# 'IN THE NAME.'

IN the last number[1] of this JOURNAL attention has been drawn to our Lord's command to baptize, as it is recorded in the closing verses of St Matthew's Gospel. The authenticity of the clause *βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος* has been ably and, as it seems to me, adequately defended against the suspicion cast upon it by reason of certain textual phenomena recently observed in the writings of Eusebius and some other authors. At the same time a new rendering of the familiar words has been offered to us, as conveying more precisely the spiritual significance of the rite which they enjoin. The new version is this: 'Immersing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' In developing this part of his essay the writer cites and challenges a closely compressed statement in an article of mine in a Bible Dictionary, and therefore it is probable that both he and others will expect that I should offer some reply. It would be the easiest course, and perhaps from the controversial point of view the most effective, to examine in detail the arguments by which Dr Chase supports the new interpretation, which is in manifest conflict with the traditional rendering which I believe to be correct. In this way the ground might be cleared for a fuller statement of my own view, together with a consideration of the objections alleged against it. But in the interval between the writing of his article and its publication, the Norrisian Professor has been summoned to leave his chair for a higher office in the Church; and it would be ungracious in any one, and above all in a personal friend, to meet a challenge written in other circumstances by a counter-challenge, even though it were equally courteous and friendly, at a time when new responsibilities must naturally preclude the possibility of a careful reply. The

[1] This was written in September, 1905.

question, however, of the true rendering and interpretation of these solemn words is of so great importance, that I feel bound to take this opportunity of stating the argument in favour of the current version in a more adequate form than was possible in the brief summary to which reference has been made. I hope that I may succeed in doing this without the appearance of a controversial method, even though alternative views may demand a passing consideration.

The summarized argument in the article on 'Baptism' in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* is so short that I may be allowed to repeat it here as the starting-point of my discussion.

*In the Name*, not 'into the name'. Although εἰς is the preposition most frequently used, we find ἐν in Acts ii 38, x 48; and the interchangeability of the two prepositions in late Greek may be plentifully illustrated from the N. T. Moreover, the expression is a Hebraism; cp. ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Matt. xxi 9 (=Ps. cxviii 26 בְּשֵׁם); so in the baptismal formula of Matt. xxviii 19 the Syriac version has ܒܫܡ (Lat. *in nomine*).

The argument here summarized is twofold: it is based, first, on the meaning of the Greek preposition in such a connexion; and secondly, on the recognition that we are here dealing with a Semitic idiom and not with a native Greek idea. Each of these points will need to be developed presently; but they cannot be satisfactorily dealt with until we have first considered the meaning and usage of the verb βαπτίζειν.

No one will question the use in general Greek literature of βαπτίζειν in the sense of 'to dip' or 'to immerse', followed by either εἰς or ἐν of the element of immersion. Here, however, we are concerned solely with the use of the word in connexion with religious rites. Already in some of the later books of the Septuagint we find it employed of cleansing by water, and in the special sense of ceremonial purification. When we come to the New Testament we find that it has no other than a ceremonial sense or a sense derived by metaphor from the commonly received ceremonial sense. The Judaism of our Lord's day had its βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων καὶ ξεστῶν καὶ χαλκίων (Mark vii 4); that is to say, ceremonial washings of vessels. In this use of βαπτισμός the notion of immersion has practically disappeared before that

of ritual cleansing; and even if we do not accept the additional item *καὶ κλινῶν*, which in some MSS is appended to the list, yet the gloss testifies to a sense of *βαπτισμός* incompatible with actual immersion. If in the same context we prefer to read *καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ ῥαντίσωνται οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν*, rejecting the alternative *βαπτίσωνται*, yet the existence of the alternative once again illustrates the change which had passed over the meaning of *βαπτίζειν*. In St Luke's Gospel we find a still more striking example of this change, in a passage in which the passive of the verb is used to express the ordinary hand-washing preparatory to a meal. The Pharisee who invited our Lord to his table *ἐθαύμασεν ὅτι οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου* (Luke xi 38). Such a sentence could not have been written until the verb *βαπτίζειν* had ceased in common parlance to connote immersion; until, in other words, the idea of ceremonial ablution had become paramount.

This use of the word by the first Christian writers in their description of Jewish observances is very instructive. For the ceremony of baptism, or the symbolic purification by water as a release from moral or ritual pollution, was not originated by Christianity. Even John's baptism, which was the immediate antecedent of the Christian institution, was not new in its idea, but only in its application. The Jews had baptized their proselytes; John had baptized the Jews themselves, and had lifted baptism out of the region of distinctions between ritual cleanness and defilement and made it the symbol of release from moral guilt. Yet the word used both for John's baptism and for the yet loftier rite of Christian initiation was a word borrowed from Jewish religious usage, a word which a Christian could still use to express the ritual cleansings of contemporary Judaism. In the light of this fact it seems to me that we cannot securely argue from the employment of the word *βαπτίζειν* that even John practised baptism by the method of complete immersion. It is possible that he did so; it is also possible that water was poured over the penitent as he stood in the stream: the word *βαπτίζειν* does not help to decide between these alternatives; for 'washing' or 'cleansing', and not 'immersion', was the idea which it of necessity suggested to the writers of our narratives of his mission. I do not wish to deny that John's baptism was

a baptism by complete immersion, or that the early Christians may have commonly used a like ceremony. I only desire to make it clear that the word *βαπτίζειν*, while perfectly appropriate to such a method, did not at that time of itself suggest immersion, but was equally applicable to more partial washings of a ceremonial nature.

I maintain, therefore, that in the language of the Gospels, and, I may add, in New Testament usage generally, *βαπτίζειν* has lost its earlier signification of 'dipping' or 'immersing'—a signification which still naturally attaches to the cognate verb *βάπτειν*[1]—and has acquired the new religious signification of 'ceremonially cleansing by water'. In a few passages a further developement may be noted, when the word is metaphorically used of 'cleansing by the Spirit' or 'by fire': in these cases it would seem obvious that the idea of 'immersion' has entirely disappeared.

If my contention is a true one, it will result that *βαπτίζειν*, as meaning 'to cleanse ceremonially by water', cannot ordinarily be followed by the preposition *εἰς* in the sense of 'into'. John the Baptist is spoken of as baptizing *εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν*: but in this phrase the preposition denotes the end in view, 'for remission of sins'. In Mark i 9 we find the words *ἐβαπτίσθη εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην*. We have here an example of the interchangeability of the prepositions *εἰς* and *ἐν*, which is a common phenomenon of the later Greek[2]. The same writer a few verses before (Mark i 5) has written *ἐβαπτίζοντο ὑπ' αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ ποταμῷ*. In either case the meaning is 'baptized in Jordan'. In Acts xix 3 St Paul asks the question *Εἰς τί οὖν ἐβαπτίσθητε*; and received the answer *Εἰς τὸ Ἰωάνου βάπτισμα*. It is most natural to suppose that the

[1] Luke xvi 24 *ἵνα βάψῃ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ δακτύλου αὐτοῦ*, John xiii 26 *βάψας τὸ ψωμίον*, Rev. xix 13 *ἱμάτιον βεβαμμένον αἵματι*.

[2] I need hardly undertake the defence of the phrase 'the interchangeability of the prepositions in late Greek'. At one time *ἐν* with the dative was very commonly used after verbs of motion, and *εἰς* with the accusative after verbs of rest. In modern Greek *ἐν* has disappeared except in a few privileged phrases, and *εἰς* with the accusative has taken its place. For the illustration of this interchange in the N.T. I may refer to Blass *Grammatik des NTlichen Griechisch* pp. 119 ff, 127 (§ 39, 3 f; § 41). See also a passing *dictum* of Field *Notes on N. T. Translation* p. 5 (Matt. v 22), 'since *εἰς* is perpetually interchanged with *ἐν*': he cites in a footnote Matt. v 35 (*μὴ ὀμόσαι*) *ἐν τῇ γῇ . . . μήτε εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα*, and Luke iv 44 'He preached in the synagogues (*εἰς τὰς σ.*)'.

preposition has the same meaning in the question as in the answer, and to render it by the word 'unto'.

But while Christian baptism, like that of the Baptist, started with the conception of the washing away of the sins of the past, it superadded a further conception which was wholly its own. It had a positive as well as a negative result. The cancelling of the past was the prelude to a higher life. Baptism, in words which are familiar to us all, was not only 'a death unto sin', but also 'a new birth unto righteousness'. Moreover, it was from the outset ordained as the method of enrolling disciples. This is plain from the context of the words which we are at present discussing: *πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς κ.τ.λ.* Thus Christian baptism added to the conception of purification from past sins the idea of initiation into a society or fellowship, based on discipleship to Christ. Hence it became possible to speak of a person as 'baptized into' the Christian society or fellowship: in other words, as 'entered by baptism into' that society. A parallel example of a modification of phraseology is offered by the curious English phrase 'to be sworn in'; that is, to be 'entered by oath' as the member of an organization. It is not the act considered in itself, but the act considered in its result, whether of privilege or of obligation, that produces in either case the unexpected phraseological combination. When Christian baptism is viewed, not merely in its primary signification of a cleansing from sin by a ceremonial washing with water, but also, and specially, as the rite of initiation into the society of Christian discipleship, then the verb *βαπτίζειν* has gained a further meaning which enables it to avail itself of new constructions, as for example in the important phrase *εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἡμεῖς πάντες ἐβαπτίσθημεν.*

We have accordingly traced a series of stages in the history of the word *βαπτίζειν*:—

(1) 'to dip' or 'immerse'; (and, metaphorically, in such phrases as 'to drown in misery', 'to overwhelm in ruin');

(2) as a religious term, 'to cleanse ceremonially by water', the idea of 'immersion' passing into the background, and then disappearing altogether, so that in New Testament times the word can be used of the ritual washing of the hands as practised

by the later Judaism; (also, metaphorically, to express 'cleansing by the Spirit' and 'by fire');

(3) of the Christian sacrament of baptism, which is not only a cleansing by water from past sins, but also a rite of initiation into the Christian society; so that it is possible to speak of a person as having been 'baptized into' the one Body of Christ, and further, as we shall see presently, 'baptized into' Christ.

We may now pass on to consider the meaning of St Matthew's phrase *βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα κ.τ.λ.* Following the recognized principle that the interpretation of a writer should first be sought in his use of language in other passages of his own writing, we begin by asking what constructions St Matthew employs to express the idea of 'in the name'.

First, we observe that the common phrase *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* and the less usual phrase *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι* are not used by this author, except in passages which he has embodied from the works of other writers[1].

Next, we find in Matt. vii 22, in a passage which has a partial resemblance to Luke xiii 25, the following words which are peculiar to St Matthew: *κύριε, κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι ἐπροφητεύσαμεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν*; With the verb *προφητεύειν* we should certainly have expected the construction *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*, corresponding with the Hebrew בְּשֵׁם[2]. With the other clauses we may compare Mark ix 38 f, *εἴδαμέν τινα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου ἐκβάλλοντα δαιμόνια . . . ὃς ποιήσει δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου*, and other similar passages. In all three clauses St Matthew prefers the construction *τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι*. We may compare his quotation (xii 21) of Isaiah xlii 4 in the form *καὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν* (LXX *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι*).

Lastly, there are three passages, all peculiar to St Matthew, which contain the phrase *εἰς (τὸ) ὄνομα*.

(1) Matt. x 41 f, *Ὁ δεχόμενος προφήτην εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου μισθὸν*

[1] Thus *ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου* in Matt. xxi 9 is from Mark xi 9, and in Matt. xxiii 39 it is from the source used also in Luke xiii 35: *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου* in Matt. xviii 5 is from Mark ix 37, and in Matt. xxiv 5 it is from Mark xiii 6.

[2] In Westcott & Hort's edition the words are regarded as based on Jer. xiv 14, xxvii 15.

προφήτου λήμψεται, καὶ ὁ δεχόμενος δίκαιον εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου μισθὸν δικαίου λήμψεται· καὶ ὃς ἂν ποτίσῃ ἕνα τῶν μικρῶν τούτων ποτήριον ψυχροῦ μόνον εἰς ὄνομα μαθητοῦ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ. Here we can hardly translate εἰς ὄνομα προφήτου and εἰς ὄνομα δικαίου otherwise than 'in the name of a prophet' and 'in the name of a righteous man'. And we are confirmed in so rendering the words when we observe that the remainder of the passage appears to be an adaptation of Mark ix 41, ὃς γὰρ ἂν ποτίσῃ ὑμᾶς ποτήριον ὕδατος ἐν ὀνόματι ὅτι Χριστοῦ ἐστέ, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ ἀπολέσῃ τὸν μισθὸν αὐτοῦ. It would seem that St Matthew preferred the simpler phrase 'in the name of a disciple' to St Mark's phrase 'in the name that ye are Christ's'; and also that he preferred to say εἰς ὄνομα rather than ἐν ὀνόματι.

(2) Matt. xviii 20, οὗ γάρ εἰσιν δύο ἢ τρεῖς συνηγμένοι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα, ἐκεῖ εἰμὶ ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν. With the former example of St Matthew's usage before us, we need feel no hesitation in accepting the familiar rendering of these words, 'where two or three are gathered together in my name'.

(3) The third passage is that which is now under discussion, Matt. xxviii 20, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Why should we not here also render εἰς τὸ ὄνομα as 'in the name'? It must at least be admitted that there is a strong *prima facie* case in favour of this translation[1].

[1] It has been suggested by more than one recent writer that the lost ending of St Mark's Gospel contained an account of our Lord's promised meeting with His disciples in Galilee, and that this was the source whence St Matthew drew the great missionary charge and the command to baptize. If this be the case—and there is much to be said in its favour—we must nevertheless be on our guard against supposing that St Matthew would be likely to embody this final charge in the exact phraseology of St Mark. The analogy of the rest of his Gospel points to the probability that he would modify St Mark's language considerably by the introduction of phrases of his own. As a matter of fact we find in these verses more than one expression which has a parallel in other passages which are peculiar to his Gospel. Thus the collocation ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς occurs in a peculiar portion of St Matthew's version of the Lord's Prayer (vi 10); and the phrase ἡ συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος is also peculiar to his Gospel. Supposing therefore that St Mark had recorded a command to baptize, whether in the triple Name or in the name of Christ, we may not assume that he would have used the construction εἰς τὸ ὄνομα which is not found elsewhere in his Gospel: we should rather assume that he used the construction with ἐν, and that St Matthew had here also preferred the alternative construction with εἰς.

We find further support for the view that the two constructions, *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι* and *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, are identical in meaning, when we turn to the Acts of the Apostles. The following four passages speak for themselves:—

Acts ii 38, *Μετανοήσατε, καὶ βαπτισθήτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν.*

Acts viii 16, *Μόνον δὲ βεβαπτισμένοι ὑπῆρχον εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.*

Acts x 48, *Προσέταξεν δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ βαπτισθῆναι.*

Acts xix 5, *Ἀκούσαντες δὲ ἐβαπτίσθησαν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.*

Here at any rate there can be no doubt that *βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* is synonymous with *βαπτίζειν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*.

We have one further example of *βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* in St Paul's opening appeal to the Corinthian Church. The names of Paul, Apollos, Cephas, even of Christ Himself, had been used as the badges of party difference. Had the Christ then been broken into fragments? Had Paul taken His place on the cross, or as the Name of their baptism? *Μὴ Παῦλος ἐσταυρώθη ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ἢ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Παύλου ἐβαπτίσθητε*; He was thankful that he himself had so seldom administered the rite—*ἵνα μή τις εἴπῃ ὅτι εἰς τὸ ἐμὸν ὄνομα ἐβαπτίσθητε* (1 Cor. i 13 ff). In reading the earlier verses of this chapter it is impossible not to observe the frequency of the Apostle's references to our Lord, and the accumulation of His titles. In *vv.* 1–9, besides *Ἰησοῦς Χριστός* or *Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς* (three times) we have *v.* 2, *σὺν πᾶσιν τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν*, *v.* 3, *κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *v.* 7, *τὴν ἀποκάλυψιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *v.* 8, *ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, *v.* 9, *ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν*. This unusual iteration is explained when we read the next verse with its appeal for unity based on the sacred Name: *Παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. The name of the Lord Jesus Christ was the symbol of their fellowship. This name, and not the name of Paul, was the name in which they had been baptized.

If we may now be allowed to assume that there is no reason to reject on philological grounds the traditional rendering of

*βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸ ὄνομα* as 'baptizing them in the name', we may proceed to make some enquiry as to the theological significance of the relation thus indicated between baptism and the divine Name.

First, let us observe certain passages in which the primary meaning of baptism, that of cleansing from the sin of the past, is predominant. In St Paul's account of his conversion as given by St Luke in Acts xxii we read (*v.* 16), *καὶ νῦν τί μέλλεις; ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι καὶ ἀπόλουσαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας σου ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ.* Here is the simplest possible description of baptism, as a release from past guilt by means of a sacramental rite consisting of (*a*) ceremonial washing with water and (*b*) an invocation of the divine Name. It is instructive to compare with it 1 Cor. vi 11, *καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε· ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.* Though the word baptism is not used, the rite is clearly referred to. It is a cleansing from past guilt and a consecration for the future—a hallowing in the holy Name. The same combination of cleansing and hallowing is expressed in Eph. v 25, *ἵνα αὐτὴν ἁγιάσῃ καθαρίσας τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι.* The 'word' which is here brought into connexion with 'the washing of water' is, according to the most probable interpretation, the same confession or invocation of the divine Name to which reference is made in Rom. x 9, *ἐὰν ὁμολογήσῃς τὸ ῥῆμα ἐν τῷ στόματί σου ὅτι* κυριος ιησους (cf. 1 Cor. xii 3). It would seem as though from the earliest days baptism was accompanied by a confession of the Name on the part of the baptized as well as by an invocation of the Name on the part of the baptizer. The interrogatory creed and the triple formula of baptism still represent to us at the present day this twofold conjunction of the Name with the symbolic cleansing by water.

The relation thus established between the baptized person and the name of the Lord Jesus brought with it a permanent obligation. He had confessed a new Master; he had been admitted a disciple 'in His name'. With the privileges of discipleship he had accepted also its responsibilities: he was to do all things henceforth 'in His name': *πᾶν ὅτι ἐὰν ποιῆτε ἐν λόγῳ ἢ ἐν ἔργῳ, πάντα ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου Ἰησοῦ* (Col. iii 17).

Here there is a simple and perfectly intelligible explanation, derived from the New Testament itself, of the expression 'baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus'. There is nothing subtle or abstruse in this interpretation; and whatever further meaning we may be justified in finding in the phrase, this at least must not be excluded or neglected.

When, however, we return to the fuller formula of St Matthew's Gospel, we are bound to recognize the fact that Western Christendom has seen in the command to baptize 'in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' a solemn authorization of the Church to act in the divine Name in conferring the sacrament of baptism. On the analogy of baptism she has employed the same words in connexion with other sacred acts, such as the conferring of holy orders and of absolution. The sense in which she has used them cannot be more vividly explained than by recalling our own formula of absolution in the Order for the Visitation of the Sick: 'Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' Are we right, if we exclude from the scope of Matt. xxviii 19 the similar meaning with which the Church has been accustomed to say, 'I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost'?

The command to baptize in St Matthew's Gospel is made to rest on the fact that 'all power (*or* authority) in heaven and on earth' has been committed to the Risen Lord. On this ground is based the great commission to make disciples by baptism, and to teach them to observe the commands of Him who thus becomes their recognized Lord. The supreme authority of the Risen Christ is the authorization of His Church to act in the Name of the Supreme, who is now fully manifested, or soon to be fully manifested, as the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost: and ever behind them in their exercise of this delegated authority, in their use of the Supreme Name, is the promised presence of the Lord Himself. Read in their context, then, the words may fairly be held to justify the use which has so commonly been made of

them, as connoting the fullest authority in the performance of the most sacred acts [1].

Moreover, not only do the words 'in the Name', when thus employed, suggest that the user of the divine Name is in some way a representative of the divine Being whose Name he is permitted to use: they have also, or at least in the early days they undoubtedly had, a further significance. The Name of God among the Jews was a thing of dread, an instrument of awful power. That such divine power could be brought into play by the use of the Name of the Lord Jesus was clearly the belief of the early Christians. We need not go beyond the Acts of the Apostles for ample evidence of this. St Peter says to the lame man, 'In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, walk': and he explains to the multitude that 'His name hath strengthened' the man (*ἐστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ*). Later, when he is asked 'In what power or in what name did ye this?' he replies that it was 'in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth', and he adds the familiar words, *οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι.* In the issue their adversaries can do no more than charge them with threatenings *μηκέτι λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τούτῳ μηδενὶ ἀνθρώπων.* The power of the Name they cannot deny; all they can hope is that they may deter them from uttering it: *καὶ καλέσαντες αὐτοὺς παρήγγειλαν καθόλου μὴ φθέγγεσθαι μηδὲ διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ.* When on a subsequent occasion they were beaten for their disobedience, and again commanded *μὴ λαλεῖν ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ* (v 40 f), they departed rejoicing 'that they had been counted worthy to suffer dishonour on behalf of the Name' (*ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀτιμασθῆναι*).

An equally striking illustration of this mode of thought is to be seen in Acts xix 13 ff. Certain Jews at Ephesus, discovering the virtue which the Christians found in the Name of the Lord Jesus, attempted to use it in their own exorcisms: *ἐπεχείρησαν . . .*

[1] The Jew was familiar with the thought of the setting of the divine Name upon persons for their hallowing or benediction. The words of the Aaronic blessing in Num. vi are followed by the command: 'And they shall put my name upon the children of Israel, and I will bless them'. This conception permanently survives in the solemn enunciation of the Threefold Name in the liturgical benediction, 'The blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost . . .'

ὀνομάζειν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἔχοντας τὰ πνεύματα τὰ πονηρὰ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ, λέγοντες Ὁρκίζω ὑμᾶς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν Παῦλος κηρύσσει. This unauthorized use of the Name was attended by condign punishment. Both Jews and Greeks were struck with terror when they heard of the event; and the result is described in the significant words, καὶ ἐμεγαλύνετο τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ.

These examples are enough to shew that, according to the conceptions which prevailed in the earliest times, those who were authorized to use 'the Name' were regarded as having at their disposal the supernatural power of the Being whom they so named. The idea was easily capable of abuse in the direction of magical superstition; but we must not on that account hastily discard it. It was part of the inheritance which early Christianity received from Judaism; and we need to recognize the truth that underlies it, if we are to understand the full value of the expression with which we are at present concerned.

To sum up the results which we have now reached: (1) A confession of faith in the Name was a preliminary of baptism: an invocation of the Name was an essential part of the ceremony. The baptized person accepted a new Master: he received remission of sins through His Name: he was 'washed, sanctified, justified' in His Name: he was henceforth to 'do all things' in His Name. This is a plain statement in New Testament language, of the relation established between the baptized person and the Name in which he was baptized[1].

But (2) a consideration of the context of the baptismal commission in Matt. xxviii 19, and also of the conceptions which Jewish thought had come to attach to the use of the divine Name (conceptions shared by early Christian teachers), seems to urge us a step further. In pursuance of the commission to

[1] As regards the relation established between the baptized person and the divine Name, we may add that according to Hebrew ideas the invocation of the divine Name by a person on his own behalf, or by another for him, involved the twofold result, (1) that he was thereby placed under the divine protection, and (2) that he received a divine consecration which brought with it a perpetual obligation. While on the one hand the Name of God was his defence, on the other hand he incurred the gravest responsibility if by his action the Name of God was brought into contempt. This latter idea finds illustration when St James, speaking of the rich men in the Christian congregation, says: οὐκ αὐτοὶ βλασφημοῦσιν τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς;

make disciples by baptizing in the Threefold Name, the baptizer acted authoritatively in that Name: he had a right to invoke the Name, and to bring into play the power which accompanied the naming of the Name. This thought is not exclusive of the former: it comes naturally into view when we regard the act from the point of view of the baptizer, as before we regarded it from the point of view of the baptized.

It may well be that with these suggestions we have not yet exhausted the meaning of the great words which we have been considering; but enough, I hope, has been said to shew that what appears to be the most natural translation of the Greek is capable of reasonable and adequate interpretation, if we approach it in the light of the prevalent conceptions of the earliest age.

There are a few examples in St Paul's epistles of the construction *βαπτίζειν εἰς* which ought to be considered, however briefly, in this connexion, although the word *ὄνομα* does not enter into the combination.

In two important passages St Paul uses the expression *βαπτισθῆναι εἰς Χριστόν*. In Gal. iii 26 ff we read: *Πάντες γὰρ υἱοὶ θεοῦ ἐστὲ διὰ τῆς πίστεως ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· ὅσοι γὰρ εἰς Χριστὸν ἐβαπτίσθητε, Χριστὸν ἐνεδύσασθε· οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλλην, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστὲ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.* The thought of this passage is closely parallel to that of 1 Cor. xii 12 f: *Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἕν ἐστιν καὶ μέλη πολλὰ ἔχει, πάντα δὲ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος πολλὰ ὄντα ἕν ἐστιν σῶμα, οὕτως καὶ ὁ χριστός· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἑνὶ πνεύματι ἡμεῖς πάντες εἰς ἓν σῶμα ἐβαπτίσθημεν, εἴτε Ἰουδαῖοι εἴτε Ἕλληνες, εἴτε δοῦλοι εἴτε ἐλεύθεροι, καὶ πάντες ἓν πνεῦμα ἐποτίσθημεν.* In each passage the Apostle contrasts with the diversity of their former conditions the unity of the one Man, the one Body, into which all alike had been introduced by their baptism. His language is peculiarly his own. He conceived of the unity of the Christian society under the figure of the human body. Sometimes he regarded Christ as the head of the body: sometimes again he considered the head and members together as 'the Christ'—Christ was more than any part, He was the whole of which Christians were the parts; to be in the body was to be 'in Christ'. This conception

underlies both these passages: baptism as the rite of initiation into the Christian society was at once the means of entry into the one Body and into Christ: the baptized were made members of the Christ, they were all one man in Christ.

In Rom. vi 3 f St Paul argues that Christians 'have died to sin': *ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν; συνετάφημεν οὖν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἠγέρθη Χριστὸς ἐκ νεκρῶν διὰ τῆς δόξης τοῦ πατρός, οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν καινότητι ζωῆς περιπατήσωμεν.* The thought of this passage is that union with Christ involves union with each condition into which Christ passed—death, burial, resurrection. Baptism, as the initial act of union with Christ or entry 'into Christ', is an entry 'into His death': it involves, as a consequence, burial with Christ and resurrection to a new life in Christ. A similar thought is reached by a different path in Col. ii 11 f. In Christ we were circumcised with a spiritual circumcision—a kind of death, a putting off of the body—in the circumcision of Christ, in fact, in baptism, which was our death and burial leading to our resurrection.

Thus the expression 'baptized into Christ' is to be interpreted as meaning introduced by baptism—the initial rite of Christian discipleship—into the relation which St Paul denotes by the words 'in Christ'. If the Apostle is thinking of Christ as of Him who died and was buried and rose again for us, then to be baptized into Christ is to be baptized into His death with its consequences of burial and resurrection. If he is thinking of Christ as God's New Man, then to be baptized into Christ is to be baptized into the one Body, the human unity constituted in Christ. When he is using such language, the primary sense of baptism as a cleansing by water from the sins of the past is not alluded to: he is thinking of baptism as the beginning of a new relation to Christ, he is considering its result and not the symbolism of its method.

In 1 Cor. x 1 ff St Paul compares the Christian dispensation to the Mosaic, and finds analogies to the two great Christian sacraments in the history of Israel. To have been under the Cloud and to have passed through the Sea was a kind of baptism, uniting the Israelites with their leader Moses—*πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο.* A spiritual meat and a spiritual drink

were also provided for them—the latter from a Rock which followed them as they journeyed through the desert: ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ χριστός. This is highly figurative language; but the phrase 'baptized into Moses' offers no special difficulty when we regard it as formed upon the phrase which we have been considering, 'baptized into Christ'.

For the sake of completeness it has seemed necessary to refer to these Pauline phrases, although they bear no direct relation to the phrases βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, βαπτίζειν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι. They are concerned with the result of baptism, not with its method or process. We must not argue from them as to the meaning of the preposition εἰς in the baptismal commission as recorded by St Matthew. That must be interpreted, as we have seen, by St Matthew's own usage and by the instances of εἰς τὸ ὄνομα in the Acts of the Apostles.

The result of this discussion, if its arguments be accepted, is to confirm the rendering of St Matthew's words which has been given to them by every branch of the Christian Church which has had occasion to translate them into its own language. The persistent tradition of the Western Church which has rendered εἰς τὸ ὄνομα by *in nomine* was departed from by the eccentricity of Tertullian, whose acquaintance with Greek often led him to desert the current versions of his day and give independent translations of New Testament passages: not only does he write *in nomen Patris*, &c., but he even offers the paraphrase *in Patrem et Filium et Spiritum sanctum*. I am not aware of any other examples of this attempt at literalism: if there be any, they can but serve to emphasize the rule to which they are exceptions.

I cannot leave this subject without emphasizing a warning which it suggests. It is an excellent illustration of the thesis that modern translators as well as modern critics must have regard to ancient tradition. It needs to be remembered that early versions were made by men whose practical object was simply to express in another language the sense of the Greek with which they were familiar in the common intercourse of daily life. These translators have no concern for grammar and its rules. In the syntax of a complicated sentence they easily come to grief; but they know well enough what is the phrase of one

language which corresponds to the phrase of another. Hence they are often what is called 'loose'; but as a rule they give the sense, especially where no obvious difficulty exists. They shew us what the Greek words meant to persons who spoke Greek of much the same type every day.

The reason why our Authorised Version is so often right where the Revised Version has gone astray—as in the passage which we have been considering—is to be found in the neglect of this witness of tradition. To guard myself against the charge of presumption in this expression of a conviction which I have long held, I will call in evidence one of the acutest of living students of the Greek language. 'When the Jacobean version was revised', says Dr W. G. Rutherford [1], 'even more than when it was made, the character of New Testament Greek was ill understood. The Jacobean translators, depending like their predecessors largely upon Latin renderings, had too little Greek to form theories of interpretation. They had not contrived to convince themselves that the same Greek word, whatever its context, must invariably be rendered by the same English word. They had as little respect for Attic idiom as St Paul himself; nor were they tempted to mar their English by any perverse wish to twist it into conformity with idioms which may have once belonged to the Greek language, but need not on that account belong to the Greek of the New Testament, and certainly do not belong to English. . . . The Greek of the New Testament may never be understood as classical Greek is understood—it contains too many alien elements,—but it has at least begun to be studied from the proper point of view. Even when the Jacobean version was revised many just conclusions, gravely affecting interpretation, had been established, although most of them seem to be ignored by the revisers, who in some places actually distort the meaning in defiance of these conclusions by translating in accordance with Attic idiom phrases that convey in later Greek a wholly different sense, the sense which the earlier translators in happy ignorance had recognized that the context demanded. Since the Revised Version was completed, great strides have been made in the knowledge of New Testament Greek. The observations of Viteau

[1] *Epistle to the Romans* Pref. pp. x ff.

and more especially of Blass have furnished a sound foundation for further research, and before scholars are done with this fascinating study they will extinguish many misconceptions and will succeed in demonstrating that, different as it is from classical Greek, the singular speech in which the oracles of God are enshrined has nevertheless a precision and a force of its own.'

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.