was come to pass."

In all this there is only just enough to prepare us for the prominent place that Peter is to fill in the first twelve chapters of Acts. He is the leading character in the first twelve chapters, after which he appears but once, at the Council of Jerusalem. Now though it is true that the literary effect of the parallel arrangement of Acts is more artistic because the parallelism (Peter i.-xii., Paul xiii.-end) is not too rigidly observed, still it would not have lost anything if St. Peter's latest Acts had been brought on to the stage. And yet again there is a loss of proportion in the fact that his preaching to the Gentiles is announced only in x. 34 foll., repeated xi. 17 foll., and mentioned xv. 7, and not once again. Is it not obvious that what is required for the completion of

¹This has been well shown by Zahn, *Eint.*, ii. § 60.

the unity, or rather the symmetry, of Acts is the subsequent record of Peter's preaching among the Gentiles, if not also to the Gentiles? This record, we may suppose, would have been, or actually was, contained in the third and concluding history of Luke following after Acts xxviii. Two topics which this concluding history would have contained are mentioned by the writer of the Muratorian Fragment, "the suffering of Peter, and Paul's departure from the city (Rome) to Spain."

And there is another reason why we are apt to miss the cardinal importance of the story of St. Peter's conversion. Possibly it may not be given by St. Luke in the chronological order of its occurrence. It has been shown elsewhere¹ that St. Luke appears to have arranged that Acts i.-xii. should illustrate each separate verse of Psalm cxlvi. in the LXX version, and for a particular reason. It can hardly be a fortuitous coincidence that for the title and the ten verses of that Psalm there are sixteen illustrations supplied in Acts i.-xii. by way of "fulfilment" of prophecy. In this fact, then, taken in conjunction with others of the same kind,² we observe the undercurrent of St. Luke's mind. He and his contemporary Plutarch followed the same method of "Parallel Lives," but St. Luke based his parallelism not merely on the comparison and contrast of two eminent historical persons, but also on the original parallelism of the prophecy and its fulfilment.

It seems to follow from these considerations that St. Luke was not entirely bent on following the chronological order of events: it might sometimes have to make way for the prophetic order of fulfilments. And his freedom in point of chronology is just what we are left to infer from his peculiarly loose way of recording marks of time in Acts i.-xii. This looseness has not been understood by some commentators,

¹ *St. Luke the Prophet*, pp. 320 foll. ² See EXPOSITOR for June 1909.

and they have accordingly charged the author with ignorance of his dates. "And in these days" is an expression that occurs often (i. 15, vi. 1, viii. 1 [singular], ix. 37, xi. 27). This seems to be vague. But is it ignorance? Again and again we are left desiderating a definite mark of time. The "conversion" of Saul was subsequent to Stephen's death, but did it precede the "conversion" of Peter? was it subsequent to Philip's preaching at Samaria? These are perhaps questions that cannot be definitely answered. But do they imply ignorance on the author's part? may he be justly charged with carelessness or ignorance in regard to his order generally, if it can be shown, as I venture to think it can, that he had other reasons for grouping his narratives than chronological considerations?

First of all there were geographical considerations, if we may infer anything from (Acts i. 8) the successive widening of the circles of witness—Jerusalem—Judaea—Samaria—the rest of the world. Next, there were biographical considerations, touching the very essence of the Church, more particularly after the untoward disagreement between St. Peter and St. Paul, which St. Luke set himself to reconcile first in person and then in literature.¹ Thirdly, there were also prophetic considerations, for St. Luke was a prophet, most jealous of the traditions and rules of prophecy, and he wished to indicate the successive waves of fulfilment that broke upon the sands of Jewish thought. To one who was thus bound by a threefold duty, to say nothing of a fourth, that of artistic treatment of his subject, it was an indispensable condition of writing that he should have a free hand in point of chronology, without being too rigidly bound by his own profession in the preface to his Gospel, that he would *write in order* (Luke i. 3). To that profession I hold that he was quite true.

¹ See *St. Luke the Prophet*, chapter v.

However, in the case of Acts x., xi., apart from its order, the main argument likely to be advanced is that the "conversion" of St. Peter is a misnomer, because he was converted already, and that since we find traces of his previous "conversion," that is his conviction of the universality of the gospel of Jesus, it is vain to find room for his conversion at such a late time as that which Acts x. and xi. indicate. This contention sounds rather plausible, and may seem to suit two opposite classes of interpreters—the conservative, who resent the idea of St. Peter being converted or needing conversion so late in life, much later than the time when he had accepted Christ; and the critical, who are not sure that the author of Acts quite knows his own subject and has mastered his own authorities.

Let us ask, then, what is meant when earlier in Acts (iv. 11) we find Peter asserting, "This is the stone that was set at nought of you the builders . . . there is no other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved." Here he speaks to the Jewish authorities as "you" and contrasts their view with the universal human need, which he asserts. He has broken with the authorities who rejected Jesus as the Christ. He is persuaded that the name of Jesus is given among men, not among the Jews only, and salvation is open to others besides Jews. And in ii. 39 he had said, "To you is the promise, and to your children, and to all them that are afar off, whomsoever the Lord our God shall call." And this latter saying in his speech at Pentecost could not be chronologically later than the vision at Joppa. Consequently it has been urged that the idea of the admission of the Gentiles to the Covenant of God in Christ was in Peter's mind before his vision, and so the vision was not of cardinal importance.

Now it may be admitted that this conviction was in his mind, and that the Scripture of the old Testament was on his lips to quote, and yet it would not of necessity follow

that he had the resolution of heart and will to apply the full grace of God in practice. The gulf between theory and practice may have required a vision to bridge it. It is one thing to know what holy Scripture has taught concerning the grace of God in Christ, and quite another thing to let it work, especially when the work is all uphill.

But this is not a sufficient explanation, for it does not touch the real practical difficulty, which was of the gravest kind, concerning circumcision. It would be an error to suppose that Peter's speeches in Acts i.-iv. imply that his mind was then open to our modern conceptions of the Christian Church. He had always maintained the ancient requirement of circumcision for every Jew, and there is nothing to show that he ceased to maintain it for every man who confessed Jesus to be the Christ. Of the 3,000 souls at Jerusalem who were baptized after accepting his word (ii. 41), every male had been circumcised and owned the Temple as his place of worship. His hearers were all Jewish, for though in the first portion of his speech (ii. 14) he had included in his address *all dwellers in Jerusalem*, he quickly narrows his audience to *men of Israel* (so iii. 12, 22), and finally to the inner circle of *brethren* (29). God is "the God of *our fathers*" (iii. 13). "*In Abraham's seed* shall all the families of the earth be blessed" — Abraham, to whom God gave the Covenant of circumcision, is represented by his "seed" Jesus (in name identical with Joshua, who circumcised the people), the *prophet* of whom Moses said that "every soul that does not hear him shall be destroyed from the people" (23). Baptism was up to this point of history well known: it was grafted upon circumcision; it coexisted with it; and no man could see that it was ever destined to supersede it. We must be careful not to read into the mouth of the Peter of Acts i.-iv. what we know of his acts and sayings after Acts x. And that is just what in our modern way of thinking we find it difficult

not to do. The law was still the same for all, "Except ye be circumcised after the custom of Moses, ye cannot be saved" (xv. 1). It seems clear, then, that the state of Peter's mind before the vision at Joppa was, by the nature of the case, one of embarrassment in regard to the necessity of circumcision in the near future.

But in the days that preceded and followed the first Christian Pentecost "visions of glory crowded on the soul"—visions associated with the fulfilment of prophecy. One lesson that the risen Lord Himself impressed on the disciples was to enlarge their understanding of prophecy. "Then opened he their minds to understand the Scriptures (Luke xxiv. 45), and He did this by means of the spirit of prophecy which He quickened in them. The Argument from Prophecy, as it has been sometimes called, is the one and only argument on which the Church made headway at the first. The Argument from Prophecy put one and one together (*συνεβιβάζοντες*, Acts xvi. 10), and said, Jesus is the Christ because Moses prophesied of Him as his successor; Jesus is the Christ because the Christ was to be rejected by the builders of the Jewish state, and Jesus has been rejected by them; Jesus is the Christ because Christ was David's son, who could not die, and Jesus fulfils that prophecy: Jesus is the Christ because Christ's time should be marked by particular signs and wonders, and Jesus fulfils those prophecies too. Then, further, the tower of Babel had been a type of confusion of tongues, and it had been followed now by its antitype in the "building of the Palace of the Great King," the Church, with its unification of the language of praise.¹ Then, too, the first Adam had his antitype in the second Adam (1 Cor. xv. 45). The first creation had its antitype in the new creation (Gal. vi. 15). The garden of Eden had its antitype in the Paradise of God,

¹ For a fuller explanation of the Pentecost narrative may I refer the reader to *St. Luke the Prophet*, chapter viii. ?

with its tree of life, whose leaves should heal the Gentiles (Rev. xxii. 2). And the deluge had its antitype in Christian baptism (1 Pet. iii. 21).

Antitype is a term that occurs but twice in the New Testament,—once in 1 Peter iii. 21. It means that of two corresponding events or names, the later one, denoting the “fulfilment,” connotes what is substantially blessed and true; and more, that it restores things back to the original state and recovers the forfeit. Baptism is a *restitution* of the injury done by the Deluge. The Paradise of God *restores* the blessing lost in the first Eden. The new creation in Christ restores the obedience lost by the first Adam. Thus *antitype* is the precise equivalent of what is to us a somewhat incomprehensible term, “restitution”—“the restitution of all things, of which God spake by his holy prophets” (Acts iii. 21). Now if we take 1 Peter iii. 21 along with Peter’s speeches (Acts i.–iv.), we find that the two together throw some of the desired light upon Acts x.

The problem in his mind was concerning Baptism, “which doth now save us.” Was it henceforward to supersede circumcision? To supersede it in a day, absolutely? It is hardly possible for us to realize the immensity of such a revolution of Jewish thought as this, such a breach with the historic past. The fact is we do not attempt to realize what the idea involved. Abraham, Moses, Joshua (Jesus), were identified with God’s ancient covenant, of which circumcision was the proof and token. Let that be removed, and what remained? Did the Argument from Prophecy remain? It had led them to Jesus, but Jesus (Joshua) was seen to be one of the pillars of circumcision when he “rolled away the reproach of Egypt” at Gilgal (Josh. v.). The Argument here would seem to turn back upon itself and be consumed. Then what value remained in the Bible as a record of God’s chosen people? Stephen had paid with his life the price of saying

that "Jesus of Nazareth would change the customs that Moses delivered to us," and it seems most probable that his pointed and powerful speech was cut short by tumult before he could deal at length with Jesus as Moses' successor (vii. 45) in that impatient audience. Did not Stephen's example show that Jewish orthodoxy was as fully determined to champion the custom of Moses as any Jewish reason could be to listen to the Argument from Prophecy? Was there the least hope that the upholders of baptism in place of circumcision would be allowed access to the synagogues? But failing this, was there any prospect of their being able to move the Jews to the Gospel of Jesus? and was there any means whatever within their reach for touching the Gentiles except through the Jews?

All this is mere human reasoning, it is very much *κατὰ ἀνθρώπων*, but it might represent something of what was passing in St. Peter's mind. "His not to reason why, His but to do or die"; so it may truly be said; but reasoning after the event is allowed to the historian, even when reason before it and in it would have been treason in the actor. Marvellous to relate, the revolution of thought did take place by the power and the everlasting purpose of God: the Argument from Prophecy still took effect: circumcision was superseded: and the vision at Joppa was the turning-point in the life of one of the two chief agents.

The solution of the problem lay in the consideration and combination of texts of Holy Writ preparatory to the vision. In other words the vision, like all other visions of the New Testament, was based upon suggestions that came direct from the Old. There are two passages which St. Peter revolved in his mind in order to draw the guidance of revelation from them: the second portion of Isaiah, and the account of Noah's deluge. The impress of the former is strongly shown in both his speeches and his epistle: the

latter has left its mark upon 1 Peter ii., iii., and the vision.

In 1 Peter ii., iii., the underlying thought of Isaiah liii. is obvious and familiar :

- | 1 PETER. | ISAIAH liii. (LXX.). |
|--|---|
| ii. 21. Christ <i>suffered for</i> (ὑπέρ) you. | 4. (my servant) is <i>put to pain for</i> (περὶ) us. |
| iii. 18. Christ <i>suffered</i> (or <i>died</i>) for (περὶ) sins once for all. | 5. He was <i>wounded for</i> (διὰ) our sins. |
| ii. 22. Who <i>did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth.</i> | 8. He was <i>led to death.</i> |
| ii. 24. Who <i>himself bare our sins</i> , that we having died to <i>sins</i> might <i>live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed.</i> | 9. <i>Transgression he did not, nor guile in his mouth.</i> |
| ii. 25. Ye were like <i>sheep going astray</i> , but are now <i>returned to the shepherd and bishop</i> of your souls. | 12. <i>Himself bare the sins of many.</i> |
| | 10. If ye give (?) for <i>sins</i> , our soul shall see a <i>long-lived seed.</i> |
| | 5. <i>By his stripes we were healed.</i> |
| | 6. We all as <i>sheep went astray.</i> |
| | lv. 7. <i>Return unto the Lord.</i> |
| | lx. 17. I will make thy <i>bishops</i> to be in <i>righteousness.</i> |

From these suggestions in the context of Isaiah liii. adopted in 1 Peter we turn to Peter's speech at Cornelius' house, and we find the same train of thought based on the same part of Isaiah.

- | ACTS x. | ISAIAH. |
|--|--|
| 36. <i>preaching the gospel of peace</i> through Jesus Christ. | lii. 7. Of him that <i>preacheth the gospel</i> of the report of <i>peace.</i> |

ACTS x.

38. God *anointed him with the Holy Spirit* and power. Who went about doing good and *healing* . . .
39. and we are *witnesses* of all that he did.
42. He commanded us to *proclaim* . . . to bear *witness* that *this is he*.
43. To him bear all the prophets *witness*, that every one that *believeth* on him shall *receive forgiveness of sins*.

ISAIAH.

- lxi. 1. *The Spirit of the Lord* is upon me, because he *anointed me* to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me *to heal* . . .
- xliii. 10. Become ye my *witnesses* . . . that ye may *believe* and understand that *I am*.
- xliii. 9, 11, 12. Who will *declare* these things? *I am God* . . . and there is *none that saveth beside me* . . . Ye are my *witnesses*.
- lv. 7. Let him *turn unto the Lord*, and he shall *receive* mercy, for he will greatly *forgive your sins*.

But the context in Isaiah (liv. 8) contains a reference to Noah which would not be overlooked by St. Peter: "In a little wrath I turned my face away from thee, but in eternal mercy will I have mercy on thee, saith the Lord who rescued thee. *From the water of the days of Noah* I have this, as I swear unto him at that time, that I would not be angry with the earth any more for thee . . . nor shall the covenant of my peace be removed." Mercy—salvation—water of Noah—baptism: that is the sequence of ideas. And accordingly we find in 1 Peter iii. 20 the reference to "the ark into which few, that is eight, souls (entered and) were carried safely through (destruction) by means of water: which (in your case as) an antitype now saves you—baptism . . ." In this sentence, reading the nominative *ō* we get a far stronger

meaning than by the dative ϕ , and though the grammar is somewhat loose, the looseness seems to be chiefly due to the peculiarity of the thought, which regards *water* first as the destroying type and next as the restoring antitype. If, then, the water of the flood is essentially the same water as that of Baptism, only regarded antitypically, we may expect to be told what "fulfilment" can be found for the Ark. In 1 Peter iii. there seems to be none, for it would be a strangely forced interpretation to say that the fulfilment was "the good conscience," in the abstract. But now if we turn to the very brief account of the vision at Joppa, we shall see that the "vessel as it were a great *sheet* ($\delta\theta\acute{o}\nu\eta$ —could not this term for a linen cerecloth (see above) remind Peter of the empty tomb, as though 'we were *buried with him by baptism into death* Rom. vi. 4, Col. ii. 12, and raised through faith in God who raised him from the dead'?) let down by *four corners* upon the earth, in which were found all *the four-footed things and creeping things of the earth and fowls of heaven*," is in fact the fulfilment of the Ark.

There is also perhaps a reminiscence of Genesis ii. 10, "And a river proceedeth forth out of Eden to water Paradise: thence it divideth into *four corners*" ($\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\alpha\rho\alpha\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$). For the previous words to these deal with the tree of knowledge of good and evil ($\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\iota\ \gamma\iota\nu\omega\sigma\tau\acute{o}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \pi\omicron\nu\eta\rho\acute{o}\upsilon$ —a singular expression for "knowing intuitively what can be known experimentally of good and evil"), which, as it happens, offers some slight resemblance to the expression in 1 Peter iii., the interrogation of a good conscience towards God ($\acute{\alpha}\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{\eta}\varsigma\ \sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$).

The Ark was a black vessel, (Gen. vi. 14), the sheet was white, the Ark contained representatives of *all animal life*, described in Genesis a dozen times over in nearly the same terms as the contents of the sheet. The Ark was a *vessel* ($\sigma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$) not precisely as we speak of a seagoing vessel, but

as anything fashioned or *prepared* (κατασκευαζομένης, 1 Peter iii. 20) is a vessel. St. Paul, after his conversion, is a "vessel of election" for God's purpose (Acts ix. 15). Noah no sooner left the Ark than he built an altar of *sacrifice* (θυσιαστήριον): so was Peter commanded to arise and *eat after sacrifice* (θῦσον καὶ φάγε). The four corners of the sheet be-token the four quarters, the furthest ends of the earth; but in the same context of Isaiah (lii. 10) we read, "*all corners of the earth* (πάντα ἄκρα τῆς γῆς) shall see the salvation that cometh from our God." And (liv. 2), "broaden the place of thy tabernacle and of thy *curtains* . . . spare not, lengthen thy cords." And his reply, "Never did I eat *anything common and unclean*," is based upon the verse (lii. 11), "Stand off, stand off, come forth thence, and *touch not the unclean* (ἀκαθάρτου), come forth from the midst of her, be ye *separate*, ye that *bear the vessels of the Lord* (ἀφορίσθητε οἱ φέροντες τὰ σκεύη κυρίου)," where St. Peter would probably interpret "vessels" as "bodies sanctified to the Lord": see Barnabas Ep. 21. There is a bitter reminder of this in St. Paul's own later language (Gal. ii. 12) concerning Peter's conduct at Antioch, "he *separated, fearing them of the circumcision*. The text from Isaiah lii. 11 is exactly that which Peter would probably have pleaded in his own excuse. The sheet descended *thrice*, and this cannot fail to recall the sending of the dove from the Ark *thrice*.

Here it may be mentioned that the association of the dove with the baptism of Jesus rests entirely on the "fulfilment" of the water of the deluge in that of baptism as the anti-type.¹ *The dove is Noah's dove*. It has no direct relation to the Holy Spirit, but only to baptism, as the antitype of the deluge. There is perhaps no passage in which the commentators have to this day laboured so heavily at sea, as

¹ For the import of the words "as it were a dove," see *St. Luke the Prophet*, p. 301.

this of the appearance of the dove in the Baptism. They have failed to put the dove in her proper relation to the Holy Spirit because they have not observed her relation to Noah's Ark; and that is because they have not observed the relation of baptism to the deluge, as understood by the Christian Prophets,—a relation that St. Luke and St. Peter did not labour because, being themselves identified with the prophet's point of view,¹ they took it for granted as known to their contemporary readers. At least St. Luke was concerned to supply the needs of Theophilus.² We have no right to exact of him the satisfaction of all the needs of the twentieth century.

One modern commentator, speaking of the Spirit employing form, says: "The tongues were appropriate when the Spirit was given by measure to many. The dove was appropriate when the Spirit was given in His fulness to one." This observation had been previously made by the Neuchatel commentator, the late F. Godet, who says: "The *fertilising and preserving incubation* of the dove is an *admirable* type of the life-giving energy whereby the Holy Spirit develops in the human soul the germs of a new life." Comment on such a comment is needless.³

The time will come at length when commentators will see that *appropriateness* is non-existent when things are not related to each other. It rests upon the *ipse dixit* of the commentator. Meanwhile we hardly need to be content

¹ This point of view was almost entirely lost by the time of Tertullian, who does, however, retain a sense of the ancient type (*præcedentis figuræ*) of the water of the deluge (*de Bapt.* 8).

² Zahn, *Eintl.*, ii. § 60.

³ Not less unfortunate is the reference made by some commentators to Philo (*Quis rer. div. hæc.* 25, 48), who carefully distinguishes the allegorical meanings of the *περιστέρα*, "the tame and gregarious pigeon," and the *τρογών*, "the solitary turtledove." The Gospels and Gen. ix. all speak of the pigeon, which to Philo symbolises human wisdom, while the turtledove is divine, "the word (or reason) of God."

with the explanation that a sheet was appropriate to the vision at Joppa.

Moreover, that the appearance of the dove at the Baptism of Jesus is the appearance in a trance is evident from the introductory words, "the heaven was opened," preceding the visible portion and the audible portion of the revelation : and here the resemblance to Acts x. is of the closest kind. St. Luke knew very well what he was describing. The *praying—heaven opened—a voice—an object descending*—nothing can possibly be gained by obscuring these common features of the two narratives, one of which, the Petrine, is definitely called a trance. Nor would any apology or defence be needed on behalf of that which is seen and heard in a trance, as it would be if "the Spirit employed form." We may compare the frequent alternation of "I saw" and "I heard" as the expressions descriptive of the state of trance in Revelation vi. 1, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12—to mention only one chapter of that book.

Lastly, to return to Acts, it is observable that not only is the vision at Joppa the prelude to the (Acts x. 48) baptism at Caesarea in the name of Jesus Christ, but the language of God's blessing to Noah and his sons, "*Grow and multiply*" is exactly reproduced in "The word of God *grew and multiplied* (Acts xii. 24), following on the slightly different formula, "The word of God *grew and* the number of the disciples *multiplied* in Jerusalem greatly" (vi. 7.) The connexion with baptism is implied in each case, as it is in ii. 41, 38. Once more the sequel of baptism is the "fulfilment" of the sequel of the Deluge.

E. C. SELWYN.