

While the limits within which each summary has been placed have been fixed on independent grounds without any regard to the requirements of a hypothetical scheme such as this, it may fairly be claimed that the strikingly symmetrical result arrived at lends a little additional weight to the arguments that have led to it. Further, the acceptance of the scheme adds one more to the reasons which already are usually given for regarding the somewhat strange termination of Acts as intentional on the author's part and not accidental. It still leaves open the possibilities that Luke finished the book shortly after the termination of Paul's two years at Rome, and that he intended to write a third work recounting later events; but it excludes the theory that the original ending of Acts is lost. As the book stands, it tells the story of a period that lasted a little over thirty years—the same interval, it may be remarked, as is covered by the author's earlier work on the life of Jesus.¹

C. J. CADOUX.

'THE LORD'S COMMAND TO BAPTIZE.'

IN the JOURNAL for July 1905 (vi 480 ff) and January 1907 (viii 161 ff) Dr Chase argued very cogently for the translation rather than the transliteration of the word βαπτίζεν. He shewed that to the Jewish apostles the word 'baptize' would carry with it no such restriction in meaning as it does for us, with whom the word has no other use in the language but to denote the sacrament of baptism. It would describe the common actions of everyday life—bathing, dipping, immersing, washing, plunging, with the additional notion of purification. The Syriac and Egyptian versions translated it: so did Tertullian always (I think), and Cyprian sometimes.

In support of this contention I should like to add that even the Latin *baptizare* was sometimes used in the strict sense of immersion, e. g. in the *Egyptian Church Order*, which is now believed to reflect the use of the Roman Church in the time of Hippolytus and to belong to the early decades of the third century. The method of baptism is described (*Texts and Studies* viii 4. 185). The candidate is asked 'Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty?' He answers 'Credo', and the presbyter immerses him once (*baptizet semel*). He is then asked 'Dost thou believe in Christ Jesus, Son of God . . . ?' And answering 'Credo',

¹ Lk. iii 23, iv 19: for the view that Luke regarded the ministry of Jesus as lasting a single year, see Turner in *HDB* i 407 a.

iterum baptizetur. Similarly, on replying to the third interrogation as to his belief in the Holy Spirit, the holy Church, and the resurrection of the flesh, for the third time he is immersed (*tertia vice baptizetur*). Here, obviously, one cannot transliterate, for that would involve a triple repetition of the sacrament: we must translate.

To the interesting note on the passive form of the verb employed in the ritual words in the Eastern rite of baptism (*J. T. S.* vi 506) there may now be added from Narsai *Hom.* xxi (C) 'Such an one is baptized in the Name of the Father and the Son and the Spirit. And he does not say "I baptize", but "is baptized"; for it is not he that baptizes, but the power that is set in the Names. The Names give forgiveness of iniquity, not a man, and they sow new life in mortality. In their Name he that is baptized is baptized (and buried) as in a tomb; and they call and raise him up from his death' (*Texts and Studies* viii 1. 51; compare similar language on the 'signing', page 44).

T. HERBERT BINDLEY.

NOTES ON THE LATIN WRITINGS OF ST PATRICK.

It is usually held that St Patrick was a man of little or no literary culture. In his valuable monograph on the saint, Prof. Bury tells us (*Life of St Patrick*, 1905, p. 206) that 'his Latin is as "rustic" as the Greek of St Mark and St Matthew. He was a *homo unius libri*; but with that book, the Christian Scriptures, he was extraordinarily familiar. His writings are crowded with Scriptural sentences and phrases, most of them probably quoted from memory.' The same statement is made by Dr Gwynn (*The Book of Armagh*, 1913, p. lxxxix): 'The Latin Bible was not improbably the only Latin book with which he was familiar'; and similar views have been expressed by Dottin (*Les Livres de Saint Patrice*, Paris, 1908, p. 11) and other writers.

I find it difficult to believe that a man who had spent many years studying at Lérins and at Auxerre (Bury, *op. cit.*, pp. 294, 296, 338) should have been so ignorant as to have read only one book, and Dr F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock is evidently of the same opinion, for he has attempted to prove (*Hermathena*, vol. xiv, no. 32, 1906, pp. 168-182; *Irenaeus of Lugdunum*, 1914, pp. 348-356; *St Patrick and his Gallic Friends*, 1916, p. 138) that Patrick in his 'Confession' and 'Epistle' was influenced in the matter of creed-like expressions, biblical quotations, and style, not only by the Latin translation of the treatise

While the limits within which each summary has been placed have been fixed on independent grounds without any regard to the requirements of a hypothetical scheme such as this, it may fairly be claimed that the strikingly symmetrical result arrived at lends a little additional weight to the arguments that have led to it. Further, the acceptance of the scheme adds one more to the reasons which already are usually given for regarding the somewhat strange termination of Acts as intentional on the author's part and not accidental. It still leaves open the possibilities that Luke finished the book shortly after the termination of Paul's two years at Rome, and that he intended to write a third work recounting later events; but it excludes the theory that the original ending of Acts is lost. As the book stands, it tells the story of a period that lasted a little over thirty years—the same interval, it may be remarked, as is covered by the author's earlier work on the life of Jesus.¹

C. J. CADOUX.

'THE LORD'S COMMAND TO BAPTIZE.'

IN the JOURNAL for July 1905 (vi 480 ff) and January 1907 (viii 161 ff) Dr Chase argued very cogently for the translation rather than the transliteration of the word βαπτίζω. He shewed that to the Jewish apostles the word 'baptize' would carry with it no such restriction in meaning as it does for us, with whom the word has no other use in the language but to denote the sacrament of baptism. It would describe the common actions of everyday life—bathing, dipping, immersing, washing, plunging, with the additional notion of purification. The Syriac and Egyptian versions translated it: so did Tertullian always (I think), and Cyprian sometimes.

In support of this contention I should like to add that even the Latin *baptizare* was sometimes used in the strict sense of immersion, e. g. in the *Egyptian Church Order*, which is now believed to reflect the use of the Roman Church in the time of Hippolytus and to belong to the early decades of the third century. The method of baptism is described (*Texts and Studies* viii 4. 185). The candidate is asked 'Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty?' He answers 'Credo', and the presbyter immerses him once (*baptizet semel*). He is then asked 'Dost thou believe in Christ Jesus, Son of God . . .?' And answering 'Credo',

¹ Lk. iii 23, iv 19: for the view that Luke regarded the ministry of Jesus as lasting a single year, see Turner in *HDB* i 407 a.