

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

A Reply to the Baptist Adamthwaite's "*Baptism is Immersion!*"

by
Rev. Prof. Dr. Francis Nigel Lee
(M.A., M.Soc.Sc., Th.D., Ph.D., D.Min., D.Ed., LL.D.)

"*Dipping* of the person *into* the water is *not* necessary; but *baptism* is *rightly* administered by *pouring* or *sprinkling* water *upon* the person.... It be a *great sin* to *contemn* or neglect this ordinance!" *Westminster Confession*, 28:3-5.

"*Baptism is Immersion!*" Such is the triumphant title of a recent archaeological article. It appeared from the hand of the noted Australian Baptist, Murray Adamthwaite.

That article has now gone forth into all the world. For it was published in Britain, and circulated internationally. See the May-June 1989 issue of the magazine *Reformation Today*.¹

That magazine —itself a noted vehicle for Baptist propaganda —has had a past history of regularly extolling immersionism. The above-mentioned recent issue, has compounded this tendency.

Yet the *Holy Bible* does not suggest the ceremony of submersion. Instead, ever since the creation and fall of man, it repeatedly teaches the symbolic *cleansing* of people (as well as of things) —by *pouring* or *sprinkling*!

* * * * *

What, in Sacred Scripture, is the significance of *sprink-ling*? From *small springs* of liquid such as *running water*, it suggests the dripping of drops of *rain-like refreshment*. This is clearly taught in both the Older and the Newer Testaments of the infallible Word of God.

¹ Ed. Erroll Hulse (75 Woodhill Rd., Leeds LS16 7BZ, British Isles), pp 30-41.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Jesus Himself upholds every jot and tittle in the Older Testament —calling it 'the Law and the Prophets.' Mt 5:17. In the Law, we frequently find a refreshing "outpouring" of liquid —while sacrificing or cleansing.² Also in the Prophets, the various non-submersionistic '*sprinkling*' passages are rich in symbolism.³

For these Prophets not only point backward —to the Law. They also point forward —to the Saviour! Thus, they actually *predict* even Christian baptism. That sign and seal, instituted after Christ's incarnation, engrafts His elect into His Church —and symbolically refreshes them.

Also in the Newer Testament —there are many relevant 'baptismal passages.'⁴ They, taken together, clearly preclude total submersion. Indeed, they establish precisely *sprinkling* as the sole Scriptural mode.

* * * * *

First of all, we would draw attention to the vital Newer Testament passage Heb 9:10-22. This refers to the various *baptisms* of the Older Testament (v 10). Such *baptisms* include "*sprinkling* the unclean" —even with "the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer" (v 13).

Moses himself performed such '*baptisms*' (see I Cor 10:2). Indeed, "he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water and scarlet wool and hyssop, and *sprinkled* both the book and all the people" (v 19). Also, "he *sprinkled* with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels of the ministry" (v 21). For "without *shedding* of blood, is no remission" of sin (v 22)!

Now Heb 9:10 speaks of the "divers washings" alias the 'various baptisms' (or *diaphorais baptismois*) of the Older Testament's "ordinances." Those "ordinances" probably go back even to the various *Pre-Mosaic* practices which then and thereafter foreshadowed Christian baptism.

Such foreshadows would include the primordial *sprinkling* with the blood of Abel —and also the *rainwater*, during Noah's flood.⁵ More demonstrably, however, the "ordinances" mentioned in Heb 9:10f clearly focus on the various *Mosaic* 'baptisms.' These commenced with Moses and thus no later than 1440 B.C. Yet they then continued —right down to the very death of Christ Himself!

² Gen 4:4-10; 7:4f; 28:18; 35:14; Ex 4:9; 9:8-10,33; 12:7,22; 14:19-29; 15:4-19; 24:6-8; 29:7,12,21; 30:8f; Lev 1:5,11; 2:1,6; 3:2,8,13; 4:3-6f,12,17f,25,30,34; 5:9; 6:27; 7:2,14; 8:11f,15,19,24; 9:9,12,18; 14:7,15f,18,26f,51; 16:14-19; 17:6,13; 21:10; Num 8:7; 18:17; 19:4,13,18-21; Dt 12:16,24,27; 15:23; *etc.*

³ Josh 3:8-17; I Kgs 18:5,31-33,44f; II Kgs 5:1-3,10,14; Pss 51:2,7; 77:16-17; 78:12-13; Prov 1:23; Isa 21:4; 32:15; 44:1-4; 45:8; 52:15; 53:12; 63:3; Song 1:3; Ezk 11:5; 36:18,25f; 39:29; Dan 4:15,23,33; 5:21; 7:14,22; 9:24-27; Joel 2:16f,23-28; Zech 12:10 & 13:1; and Mal 3:1-3,10 & 4:5f.

⁴ Mt 3:11; Mk 1:8; 7:1-8; Lk 3:4-22; 11:38; 24:49; John 1:21-33; 3:22-26; 13:5-10; 19:39f; Acts 1:4f; 2:1-4,16-18,33,38f; 8:12-16; 8:28-39; 9:18; 10:37-48; 11:15-17f; 22:16; Rom 6:3-4; I Cor 1:16; 3:6-8; 6:11; 7:14; 10:1-2; Eph 4:4-8; 6:1-4,17; Col 2:11-13; Heb 6:1f; 9:10-21; 10:22; 11:4-7,28-29; 12:22-25; I Pet 1:2; 3:20f; Rev 7:3-9; 14:9f; 19:16; 20:3-4 & 22:2-4.

⁵ Gen 4:4f; 7:4f; Heb 11:4; 12:22-24; I Pet 1:2; 3:20f.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Such 'baptismal washings' included those portrayed by the blood of animal sacrifices—which Moses "*sprinkled* on the altar."⁶ Further, they also included the symbolic *sprinkling* of those previously suffering from leprosy.⁷

God further said to Moses concerning even the Levites: "*Sprinkle* water of *purifying* upon them!"⁸ Indeed, we are also told that an uncleansed person defiled by a corpse "shall be cut off from Israel—because the water of separation was *not sprinkled* upon him."⁹

As regards the latter passage, even the Baptist Adamthwaite calls it: "the sprinkling ritual."¹⁰ He concedes that this unclean person had to be purified not by immersion—but by *sprinkling*!

Indeed, Adamthwaite specifically states that the verses "Hebrews 9:13" and "19"—both "refer" to "Num 19:6" and Num 19 verses "17-18." For he rightly remarks—emphases ours—that "this is indeed the *sprinkling* ritual, using...*water*."¹⁰

* * * * *

Here is a summary of the "sprinkling" passages in the Mosaic writings. Right after the fall, the *shed* blood of Abel pointed forward to *sprinkling* with the better blood of Jesus.¹¹ Later, so too did the *rainwater* of Noah's flood—and the *blood-drops* of the animal sacrifices on his altar.¹² Similarly, also Jacob *poured out* oil and drink offerings—when he too sacrificed to the Lord.¹³

Moses himself *poured* water on the ground and *sprinkled* ashes toward heaven—so as to withhold *rain* from being "*poured* upon the earth."¹⁴ He *sprinkled* the blood of the Passover lamb upon the doorposts of God's people.¹⁵ Indeed, the Israelites were actually *baptized* unto Moses '*from a cloud*'—while they were crossing the Red Sea *on dry land*!¹⁶

Moses further *sprinkled* blood on the altar; on the book; and on the people.¹⁷ He also *anointed the head* of Aaron with oil; *poured* blood on the altar; and *sprinkled* both oil and blood upon the priests.¹⁸

⁶ Ex 24:6.

⁷ Lev 14:7 & 16:19.

⁸ Num 8:5-7.

⁹ Num 19:13-21.

¹⁰ *Baptism is Immersion!* In *Reformation Today* (see n 1 above) p 35.

¹¹ Gen 4:4-10; Heb 11:4; 12:24.

¹² Gen 7:4f; 8:20f; I Pet 1:2; 3:20f.

¹³ Gen 28:18f; 31:13; 35:14.

¹⁴ Ex 4:9; 9:8-10,33.

¹⁵ Ex 12:7,22; Heb 11:28.

¹⁶ Ex 14:19f; 15:4f; Pss 77:15f; 78:13f; I Cor 10:1f; Heb 11:28f.

¹⁷ Ex 24:6f; Heb 9:10,19f.

¹⁸ Ex 29:7,12,21; Lev 21:10.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

These priests were to *pour out* only regular drink offerings. They were to *sprinkle* blood upon God's altar —and upon other objects in the sanctuary. Further, they were to *pour* oil upon the sacrifices —and to *pour out* the left-over ashes.¹⁹ They were also to *sprinkle* healed lepers with blood and with oil —and to *sprinkle* the houses of those lepers, with blood.²⁰

Ancient Israelitic priests were also to *sprinkle* on the day of atonement —in order to *cleanse* the people of God.²¹ They were further to *sprinkle* the water of *purifying* upon the Levites.²²

All those defiled by corpses, were to be *cleansed* —by *sprinkling*.²³ Also, the blood from sacrifices was to be *poured out* —like water.²⁴

* * * * *

After the Law, comes the rest of the Older Testament. Here it should be noted that the priests *ebapheesan* —alias 'bapt-ed' —in the Jordan. This they did when they, and all the Israelites, crossed it *on dry land*.²⁵ They did so —just as they had previously crossed the Red Sea —*totally without submersion*. On that earlier occasion, while following Moses, they were all "*baptized*" there "*from a cloud*" —namely when "*the clouds poured out water*."¹⁶

David prayed to be *washed* from his iniquity —by being purged through *sprinkling*.²⁶ Indeed, David's psalmist Asaph stated that the clouds had "*poured out water*" —when the people had been '*baptized unto Moses*.' That had occurred when God had previously led His people through the Red Sea —*on dry land*.²⁷

Solomon predicted that God would one day *pour out* the Name of His Anointed. Then, God would further *pour out* His Spirit —at the *baptism* with the Holy Ghost. That would take place when God Himself would "*come down like rain*" —and like "*showers that water the earth*."²⁸

The same things was predicted also by Hosea: "Let us return to the Lord! ... After two days, He will revive us! On the third day, He will raise us up —and we shall live before His sight! Then we shall know —if we follow on to acknowledge the Lord. His going forth has been prepared as the morning. Then *He* shall come to us as the *rain* —as the latter and former rain *to the earth*."²⁹

¹⁹ Ex 30:8f; Lev 1:5,11; 2:1,6; 3:2, 8,13; 4:3f,12,17f,25,30f; 5:9; 6:27; 7:2,14; 8:11f,15,19,24; 9:9,12,18; 17:6,13; Num 18:17; 19:4.

²⁰ Lev 14:7,15f,26f,51.

²¹ Lev 16:14f.

²² Num 8:7.

²³ Num 19:13f.

²⁴ Dt 12:24f; 15:23.

²⁵ Josh 3:8-17 (the Greek Septuagint alias LXX has *ebapheesan* at v 15).

²⁶ Ps 51:2,7 (cf. Heb 9:10,19).

²⁷ Pss 77:1,16f & 78:12f (cf. I Cor 10:1f).

²⁸ Song 1:23; Prov 1:23; Ps. 72:1,6 (cf. Acts 1:4f; 2:1f,16f).

²⁹ Hos 6:1-3.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Elijah gave a *preview* of the work of his later successor John the *Baptizer* —alias 'John the Presbyterian' (but not 'John the Baptist')! Elijah did this when he thrice *poured* water on his sacrifice —just before it *rained*.³⁰

His student Elisha told Naaman the leper to be *baptized*. Indeed, Naaman was commanded to receive this symbolic *cleansing* —apparently by being *sprinkled* in the Jordan.³¹

* * * * *

Isaiah predicted that the suffering Christ would *pour out* His own soul. At that time, He would *sprinkle* blood on His garments. As a result, in terms of the Great Commission, He would *sprinkle* many nations.³² To expedite this, however, He would first *baptize* His Church *with* His Spirit.

Hence, Isaiah further predicted the baptismal *outpouring* of the Holy Ghost. "The Spirit," he explained, shall "be *poured upon* us from *on high*." Through Isaiah, God Himself declared: "I will *pour water upon* him that is thirsty.... I will *pour My Spirit upon your seed*, and My blessing *upon your offspring*.... *Drip down*, you heavens, *from above*; and let the skies *pour down* righteousness!"³³

Ezekiel was commanded by God to "set a mark upon the *foreheads* of the men" who repudiated the abominations of the ungodly. Upon the latter, the Lord would soon be "*pouring out*" His fury. Ezekiel also predicted that God would *sprinkle clean water* on His people —at the time He would give them a new heart. That was to occur when He would *pour out His Spirit*.³⁴

Daniel explained that Nebuchadnezzar would be *baptized* by the *dew*. He also predicted that, centuries later, the Messiah Himself would be *anointed* —namely at His 'Christ-ic' *baptism*.³⁵

Joel foresaw that God would send His *rain* —even upon *sucklings*! That was to take place especially when He would *pour out* His Spirit —at the *baptism* of the Holy Ghost.³⁶

Zechariah predicted this *outpouring* would occur at the opening of a *Fountain*. This would happen just after the piercing of the Messiah.³⁷ For "in the time of the *latter rain*...the Lord shall make bright *clouds* and give...*showers of rain*."³⁷

³⁰ I Kgs 18:5,31-33,44f (cf. John 1:25).

³¹ II Kgs 5:1-3,10,14 (v 14 LXX has *ebaptisato*) cf. Lev 14:7f.

³² Isa 52:15; 53:12; 63:3.

³³ Isa 32:15; 44:1f; 45:8 ("*ha-r'iyf-uu*"; Hiph.; "distil").

³⁴ Ezk 9:4-8; 36:18,25f; 39:29.

³⁵ Dan 4:15,23,33 & 5:21 (4:33 & 5:31 LXX both have *ebaphee*) and 9:24-27.

³⁶ Joel 2:16f,23f (cf. Acts 1:4 & 2:1f,16f,33,38f).

³⁷ Zech 10:1; 12:10; 13:1.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Finally, Malachi indicated that the Messiah would *purify* His people —and *pour out* His blessings. He also indicated that this would occur after Jehovah's messenger (John the Baptizer) had come as a second Elijah —preaching the *baptism* of repentance!³⁸

* * * * *

In his famous *Biblical Thesaurus*, Rev. Dr. Hellmuth —the well-known Professor of Hebrew and Rabbinical Literature —discusses the meaning of the Hebrew word *taabal* in the Old Testament. There, he renders it: "dabble, *i.e.* wetting by little dips or by *sprinkling*."

Also Dr. Robert Young offers a similar definition of this Biblical word *taabal*. In his famous *Analytical Concordance to the Holy Bible*, he renders it: "to moisten" or "*besprinkle*."

Now this Hebrew word *taabal* is often translated either as *baptein* —or as its cognate *baptizein*. Indeed, *taabal* is so rendered even in the *LXX*. That latter work, reputedly compiled by some 'seventy' erudite scholars, is the (270 B.C.) Greek Septuagint translation of the ancient Hebrew Scriptures.

Those many eminent Hebrews who then produced the Septuagint, all professed the one true religion of Ancient Israel! It is thus very significant that precisely they often used the word *baptein* —as their own Greek translation of the Hebrew word *taabal*.

They did so in many places of Holy Scripture.³⁹ In some⁴⁰ of those places, the word *taabal* cannot possibly imply even partial im-mersion. Still less can it there imply complete sub-mersion! Nowhere is this clearer than in the Septuagint's translation of Josh 3:15f.

For there, we are told that when the priests came to the Jordan river —they 'bapt-ed.' The Hebrew here has: *ni-t^eb^el-oo*. The Greek Septuagint renders this: *e-baph-eesan* —'they bapt-ed.' However, we are also told that the Israelites then "passed through" the Jordan —"*on dry ground*." Consequently, they 'bapt-ed' *without being submersed!*

³⁸ Mal 3:1-3,10 & 4:5f (*cf.* Lk 1:15-17 & 3:3-22 & n 30 above).

³⁹ The following are the usages of *baptein* in the Septuagint (see Oepke in Kittel's *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* alias *TDNT*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983, I:535, citing *inter alia* Jth 2:14 & Grk Sir 31:30 [34:30]). The *LXX* thus translates *taabal* in the Qal, at: Ex 12:22; Lev 4:6,17; 9:9; 11:32; 14:6,16,51; Num 19:18; Dt 33:24; Ru 2:14; I Kgs [= I Sam] 14:27; IV [= II] Kgs 8:15 & Job 9:31. It thus translates *taabal* in the Niph'al, at Josh 3:15. Similarly, in Ezk 23:15, the *LXX*'s *baptos* translates *taabal*. The word *baptein* further translates *boo'* in the Hoph'al at Lev 11:32; and *maachats* at Ps 67:23 [68:23]. Indeed, it thus translates *ts^eba'* in the Ithpa'el at Dan 4:30 (Th) = 5:21 [Dan 4:22+ (Th)] & at Gen 27:31 (Al). All the above *LXX* usages of *baptein* in the Old Testament are listed by Hatch & Redpath in their *Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books)*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1987, I:190.

⁴⁰ Thus, at: Ex 12:22; Lev 4:6,17; 9:9; 14:6f,16,51; Num 19:18; Josh 3:15; *etc.*

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

In almost all Bible texts where it occurs, *taabal* is consistently associated with *dyeing* or *painting* or *pouring* or *sprinkling*. Take, for example, Ezk 23:15. There, Ezekiel uses the phrase "dyed attire" —alias the 'painted turbans' which people then often wore "upon their *heads*." Now "dyed" translates the Hebrew word *t^ebuul-iyim* —derived from *taabal*. Rightly, the Septuagint itself renders this derivative —*bapt-os*!

The word *baptein* itself —which frequently translates *taabal* —often means "to dye." Indeed, the latter is frequently associated with painting —by way of *sprinkling*. Compare too the frequentative *baptizein* (in Isa 21:4) —with the word "sprinkle" in Isa 52:15 and 63:3. With the two latter verses, also compare Mt 28:19's "baptize" and Rev 19:13-16's "vesture dyed with blood" (or *himation bebammenon haimati*). There, "baptize" and "dyed" translate derivatives from *baptizein* and *baptein*!

* * * * *

We have seen that the Septuagint Bible often uses the Greek word *baptein* to translate the Hebrew word *taabal*. However, it also uses *baptein* —often to translate several other Hebrew words as well. Thus, *baptein* is used to translate *boō* (or "put") —at Lev 11:32f.

Baptein is again used to translate the Hebrew word *maachats* —at Ps 68:23f. In that context, this implies '*sprinkled*' or '*poured out*' or '*shed forth*.' For just compare Ps 68:18f —with Acts 1:4-5; 2:1-3; 2:16-18; 2:33 & Eph. 4:4-8f!

Indeed, the Septuagint again uses *baptein* to translate the Aramaic word *yits^etabba'* —at Dan 5:21. There, the latter verb is translated *moistened* or "[made] wet" —namely from or by or "with the *dew*." This is "the dew of *heaven*"⁴¹ —the dew *from above*!

Baptein is further used in the Septuagint's version even of the Apocrypha. The latter was written between the end of the Older and the beginning of the Newer Testament. Though not infallible like Holy Scripture, the Apocrypha is nevertheless instructive.

Thus, in II Maccabees 1:19-36, we are told that Neemias (alias the great Hebrew leader Nehemiah) commanded that water "be drawn up." The latter phrase translates *apo baphantas* (from the verb *baptein*). Nehemiah is said to have done this —so that the priests could "*sprinkle*." Indeed —so that they could "*sprinkle with the water*" (*errhanai too; hudati*).

* * * * *

⁴¹ Aramaic: (*uumittal sh^emayyaa' gishmeehh*) *yits^etabba'* = LXX *ebaphee*.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Now in addition to this relatively common Greek word *baptein* —the Septuagint translators also employed its rarer but cognate frequentative *baptizein*.⁴² The latter too they utilized —to translate the Hebrew word *taabal*, alias the verb associated with *pouring* or *sprinkling*. In Holy Scripture, they did so: at Job 9:31; at II Kgs 5:14 (cf. Lev 14:3-7); and at Isa 21:4.

The usage of *baptizein* at II Kgs 5:14, warrants special attention. The Word of God elsewhere declares that lepers were to be cleansed by sevenfold *sprinkling*.⁴³ Preaching this very Word of God, the prophet Elisha therefore commanded Naaman the leper to "be *baptized* seven times in the Jordan."

Here, the word "baptized" translates the Hebrew *wayyi-t'bol*. Significantly, the Pre-Christian Septuagint here renders this form of the well-known Hebrew verb *taabal* — as *ebaptisato*!

Baptizein is also used in the Septuagint's version even of the Apocrypha. There, in Judith 12:7f, the Septuagint again has *ebaptizeto*. For it states that Judith "*washed* herself" —namely "at the *fountain* of water in the camp." This too probably implies *sprinkling*.⁴⁴

Furthermore, the Septuagint has *baptizomenos* at Sirach 31:25 (34:30). There, it describes the man who "*washes* himself because of a dead body." Here again, total submersion seems precluded. Precisely *sprinkling* is once more indicated.⁴⁵

Now in this regard, the great linguist and theologian Rev. Prof. Dr. Gerhard Kittel makes an acute observation —in his famous *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. There,⁴⁶ he points out that some of the later Pagan Greek meanings of *baptein* and *baptizein* —"the meanings 'to drown,' 'to sink' or 'to perish' —seem to be quite absent[!] from the Hebrew and Aramaic *taabal*, and therefore from *baptizein* in Jewish Greek" before the birth of the Christian Church.

Here, Kittel is quite correct —writing about "Jewish Greek" in Pre-Christian times. In Post-Patristic times, however, we also find — the increasingly sacramentalistic concept of *total submersion*. That —deriving from the 'magical' world of Greek and Oriental Paganism —then unfolded in hellenized Post-Christian Judaism; in mediaeval Sub-Christian Ritualism; and also among maverick Modern Baptists.

⁴² The following are the usages of *baptizein* in the Septuagint. The LXX thus translates *taabal* in the Qal, at: IV [= II] Kgs 5:14; Jud 12:7; Sir 31:25 [34:25]; Isa 21:4+; Job 9:31 (Aq); Ps 68:3 [69:3]; Jer 38:22 [45:22]; Lev 6:28[21] (Al); & Ps 9:16. Here, *mutatis mutandis*, consult the last sentence at the end of note 39 above.

⁴³ Lev 14:7f.

⁴⁴ Cf.: Ex 29:4f; 30:18f; Num 19:12f.

⁴⁵ Cf. Num 8:7 & 19:4f—and, above all, Heb 9:10-13!

⁴⁶ TDNT I:535f.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

However, that concept is unknown in the *Older Testament*! It is also, as Kittel observes, "quite absent" in the intertestamentary Hebrews' Septuagintic use of the words *baptein* and *baptizein*. Indeed, it is by and large quite conspicuously absent from the writings even of Post-Maccabean Judaism (at least until after 100 A.D.).

* * * * *

So *taabal* is the Biblical Hebrew word associated with *painting* and *pouring* and *sprinkling*. In the (280 B.C.) Greek Septuagint, this word was often translated *baptein* and *baptizein*. These translations enable us rightly to understand the ancient meaning of an important derivative from *taabal*—the noun *t^ebiylah*.

This word *t^ebiylah* was used to describe the intertestamentary 'baptism' of proselytes (alias converts to Judaism). Thereby, catechised Gentiles and their entire families were incorporated into the Commonwealth of Ancient Israel.⁴⁷

Only later below will we further scrutinize this 'proselyte baptism' *t^ebiylah*. At the moment, we would merely establish the "pouring" and "sprinkling" connections between the words *taabal* and *t^ebiylah* on the one hand—and the words *baptein* and *baptizein* on the other.

* * * * *

Now the Baptist Adamthwaite's article hardly touches on the 'once and for all' *t^ebiylah*—of intertestamentary proselyte baptism (of Gentiles into Judaism). Instead, it is largely devoted to the *miqvah* (or 'pool of running water') used specifically by Jews: for the purpose of ritually cleansing *themselves*. This they did not 'once and for all—but repeatedly.

Adamthwaite discusses the *miqvah*—of specifically *Intertestamentary* Judaism. He traces its trail especially from around B.C. 200, until about 30 A.D. He sees this not even as a partial immersion, but as a total submersion. Why?

Because he pictures it largely from his own misunderstanding of the permutable perspective thereon—given in *Post-Christian* (if not *Anti-Christian*) Talmudism! Indeed, he draws particularly on the later and uninspired Jewish *Mishnah*—and on modern Israeli archaeologists—in his own imaginative attempt to understand the *miqvah*.

He then further misconceives the intertestamentary repetitive *miqvah* of Jews themselves—to be the linear ancestor of the 'once and for all' proselyte baptism *t^ebiylah* of Gentiles into Judaism. Predictably, he then wrongly takes the *different* institution of *Johannine and apostolic baptism*—to be the direct descendant of both the *miqvah* and the *t^ebiylah*.

⁴⁷ Cf. Mt 15:2f & 23:15 with Mk 7:3f and Acts 2:10 & 6:5.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Adamthwaite asks: "**Can archeology decide an issue of doctrine?**" To this, his own boldface query, he himself then replies: "Archeology, as a handmaid to historical study, can so often provide valuable information on that historical background.... It will inevitably influence and illuminate our understanding of a given text.... Christianity is an historical revelation, and comes into a real historical and geographical context.... This context will have continuity with both preceding and subsequent history: the Jewish precursors and the early sub-apostolic period of the Church respectively.... Careful exegesis is done in the light of Jewish sources and the excavations."⁴⁸

To Adamthwaite, apparently the latter is the true light. It is not the light of God's Holy Word —nor the light of 'Christ The Light' of the world! Instead, it is "the light of Jewish sources and the excavations."

* * * * *

As Adamthwaite alleges: "The Jewish Mishnah (compiled A.D. 200)...contains ten chapters of stipulations regarding the miqveh or ritual immersion.... The Mishnah and Jewish practice accordingly persisted throughout the centuries, but until recently there was no evidence of the early use of these pools.... Then came the discovery of a fine example of Yigael Yadin's mid-1960 excavations at Masada (thus dating it prior to A.D. 70); also several examples of Qumran dating back to the foundation of that community, c. 200 B.C."⁴⁸

Notice that Adamthwaite here not at all attempts to explain why the Hebrew equivalents of the words *baptein* and *baptizein* were used —*priorly!* For he is silent about the repeated non-immersionistic employment of these words —in the *Older Testament of Holy Scripture* (long before his "200 B.C.")!⁴⁸ Yet, as already seen above, these meanings can readily be established from the (270 B.C.) Greek Septuagint translation of the Older Testament —which latter itself started being inscripturated from no later than 1400 B.C.

Nor does the Baptist Adamthwaite's article deal with Peter's inspired use of the word *baptisma*. Yet that apostle describes the very first Older Testament 'type' or prefigurement of the Newer Testament's "antitype" or baptismal fulfilment.

That prefigurement of baptism —was the *downpour* on the roof of the ark, during the Great Flood before 2300 B.C. By *sprinkling*, that downpour then and there preserved the godly Noah's entire family. Total submersion was then experienced only by the unbaptized ungodly —outside the ark!⁴⁹

Nor does the Baptist Adamthwaite's article address the inspired use of the word *ebaptisanto* by Paul. That apostle uses that very word to describe the *sprinkling* of Ancient Israel's Mosaic "fathers" —together with their infants. It occurred when they all passed through the Red Sea on dry ground.

⁴⁸ *Op. cit.* pp 30-31.

⁴⁹ 1 Pet 3:20-21 & 1:2 *cf.* Gen 6:7-10,17-18 & 7:4-23.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

That baptismal sprinkling of the people of God, explains Paul, occurred "*under* the cloud" and by or "*in* the cloud." That was when "the clouds *poured out* water"⁵⁰ upon the Israelites, around 1440 B.C. That baptismal sprinkling happened shortly before God's people's unbaptized wicked enemies —were themselves totally submersed in the Red Sea!

* * * * *

Frankly, the Baptist Adamthwaite is *unable* to ground his post-biblical submersionism in the writings of Moses around 1440f B.C. However, he does toy with grounding in I Kgs 7:26 (around B.C. 930) —the Post-Mosaic *miqvah*, alias the 'pool of running water' known to *Later Judaism*. Indeed, Adamthwaite claims that "its origin may extend back to Solomon's Temple with its huge bronze laver containing forty-five thousand litres."⁵¹

However, in I Kgs 7:26f (*cf.* II Chr 4:2-6) the molten *sea* was used as the vessel where the priests washed *themselves*. It was located alongside the ten *lavens*, where the sacrificial *animals* were washed.

There was no question of 'unclean' Gentile *proselytes* to Judaism being 'washed' or 'baptized' at any of those bowls. For the latter were adjacent to the Holy Place itself! Yet Adamthwaite⁵² gives as authority for a possibly Solomonic origin of the 'Miqveh': *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, col. 1511."

Now Adamthwaite here misquotes the modern *Judaica*! There, we find no such reference to the 'Miqveh' —in "col. 1511." Probably, his article had intended to refer instead to column 1542 (in Volume Eleven).

Elsewhere, the Baptist Adamthwaite accuses the Presbyterian Jay Adams of lacking "careful scholarship"⁵³ —and of making "wild claims" which he alleges "are palpably false."⁵⁴ Frankly —as seen from his own misquotation of the *Judaica* —it is Adamthwaite himself who here lacks careful scholarship!

All attempts to ground Baptistic immersionism in the (850f B.C.) example of Naaman, are also doomed to failure. It is true that Naaman then washed himself in the Jordan seven times —and that the Septuagint at II Kgs 5:14 here has *ebaptisato*. Yet Baptists do not thus 'wash' *themselves* —as Naaman did. Nor are they thus washed *repeatedly* —as he was.

⁵⁰ I Cor 10:1-2 (*hupo teen nepheleen and en tee, nephelee*). Compare Ex 14:21 to 15:19, and Pss 77:15f & 78:12f & 105:6-39 & 106:7-11. See too Kittel's *TDNT* I:536 at n 32, I:539 at n 50, and I:544 at n 74.

⁵¹ *Op. cit.* pp 31 & n 4.

⁵² *Ib.* p 40 n 4.

⁵³ *Ib.*, p 30 between n 1 & 3.

⁵⁴ *Ib.*, p 30 n 2 & p 31 at lines 1-2.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Nor was Naaman then *submersed* —not even once. For, as a *leper*, Naaman was here cleansed specifically by *sprinkling*!⁵⁵ Thus too Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Cyril.⁵⁶

The last usages of *baptein* in the Older Testament, occur at Dan 4:30-33 and 5:21 —around 580 to 540 B.C. Understandably, these references too are carefully avoided by the Baptist Adamthwaite. For, as we shall next see, they clearly preclude submersion —and presuppose *sprinkling* by *dewdrops*.

Only *after* 540 B.C., was the meaning of *baptein* and its cognate *baptizein* sometimes changed. However, that was done *not* in the *Older Testament* of God's Holy Word —but in the later unholy literature of *Pagan Greece*! This is what we should next survey —before later scrutinizing Adamthwaite's intertestamentary theories (from 200 B.C. onward).

* * * * *

In Pagan Greece as elsewhere, especially after the (*circa* 580f B.C.) 'baptismal' prophecies of Daniel toward the end of Old Testament times, there was indeed a *degenerative transition*. That *progressive* or rather cumulative change was one which swung *away* from Biblical sprinkling —and *toward* unbiblical submersion. The transition was from the Older Testament's *pure* concept of the word *baptein* —toward the later and *impure* concept of that word as understood by the Pagan Greek Hellenes.

This in turn further yielded to the still later *hellenistic* concept of the word *baptein*. That *impure* concept then took root —until the *purifying* incarnation and baptismal anointing of Jesus Christ. For He it was Who —in both precept and example —restored even the frequentative *baptizein* to its more ancient meaning.

According to the infallible Word of God, the (580f B.C.) relevant writings of the prophet Daniel shed light on this. They help explain how the original Biblical meaning of the word *baptein* —'sprinkling' among the Ancient Israelites! —degenerated into its later unbiblical meaning of 'immersion' among Greek-speaking Pagans.

Daniel predicted how, when Jesus actually came, He would "finish the transgression" and "make an end of sins" and "make reconciliation for iniquity." For God would then "*anoint* the most Holy One" —namely at 'Christ' the Anointed One's own baptism. Dan 9:24. Jesus would be anointed, *baptismally*, precisely by *sprinkling*. Thereby —pointing forward to the even more important *sprinkling* with His blood on Calvary —He repudiated degenerate pagan submersions and restored Biblical sprinkling.

* * * * *

⁵⁵ Lev 14:2-7 (*q.v.*) & II Kgs 5:1-3,10,12,14!

⁵⁶ Just. Mart. *Frag.* X (in Migne *PG* VI:1596); Iren. *Frag. ex Cod. S. Marci*, Ven. 534, fol. 220 (Cod. Coislin 3, Paris); Tert. *Adv. Marc.* 4:9; Cyr. *Polished Disc. on Lev*, in Migne *PG* 79 cols 557 A-B, 560 C-D, 561B, & 576-7.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Already around 580 B.C.,⁵⁷ Daniel explained a dream of the Babylonian King Nebuchadnezzar. The King had dreamed that a 'watcher' came from heaven, and cut down a huge tree. Its stump, however, would then "be *moistened* with the *dew* of heaven"⁵⁸ —after which new growth would recur. Later, the (270 B.C.) Greek Septuagint here uses *koitastheesetai* —to translate the word "*moistened*."⁵⁹ The latter word means: "to put into bed"; "to put to sleep"; "to cause to rest."⁶⁰

When none of the wise men of his kingdom could interpret the dream for him, Nebuchadnezzar asked Daniel to do so. Explained that prophet:⁶¹ "The dream is for them that hate you, and the interpretation of it for your enemies! The tree...is you, O king.... The king saw a watcher...coming down from heaven and saying, 'Hew the tree down...and let it lie out with the *dew* of heaven!'"

This latter phrase is well translated by the Greek Septuagint. It uses the word *aulistheesetai*.⁶² That means: "to lie out at night"; "to lodge"; "to live." The verb is derived from the noun *aulee*: 'an open courtyard.' Daniel's phrase thus means to sleep outside in the open —while getting *bedewed* (Aramaic *yits^etabba'*). Compare Dan 4:15.

Daniel continued: "This is the interpretation, O king! ... They shall drive you away from mankind.... They shall *moisten* you with the *dew* of heaven...until you acknowledge that the Most High rules in the kingdom of men!"⁶³ Here, the Greek Septuagint translates the relevant phrase: "shall be *bedewed* from the *dew* of the heaven."⁶⁴

Now the above prediction came to pass —in full! For Nebuchadnezzar later repented. Then (around 570 B.C.), he sent an account of these events "*to all people, nations and languages that dwell in all the earth*."⁶⁵ Even if "the earth" here means only the world known to Babylon —it must for that very reason have included also *Ancient Greece*.⁶⁶

⁵⁷ Dan 4:1,4,13,16,18,23,34. Cf. esp Dan 4:16 with 9:24-27 & 11:13 & 12:7.

⁵⁸ Dan 4:1-5,13-15.

⁵⁹ Dan 4:12 LXX.

⁶⁰ *Koitastheesetai*, in the phrase "*en tee, drosou, tou ouranou koitastheesetai*." Forms of the same word *koitastheesetai* further occur in the LXX also at: Lev 15:20; Dt 6:7; 11:19; Ps 104:22 (= 103:22 LXX); Song 1:7; Zech 2:14 LXX; 3:13 LXX; Isa 27:10 (Sm); Jer 40:12 (= 33:12 LXX); and Dan 4:15 (= Dan 4:12 Th). Reading the latter text with Lev 15:20f perhaps implies that menstruous women were cleansed by a dew-like washing. When Dan 4:15 is read together with Jer 40:12 and Song 1:7, it seems there is a foreshadowing of New Testament baptism (conceivably even as to its dew-like mode).

⁶¹ Dan 4:19f.

⁶² Dan 4:20 LXX ("*en tee, drosou, tou ouranou aulistheesetai*").

⁶³ Dan 4:24f.

⁶⁴ Dan 4:22 LXX ("*apo tees drosou tou ouranou aulistheeseei*").

⁶⁵ Dan 4:1.

⁶⁶ Dan 2:32f,39,45; 7:6; 8:5f,21; 10:20f; 11:2f,30; Isa 66:19; Ezk 27:6,13,19; Joel 3:6; Zech 9:13 (Gen 10:2f; Num 10:24; Est 1:1).

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Hence, Nebuchadnezzar would have informed even the sixth century Greeks —as to how he had dreamed that "the dew of heaven" would "moisten" him.⁶⁷ In that announcement, he also reported how the prophet Daniel had explained the meaning of the angel's words —the words that the king would be moistened with the dew.⁶⁸ Also, Nebuchadnezzar further noted how Daniel himself had predicted he would be moistened with the dew⁶⁹ —until that king would acknowledge the Most High God!

* * * * *

Continuing his message to all the nations, the king next included an account of how in fact "his body had been *moistened* with the *dew*"⁷⁰ —before he had later repented. Here, the Greek Septuagint translates this word "moistened" as *ebaphee*" (or 'baptized').⁷¹ *Ebaphee* means: "it became dabbled" or "dabbled." From this word, our sacramental term "baptized" has been derived. Total submersion and even partial immersion are quite precluded here. For such modes are altogether foreign to Nebuchadnezzar's being dabbled with dewdrops.

Through this international message, even the Ancient Greeks were soon informed of Nebuchadnezzar's dew-like '*baptism*' and repentance —around 580 B.C. They too⁷² then invested this word *baptein* with a religious content —which, however, being pagans, they soon perverted! Meantime, even around 540f B.C., Daniel himself reminded also Nebuchadnezzar's proud successor Belshazzar —as to how God had humbled his father.

Warned Daniel: "O king, the Most High God gave Nebuchadnezzar your father a kingdom.... But when his heart became lifted up and his mind hardened in pride, he was deposed.... He was driven from the sons of men.... His body was *moistened* with the *dew* of heaven, till he acknowledged that the Most High God rules in the kingdom of men!"⁷³

Here again, precisely as at the previous time,⁷⁴ the Greek Septuagint translates the word "moistened" as *ebaphee*.⁷⁵ Doubtless, news also of Daniel's intimation to Belshazzar would have reached even the Ancient Greeks.⁷⁶ For, after the Medo-Persians soon overthrew Belshazzar, Darius appointed Daniel (around 538 B.C.) as one of the three Chief Presidents over the 120 Provinces of his Persian Empire.⁷⁷

⁶⁷ Dan 4:15.

⁶⁸ Dan 4:23.

⁶⁹ Dan 4:25.

⁷⁰ Dan 4:33.

⁷¹ Dan 4:30 LXX ("*apo tees drosou...ebaphee*").

⁷² See n 66.

⁷³ Dan 5:1.18f.

⁷⁴ Dan 4:30 LXX.

⁷⁵ Dan 5:21 LXX ("*apo tees drosou...ebaphee*").

⁷⁶ See n 66.

⁷⁷ Dan 6:1 *cf.* Est 1:1.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Daniel had already previously made predictive statements about Greece to Belshazzar—and even to his father Nebuchadnezzar.⁷⁸ As already noted, some of those statements even foreshadowed the later baptismal anointing of the Saviour of the world—Jesus Christ Himself.⁷⁹ Indeed, it is almost certain that news of this too soon reached even the Ancient Greeks.

That would then become ingrained into their perverted and perverting culture—even in the Hellenic Period from about 460 B.C. onward. This was especially the case—both "importingly" and "exportingly"—during the international 'Hellenistic Age' after the time of the (B.C. 335f) Alexander the Great.⁸⁰

* * * * *

We have already seen⁸¹ that, according to the inspired apostles Peter and Paul, both the inspired Noah and the inspired Moses anciently understood 'baptism' to imply not submersion but *sprinkling*. However, uninspired Baptist writers rarely discuss this *earliest* (Noachic) concept of Biblical 'baptism' by *sprinkling*. Instead, they often prefer to discuss the *Post-Mosaic* and uninspired later usages of the word *baptizein* by Pagan Greeks—sometimes even with *perverted meanings*.

Indeed, we have yet to encounter a Baptist writing which attempts to interpret the fallible Pagan Greek meanings of *baptein* and *baptizein*—in the light of their meaning in the Holy Bible. The true meaning of these Biblical words should be ascertained only from the infallible Word of God itself. Yet all Baptist writings we have ever seen, have ended up defining the meaning of the Biblical words *baptein* and *baptizein*—against the background of their perverted secular usage in Pagan Greek literature!

In this monograph, however, we will do the exact opposite. We will evaluate the perverted usage of these words *baptein* and *baptizein* in Pagan Greek literature—in the clear light of their untarnished meanings in infallible Holy Writ. For to Christians, it should be undeniable that it is the earlier Biblical concepts of *taabal* and also of *baptein* and *baptizein* which somewhat influenced even later paganism. *Not* the other way round!

This Biblical influence of these words and concepts, infiltrated even Pagan Greece. It did so perhaps as early as Late-Mosaic times around 1400 B.C.⁸²—and certainly no later than the days of Daniel in 580-40f B.C.⁸³

⁷⁸ See n 66.

⁷⁹ Dan 2:35,44f; 7:9f,22; 8:11,21f; 9:24f; 12:1f (Lk 3:15f; 7:19f; 21:24f; Mt 24:3f,15f).

⁸⁰ *New Illustrated Columbia Encyclopedia (NICE)*, New York, Columbia Univ., 1979, 1:168f; 10:3042f; 17:5221.

⁸¹ See n 49-50.

⁸² Note not only the Mosaic Gen 7:4 (*cf.* I Pet 3:20f) and Ex 14:21f (*cf.* Ps 77:16f & I Cor. 10:1f), but also the Mosaic word *Kittim* or *Chittim* in Gen 10:4f & Num 24:24 & Dan 11:30, and also Calvin's comments thereon *in loc.*

⁸³ *Cf.* Dan 2:32f; 7:6; 8:5f,21; 10:20f; 11:3f; 9:24f [Lk 3:15f; 7:30f; 21:20 *cf.* Mt 24:15].

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

As regards the word *baptein*, its earliest known incidence in secular literature is in the 'legendary' Homer.⁸⁴ This cannot be dated earlier than 1160 B.C., and it probably dates from only many centuries later.⁸⁵ The word is also found in Aeschylus⁸⁶ —and thus definitely by 460 B.C.⁸⁷

Even in this secular literature, such Greek words were often used metaphorically. They were also often used with the technical meaning of "to dye" —by painting or by affusion alias sprinkling. Indeed, they were also even used to express the paganizing or paganized religious rites of various heathen 'sprinklings.'

* * * * *

In his *Odyssey* even ancient 'Homer'⁸⁸ described how "Telemachus, *washing* his hands with sea-water, prayed." He also related how "Penelope, *sprinkling* herself, prayed." Homer in the same work described how, with "water in a basin," Nestor performed the rite of "hand-washing" —and also that of "*sprinkling* the meal."⁸⁹ Also in the *Iliad*,⁹⁰ Homer wrote of how an old man bade his servant to "*pour* pure water on his hands."⁹¹

Interestingly, some of these Homeric passages were later cited by the Early Church Father Clement of Alexandria (195 A.D.). He, together with the Early Church, himself practised baptism by *sprinkling*.

Clement claimed these Homeric usages had been derived by the Greeks from "a custom of the Jews." Indeed, they show how —whenever the Pagan Grecian "laws are consistent with truth" —the Ancient Greeks are "indebted to the Hebrews themselves." For such age-old Grecian customs, insisted Clement, had —before their later pagan perversion! —been "handed down *from Moses* to the poets" of Greece!⁹²

⁸⁴ *Od.* 9:392.

⁸⁵ Cf. article 'Homer' in *Encyclopaedia Britannica (EB)*, London, 14th ed, 1929, 11:689.

⁸⁶ *Prom.* 863.

⁸⁷ Cf. article 'Aeschylus' (in *EB*, 1929, 1:261).

⁸⁸ *Od.* 2:260f & 4:761,750f (4:750,759 cf. 17:48,58) & 3:440f.

⁸⁹ Greek: *cherniba t' oulochutas te kateercheto*.

⁹⁰ *Il.* 24:302-5.

⁹¹ Greek: *chersin hudoor epicheuai akeeraton*.

⁹² *Strom.* 4:22 and *Exhort. ad Gent.* 6.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

According to Clement, these primordial Hebraic sprinkling customs *antedated* even Moses! Around 1500 B.C., he was discovered —when still a baby —by an Egyptian princess. This occurred while she was seeking to follow the ablutionary customs of the Hebrews then resident in Egypt.⁹³ For she had come "to the river, to wash and *sprinkle* herself."⁹⁴ And such sprinkling —claimed Clement! —was "the image of *baptism*."⁹⁵

* * * * *

In 416 B.C., the Thracian playwright Eupolis wrote a comedy called *Baptai*. This was not about anyone being submersed —but about female "Dyers."⁹⁶ Then, around 408 B.C.,⁹⁷ we encounter Euripides's famous statement *naus...ebapsen* — "the ship...dipped."⁹⁸ Because of this dipping, the ship does indeed seem to have sunk. Yet it apparently did so —as a result of being powerfully *sprinkled* by water from the waves.⁹⁹

For the very same Euripides also had the priestess of Delphi to say:¹⁰⁰ "You Delphian ministers..., go to the silvery eddies of Castalia! ... Having *sprinkled* yourselves with its pure *dews*,¹⁰¹ approach the temples.... But I will cleanse...and water the ground with *moist drops*¹⁰² ... I will *sprinkle*¹⁰³ the stream...which the eddies of Castalia *distil*,¹⁰⁴ by *sprinkling the dewy water*¹⁰⁵ ... I will go, and with my golden pitcher put water into the *sprinkling-vessels*."¹⁰⁶

Indeed, in his *Iphigenia in Tauris*, Euripides had the heroine say: "I shall *sprinkle* around your *head* the lustral waters.... I would fain *lave* them with *pure cleansings*.... The [*dew* of the] sea washes away all the ills of men!"¹⁰⁷

* * * * *

⁹³ See: Gen 4:4f; 8:20f; 12:7f - 13:4; 28:18; 35:14; 46:32f; Ex 1:7f; 2:1f; 4:9; 9:8f,33; 12:7,22 (*cf.* Heb 6:1f & 9:10-21 & 10:22 & 11:4f,17,28 & 12:24). See too: Ex 24:6f; 29:7,12,21; 30:9f; Lev 1:5,11; 2:1,6; 3:2,8,13; 4:6f,12,17f,25,30,34; 5:9; 6:27; 7:2,14; 8:11f,15,19,24; 9:9,12,18; 14:7,15f,18,26f,51; 16:14f; 17:6,13; 21:10; Num 8:7; 18:17; 19:4,13,18f; Dt 12:16,24,27; 15:23; *etc.*

⁹⁴ *Strom.* 1:23.

⁹⁵ *Strom.* 4:22.

⁹⁶ Thus Kittel's *TDNT* I:546 n 5.

⁹⁷ Thus the *NICE* 8:2267.

⁹⁸ Euripides: *Orest.* 705. Cited in J.W. Dale's *Classic Baptism: an Inquiry into the Meaning of the Word as Determined by the Usage of Classical Greek Writers*, Bolchazy-Carducci, Wauconda Ill. & Presbyterian & Reformed, Phillipsburg N.J., 1989, p 139.

⁹⁹ See n 121 below; *cf.* too Kittel's *TDNT* I:530 para 1.

¹⁰⁰ *Ion* 94,102,143,434.

¹⁰¹ *katharais de drosois*.

¹⁰² *rhanisin noteron*.

¹⁰³ *rhipsoo*.

¹⁰⁴ *apocheuoontai*.

¹⁰⁵ *noteron hudoor balloon*.

¹⁰⁶ *aporrhanteeria*.

¹⁰⁷ *Iph.* 622,1191f: *chaiteen amphi seen chernipsomai... Hagnois katharmois proota nin nipsai theloo.... Thalassa [drosoo] kluzei panta t'anthroopeen kaka*.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

At about the same time Malachi was predicting the *pouring* purifications of John the Baptizer and also of Jesus Christ Himself, the young Plato became a pupil of Socrates in 407 B.C.¹⁰⁸ Plato later recorded how his teacher had referred to "purificatory rites...and likewise...the lustrations...and the *sprinklings*...and washings."¹⁰⁹

Plato also used the word "baptized" with the meaning of "having been made drunk"¹¹⁰ —through inebriating liquid being *poured* down one's throat! He also employed the word *baptizomenon* —in the sense of constantly being *showered* with questions.¹¹¹

After Plato, came the great Greek playwright Menander. He died *circa* 291 B.C. (or some two decades *before* the Septuagint was inscripturated). Menander wrote of Phidias: "Let women wipe you, and bring *water* from three *fountains*.... Then, *sprinkle* yourself! Each one is *pure*, who is conscious of no sin."¹¹²

Very significantly, this excerpt was later cited (around 195 A.D.) by the Early Christian Church Father Clement of Alexandria.¹¹³ For he, an advocate of Christian baptism by Scriptural *sprinkling*, was attempting to show how God had 'pre-evangelistically' not left Himself without witness even among the ancient heathen. Indeed, God did this —also in giving the heathen '*rain* from heaven.' Acts 14:11-17.

There is also a famous (163f B.C.) *Greek Papyrus*, now preserved in the Louvre Museum. It employs a word meaning "dyed" —'*bapta*' (the past participle of *baptein*) —in the expression "coloured clothes."¹¹⁴

Even more significantly, the same verb *baptein* was again so used —in the Late-Hellenistic Greek of the famous Jewish historian Flavius Josephus. He wrote around 75 A.D.,¹¹⁵ —and thus during the Apostolic Age itself.

By *baptein*, he means: "to dye." In fact, Josephus uses the word in this sense *only*.¹¹⁶ He also employs even the cognate word *bamma* —with the similar meaning of "dyed material"¹¹⁷ (alias *painted* fabric).

So much, then, in secular literature, as to the word *baptein* —and its cognate *bamma*. We next turn to the secular use of the similar but apparently frequentative word *baptizein*.

* * * * *

¹⁰⁸ NICE 18:5366.

¹⁰⁹ Cited in R. Ayres's *Christian Baptism: a Treatise on the Mode of Administering the Ordinance by the Apostles and their Successors in the Early Ages of the Church*, Charles H. Kelly, London, n.d., p 443.

¹¹⁰ *Symp.* 176 B.

¹¹¹ *Euthyd.* 277 D.

¹¹² NICE 14:4335.

¹¹³ *Strom.* 7:5.

¹¹⁴ P.Par. 52:10 & 53:5; compare TDNT I:xxxix & 529.

¹¹⁵ W. Whiston: *The Works of Flavius Josephus*, Routledge, London, 1890, p 480*.

¹¹⁶ *Ant.* 3:102 & *Wars* 4:563; TDNT I:529.

¹¹⁷ *Id.*, & *Ant.* 3:129.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Not *baptein* but its frequentative *baptizein* is the regular word later used in the Newer Testament to describe Christian baptism. However, its earliest secularized usage outside of the Older Testament itself —is only from the Late-Hellenic and Early-Hellenistic times onward.¹¹⁸

The first such secularized occurrences, are in Hippocrates and Plato —*circa* 400 to 350 B.C.¹¹⁹ *Baptizein* —in the sense of "to bathe" or "to wash" —is found only occasionally in Hellenism. There, "to billow so as to perish" seems to be its general meaning.¹²⁰ Thus, even the (75f A.D.) Greek-speaking Jew Josephus has: "to baptize the ship"; and "the wave baptized the ships."¹²¹

In the Latin writings of Vergil about the Greek hero Aeneas, we are again reminded of Dan. 5:21's familiar phrase: "baptized with the dew."¹²² Thus, before his own death in 19 A.D.,¹²³ Vergil wrote that Aeneas's helmsman Palinurus was *baptized* into sleep —by sprinkling his *head* with *dew*.¹²⁴ "Sleep took branches *drenched* in Lethe's *dew*...over the helmsman's *head*."¹²⁵

Vergil also wrote that, at the gates of the Cyclops, "Aeneas springs forward" and "*sprinkles* his body with fresh water."¹²⁶ Indeed, in his *Georgics*, Vergil wrote of how Cyrene "*thrice sprinkled* the glowing hearth-fire with the liquid nectar."¹²⁷

The (42 A.D.) hellenised Jew Philo commented¹²⁸ on Num 19:2-19 as to how "persons are *sprinkled* with pure water." There —"having previously prepared ashes" — Moses commanded "to *pour* water upon them." Then —"*moistening* some branches of hyssop with the mixture of ashes and water" —he further commanded "to *sprinkle* it over those who were to be *purified*." See too Heb 9:13!

Philo also declared that "reason is *baptized* with the things that come *upon* it."¹²⁹ Further: "Outside the outer vestibule [of the 42 A.D. Jewish Temple], at the entrance, is a brazen laver.... Let him who is about to be *sprinkled* with the *water of purification* from this laver, remember!"¹³⁰

¹¹⁸ *NICE* 1:168f; 10:3042f; & 17:5221.

¹¹⁹ *Ib.*, 10:3111 & 18:5366.

¹²⁰ *TDNT* I:530.

¹²¹ *Wars* 3:368 & 423 (*baptizein to skaphos*, and *ho kludoon [tas naus] ebaptizen*).

¹²² LXX; *cf.* n 41 on Dan 5:21.

¹²³ See Copley's ed. of Vergil's *Aeneid*, Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1965, pp *vii* & *xxiii*.

¹²⁴ Dale: *op. cit.* p 345.

¹²⁵ Copley: *op. cit.* p 115.

¹²⁶ *Aen.* 6:633f.

¹²⁷ *Georg.* 4:374f.

¹²⁸ III:230f; in Ayres: *op. cit.* p 103 n 1.

¹²⁹ *On Sobriety*; in Ayres: *op. cit.* p 43 (*baptizomenou* and *tois epiousi*).

¹³⁰ *Life of Moses* 3:15.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Similarly, around 75 A.D., the Jew Josephus commented¹³¹ on Ex 29:10-18. Said he: "Within these gates [to the tabernacle], was the vessel for *sprinkling*¹³² ... Therefrom, the priests *washed* their hands and *poured water* on their feet.... Moses took some from the blood of the sacrifices, and *sprinkled*¹³³ the robes of Aaron himself and his sons—and sanctified them with *spring water*."¹³⁴

Josephus also declared¹³⁵ that in Num 19:4-20 the red "heifer was slain by the high priest, and her blood *sprinkled* with his finger.... When therefore any persons were defiled by a dead body, they put a little of these ashes into *spring water*, with hyssop." Then, "*baptizing*¹³⁶ part of these ashes in it, they *sprinkled*¹³⁷ them with it."

With this, we may compare the (400f A.D.) Christian Patriarch Cyril of Alexandria. Wrote he:¹³⁸ "We have been *baptized*¹³⁹ not with naked water nor with the ashes of the heifer, but with the Holy Spirit!"

* * * * *

Just after the completion of the Newer Testament—one encounters perhaps the earliest Christian treatise dealing with the *sprinkling* ceremony of the Older Testament's red heifer. We refer to the *Epistle of Barnabas*, written around 100 A.D.¹⁴⁰ In that treatise, the Older Testament's ceremony is compared with the similar sprinkling—of New Testament *baptism*!

The Epistle addresses Christians awaiting baptism. Speaking to them about the red heifer, it says:¹⁴¹ "What do you think this type was? ... The 'young men' [or Old Testament priests] would *sprinkle*¹⁴² the people one by one.... The 'young men' [or New Testament administrators] who *sprinkle*, are those who preach to us the 'Good Tidings'.... We go down toward the *water*, full of sins and uncleanness—and come away, bearing fruit in the heart!" Cf. Isa. 52:15f & Acts 8:35-39.

Contemporary with the Epistle of Barnabas, also the renowned Plutarch stated¹⁴³ that "*plants are nourished by water in measure—but are choked by excess.... After the same manner, the soul grows.*" Thus, "the priests...*besprinkle* themselves."¹⁴⁴

¹³¹ *Ant.* 3:6:2 & 8:6.

¹³² *perirhanteerion*.

¹³³ *errhainen*.

¹³⁴ *ap-hagnisas peegaiois te hudasi*.

¹³⁵ *Ant.* 4:4:6.

¹³⁶ *baptisantes*.

¹³⁷ *errhainon*.

¹³⁸ *bebaptismena*.

¹³⁹ *On Isaiah*, 4:4 (in Ayres: *op. cit.* pp 104f); cf. Num 19:4-20 & Heb 9:10,19-21.

¹⁴⁰ *Ante-Nicene Fathers (ANF)*, Eerdmans ed., Grand Rapids, 1969, I:133.

¹⁴¹ *Ep. Barn.* chs. 8 & 11.

¹⁴² *rhantizen*.

¹⁴³ Article 'Plutarch' in *NICE* 18:5379.

¹⁴⁴ *De Isid. et Osir.*, 89; cf. Dale's *op. cit.*, pp 308 & 346.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Plutarch also enjoined:¹⁴⁵ "Baptize yourself *at the sea*"¹⁴⁶ —but not 'in' or 'under' it! "Remain seated *on the shore* throughout the day!" Indeed, according to him, even a city-state could be 'baptized' — without being submersed. For he declared of Athens:¹⁴⁷ "You *are baptized*; but fate *forbids* your *sinking*!"¹⁴⁸

However, Adamthwaite's article *Baptism is Immersion* does refer to at least *one* submersionistic usage of the word *baptizein* —in degenerate literature! Adamthwaite avidly alleges¹⁴⁹ "that this word means 'immerse' or 'submerge.'" To try to prove his allegation, he then immediately refers to a writing from the late date of *circa* the fourth century after Christ —"a papyrus" of "c. 4th A.D."

That was, of course, a time when the Church was fast adopting a 'magical' view of the Sacraments —under the invading influence of neo-paganism! Biblical sprinkling was by then being replaced by ritualistic submersionism. The more water used, the more effective it was now deemed to be: *ex opere operato*! So, in that fourth century papyrus —the Baptist Adamthwaite assures us¹⁴⁹ —"*baptizoo* is used to describe a ship sinking."

It seems to us, however, that it is only the Baptist ship that is here sinking! For, unlike our modern Baptist brethren, such anciently 'baptized ships' —overwhelmed by the *sprinkling* of the waves —thereafter *stayed* submerged, for ever!

* * * * *

In his article, the Baptist Adamthwaite almost totally ignores the Older Testament of the infallible Holy Scriptures. He also ignores the classical usages of the word *baptizein* even in secular Greek.

Furthermore, he seems to write off as less than "careful" even the encyclopaedic exegetical expositions of that great Trinitarian —the renowned Hebrew Christian Scholar Rev. Prof. Dr. Alfred Edersheim!¹⁵⁰ What, then, does Adamthwaite offer us in the place of all this?

He absolutizes modern *archaeological excavations*. Indeed, he shares the recent misinterpretations thereof — offered by Neo-Evangelicals, Non-Evangelicals, and even by Non-Christians in the Non-Trinitarian and 'Unitarian' Jewish State of modern Israel!

In Adamthwaite's article, one searches almost in vain for the views of the Old Testament Mediator Moses —and of Jehovah's messenger John the Baptizer. Indeed, Adamthwaite scarcely offers us any of the views of the world's Saviour Jesus the Messiah —or any of the views of His inspired apostles.

¹⁴⁵ *Essay on Superstit.*, in *Moral*. 166A.

¹⁴⁶ *baptison seauton eis thalassan*.

¹⁴⁷ *Theseus* 24.

¹⁴⁸ *Askos baptizee;* *dunai de toi ou themis estin*.

¹⁴⁹ *Op. cit.* p 32 & n 14.

¹⁵⁰ *Op. cit.* p 30.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Instead, Adamthwaite asks us to heed the views of unitarians! He asks us¹⁵¹ to heed the Philip Blackman edition of the Post-Christian Judaistic *Mishnah* (200f A.D.). He would have us revise our views "in the light" of those: of A. Mazar;¹⁵² of Ronny Reich;¹⁵³ of Rabbi D. Minzberger and Aluf S. Goren.¹⁵⁴

Some four times, Adamthwaite points us to the modern Israeli archaeologist Yigael Yadin.¹⁵⁵ Indeed, Adamthwaite authoritatively cites the modern *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem 1971) —some *thirteen* times in just eleven pages!¹⁵⁶

Thus, for the Baptist Adamthwaite, not the Sacred Scriptures but rather the non-christian and judaistic *Judaica* seems to have become his *chief* 'canon' or yardstick — with which to evaluate even Christian baptism! The Ancient Trinitarian hermeneutic is abandoned. Neo-Unitarian methodology is eagerly embraced!

* * * * *

Yet the Baptist Adamthwaite is not totally ignorant of all good Trinitarian Scholarship. For he indeed refers, in passing, to a few short statements —of Murray, Adams and "Hodges" —from the vast armoury of the very many volumes of "paedobaptist writers."¹⁵⁷

[Such "paedobaptist writers" are the defenders of the Biblical baptism of *whole households*. Acts 2:38f & 16:15,33f & 18:8 *etc.* They usually insist that such Biblical baptisms were and are to be administered also in the Biblical manner or mode — namely, by way of *sprinkling*. Acts 1:5 & 2:1f,16f & 10:45f *etc.*]

Material in Rev. Prof. John Murray's landmark book *Christian Baptism* — Presbyterian and Reformed, Philadelphia — is described by Adamthwaite as "slipshod and suspect."¹⁵⁸ Murray's "evidence" is stated to be only "thin at best" — depending on "a misreading of Lev. 15" (alleges Adamthwaite).¹⁵⁹ Indeed, in one pontificating phrase, he assures us in his summarizing statement: "Murray is ignorant of a number of things."¹⁶⁰

¹⁵¹ *Ib.* pp 31 & 40 n 16.

¹⁵² *Ib.* p 40 n 31.

¹⁵³ *Ib.* p 40 n 12.

¹⁵⁴ *Ib.* p 40 n 13.

¹⁵⁵ *Ib.* pp 31 & 40 (n 9,13,31).

¹⁵⁶ *Ib.* pp 33 (twice) & 40 (n 4,4a,6,8,17,18,19,20,21,22,41).

¹⁵⁷ *Ib.* p 36.

¹⁵⁸ *Ib.* p 30 n 3 & p 31 at lines 2-3.

¹⁵⁹ *Ib.* pp 32 & n 15.

¹⁶⁰ *Ib.* p 37.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

True, (Rev. Prof. Dr.) Jay Adams's standard work *The Meaning and Mode of Baptism* (Presbyterian and Reformed) is at least briefly noted by Adamthwaite. Yet it too is then even more aggressively assailed! For Jay Adams, alleges Adamthwaite, wishfully "waxes triumphant"¹⁶¹ —in spite of his lack of "careful scholarship."¹⁶² Indeed, Adams is said to make "wild claims" which "are palpably false."¹⁶³ Frankly —so Adamthwaite assures us —"Adams" is plainly "wrong."¹⁶⁴

So too is —or are? —"Hodges."¹⁶⁴ Here, it is not clear whether Adamthwaite is castigating the modern Rev. Prof. Dr. Jesse Hodges —or the more famous Rev. Prof. Dr. Charles Hodge together with his son Rev. Prof. Dr. A.A. Hodge. We can only assume he is here assailing *Jesse* Hodges. For Adamthwaite's own word "Hodges" has no apostrophe —and Adamthwaite, we recall, scorns what is "slipshod" in his zeal for "careful scholarship."

Adamthwaite is, however, somewhat kinder toward the modern Presbyterians Rev. Prof. Louis Berkhof and Rev. Prof. Dr. Gordon H. Clark; the "paedobaptist" Rev. Prof. Dr. O. Noordtjiz; and Rev. Prof. Dr. J. Barton Payne. In their cases, Adamthwaite simply *discounts* their views —without any argumentation.¹⁶⁵

Yet 'sprinkling advocates' of infant baptism in general —continues Adamthwaite —eccentrically exude "polemical zeal." Moreover, those advocates also make what Adamthwaite calls: "'cannot exclude' claims." That is — he alleges! — they dogmatically decree that Christian churches 'cannot exclude' at least the infant of a believing parent from baptism.

Yet such claims, insists Adamthwaite, only reveal their "ignorance of the operation of the then operating Temple ritual." This "ignorance" in the minds of "paedobaptist writers" —Adamthwaite further insists —is "truly pathetic." For it is "based on gross ignorance" —and is indicative of "the merry pranks by paedobaptists who...are wide of the mark."¹⁶⁶

Thus, Adamthwaite asserts that Scriptural sprinklers alias non-immersionistic Presbyterians like John Murray are "slipshod." Even Jay Adams lacks "careful scholarship." Let us, however, now take a closer look at the more obviously "slipshod" lack of "careful scholarship" in the Baptist Adamthwaite himself!

* * * * *

First, we are appalled by Adamthwaite's most Un-Protestant and indeed Neo-Thomist apologetic. Thereby, he has attempted to re-read Holy Writ —through the spectacles of secular science. The correct approach, however, demands just the opposite!

¹⁶¹ *Ib.* p 38 at n 38 & 39.

¹⁶² *Ib.*, p 30 at n 1 & 3.

¹⁶³ *Ib.*, p 30 n 2 & p 31 at lines 1-2.

¹⁶⁴ *Ib.* p 35 at n 27 & 28.

¹⁶⁵ *Ib.* pp 31 n 5, 34 n 25, 35 n 27, & 39 n 40.

¹⁶⁶ *Ib.* pp 35f.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Second, Adamthwaite has misconstrued Holy Writ specifically in the darkness of modern archaeology —which he has called "the light of Jewish sources and the excavations."¹⁶⁷ He should have done precisely the opposite. Obscure archaeology investigates the sin-stained terrain of God's general revelation. This therefore needs to be interpreted in the clear light of God's special revelation —in sinless Sacred Scripture!

Third, Adamthwaite seriously erred when he sought to begin his understanding of New Testament baptism —from the perspective of Judaistic 'proselyte baptism.' He should, as we have done, instead have started his study in the Older Testament and at the most ancient time. Mt 19:4f; Rom 4:3f; 6:3f; I Cor 10:1f; I Pet 3:20f!

Fourth, he should at the very least have discussed the baptism of Noah and his household —by the mode of sprinkling, during the Great Flood. He should also have discussed the baptism of the Israelites at the Red Sea —by the cloud which poured out water. Instead, Adamthwaite has attempted to ground Judaistic 'proselyte baptism' —in practices absolutely no earlier than the bronze laver in Solomon's Temple!

Fifth, Adamthwaite has restricted nearly all of his sources solely to *Non-Biblical* material. Indeed, he has even reinterpreted the (200f A.D.) Hebrew *Mishnah* —in the light (or darkness) of the modern *Encyclopaedia Judaica* and contemporary Israeli archaeology. Nowhere has Adamthwaite attempted to interpret the uninspired *Mishnah* nor uninspiring unitarian archaeology —in the light of the infallibly inspired Holy Scriptures of the Older and the Newer Testaments!

Sixth, Adamthwaite's approach was bad —even archaeologically. An acquaintance with Rogers's *Baptism and Christian Archaeology* —instead of with 'Baptism and Judaistic Archaeology' as gleaned from the unitarian *Encyclopaedia Judaica* —would have helped him.

Seventh, he should have been aware of the essential need to adhere specifically to *Biblical* alias *Christian* presuppositions in studying *any* matter. That would then have enabled Adamthwaite to have been more loyal to Consistent Christianity.

However, we shall now show that the Baptist Adamthwaite has misinterpreted even the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*! Indeed, he has misunderstood even those Talmudic traditions —which our spotless Saviour Himself so rightly rejected.¹⁶⁸

* * * * *

Adamthwaite majors heavily —indeed, almost exclusively —on the Judaistic *miqva'oth* or pools of running water for ritual cleansings. Compare the *miqvah* or "pool" of running waters mentioned in Isa 22:9-11. He overlooks the fact that this pool was fed by a "conduit" (Isa 7:3) coming from outside the walled city. He also seems to overlook that its purpose was strategic rather than ablutionary.

¹⁶⁷ *Ib.* p 30 paras 1f.

¹⁶⁸ Mt 15:1-20; Mk 7:1-8.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Now the very word *miqvah*, plural *miqva'oth*, means a "collection of waters" and hence a "reservoir." It is derived from the Hebrew verb *qavah*, meaning "to collect." In the Niph'al, this verb means "to gather themselves together" —referring to *running waters*, such as those mentioned in Isa 22:11.

Throughout, the emphasis is *not on the depth* of the water concerned —but upon its '*runningness*' alias its non-stagnancy.¹⁶⁹ Even Adamthwaite himself almost grasps this —where he rightly states that "the basic meaning of the miqveh" is connected to "the flowing ('living') water of a river, stream or spring."¹⁷⁰

Yet Adamthwaite should have reflected even further. He should also have considered the relationship of the words *spring* and *sprinkle* —to the idea of *refreshment* by specifically *running* water.

Instead, he refers to the Post-Christian Talmudic "tractate *Miqva'ot*" —in "the Jewish Mishnah (compiled A.D. 200)."¹⁷¹ Here, Adamthwaite *admits* that this source (the uninspired Mishnah) — the chief writing on which he bases his own immersionism —was only compiled well over a century *after* the completion of infallible Sacred Scripture!

For this reason alone, we could well ignore the uninspired Mishnah completely —in favour of the earlier evidence of the inspired New Testament. Yet it is just possible that also the Post-Christian Mishnah —occasionally at least —might itself reflect even the prior intertestamentary ablutions of degenerating Judaism. By this, we mean ablutions among the Israelites —between the times of Malachi and of Matthew. So, it is appropriate to deal definitively with this mishnaic material right away.

* * * * *

Adamthwaite himself draws our attention to the "Jewish Mishnah (compiled A.D. 200), sixth tractate *Miqva'ot*." He does not also tell us that the latter word actually means: "the gathering places of *running* water." Yet he confidently reminds us that this mishnaic tractate in the Talmud "contains ten chapters of stipulations regarding the miqveh." Erroneously, by 'miqveh' (masculine) he apparently means the related feminine word *miqvah* (plural *miqva'oth*). For Adamthwaite then adds that this is "the miqveh...(plural *miqva'ot*)."¹⁷¹

He also adds that "these pools...were for ritual purification" and indeed —according to him! —for "ritual immersion." He further states that they were "for all who had contacted a corpse (Num 19:18-19) or any other defiling object" —for "all with any sort of discharge"; for all "after marriage relationships"; and for all "menstruant women."¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁹ See the Hebrew-English Lexicons of Gesenius, Davidson, Brown-Driver-Briggs.

¹⁷⁰ *Op. cit.* p 38.

¹⁷¹ *Op. cit.* p 31.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Now it needs to be noted that, unlike Adamthwaite, Sacred Scripture prescribes not "ritual immersion" but precisely *sprinkling* "for all who had contacted a corpse."¹⁷¹ Num 19:13-19 is quite specific in this regard: "Whoever touches the dead body of any man that is dead, and does not purify himself, defiles the tabernacle...because the water of separation was not *sprinkled* upon him.... A clean person shall...*sprinkle* it...upon him that touched a bone or one slain or one dead or a grave. And the clean person shall *sprinkle* upon the unclean."

It also needs to be said that, in the (270 B.C.) Greek Septuagint, the word *koitazeetai* is used (at Lev 15:20f) — in respect of *cleansing by water* after menstruation. The very same verb is also used in Dan 4:15 (4:12 LXX). There, we find *koitastheesetai* —in association with being moistened by *dewdrops*! Indeed, why *should* total submersion of the *entire* human body have been required —when heeding Old Testament ritual cleansings even after purely *localised* 'pollutions' such as specifically menstruation?

At this point, Adamthwaite has made several gratuitous misassumptions. He inaccurately assumes that the *mode* by which Jewesses (defiled as above) washed themselves in Early *Post-Christian* times —was the same as earlier, in Pre-Christian Intertestamentary times.

He also misassumes that the Judaistic washings in Post-Christian times took place by the same mode —as they did in the earlier Pre-Christian times. He further misassumes that intertestamentary (*hellenistic*!) practice in this regard —was the same as the prescribed *Mosaic* practice.

Indeed, he once again misassumes that the mode of (self-)cleansing after menstruation even in Mosaic times —was then identical to the mode(s) whereby Hebrew priests contemporaneously washed Hebrew lepers. He also misassumes that it was identical to the mode whereby various inanimate 'Hebrew objects' were then being cleansed. However, all of these (mis)assumptions are rebuttable!

* * * * *

For, also according to many of the Early Church Fathers,¹⁷² Ancient Hebrew *lepers* were cleansed not by immersion but by *sprinkling*. Indeed, Christ Himself apparently *disapproved* of the *Post-Mosaic* and uninspired *Judaistic* methods —of 'baptismally' cleansing various inanimate 'Hebrew objects' such as pots and beds.¹⁷³

But what if Adamthwaite were to be correct on this point? Then, it would only prove that also the Early Post-Christian Judaical ceremonies —all used the *same* mode as the more ancient Old Testament practice of *sprinkling*! So Adamthwaite should now relinquish the views of unitarianizing modern archaeologists —and return instead to the *Mosaic* portions of the *Trinitarian Bible*!¹⁷⁴

¹⁷² See n 56 above.

¹⁷³ Mk 7:1f.

¹⁷⁴ Lev 13:54f; 14:5f,48f; 15:2f; Num 8:7; 19:18f; Mk 7:1f; Lk 11:37f; John 3:25f; Heb 9:10,13,19,21.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Significantly, even the Baptist Adamthwaite claims it was only in "most cases" — and therefore not in all! —that "total immersion...was/is required for...cases of ritual impurity" in Judaism. He claims that such cases were "decreed in the Torah" —alias the first five books of the Old Testament. But then he promptly refers¹⁷⁵ not at all to the Torah (of 1440f B.C.), but instead to the (1971 A.D.) "entry 'Ablution' in *Encyclopaedia Judaica*."

Would that the uninspired and modern *Judaica* always agreed with the inspired and ancient *Torah*! Yet what does even this "entry" in the *Judaica*¹⁷⁶ really claim? On its very same page to which Adamthwaite refers, it actually states that "the person or article must be clean —with nothing adhering (*chazizah*) to him or it.... According to law, one such immersion is sufficient; but three have become customary."

Here, the *Judaica* speaks not of total *sub*-mersion but only of *im*-mersion —alias *partial* insertion into water.¹⁷⁷ The *Judaica* is right as to the customary *tripleness* of the cleansing. That is Biblical!¹⁷⁸ But the *Judaica* is wrong¹⁷⁹ as to the *nakedness* of that cleansing —("nothing adhering"). It has overlooked the 'clothed ablutions' of the Pre-Christian Judaistic Essenes mentioned by Josephus!¹⁸⁰

Now it should be noted that modern Baptists themselves by and large disregard this customary triple washing (dating apparently even from Old Testament times). This is curious, for Scripture itself describes the administration of the Christian rite in terms of the frequentative *baptizein* —not in terms of its non-frequentative cognate *baptein*. And never does Sacred Scripture use the submersives *hupodu(n)ein* and *katadu(n)ein*!

Indeed, the Early Christian Church Father Gregory of Nyssa¹⁸¹ and many modern Presbyterians see the continuation of Elijah's triple pouring —*via* the similar rite of John the Baptizer — in Christ's mandate to administer triune baptism.¹⁸² Consequently, they still practise triple sprinkling at Christian baptisms.

It is, however, indeed fortunate that modern Baptists —in their own *clothed* public immersions —follow the clothed washings of the Pre-Christian Essenes.¹⁸³ In that matter, Baptists fortunately disregard the Post-Christian Judaical public ablutions — and the modern *Encyclopaedia Judaica*'s version of Post-Christian Judaical *naked washings* "with nothing adhering" *etc!*

* * * * *

¹⁷⁵ *Op. cit.* pp 31 at n 4a.

¹⁷⁶ *Encyclopaedia Judaica (EJ)*, Keter, Jerusalem, II col. 82.

¹⁷⁷ Lev 4:5f; 14:5f *etc.*

¹⁷⁸ Num 6:23f; I Kgs 18:33f; Mt 28:19.

¹⁷⁹ See: Num 19:12f & Mt 3:4f.

¹⁸⁰ *Wars* 2:8:5.

¹⁸¹ *De Bap. Chr.*, in Migne's *PGL* 46:592.

¹⁸² I Kgs 18:33f; John 1:19-33; 3:22f; Mt 28:19.

¹⁸³ Josephus: *Wars* 2:8:5,7.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Adamthwaite quite gratuitously assumes that the "immersion" of Jewish persons referred to in the Talmudic tractate *Miqva'oth*, is indeed "total immersion" alias *submersion* —in "cases of ritual impurity."¹⁸⁴ However, not even the Mishnah (and still less Holy Scripture) here equates partial "immersion" with the total *sub-mersion* alias 'hupo-dusis' or 'kata-dusis' sometimes referred to in the later stages of Pre-Christian Greek Paganism.¹⁸⁵

Indeed, why should a *total submersion* even of undefiled *toes and fingers* —be required for Pre-Christian Israelitic ritual cleansings of *other* body parts? Why should also *the shoulders and the arms* need to be totally submersed (or even totally sprinkled) —even after mere menstruation or localized seminal issues *etc*?

Further, Adamthwaite gratuitously assumes that this "im-mersion" or 'dipping into' a pool constituted *total submersion*. He jumps to the conclusion that the 'dipping in' of defiled Hebrews and of their unclean utensils —necessarily involved their *sub-mersion totally*!

Yet such was not the case —according to the infallible Scriptures of the Older Testament. For note the usages of *baptein* and *baptizein* —in many clearly *non-submersionistic* passages in the Septuagint Bible.¹⁸⁶ Nor was total submersion the case —even according to the fallible modern *Encyclopaedia Judaica*!

For, as far as the cleansing of the 'defiled' *body-parts* of intertestamentary Jews is concerned, this was done not by total submersion but by *sprinkling*. Thus, the Pharisees and all the Jews washed or "baptized" their hands by *sprinkling* them —even in Christ's own time! "The Pharisees...saw some of His disciples eat bread...with unwashed hands. They found fault. For the Pharisees...do not eat, unless *they wash*" their hands.¹⁸⁷

For the above words "they wash" —the Textus Receptus, the Codex Alexandrinus and the Codex Bezae all have: *baptisoontai*. This means: "they baptize" —*cf.* Heb 9:10. Some other ancient manuscripts and two uncials (the Codex Sinaiticus and the Codex Vaticanus) here use the word *rhantisoontai*. This means: "they sprinkle." *Cf.* Heb 9:10,13,19,21.

* * * * *

¹⁸⁴ *Op. cit.* p 31.

¹⁸⁵ *E.g.*: Homer's *Il.* 18:145 & *Od.* 4:435; Aristotle's *De Incess. Animalium* 7:13a:20; *Corp. Gloss.* V:1 (ed. G. Loewe & Others, Leipzig, 1888). *Cf.* Just. Mart. *Tryph.* 46 & *Frag.* 10 (in Migne *PG* 6:1596).

¹⁸⁶ Thus: Josh 3:15; II Kgs 5:14; Dan. 4:33; 5:21.

¹⁸⁷ Mk 7:1f *cf.* Mt 15:1f.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

What about the cleansing of defiled Jewish *utensils*? Here again, the (total?) "immersions" of the Post-Christian Judaistic *Mishnah* (from 200 A.D. onwards) cannot be reconciled with the Older Testament prescriptions. Heb 9:10-19. Nor can they be reconciled even with the unprescribed *inter*-testamentary practices. For even in Christ's own time, the Pharisees were apparently still performing the "baptisms" of defiled utensils by *sprinkling*.¹⁸⁷ Indeed, some of those utensils —like tables and beds —could hardly have been submersed!

The inspired Gospel of Mark itself tells us about these practices of Mark's contemporaries the Pharisees. It states¹⁸⁸ that "there are also many other things which they have received to hold, such as the washing (*baptismous*) of cups and pots, brazen vessels and of tables." Indeed, after "tables" —some manuscripts have the extra words "and beds."¹⁸⁹

Even partial immersion of all these utensils, was quite unnecessary —and also a departure from the Sacred Scriptures. For the inspired Heb 9:10-21 describes the prescribed Old Testament "washings" or *baptismois* of temple utensils. It says this was done by "sprinkling" —*rhantizousa* and *errhantisen*. It says absolutely nothing at all about total sub-mersion or even about partial im-mersion of such articles —least of all about the submersion of large objects such as tables and beds!

Now the Baptist Adamthwaite says ("rightly") that a Pharisee was actually *washing* his hands —and thus even engaged in "Rabbinic handwashing" —when he "poured cleansing water over only one of his hands."¹⁹⁰ Here, note Adamthwaite's own words: "rightly"; "poured"; and "only one" hand!

He further admits that the Pharisees could thus "acquire cleanness by the cleansing water poured over them up to the wrist."¹⁹¹ Here, Adamthwaite agrees that —to the ancient rabbi's —there was an adequate and proper ritual "washing" even when water was merely "poured" over one of the hands and just as far as "up to the wrist."

Adamthwaite correctly adds that "this ritual seems to have arisen in the first century B.C." —and was thus not an ordinance prescribed by the Older Testament itself. Indeed, he even admits that "Jesus opposed it" —and that "other rabbis did so too."¹⁹¹

In referring to the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Adamthwaite does not, however, tell us —as the *Judaica* itself does!¹⁹² —that the famous (50-137 A.D.) Rabbi Akiva opposed the practice of ritual handwashing. Nor does Adamthwaite tell us (as even the *Judaica* does)¹⁹² that *sprinkling* was in fact quite *sufficient* —even though there were indeed "sects" which, unnecessarily, required immersion (of the hands before eating).

* * * * *

¹⁸⁸ Mk 7:4.

¹⁸⁹ Text. Recept. & Cod. Bezae.

¹⁹⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp 32f, citing *Tohoroth* and *Yadayim* in the *Mishnah* 1 & 3 ch 1.

¹⁹¹ *Ib.* pp 32 & 40 and at n 17.

¹⁹² 13:1412, and see n 191 above.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

It should be noted that the Baptist Adamthwaite —though unwittingly so! —has already admitted to 'baptism' by *pouring*. For he has agreed that *not even* just the *hands* of (first-century A.D.) Pharisees were totally immersed. He has conceded that their hands merely had "cleansing water poured over them"¹⁹¹ —or even "poured over over only one" of them!¹⁹⁰ Most curiously, therefore, Adamthwaite now goes on —unlike even the 200 A.D. *Mishnah*!¹⁹³ —to demand the *total submersion* of all defiled objects!

Adamthwaite is suddenly emphatic.¹⁹⁴ "Immersion must be total." For the regulations 'require for valid ritual immersion that the water enters inside them: the shoulder knot of underwear, the hem of a sheet..., the thongs of a sandal' (i.e. water must penetrate to all parts). *Miqva'ot* chap. 10, *Mishnah* 4."

Right here, Adamthwaite immediately refers to his own footnote "19." That points us to the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. The footnote reads: "Entry 'Miqveh' col. 1536 features a 14th century woodcut depicting the immersion of utensils in a miqveh."¹⁹⁵ Here, Adamthwaite assumes *submersion*.

However, that is not what the *Judaica* here depicts! "Entry 'Miqveh' col. 1536" actually does something else. The woodcut there referred to, instead depicts women dangling objects *over* a pit —with water only in the *bottom* thereof. It does *not* depict them giving an "immersion" which is "total" to the objects in that pit —as Adamthwaite wrongly alleges¹⁹⁵ it does.

He also misassumes that the ritual cleansing of defiled Jews themselves —took place in exactly the same way as did the cleansing of a utensil. Yet this is incredible. For, following Adamthwaite's Baptist misinterpretation of the (200f A.D.) *Mishnah*, this would then "require for valid ritual immersion that the water enters inside them" —and hence enters even *inside* the defiled Jews themselves! Indeed, Adamthwaite further insists, the "water must penetrate to all parts."¹⁹⁵

Strange spectres of absurd and 'apocryphal' ablutions here suggest themselves. Were the defiled Jews then to be required to *swallow* the water —and to have it enter into *all* of their body orifices? On this hypothesis —even Adamthwaite should be insisting that very few Baptist submersions have ever met these man-made criteria of validity!

Once again, Adamthwaite refers¹⁹⁶ to the *Encyclopaedia Judaica*.¹⁹⁷ This time, he alleges anent the Judaical cleansing specifically of defiled *Jews*: "Rabbis stipulated a minimum of 47 inches depth, to enable total immersion of the candidate, preferably in a standing position." Yet Adamthwaite then omits the rest of the sentence in the *Judaica*. That goes on to say: "even though he has to bend his knees."

¹⁹³ *Op. cit.* p 33, citing "Kelim chap. 25, *Mishnah* 1."

¹⁹⁴ *Op. cit.* p 33 at its n 19.

¹⁹⁵ *Op. cit.* p 40 n 19.

¹⁹⁶ *Op. cit.* p. 31 n 6 & p 40 n 6.

¹⁹⁷ 11:1536f (*cf.* n 196 above).

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

We have not yet heard of modern Baptists receiving their *immersions* on bended knees. Undoubtedly, however, the notion indeed has merit!

* * * * *

Significant indeed is Adamthwaite's admission¹⁹⁸ that the "pools" excavated by Yigael Yadin and others in Israel since the 1960's, were connected with "private homes" —and not with the Temple! Their principal use was thus for domestic purposes such as daily baths —and not for the more occasional ritual washings.

Important too is his further assertion that the "six stone jars" in the house at Cana mentioned in John's Gospel, were "for the purification (rite) of the Jews." Indeed, he even alleges that they "were clearly to service the water supply for the miqveh."¹⁹⁹

Yet here, Adamthwaite has missed the obvious fact that this was 'running water' — water to be *poured forth* from such jars! See John 2:7-10. He has also missed the implication that — being "for the *purifying* of the Jews"¹⁹⁹ — that water was 'baptizingly' to be *sprinkled* over their hands.²⁰⁰

* * * * *

We have just been considering the *self-washing* of all defiled Jews on the one hand, and their own washing of their defiled utensils on the other —during the intertestamentary period. We now look at the quite different 'washing' of *Gentile proselytes* by Hebrews —during that same time.

The Baptist Adamthwaite seems to have forgotten this difference! He also seems to have forgotten that, unlike Gentiles, the defiled Jews had previously been conceived in the covenant —and circumcised in infancy. Unlike their prior circumcision (and unlike the Christian baptism which replaced it), these subsequent 'washings' of such Jews were not once and for all but *repetitive*. For such washings were repeated — *whenever* the Jews themselves again became defiled.

However, in the case of Gentile proselytes to Judaism —their ritual washing was indeed once and for all. Indeed, it was just one of several successive rites —by which they got engrafted into the covenant. This was during Hellenistic times —some considerable time after the closure of the Old Testament canon around 400 B.C.

Nevertheless, it is significant that also this proselyte baptism was called a *ʿbiylah*²⁰¹ —from the Hebrew verb *taabal*! And it was previously noted that this verb is frequently rendered either *baptein* or *baptizein* — in the (270 B.C.) Greek Septuagint translation of the Old Testament.

¹⁹⁸ *Op. cit.* pp 31f.

¹⁹⁹ John 2:6.

²⁰⁰ In Mk 7:3-4, "wash" translates *nipsoontai* and *baptisoontai* or *rhantisoontai*; and in Lk 11:37-38, "washed" translates *ebaptisthee*. In Heb 9:10-13, the "washings" (*baptismois*) were clearly accomplished by "sprinkling" (*rhantizousa*) unto "purifying" (*katharoteeta*). Compare John 2:6's "purifying" (*katharismou*), and 3:23-25's "baptizing" and "baptized" and "purifying" (*katharismou*).

²⁰¹ Cf. Cullmann: *Baptism in the New Testament*, London, SCM, 1956, pp 25f & 63.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

In some of those cases —such as at Josh 3:15 —it was seen that *taabal* and *baptein* could not possibly mean submersion. In most of the rest of those cases, it was seen that these words clearly imply *sprinkling*.²⁰² Indeed, also the New Testament texts which refer to those proselytized to Judaism —would confirm that they had been 'baptized' specifically by *sprinkling*.²⁰³

Adamthwaite assumes that the intertestamentary ritual washing of proselytes —took place in the same way as did the various Old Testament washings. Yet if it indeed did —that would then have occurred by way of the *sprinkling* used in the various Mosaic 'baptisms.' Heb 9:10-21.

* * * * *

For even Adamthwaite rightly states:²⁰⁴ "The rabbis held that impurity came by contact with (a) an idolater; (b) a Gentile; (c) a leper or anyone else already unclean. For all these impurities the miqveh was the proper means of purification." Yet here, Adamthwaite has apparently forgotten that such lepers were symbolically purified precisely by way of *sprinkling*! Lev 14:7f.

Nevertheless, Adamthwaite does not hesitate to quote²⁰⁵ from the Unitarian and Post-Christian *Encyclopaedia Judaica* —"[Vol. 11] Column 82" —in order to try to establish his own notion of "total immersion." Yet he totally ignores this same "Column 82" (and also the next Column 83) of the *Judaica* —on the subject of the Judaic 'baptism' of Gentile proselytes!

For there, in its columns 82-83, even the *Judaica* declares: "Immersion also came to form part of the ceremony of conversion to Judaism.... Pouring nine *kav*...of water over the body, was considered sufficient."

Here, the language of the *Judaica* is very precise. No total submersion of the proselyte under the water was then required. Instead, the partial immersion involved —was sufficiently administered by a "*pouring*" of water. Indeed, the water was to be poured "*over*" the candidate!

Furthermore, this involved precisely *running* water —nine *kav* of it. The very word "*kav*" (or *qav*) —a measurement —is, just like the word *mi-qv-ah*, derived from the Hebrew verb *qav-ah*.

Qav-ah means to "collect together" —to collect water which had been, and could further be, *poured out* as 'running water.' One could then pour out a very small outpouring —a *qav*. One could even proceed "to pour out" —*l^e-qav-oth* —more of this running water. One could also *pour* it, or cause it to *be poured*, into *mi-qv-a'oth* —alias "pools of running water."

²⁰² Ex 12:22; Lev 4:6-17; 14:6f; Num 19:18; II Kgs 5:14; Ezk 23:15.

²⁰³ Mt 15:2f & 23:15 with Mk 7:3f and Acts 2:10f & 6:5.

²⁰⁴ *Op. cit.* pp 33f & 40 n 22.

²⁰⁵ *Op. cit.* pp 33 & 40 at n 18.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Now even the modern *Encyclopaedia Judaica* agrees that submersing the Gentile proselyte to Judaism, was not necessary. Merely "pouring nine *kav*...of water *over*" him —nine small outpourings of running water —"was considered sufficient." This running water was "*poured*" out "*over*" the Gentile proselyte —in order to graft him into the covenant. *That* ritual outpouring "was considered *sufficient*" for this purpose —by Ancient Judaism —according to the modern *Encyclopaedia Judaica*!

Hence, Rev. Prof. Dr. Jay Adams draws the correct conclusion in his book *The Meaning and Mode of Baptism*. There, while discussing total submersion, he rightly remarks:²⁰⁶ "Immersion as a Pre-Johannine, Pre-Christian practice must be discounted."

* * * * *

We have just considered the 'washing' of *Gentile proselytes* by Hebrew administrators. We next move on to look at the 'washings' of *Hebrew* proselytes by Hebrew administrators. That occurred when such Hebrew proselytes joined Hebrew sects —such as the Essenes. It thereafter continued —as a whole series of ritualistic self-washings —performed by those sectarians themselves.

Now the Baptist Adamthwaite alleges that the Qumran community was founded *circa* 200 B.C.²⁰⁷ He quotes triumphantly from Bryant Wood's article *To Dip or Sprinkle?* There, Wood had insisted²⁰⁸ that "the members of the Qumran sect most certainly dipped." Here, Adamthwaite also assumes that even 'dipped' can only mean to be totally submersed.

Yet he seems to have forgotten that the Hellenistic era —during which time he believes Judaical proselyte baptism arose —was a time of *syncretism*! The careful Kittel —here citing with approval that celebrated scholar of Intertestamentary Judaism, Rev. Prof. Dr. Emil Schuerer —has demonstrated²⁰⁹ that the Essenes were indeed *syncretistic*. Also Josephus, their own contemporary, anciently attributed some of the Essenic views —to Paganism!²¹⁰

Moreover, Rev. Dr. J.B. Lightfoot, in his three classic studies on the Essenes,²¹¹ has shown that there were indeed "foreign elements in Essenism" — such as Pythagoreanism. "The characteristic features of Pythagoreanism" — namely "the asceticism, the magic, the mysticism" —are "more Oriental" than they are Biblical. So, as regards the Essenes, "when we turn to the representations of Philo and Josephus, it is impossible to overlook...traits which betoken foreign affinities."

²⁰⁶ Philipsburg N.J., Presb. & Ref., 1975, p 8.

²⁰⁷ *Op. cit.* p 31 at n 10.

²⁰⁸ *Op. cit.* pp 37 & 40 at n 5 & 34.

²⁰⁹ *TDNT* 1:537 (n 39) & I:546 (n 4).

²¹⁰ *Wars* 2:8:11.

²¹¹ See in his *St Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, Macmillan, London, 1886, pp 354,378,384f,398.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Indeed, according to the learned Josephus, even his own former teacher Banus was "often washing in cold water day and night with a view to cultic purity."²¹² Josephus also explained —as an eye-witness! —that the Essenes "practise the mode of life which among the Greeks was introduced by Pythagoras."²¹³

Yet the Essenes and Banus had no influence upon either John the Baptizer or Jesus Christ. The Essenes were 'communal' vegetarians;²¹⁴ the 'individualists' John and Jesus ate respectively locusts²¹⁵ and fish.²¹⁶ Banus wore garments of bark or leaves;²¹⁴ John wore camel-hair;²¹⁵ and Jesus wore woven fabric.²¹⁷

Again, the Essenes and Banus both practised frequent *self*-lustrations.²¹⁸ But John baptized people once only,²¹⁹ Jesus condemned repeated ritual washings;²²⁰ and Christian baptism was never administered by the candidates to themselves but only by their instructor.²²¹ Indeed, the Essenes even denied the resurrection of the body²²² — whereas John²²³ and Jesus²²⁴ both insisted on that very doctrine (as indeed reflected in their baptisms)!²²⁵

There is thus no connection between the earlier 'washings' of the Essenes and Banus on the one hand —and the baptisms performed by John the Baptizer on the other. As Kittel explains, from these earlier Essenic washings "there is no solid bridge to [John] the Baptist.... The completely different attitude to ritualism demonstrated by the daily repetition of washings on the one side and the uniqueness of baptism on the other, denotes an unbridgeable distinction."²²⁶

Yet, both the Essenes and Banus greatly affected —the *later* 'hemerobaptists.' The latter — whether 'daily baptists' or 'morning baptists'²²⁷ — ritually re-washed themselves, every day of their lives!²²⁸ As such, they were clearly outside the pale of Christianity. Instead, they flourished precisely on the 'communal' or 'left-wing lunatic fringe' —of reactionary Post-Christian *Judaism*.

* * * * *

²¹² *Vit.* 2.

²¹³ *Ant.* 15:10:4.

²¹⁴ Josephus's *Wars* 2:8:3, and Lightfoot's *op. cit.* p 398.

²¹⁵ Mt 3:4.

²¹⁶ Lk 24:41f.

²¹⁷ John 19:23.

²¹⁸ Josephus's *Vit.* 2, and *Wars* 2:8:5,7,9,12f.

²¹⁹ Lk 3:3-7; 7:29f; Acts 19:1-4.

²²⁰ Mk 7:1f.

²²¹ Acts 8:29f.

²²² *Wars* 2:8:11.

²²³ Mt 3:9f; 14:2f.

²²⁴ Mt 16:21; 22:28f.

²²⁵ Rom. 6:3f; I Cor.15:29.

²²⁶ *TDNT* I:537 & I:546.

²²⁷ *toobleey-yoom* and *toobleey-sh^echaariym*. See Kittel's *TDNT* I:546.

²²⁸ Acts 19:1f; *Syb. Or.* 160; *Apost. Const.* 6:6,2; *Epiph. Haer.* 17:1.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Adamthwaite also discusses the *Biblical* baptism of penitent Hebrews —by John the Baptizer. However, he wrongly assumes John used the same mode of baptism as did the later unitarian Judaists —as described in the ritualistic *Mishnah* of 200 A.D.

He further makes the same misassumption —as regards the apostolic mode of baptizing penitent Gentiles, in the trinitarian terms of the Great Commission. Indeed, there never was any *self*-washing from defilement —in the baptismal mode employed during the New Testament baptisms practised by John and by Christ's apostles!

Now even the Levites and the Pharisees of the first century A.D., knew that *Christ* would baptize in the same '*pouring*' way as had *Elijah* —at his dramatic and unforgettable public showdown atop Mt Carmel. It is because they saw *John* baptizing in this way —by pouring! —that they initially confused him with Elijah, and with Christ.

Thus, the Pharisees asked John: "Are you Elijah?" John replied: "I am not." Then they asked him: "Why are you then *baptizing* —if you are neither Christ, nor Elijah?"²²⁹

In Elijah's day, because of the ungodliness of the Israelites, God had withheld the *rain*. So, Elijah re-erected Israel's dilapidated altar —"according to...the tribes of the children of Jacob" —and publically *poured* water over it: *thrice*. Then God sent —the *rain!*²³⁰

Later, Malachi had predicted that God would send an "Elijah" —as His Own "messenger." That would occur just before the manifestation of the Lord Jesus Christ —"before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord."²³¹ Then, the Lord Himself —the Mediator of the Covenant —would suddenly come to His temple (alias His true people). He would come to them as their great "Refiner" —to "purge" and to "*pour out*" His blessing upon them!²³²

The Priests and the Levites and the Pharisees knew these Scriptures! Hence their questions to John —when they saw him baptizing by *pouring*.²³³ Jesus Himself later declared that John had thus fulfilled Malachi's prediction regarding Elijah.²³⁴ Yet later, so too —under the infallible inspiration of the Holy Spirit —did Luke.²³⁵

²²⁹ John 1:19-25; cf. J. W. Dale's *Johannic Baptism* (Philadelphia, Rutter, 1871), p 145.

²³⁰ I Kgs 18:1,31f,45.

²³¹ Mal 3:1a & 4:5f.

²³² Mal 3:1b-3,10.

²³³ Cf. n 1.

²³⁴ Mt 11:7f & 17:11f cf. 7:28f.

²³⁵ Lk 1:13-17.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Significantly, the famous Early Church Father Clement of Alexandria insisted on the above identification. Clement wrote of being "*baptized by tears*."²³⁶ Said he: "If you truly desire to see God —take to yourself means of *purification*..., wreathing your *brows* with righteousness...like Elijah's *rain* of salvation.... So receive the water of the Word! Wash, you polluted ones! Purify yourselves..., by *sprinkling* yourselves with the true *drops*!"²³⁷

Origen gave a similarly testimony. He wrote that John the Baptizer said that Elijah had commanded "the priests" to "baptize the wood upon the altar in the time of Ahab." Similarly, Elijah had "assigned the work" to John —the work "to baptize" the people —"when he came according to the prophecy of Malachi."²³⁸ Did John then, like Elijah, *pour out thrice* —like *rain*?

Especially Gregory of Nyssa compared Elijah's "pouring" of the water —with the trinitarian baptism of his own day. "Thus did Elijah, through that wondrous sacrifice of his, evidently proclaim to us beforehand —the mysterious consecration by baptism which was afterwards to be accomplished! For the fire was kindled by the water which had been *thrice poured over* —so as to show that where the mystic water is, there also is the...fiery Spirit Who burns up the ungodly and enlightens the faithful!"²³⁹

Yet there were such predictions not only in Malachi. There was in addition the similar teaching in Numbers regarding purification —and also the prophecies in Isaiah and Ezekiel that Jehovah would *pour* and *sprinkle* water *upon* His people. Indeed, Zechariah too had predicted that God would *pour out* the Spirit of grace and supplications —when a *Fountain* would be opened for sin and uncleanness!

* * * * *

Now John the Baptizer knew that he himself, as Jehovah's messenger, would *pour out* a blessing. He knew this was to occur —soon before the advent of Christ, the Mediator of the Covenant.²⁴⁰

John himself therefore declared to his converts: "I indeed baptize you *with water*"²⁴¹ —not *under* it! Here, John was quite categorical. For he insisted that God Himself had sent him "to baptize *with water*."²⁴²

²³⁶ 2:649, *dakrusi baptizomenos*. See *Strom.* 2:13.

²³⁷ *Exhort. Gen.* 1:94-6 & 10:12-23,59-60.

²³⁸ Orig.: *Comm. on John* 6:13.

²³⁹ *In Bapt. Chr.*, in Migne's *PGL* 46:592.

²⁴⁰ Mt 3:1f; Lk 1:13f,76f; 3:2f; John 1:31f; Mal 1:1; 3:1f,10; 4:5f (*cf.* Num 8:7; 19:9-21; Ezk 36:25; Zech 12:10; 13:1).

²⁴¹ Mt 3:11a; Mk 1:8a; John 1:26a,31b,33a. Throughout, the Greek has *en*, meaning "with" and not *hupo(katoo)*, meaning "under(neath)". Lk 3:16a & Acts 1:5a are perhaps even stronger, having simply "with water" or *hudati* in the dative.

²⁴² John 1:33a.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Indeed, it was not under but *at* the Jordan²⁴³ that John so *baptized*. He did so, with fresh running water —as the *sprinkling* symbol of *purification*!²⁴⁴ Significantly, he did not baptize where the water was *deep*. Instead, he baptized where the water was fresh and running —at *AEnon* alias 'Fountains'.²⁴⁵

That was a place where there were "many" sprinkling springs.²⁴⁶ There, John baptized *with* that running water. Indeed, not just the apostle Peter but also the infallible Jesus Himself tells us so!²⁴⁷

Usually, an Old Testament priest or a prophet or a king —all being types of Christ the 'Anointed One' —were themselves anointed. Indeed, this was done —precisely by their being *sprinkled* on their *heads*.²⁴⁸

So too —at His baptismal anointing —was their Antitype, Jesus Christ Himself! Thus, when John got ready to baptize Jesus as our great Prophet and Priest and King —he would do so not by submersing but precisely by *sprinkling* Him.

Centuries earlier and just after Moses, a lesser Joshua had come —together with God's people —"to the Jordan." At that time, they all went "*in* the Jordan" —and then "came up *out of* the Jordan." That was right after "passing *through*" it "on dry land" —and hence without being submersed in it.

As Joshua then told God's people: "Let your children know...Israel came over this Jordan on dry land! For the Lord your God dried up the waters of Jordan from before you, until you had passed over —as the Lord your God did to the Red Sea, which He dried up from before us until we had gone over!"²⁴⁹

²⁴³ Mt 3:6 & Mk 1:5 (*en* here meaning "at"); *cf.* "in [the] Jordan" at Josh 3:8-17, where there was no submersion when "all the Israelites passed over on dry ground...clean over Jordan."

²⁴⁴ John 3:25-26; *cf.* the "washings" and "purifying" at Heb 9:10-13 (*baptismois* and *rhantizousa* and *katharoteeta*). See too *Antiq.* 3:11:1, where Josephus declares that "Moses took out the tribe of Levi...and purified them by water taken from perpetual springs." *Cf.* too our next note.

²⁴⁵ John 3:22a. 'AEnon' is the plural form of the Hebrew *ayin* (= a 'fountain'). Many such fountains adorned Judaea, Ezk. 47:10.

²⁴⁶ John 3:22b, "in AEnon..., because there were many waters (*polla hudata*)." Here, our own translation "many waters" better brings out the meaning of the Greek (*polla hudata*) than does the translation "much water." Such "many waters" were required for "purifying" or *katharismou* (John 3:25b).

²⁴⁷ Acts 11:16a; 1:5a, *hudati*.

²⁴⁸ Ex 29:7; 30:30; Lev 8:12; Num 4:2f; I Sam 10:1; 16:13; Ps. 23:1-5; I Kgs 19:16f; II Kgs 2:9; 3:11; 9:1f.

²⁴⁹ Josh 3:1,15f & 3:8 & 4:16 *cf.* 4:22f LXX (respectively: *heoos tou Iordanou; epi ton Iordaneen; en too; Iordanee; dia xeeras...diabainoon ton Iordaneen; & ekbeenai ek tou Iordanou*). Compare too Pss. 78:15-20; 78:12-24f; I Kgs 1:33,38,45; Acts 8:29-39; and I Cor. 10:1-2 (*hupo teen nephaleen...dia tees thalassees...ebaptisanto en tee; nephalee; kai en tee; thalassee*). Though the phrase "rained down" in Ps. 78:24 refers to the manna (and the words "rained" and "fall" in vv 27f refer to the quails), the entire sequence Ps. 78:11-28 (*cf.* vv 13-14 & 16 & 20 & 23-24 & 26-28) is intimately connected to the 'baptism' at the Red Sea when "the clouds *poured* out water" (Ps 77:15-20 esp v 17 *cf.* I Cor. 10:1-2). Throughout, there is no *apo hupokatoo* or 'from beneath' (the water)!

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Indeed, it was "*under* the cloud and...*through* the Sea" that God's people had been "baptized" *with* or "in the cloud" and *with* or "in the Sea." That was when "the clouds *poured* out water" —after God "had commanded the clouds from above, and opened the doors of *heaven*, and had *rained* down!"²⁴⁹

Similarly, together with God's later people, a New Testament Joshua greater than even Moses —likewise came "*to* the Jordan." He —'Joshua-Jesus' —came to its running water. There He came, in order —"*to* be baptized."²⁵⁰

That was done *not underneath* the Jordan, but *with* its water —and indeed *from* heaven *above*!²⁵¹ Then, just like the unsubmerged lesser Joshua of old, the New Testament Joshua-Jesus was Himself baptized. Thereafter, He too went "*away* from the water" —and "*away from* the Jordan."²⁵²

* * * * *

Moreover, at the very time John baptized Jesus *with* water —God the Father also baptized Him *with* the Spirit. For when "Jesus...was baptized..., *the heavens* were *opened* to Him."

Thus, John then saw "the Spirit of God *descending* like a dove, and coming *upon* Him." Hence, we read that "John bare record, saying: 'I saw the Spirit descending *from heaven* like a dove.... I saw [that] the Spirit...abode *upon* Him!'"²⁵³

Now when Jesus "returned from the Jordan," He was "*full of* the Holy Ghost." As He Himself then affirmed: "The Spirit of the Lord is *upon* Me —because He *has anointed* Me!"²⁵⁴

Later, also Peter recalled that, during "the *baptism* which John preached, God *anointed* Jesus of Nazareth *with* the Holy Ghost and *with* power." For all such *anointings* —whether in respect of a prophet, a priest or a king —were effected not by submersion but *by sprinkling alone*!²⁵⁵

²⁵⁰ Mt 3:13 (*epi ton Iordaneeen...baptistheenai*) compare Lk 3:21f; Heb. 3:1-16; 4:8-14; 6:1-2.

²⁵¹ Mk 1:8f, *en hudati* and *en Pneumati*. Compare n 249 above and "from heaven" in Mt 3:16f & 17:2-5 & II Pet 1:16-18.

²⁵² Cf. Mt 3:16 & Mk 1:10 (*apo tou hudatos*; Lk 4:1 (*apo tou Iordanou*)).

²⁵³ Mt 3:16f; cf. n 251 above. In John 1:32f, we are *twice* told that the Spirit *descended* upon Jesus (*katabainon*); at His baptism. *Twice* we are also here told that the Spirit then descended *upon* Jesus (*ep*). Similarly at Mk 1:9f & Lk 3:21f.

²⁵⁴ Lk 4:1 (*apo tou Iordanou kai eegeto en tooi Pneumati* & 4:18 (*Pneuma Kuriou ep' Eme hou heneken echrisen Me*)).

²⁵⁵ Acts 10:37-38, *meta to baptisma ho ekeeruxen Iooannees Ieesoun ton apo Nazaret, hoos echrisen Auton ho Theos Pneumati Hagiooi kai dunamei*. Compare Liddell & Scott: *Abridged Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford, Clarendon, 1868, p 425, *meta* with acc. *meth' heemeran*, Lat. *interdui*, "during the day"; II.2, *after, next to*. See too n 248 above.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Significantly, the noted Early Church Father Hippolytus clearly implies that John baptized Jesus — by *sprinkling* or *pouring* water upon His head. Hippolytus records²⁵⁶ how "Christ, the Maker of all, came down as the *rain* [Hos 6:3] and...was *baptized* in the Jordan.... He *bent* His head to be baptized by John.... Lo, the Spirit of God *descended* in the form of a dove...when Christ the Bridegroom was baptized."

Also the great Ante-Nicene theologian Lactantius has the same teaching. For he writes²⁵⁷ about Jesus that "He was baptized (*tinctus*) by the prophet John at the river Jordan..., by the *sprinkling* of the *dew* of *purification*."

* * * * *

However, it was not only John's disciples and Jesus Himself that received baptism by *sprinkling*. Later, Jesus in turn —through the agency of His Ministers of the Word and Sacraments —would *similarly* baptize others too.

Jesus would do so, not underneath but rather *with* water —even before Calvary.²⁵⁸ Thereafter too He would do so, not underneath but rather *with* the Spirit —especially on Pentecost Sunday.²⁵⁹

For the infallible and sinless Christ Himself was only baptized *at all* —precisely so that His fallen yet sin-hating Christ-ians could thus be benefitted! They therefore now share in His Own baptism. They also partake of all of the many blessings of Christ Himself —blessings which His Own baptism *depicts* for them. Accordingly, Christ would have His followers to be baptized —both with water and with Spirit —in the same *way* He Himself had been baptized, *for them!*

Thus, Christ would baptize His Christ-ians not by submersing but precisely by sprinkling them —as He Himself had been, for them. This is why Lactantius writes of Christ: "He was *baptized*...so He might save the *Gentiles* also *by baptism* —that is, by the *sprinkling* of the *dew* of *purification*."²⁵⁹

For Jesus Himself told His disciples: "With the baptism that I am baptized —you shall be *baptized!*"²⁶⁰ Thus, just as Christ Himself was *sprinkled*, so too should all His disciples be —at their own baptism!

Also Kittel rightly rejects the subversionistic notion of being "*immersed* in Christ." For, as he declares: "The idea of a mystically understood *medium* of baptism —is always and in every respect wide of the mark!"²⁶¹

²⁵⁶ Hipp. 10:856, *eklinen teen kephaleen Autou baptistheenai hupo Iooannou*. See his *Disc. on the Holy Theoph.*, 2,4-6.

²⁵⁷ Lact. *Div. Inst.* IV:15.

²⁵⁸ John 3:22 *cf.* 4:1f.

²⁵⁹ *Cf.* n 257 above.

²⁶⁰ Mk 10:39 *cf.* Lk 12:50.

²⁶¹ *TDNT* 1:538f.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Of course, the traditionalistic Pharisees were —unnecessarily²⁶² — constantly washing or 'baptizing' themselves. Yet even they were doing so —not by total submersion, but by 'sprinkling' water over their hands!

However, unlike the Pharisees, Jesus Himself was not thus *re*-baptized! For He did not *constantly* get "washed" or "baptized" —every time He ate.²⁶³ Jesus did *pour* water into a basin —when once *washing* Peter's dusty feet at dinner. Yet at that time, He refused to wash Peter's hands —in addition. Indeed, He so refused —even after Peter himself had wrongly requested Jesus to wash him still more extensively!²⁶⁴

* * * * *

For John the Baptist had not predicted that Jesus would submerge people under the Holy Spirit. To the contrary, John had declared that Christ would "baptize...*with* the Holy Ghost."²⁶⁵

Also Jesus had promised that He Himself would baptize —by sending His Spirit "upon" His apostles!²⁶⁶ They would thus be "*en*-dued" —or "*clothed with*" —power from on high.²⁶⁷ To them Christ declared: "You shall be baptized *with* the Holy Ghost!"²⁶⁸

This *Spirit-baptism* occurred, when "suddenly there came a sound *from* heaven like a rushing mighty wind."²⁶⁹ This was a stormy gust, bringing holy *rain*²⁷⁰ from God! "Cloven tongues like as of fire...sat *upon* each of them, and they were all filled *with* the Holy Ghost."²⁷¹

The apostle Peter was one of those thus baptized *with* the Holy Spirit. Right then, as an eye-witness, he himself declared: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel!"²⁷²

Now Joel had predicted a *rainstorm* —such as the one Peter himself had just experienced when Christ baptized him with the Holy Spirit. Joel had spoken of "a day of clouds" and "the noise of a flame of fire." He had described the gathering of God's people —"the congregation" of "the elders" and "the children" together with "those that suck the breasts."

²⁶² Mk 7:1-9 *cf.* n 187f above.

²⁶³ Lk 11:38.

²⁶⁴ John 13:5-10 & 15:3.

²⁶⁵ Mt 3:11b; Mk 1:8b; Lk 3:16b; John 1:33b. The Greek has *en*, meaning "with"; and not *hupo*, meaning "under" (the water).

²⁶⁶ Lk 24:33,49a (v 49a has *eph'* for "upon").

²⁶⁷ In Lk 24:48b, "en-dued" renders *en-duseesthe* (meaning to "clothe *with*").

²⁶⁸ Acts 1:5b, where "with" translates *en*.

²⁶⁹ Acts 2:2, where "from" translates *ek* alias 'out of.'

²⁷⁰ Acts 2:16-18 *cf.* Joel 2:2,5,23,28f.

²⁷¹ Acts 2:3-4, where "upon" translates *eph'* and "with the Holy Ghost" translates *Pneumatōs Hagiou* apparently as a partitive genitive.

²⁷² Acts 2:14-18.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Joel had then explained how God would also "cause to come *down* the *rain* —the former rain and the latter rain" —together! Through Joel, God had predicted: "I will *pour* out My Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.... Also upon the servants and upon the handmaids, in those days will I *pour* out My Spirit!"²⁷³

Peter felt he needed to *describe* the baptismal anointing *with* the Spirit, which he himself had just experienced on Pentecost Sunday. So Peter did so —precisely by citing the latter words of Joel's prophecy, and by applying those words to Peter's own recent experience of Spirit-baptism.

Said Peter: "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel: 'And it shall come to pass in the last days, says God, that I will *pour out*...My Spirit *upon* all flesh. And your sons and your daughters shall prophesy.... And *on* My [man-]servants and *on* My handmaidens I will *pour out* in those days *from* My Spirit!'"²⁷⁴

* * * * *

Peter next immediately told his listeners that the risen and ascended Christ had gone to heaven and "received from the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost." Accordingly, Peter explained, Christ had just now "*shed* forth this" promise. For He had right then "poured out" that promise —in the *baptism* of His Spirit!²⁷⁵

Peter then promptly urged his listeners: "Repent and *be baptized* every one of you —in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins! ... For *the promise* is unto you —and *to your children*!"²⁷⁶

Fully "three thousand" were thereupon baptized —that very same day.²⁷⁷ Even the *hypothetical* logistics of trying to perform so many baptisms specifically *by submersion*, are simply mind-boggling. For all three thousand would then have needed to be submersed —after nine o'clock in the morning, and before sunset that same afternoon!

Of course, the three thousand were baptized *not* by submersion —but by sprinkling! And Peter never forgot this. Even many years later, he still "remembered the saying of the Lord, how that He had said: 'John indeed baptized *with* water, but you shall be baptized *with* the Holy Ghost!'"²⁷⁸

²⁷³ Joel 2:2,5,16,23,28f.

²⁷⁴ Acts 2:1-4,14-18 (where *ekcheoo* translates "pour out" and where "from" translates *apo* in vv 17 & 18).

²⁷⁵ Acts 2:33, where "shed" translates *execheen*. The future tense of the same word is translated "pour out" in vv 17 & 18.

²⁷⁶ Acts 2:38-39.

²⁷⁷ Acts 2:41a.

²⁷⁸ Acts 11:16 *cf.* 1:5; 2:1-4,14-18,33; 10:47.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Peter remembered this —precisely when he himself was about to baptize the various members of the household of Cornelius. Peter had just told them how, "after the *baptism* which John preached," God the Father had "*anointed* Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost."²⁷⁹ Then, "while Peter yet spoke these words, the Holy Ghost *fell on* them all."²⁸⁰

On the Gentiles too the gift of the Holy Ghost had just been "*poured out*."²⁸¹ So Peter then immediately *baptized* them. He "commanded them to be baptized *with* the name of the Lord."²⁸² For nobody could any longer "*forbid the water* —that these should not be *baptized* who have *received* the Holy Ghost just as we did!"²⁸³

Peter soon gave a report to the other apostles of these events in the life of Cornelius and his family. Peter reported how "the Holy Ghost *fell on* them —as on us at the beginning! Then I remembered the saying of the Lord, how He had said: 'John indeed baptized *with* water, but you shall be baptized *with* the Holy Ghost.' Forasmuch then as God gave them the like gift as He did to us who believed on the Lord Jesus Christ—who was I to *withstand* God?" That is: 'How could I then still *withhold the water* from them?'²⁸⁴

All possibility of water baptism by total submersion, is here precluded. For it was not that Cornelius's family *could* be withheld —from the *water*. It was not that they *could* be kept back from *coming* to it in order to be *submersed* under it. To the contrary! Peter could no longer withhold the water —*from them*! So, that unwithheld water was now *brought* to them —for them to be *sprinkled* with it!

For Peter knew that the correct mode or "figure" of "baptism" was not that of total immersion. It was not like the submersion of the unbaptized ungodly, during Noah's flood. To the contrary. Peter knew that baptism was like the *rainwater* which *poured down* on the roof of the ark over the heads of Noah's faithful family. For Peter knew that only such a symbolic sprinkling —as a rainlike representation —signifies the "*sprinkling* of the blood of Jesus"²⁸⁵ which alone saves!

* * * * *

Also Philip apparently maintained the same mode. After he baptized the Samaritans with water, it seems he also saw them being baptized with the Holy Spirit. That was when the Spirit fell *upon* them. Hands were laid "*upon*" them —while "they *received* the Holy Ghost."²⁸⁶

²⁷⁹ Acts 10:37f, where "baptism" and "anointed" translate respectively *baptisma* and *echrisen*. Cf. too Ex 30:30 & n 348f above.

²⁸⁰ Acts 10:44, where "fell on" translates *epepesen...epi*.

²⁸¹ Acts 10:45, where "poured out" translates *ekkechutai*.

²⁸² Acts 10:48, where "with" (cf. KJV's "in") translates *en*.

²⁸³ Acts 10:47, where "forbid the water" translates *to hudoor koolusai*, and "received" translates *elabon*.

²⁸⁴ Acts 11:15-17f, where "fell on" translates *epepesen*, where "with water" translates *hudati*, where "with the Spirit" translates *en Pneumati*, and where "withstand" translates *koolusai* (as too in n 283 above).

²⁸⁵ I Pet 1:1-2 & 3:20f.

²⁸⁶ Acts 8:12-17, where "fallen upon" translates *epipeptookos*, "upon" translates *ep'*, and "received" translates *elambanon*.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Philip next met an Ethiopian, who had just read in Isaiah how the Saviour would "*sprinkle* many nations."²⁸⁷ The Ethiopian then wanted to get *baptized*.²⁸⁸ Seeing some water there in the desert, he climbed down from his chariot²⁸⁹ —and sought the *sprinkling* about which he had just been reading.

So he and Philip "both" walked toward that water.²⁹⁰ There, Philip "baptized" the Ethiopian. Then, neither having been totally submerged, they both came up away from the water and went back toward the chariot.²⁹¹

* * * * *

Paul too seems to have upheld baptism by *sprinkling*. Before his conversion, he had —as a Pharisee —been accustomed to *sprinkling*.²⁹² Soon after his conversion, he himself "*arose and was baptized*."²⁹³

Now Paul never forgot *how* he had been baptized! Many years later, he still recalled the words of Ananias just before he had baptized Paul: "Brother Saul..., why do you keep on tarrying? *Arise* and be baptized!"²⁹⁴

When Paul "*arose*" to be "*baptized*" —he was *not* going "*down*." *Arising*, he was doing *the very opposite* of being submersed under water! Later, Paul met some men whom he himself similarly "*baptized in the Name of Jesus*." Thus, "*when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them*."²⁹⁵ Again, sprinkling is suggested; submersion seems impossible.

Nor did Paul imply that either the Roman or the Colossian Christians had been baptized *by submersion*. Instead, he reminded them both that they had been 'funeralised' in baptism. For then, they had been 'honoured with funeral rites'²⁹⁶ — *together with Christ!*

It must be remembered that Christ at His burial was not submersed, down under the earth. Instead, He was placed *up* on a ledge —after being *sprinkled* with spices.²⁹⁷ And at their own baptism, Christians were buried *with Christ* —and *baptized* into His death! Rom. 6:3-4.

* * * * *

²⁸⁷ Isa 52:15 - 53:7f (cf. 52:13 - 53:12) with Acts 8:26-33.

²⁸⁸ Acts 8:36.

²⁸⁹ Acts 8:31,38.

²⁹⁰ Acts 8:36-38, where *ti hudoor* ('some water') is rendered "water" and *eis to hudoor* "to the water." See n 249 above.

²⁹¹ Acts 8:39, *ek tou hudatos*; see n 249 & 290 above.

²⁹² Acts 23:6; 26:5; Phil 3:5 (cf. Mk 7:1-48 at n 187f above).

²⁹³ Acts 9:18.

²⁹⁴ Acts 22:16.

²⁹⁵ Acts 19:5f, where *epi(-thentos)* and *ep'* are translated "upon" in vv 6a & 6b.

²⁹⁶ Rom 6:3-4 has: "we were baptized, therefore we were funeralised together with Him" (*ebaptistheemen, oun sunetapheemen Autoo*). Col 2:11-13 has: "having been funeralised together with Him in baptism" (*suntaphentes Autoo, en too, baptismati*). The above words *-etapheemen* and *-taphentes*, are forms of the verb *thaptoo*. Liddell and Scott *op. cit.* p 300 give as the meaning of this verb: "to perform funeral rites" (regardless as to the method of disposing of the corpse).

²⁹⁷ Lk 23:55 - 24:2; John 19:39-42.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Paul also implies that the whole households of sanctified Corinthian Christians — at the time of their baptism — had been "watered" or *sprinkled* like plants.²⁹⁸ Thus he reminds them that even their spiritual ancestors, the people of Israel, "were all baptized...with the cloud." That occurred "when *the clouds poured out water*" — while the Israelites, together with their babies, went through the Red Sea on dry land!²⁹⁹

Here, Kittel rightly reflects:³⁰⁰ "*Baptizein* means technically 'to baptize in water' — meaning 'with water.' Otherwise, 'the notion of being baptized *in* Moses, would be meaningless — and would clash with a second *spatial* indication in I Cor 10:2 (*en tee; nephleei*)." The latter means *with* and hence "*in* the cloud." But this presupposes not submersion but sprinkling!

Compare the statements in I Cor. 1:12f, 3:6f and 12:13. "Were you *baptized*? ... Apollos *watered*.... You have all been *baptized*....and have all been *drenched*...."

Paul reminded the Galatian Christians that all who had been "*baptized* into Christ, have *put on* Christ"³⁰¹ — like a helmet. He also reminded the Ephesian Christians of their need to keep on wearing their "*helmet* of salvation"³⁰² on their *head* — after he himself had earlier *baptized* some in Ephesus and laid his hands "*upon*" them.³⁰³

He now further reminded the Ephesian Christians that there was but "one baptism." For, after Christ "ascended up on high," on Pentecost Sunday He "gave gifts to men."³⁰⁴ Christ did so, when He baptized His apostles *with* His Spirit. For it was then that Christ *shed forth* His Spirit, and *poured out* His gifts like Joel's *rain*.³⁰⁵

Similarly, Paul reminded Titus that Christians had been saved "by the *washing* of regeneration." That was at their "renewing by the Holy Ghost, which He *shed on* us"³⁰⁶ — or 'poured out' over us.

* * * * *

Irrespective of the Pauline authorship of the inspired Epistle to the Hebrews, the latter definitively deals with "the doctrine of *baptisms*." Indeed, it even seems to compare them to "*the rain*."³⁰⁷

²⁹⁸ I Cor 1:12-16 *cf.* 3:6-8; 6:11; 7:14; 12:13; 16:15.

²⁹⁹ I Cor 10:1-2, where 'in' or "with the cloud" translates *en tee; nephleei*. Compare Ex 14:19-29 & 15:4-10 and esp Pss 77:15-20 & 78:12-14,23-28.

³⁰⁰ TDNT I:539 (on I Cor 10:2).

³⁰¹ Gal 3:27, *baptistheete* and *enedusasthe*.

³⁰² Eph 6:17, *perikephalaian* (compare *peribolaion* in I Cor 11:15).

³⁰³ Acts 19:5-6, *cf.* n 295 above.

³⁰⁴ Eph 4:5,8.

³⁰⁵ Acts 1:5; 2:1f,16f,33; Joel 2:23,28f.

³⁰⁶ Tit 3:5f, where "washing" translates *loutron* and "shed on" translates *execheen*.

³⁰⁷ Heb 6:1,7.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Moreover, while still discussing these 'various *baptisms*' or "divers *washings*,"³⁰⁸ it thrice describes them as *sprinklings*.³⁰⁹ Indeed, it reminds all of us Christians that we have had "our hearts *sprinkled* from an evil conscience, and our bodies *washed* with pure water."³¹⁰

Hebrews further reminds Christians that it was by faith that also Moses "kept the Passover and the *sprinkling* of blood." It also states that, soon thereafter, Moses and the Israelites "passed through the Red Sea as by *dry land*."³¹¹

Indeed, the Epistle also reminds Christians that they had come to "Mount Zion" and "the heavenly Jerusalem" alias the "church of the firstborn." For they had come "to Jesus the Mediator of the New Covenant —and to the blood of *sprinkling* that speaks better things than that of Abel."³¹²

* * * * *

Now *baptism* is the sign and seal of this *sprinkled* blood of Christ! The latter speaks of better things than did the sprinkled blood of Abel. It speaks of better things than did the sprinkled rain of Noah's flood. It speaks of better things than did the cloud 'baptism' of the Israelites at their exodus from Egypt. Of course, Abel's blood and Noah's rain and the baptismal cloud of Moses —all *pointed* to that much superior sprinkling with the powerful blood of Jesus.

Peter's First Epistle (3:18f) reminds Christians that "Christ has suffered for sins once and for all..., so that He might bring us to God... The longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah while the *ark* was being prepared, in which...eight persons were delivered by water. *Baptism*, the antitype of this, delivers us now —not as a putting off of filth from the flesh, but as the answer of a good conscience toward God through the resurrection of Christ."

As Kittel explains:³¹³ "The water of baptism was...regarded as an antitype of the Flood (I Pet 3:21) and the Red Sea (I Cor 10:1f). It now flows as 'Jordan' into the font... It cannot be proved that infant baptism was an innovation adopted in the middle of the second century." For, in the light of I Pet 3:20f, household baptism (and indeed specifically by *sprinkling*) is seen to be an apostolic ordinance —and one with even antediluvian *family* roots!

* * * * *

Also the apostle John seems to presuppose the *baptisms* of households —and indeed specifically by *sprinkling* them on their foreheads. For he reminds even the "little children"³¹⁴ that they too have received a sealing "unction" or an "*anointing*."³¹⁵

³⁰⁸ Heb 9:10.

³⁰⁹ Heb 9:13,19f.

³¹⁰ Heb 10:22.

³¹¹ Heb 11:28f.

³¹² Heb 12:22f.

³¹³ TDNT I:544.

³¹⁴ I John 2:12f,18 (*teknia* and *paidia*).

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Thus, God's "angel" or messenger —probably meaning His 'Minister of the Word and Sacraments' —seals "the servants of the living God." He does so —*on their foreheads.*" Indeed, God permits His plague of scorpion-locusts to "*hurt...only those men who do not have the seal of God on their foreheads.*"³¹⁶

These wicked people do not have God's seal "*on their foreheads.*" They do not have it "*on their foreheads!*" Yet God's servants are sealed —in *baptism* —with the '333' mark of the Trinity!

For this reason, they should never fear the Satanic seal of "666" —which the ungodly receive on *their foreheads!*³¹⁷ For the godly have been brought into contact with the "baptized" (or 'dyed') garment of their Saviour —"a vesture dyed *with blood!*"³¹⁸

Thus does John's Revelation describe the Saviour's own prediction in Isaiah.³¹⁹ It is the prediction that "*blood shall be sprinkled*" —and indeed sprinkled *upon* —My garments!"

Because of that sprinkling with His blood, the elect shall always keep on seeing His blessed face —even in glory! Then and there —all the nations will indeed have been *baptized*, in terms of the Great Commission.³²⁰

Then and thereafter, they shall therefore keep on dwelling in the New Jerusalem —unto all eternity. For "*His Name shall be on their foreheads...*, for ever and ever!"³²¹

* * * * *

So, in the words of the title of this present monograph, *Sprinkling is Scriptural*. However, submersion is subversion. By calling submersion 'subversion' —we mean that it subverts the Scriptural sprinkling of Holy Writ. Submersion is subversion —for it is not the mandated mode of Biblical Baptism.

Indeed, immersion-*ism* —the absolutization of submersion as the only manner in which the Sacrament should be dispensed —is heterodoxy. Moreover, it contains the *seeds* even of horrible heresies —such as baptismal regenerationism, as taught by many of the cults.

³¹⁵ I John 2:20,27, where "unction" and "anointing" each translate *chrisma* (twice).

³¹⁶ Rev 7:2f & 9:4 (1:20 & 2:1f & Ezk 9:4-8).

³¹⁷ Rev ch 13; 14:9f; 20:4.

³¹⁸ Rev 19:13, *bebammenon haimati* = 'dyed with blood' and 'dyed *with blood*' (see *TDNT* I:530).

³¹⁹ Rev 19:13's *bebammenon* (= 'dyed') fulfils Isa 63:2-4's prediction that "*blood shall be sprinkled*" and indeed "*sprinkled upon My garments*" (*v^eyeez nitschaam 'al-b^egaaday*), LXX *kateegagon to haima autoon eis geen, kai panta ta endumata mou emoluna*.

³²⁰ Mt 28:19.

³²¹ Rev 22:2-4.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Here, we have *not* been arguing against the *validity* of Christian baptisms performed by partial immersion or even by total submersion. Instead, we have been arguing that the fetish of submersion-*ism* — the magical notion that all non-submersional purported Christian baptisms are *ipso facto* invalid — is itself unscriptural and ritualistic. Moreover — it is sacramentarian, sectarian and schismatic!

Quite frankly, the very title of the Adamthwaite's article *Baptism is Immersion!* is at least 'heretical' (alias divisive) — if not apostate (or anti-christian). For it not merely claims that Christian baptism is *best* administered by submersion. Nor does it merely claim that valid baptism can be administered *only* by submersion. Taken at face value, the title arrogantly asserts that '*Baptism is immersion!* By which it means: *total submersion*.

Consistently, this must mean that all those who have been submersed — have thereby been baptized. Conversely, it also implies that not to have been submersed — is not to have become a Member of the *Visible* Christian Church.

This further implies that the submersionistic rites of non-trinitarian cults like "Jehovah's witnesses" and "Mormons" — *because* performed by total immersion — *therefore* meet the requirements of Adamthwaite's Baptist baptism! Conversely, it also implies that all Scriptural sprinklings in the Name of the Triune God *do not* — even when performed by Adamthwaite's fellow-trinitarian Anglicans, Congregationalists, Independents, Lutherans, Methodists and Presbyterians *etc!*

We ourselves could *never* take the opposite view — the view that a *trinitarian* submersion does *not* qualify as a valid Christian baptism. To us, is it obvious that also submersionists were unintentionally *sprinkled* during their baptisms. Those baptisms, though highly irregular, are therefore nevertheless still valid.

Yet we see *Christian* baptism as neither submersion nor sprinkling — *as such*. It is rather the *ingrafting* of Christ-professing candidates and their children into the Visible Church. It is their incorporation into Christ's visible body — *with* water; *by* the Spirit; *in* the Name of *God Triune!*

* * * * *

Thus, we entirely agree with the *Westminster Confession of Faith*.³²² This states that to signify their adoption, "the children of God have His Name *put upon* them." For "baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the Visible Church, but also to be unto Him a sign and *seal* of the covenant of grace....

³²² *W.C.F.* 12:1 & 28:1-7.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

"The outward element to be used in this Sacrament, is water —*wherewith* the party is to be baptized in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Dipping of the person into the water is not necessary; but baptism is *rightly* administered by *pouring or sprinkling water upon* the person. Heb 9:10,19-22; Acts [1:5 & 2:1-17f &] 2:41; 16:33; Mark 7:4 [*& cf.* too I Pet 3:20f with Gen 7:4f and I Cor 10:1f with Pss 77:15-17 & 78:12-14].

"Not only those that do actually profess faith in and obedience unto Christ, but also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized. Gen 17:7-9; Gal 3:9,14; Col 2:11; Acts 2:38f; Rom 4:11; I Cor 7:14; Mt 28:19; Mk 10:13f; Lk 18:15.... It be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance. Lk 7:30; Ex 4:24-26.... The Sacrament of baptism is but once to be administered to any person. Gal 3:27; Tit 3:5; Eph 5:25f; Acts 2:38-41."

Now we ourselves truly love all godly Christians! We also love even those of our Christian brethren who erroneously submerge. Indeed, we love them —more than we care for those Presbyterians who compromise *their* convictions! Yet we must also state that —whenever Christian baptism is to be administered —we definitely prefer Scriptural sprinkling to 'improper' immersion and to subversive submersion.

The Baptist Adamthwaite seems to be unaware of the great Presbyterian Rev. Dr. James W. Dale and his massive defence of Scriptural sprinkling. We ourselves, however, thoroughly agree with Dale's conclusions.

As Jay Adams declares in his Foreword to the recent Adams-Countess reprint of Dale:³²³ "No other work on baptism begins to approximate James Wilkinson Dale." Such is his five-part set on "*Classic Baptism, Judaic Baptism, Johannic Baptism, Christic [and Apostolic Baptism], and Patristic Baptism.*" These are "comprehensive volumes on the use of the word *baptizoo*.... There is nothing like Dale's work in all of Christian literature!"

At the end of his volume on *Classic Baptism*, after a lifetime of study, Dale gives his own conclusion.³²⁴ Even in Pre-Christian Pagan Greek literature, *baptein* often means "to affect...*without the act of dipping*; e.g., *to sprinkle* blood." Indeed, *baptizein* often means "to affect...*without the condition of mersion*; e.g., *to sprinkle* poppy-juice; *to pour* water," etc.

After scrutinizing Sacred Scripture, we must also agree with Adams himself. As he states in his own book *The Meaning and Mode of Baptism*, "immersion...must be discounted."³²⁵

For baptism *by total submersion* is not a divine but a purely human institution. Indeed, it is a 'tradition of men.' As Adams concludes, it is a "custom not only lacking Scriptural support, but completely out of accord with the Scriptural mode of baptism!"³²⁵

* * * * *

³²³ *Op. cit.*, p 1.

³²⁴ *Op. cit.*, p 353.

³²⁵ Presbyterian & Reformed, Phillipsburg N.J., 1975, p 8.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

For in Biblical times, baptism was administered *solely by sprinkling*. Such is the testimony of both the Older and the Newer Testaments of God's Infallible Word.

In the Older Testament, just compare, cumulatively: Gen 28:18; 35:14; Ex 4:9; 9:8-10,33; 12:7,21-23,37; 14:21-29; 15:8-10; 24:6-20; 29:7-21; 30:9f; Lev 1:5-11; 2:1-6; 3:2-13; 4:6-34; 5:9; 6:27; 7:2-14; 8:11-24; 9:9-18; 14:3-51; 16:14-19; 17:6-13; 21:10; Num 8:6f; 18:17; 19:4-21; Dt 12:16,24,27; 15:23; Josh 3:13-17; I Kgs 18:5,31-33,44f (cf John 1:21-25 & 3:23-26 & Mt 11:13f & 17:11-13 & Lk 7:28-33); II Kgs 5:1-3,10,14 (cf Lev 14:3-7); Ps 77:16-17; Prov 1:23; Isa 21:4; 32:15; 44:1-4; 45:8; 52:15; 53:12; 63:3; Song 1:3; Ezk 11:5; 36:18,25f; 39:29; Dan 4:15,23,33; 5:21; 7:14,22; 9:24-27; Joel 2:16f,23-28; Zech 12:10; and Mal 3:1-3,10 & 4:5f.

The last verses of the Old Testament on Scriptural sprinkling are continued in the first verses of the New. There, consult: Mt 3:1-17; Mk 7:1-8; Lk 1:15-17; 3:4-22; 11:38; 24:49; John 1:21-25,31-33; 3:22-26; 13:5-10; Acts 1:4f; 2:1-3,16-18,33,38f; 10:37-39,44-48; 11:15-17f; 19:5f; I Cor 1:16; 3:6-8; 6:11; 7:14; 10:1-2; Eph 4:4-8; Heb 6:1f; 9:10-21; 10:22; 11:28f; 12:22-25; I Pet 1:2; 3:20f; and Rev 7:3-4; 9:4; 14:9f; 19:13; 20:3-4; & 22:2-4.

* * * * *

Last — and without argumentation — we simply state the baptismal mode described in the writings of the most ancient Early Patristic Fathers. *All* of them upheld first-century Christian baptism —*solely by sprinkling!*

Thus, in the second century, we find *baptism by sprinkling* in the Epistle of Barnabas,³²⁶ in the *Didache* alias the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,³²⁷ and in Justin Martyr.³²⁸ We also find it in Irenaeus,³²⁹ in Tertullian I,³³⁰ and in Basilides.³³¹

In the third century, we find *baptism by sprinkling* in Clement of Alexandria³³² and in Hippolytus.³³³ We also encounter it in Origen,³³⁴ in Cyprian,³³⁵ and in Dionysius Alexandrinus.³³⁶

³²⁶ Chs 8 & 11.

³²⁷ Ch 7.

³²⁸ *Tryph.* 46,66,86; *Frag.* 10 & 11; *1st Apol.* 62 & 64.

³²⁹ *Adv. Haer.* 3:17:1f cf 4:22:1.

³³⁰ *De Bap.* 1,2,4,5,11,12; *Presc. adv. Haer.* 40; *De Poen.* 6. Tertullian II, however, in his Semi-Montanistic phase from about 199 A.D. onward, seems to have embraced the triple immersionism of that heterodox sect. See too, however, his *De Cor.* 3 & 4, in which latter chapter he implicitly admits that even Semi-Montanistic immersionism lacks "positive Scriptural injunction."

³³¹ Cf. Eusebius: *Hist. Eccl.* 6:5.

³³² 2:649; *Strom.* 1:23 & 4:22 & 5:11 & 6:4; *Paedag.* 1:6 & 3:9; *Exhort. to Heath.* 1:94-96 & 10:12-23,59-60 & 12:92; *Who is the Rich Man*, 34,40,42.

³³³ 10:856.

³³⁴ 4:241; *Comm. on John* 6:13; *Hexapl.* at I Kgs 18:33f (LXX III Kgs 18:33), rendering "pour it" as 'baptizing.' It should be recalled that Origen himself was an Alexandrian hellenist! Cf. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 6:19.

³³⁵ *Ep. to Magnus*, 12,13,16 (cf. Migne's *PL* III:1196-2000); *Ep.* 69 (citing Num 19:8f & 8:5f), 70,72 & 73:17. Cf. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 6:5,43 & Petav. *Opus de Theol. Dog. & Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bapt.*, Oxford, 1844, I pp 142-160 & II p 386.

³³⁶ Cf. Mosch.: *Prat. Spir.* 176.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

In the fourth century, we find *baptism by sprinkling* in: Eusebius;³³⁷ Lactantius;³³⁸ Athanasius;³³⁹ the Apostolic Constitutions;³⁴⁰ and Cyril of Jerusalem.³⁴¹ We also find it referred to in: Hilary;³⁴² Basil;³⁴³ Gregory Nazianzen;³⁴⁴ Gregory of Nyssa;³⁴⁵ the Second Council of Constantinople;³⁴⁶ Ambrose;³⁴⁷ Didymus of Alexandria;³⁴⁸ and Jerome.³⁴⁹

Finally, in the fifth century —just before the Church's immersion into the Dark Ages! —we still find *Scriptural sprinkling* in the baptisms administered by Cyril of Alexandria³⁵⁰ and Theodoret.³⁵¹ Significantly, sprinkling is also the sole baptismal practice constantly upheld in the ancient Armenian Liturgical Codex.³⁵²

* * * * *

The relevant citations from all of the above, should be studied in their original languages (chiefly Greek or Latin). Most of these citations are contained in Robert Ayres's 627-page standard work on the mode of Christian baptism during the apostolic and early-patristic ages.³⁵³

Only from about 350 A.D. onward, did deformation of the *mode* of baptism increasingly take root. This was the result of the influx into the Church —of paganizing heresies in general, and of the submersionistic heathen 'mystery religions' in particular.

These deformatory tendencies included even prebaptismal perversions. Such were: the unnecessary delaying of baptism; the requiring of godparents or other non-parental sponsors; fasting by the candidate; the tasting of milk and honey; anointing; exorcism; exsufflations; divesting unto nakedness; and, alternatively, clothing the neophyte in white.

³³⁷ Cf. Eus. *Hist. Eccl.* 6:5; *Conc. Nic.* canon 12.

³³⁸ *Inst. Div.* 4:15.

³³⁹ *Quaest. ad Ant.* [in PGL 28:644C-D,760A-C]; cf. Soz.: *Hist. Eccl.* 2:17 & *Cons. Epon.* 26.

³⁴⁰ 6:15.

³⁴¹ 425; *Cat.* 3:4,15,16 & 16:30.

³⁴² Hil. 1:238.

³⁴³ 3:428.

³⁴⁴ 2:428,372. *Orat.* 34:17; 39:1-3,17; *Disc.* 40.

³⁴⁵ *In Bapt. Chr.*

³⁴⁶ Canon 7.

³⁴⁷ Amb. 1:727f; 3:399,424; 4:827-9,875.

³⁴⁸ Did. Alex. 713.

³⁴⁹ 5:341f; *In Ps 50(51):7*; *In Ezk 36:22f & 16:4*; *In Zech 13:1*.

³⁵⁰ *In Isa.* 4:4; *Polished Disc. on Lev.* 14:1-7; *Disc. on Book of Num.* (on ch 19).

³⁵¹ *Hist. Eccl.* 3:10-12 & 5:18 (on Ps 51 [LXX = 50]: 1-7 & on Ezk 36:25 & Zech 13:1); *Comm. in Ep. Heb.* 9:10.

³⁵² Cited in Ayres: *op. cit.*, pp 620-4.

³⁵³ *Ib.*, pp: 268-70; 281-2,289; 50,103-4,121f,292-4,314f; 302f; 324-30; 353-5; 112f,128,310f,314f,429,440f; 319f,322f; 339-51,355; 364; 353-55; 169; 356,359-61; 481; 588-91,601; 365-9; 375; 594-6; 385-8; 104f; 123f,383f; 93,379-82; & 620-6.

SPRINKLING IS SCRIPTURAL

Further deformations at the time of baptism itself, included: consecration of the water; baptismal regenerationism; transferring a 'kiss of peace'; immediate post-baptismal communion (including even paidocommunion); and, finally, transubstantiationism.³⁵⁴

Of all the above errors, the paganistic and paganizing heresy of baptismal regenerationism was probably the most dangerous. Especially this insidious evil, particular from the middle of the fourth century onward, promoted the rapid advance of the further error of total submersionism.

Only at the advent of the Protestant Reformation in general, and of paidobaptist Presbyterianism in particular, was this paganizing perversion fully reversed. For it was then that Biblical baptism —with its meaningful mode of Scriptural sprinkling —was reformatory restored!

³⁵⁴ *Ib.*, pp 467-555f.