

ARTICLE IV.

INTERPRETATION OF THE BAPTISMAL FORMULA: *Βαπτίζω τινά εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.*
 MATT. 28. 19.

By Dr. H. E. Bindseil, Halle. Translated from the "Studien und Kritiken," 1832, by Rev. Henry B. Smith, West Amesbury, Mass.

THE expression, *Βαπτίζω τινά εἰς τὸ ὄνομά τινος*, in Matt. 28: 19, seems to require a more exact investigation, than it has yet received. Many understand it as meaning, that the baptism imposes the obligation of reverencing those, in whose name the individual may be baptized. Others interpret it by the phrase, to baptize into the confession of faith in some one. Our own view is that *ὄνομα* is here to be understood in its original signification, and the whole expression to be interpreted, by means of baptism to give to one the name of another: that is, by baptism one is named after another. This is the interpretation of Clericus in his *Animadv. in Hammondi Annott. Vitringa*, in his *Observatt. Sacr. T. I. l. iii. c. 22. § 2*, cites his arguments, and endeavors to refute them. Clericus relies, with justice, upon 1 Cor. 1: 12, 13; and upon the rabbinical expression עַל לְאָס לְ. In 1 Cor. 1: 12, 13, Paul speaks thus: "Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?" From this it is clear, that the baptized person was accustomed to take the name of him, in whose name he was baptized. If this were not so, how could Paul, from the fact that some called themselves *Paulinists*, have any fear, that it might thence be inferred, that he had baptized them in his own name?

The rabbinical phrase, עַל לְאָס לְ likewise confirms the same interpretation; for this signifies, to baptize, and by this means to affix a name. For example, לְאָס עַבְדוּת, to the name of servitude; לְאָס בְּן חֹרֵין, to the name of the son of free parents; לְאָס גִּירוּת, to the name of proselytism;¹ so that the baptized person was called

¹ The word גִּירוּת, which is not to be found in Buxtorf's *Lex. Chald. Talm. Rabb.*, is derived, according to the analogy of עַבְדוּת, from גֵּר, stranger, proselyte; and defines the condition of a proselyte, that is, proselytism: just as עַבְדוּת denotes the condition of the עַבֵד, that is, servitude.

a slave; the son of free parents, a proselyte. The circumstance, that he, who, e. g. $\text{מִתְּנַת עַל לְבַב}$ by baptism had received the name of a slave, is at the same time actually a slave, can by no means be a proof, as Vitranga, in the passage above quoted, asserts, that the proper signification of the phrase is, that the person is a slave. Wherever this is actually the case, it must always be inferred from the connection, but is not included in the literal signification of the words.

From this it is evident that the words, *Βαπτίζεν τινὰ εἰς ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, literally mean, to baptize some one, and thus to bring him to the reception of the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; or, by means of baptism to effect, that a person be called after the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. In the Scriptures, baptized persons are actually so called, by the name of each one of the three persons of the Godhead. They are called *υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ*, *δοῦλοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and *πνευματικοί*. These expressions designate the closest connexion of the parties; of son and God; of servant and Christ; of the spiritual and the Spirit.

We are now to inquire, what is meant by this bestowal of a new name.

1. He, that receives the name, is thus declared to be subject to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. For the giving a name, is a sign of the subordination of the party that receives it, and of the supremacy of the party that confers it. Many examples of this are to be found in the Orient, as well as among the Greeks and Romans. Pharaoh gave to Joseph another name, Zaphnath-paaneah (Gen. 41: 45); or, as Michaelis assumes, Photonpanech. When Pharaoh-nechoh made Eliakim king of Judah, he "turned his name to Jehoiakim." (2 Kings 23: 34 and 2 Chron. 36: 4. Comp. the commentary of Clericus on the passage). In the same way, Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, when he made Mat-taniah king of Judah, changed his name to Zedekiah, (2 Kings 24: 17). The prince of the eunuchs, in the name of his king, gave to Daniel the name of Belteshazzar; and to Hananiah, of Shadrach; and to Mishael, of Meshach; and to Azariah, of Abednego, (Dan. 1: 7). In the same way, Zorobabel, in his exile at the Babylonian court, received the name of Sheshbazzar, (Ezra 1: 8), in token of his subjection. Paulsen in his work upon the governments of the Oriental nations confirms this position; "the giving and change of names has been always regarded as a sign of supremacy; and in the East is still so regarded," (p. 79).

He cites the following example, (p. 64. No. xxii.); "the East-Indian princes give new names to those elevated to a higher rank. This occurs in other Oriental kingdoms, as in Siam; where the king gives new names, not only to his officers and to the Mandarins, but even to his elephants."

Among the Romans, it was formerly the custom for the slaves to have the prænomen of their masters; e. g. Marcipores, Lucipores, Publipores, (derived from Marci, Lucii, Publii pueri,); vide Adam's Roman Antiquities, Part I pp. 72, 76. Even after they were manumitted, they took a prænomen and the name of their master, to which they appended their own name as an agnomen. The freedman of Marcus Tullius Cicero called himself Marcus Tullius Tiro. Those who received Roman citizenship, often took the name of the friend who assisted them in obtaining this right.

As those who were subject to worldly masters received other names, in sign of their subjection; so, for like reasons, the worshippers of a god assumed the name of the god. To this class belong those frequently occurring names of persons among the Hebrews, Syrians, Phoenicians and Carthaginians, which either consist wholly of the names of their gods, or are composed of these with the annexation of a word (e. g. צַדִּיק) denoting their subjection to these divinities. Vide Simonis Onomasticon, V. T. Sect. x. cap. 4. § 6. Comp. his Onomast. N. T. § 17. In respect to the Syrians, Grotius upon Zach. 12: 11, gives the evidence of this custom. D'Herbelot cites examples among the Persians, in his Oriental Biblioth. Th. I. S. 529, under the word, Baharam. Many similar instances are adduced by Gesenius, in his Commentary on Isaiah, 7: 6, and in his History of the Hebrew language, p. 225.

2. We are now to show that the bestowal of a new name, was also often the sign of an elevation in dignity; although, the idea of subjection on the part of the one who was exalted, and of supremacy, on the part of the one who gave the exaltation, was always included therein. The examples we have cited for our first position, confirm this also. The change of Joseph's name occurred, when Pharaoh had placed him over all Egypt, (Gen. 41: 40—45). Eliakim and Mattaniah were promoted to a higher rank in conjunction with the change of their names, (2 Kings 23: 34, 2 Chron. 36: 4, and 2 Kings 24: 17). Zorobabel, (Ezra 1: 8), also received his new name, Sheshbazzar, when he was appointed

prince of Judah. This may be inferred from the above examples, and from Ezra 5: 14. Thus, too, with the giving of names in Daniel 1: 7. Comp. 4: 5. These examples show us why God changed the names of Abram and Sarai, (Gen. 17: 5), and afterwards of Jacob (Gen. 32: 28). While God thus gave them to see his supremacy, he elevated them, in conjunction with the change of name, to a higher dignity, which was connected with great promises. Even now, the same custom is observed in Oriental nations. When an East Indian prince exalts one who has pleased him, to a higher grade of honor, and esteems him worthy of greater trust, he gives him a new name. Vide Paulsen, as above quoted, B. I. Hauptst. II. No. xxii. S. 64. And Oriental kings, even when not subject to any higher ruler, from whom they might receive a new name, yet give themselves one at their coronation. Even in Occidental nations, this is not unfrequently the case, at the accession to the throne. Examples of this Oriental custom may be found in Paulsen, as above, No. xxi. S. 64, and § 17. S. 79; especially Anm. 44, and in Harmar's Beobachtungen über den Orient. Th. III. Anm. lvi. S. 370. Hence, in the East, to receive a new name, or to give one's self a new name, means the same as, to arrive at a higher dignity, to enjoy a more fortunate position. Hence the expression in Isaiah 65: 16, "*call his servants by another name,*" is to be interpreted with Gesenius, in his Commentary on the passage, *to be happy, to be blessed.* Another instance is in Isa. 62: 2: "*Thou shalt be called by a new name which the mouth of Jehovah shall name.*" The addition, "*which the mouth of Jehovah shall name,*" shows, according to what we have said, that it is God, who elevates to this higher dignity, and transfers to this more fortunate position; but it also shows, that He is their Lord, who does this of his own good pleasure. Both these points are clearly brought out in Philip. 2: 9—11: "*Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: That at the name of Jesus,*" etc. The words, "*God hath highly exalted him,*" give the ground of the addition of the new name. At the same time, the dependence of Jesus upon the Father, is here declared, since it is the Father who has exalted him and given him the new name. Thus in Rev. 2: 17, *ὄψου σου λίθον*, the new name, written in the white stone, which is given to him, who has overcome the evil of the world and remained true to the doctrine of Christ, is the sign of a new dignity, in virtue of which, the receiver of the name, attains to the king-

dom of heaven. Comp. Rev. 3: 12, 21. 1: 6. This new name and this new dignity, they receive from Christ; by which it is, at the same time, intimated that they will ever remain dependent upon him. Hence, the designation of Christians, as *Kings*, (*Βασιλεῖς*, Rev. 1: 6), agrees well with their designation, as *servants*, *δούλοι*. The highest officer in the Orient, rules, as a king, over those subject to him; but yet, ever remains the servant of his master. From these passages it is clear, how the word, name, can be used as exactly synonymous with, dignity.

Applying all this to the passage in Matt. 28: 19, we obtain the result, that, *Βαπτίζειν τινὰ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος*, means; to baptize one, and thus to give to him the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; and to declare, that by receiving this name, 1. he acknowledges his subjection to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; but 2. also, that with this new name, he is at the same time elevated to a higher dignity, since he has come into a closer alliance with the Godhead.

Vitringa brings another objection to this interpretation, besides the one already mentioned; viz. that Christians are never elsewhere called by these three names, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, in immediate succession. But this proves nothing against the interpretation. What object could there be in making use of this three-fold designation, on any other occasion than baptism. It was necessary in baptism, that the baptized person, in this solemn act of consecration, might hear his new name in full, and thus be reminded of all the duties and promises included in these names. Thus it always is, when any one is to be greeted or treated in the most solemn manner, his whole name or dignity is alluded to or announced. Of such allusion, there are examples in the Revelation of John. When the Godhead is solemnly worshipped, seven words of worship are used, on account of the seven attributes and works of God, e. g. Rev. 7: 12. See Eichhorn's Bibliothek der bibl. Litt. Th. III S. 203. The whole name is used in Matt. 16: 17, in the solemn address of Jesus to Peter, "Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona!" And it is worthy of notice, that when one receives a new name, it is communicated in full to him as well as to others; but afterwards, when the person is to be addressed, in conformity with his ordinary circumstances and position, if he has several names, that one of them is usually selected, which in a sense includes the others. This is particularly applicable to the three names of Christians. Each one of

them can be perfectly well used for all three : since no one of them can be given to him, to whom all three do not belong ; for that which is designated by each of them, has the closest affinity with what is denoted by the others.

ARTICLE V.

THE COLLOCATION OF WORDS IN THE GREEK AND LATIN LANGUAGES, EXAMINED IN RELATION TO THE LAWS OF THOUGHT.

By Rev. Frederic A. Adams, Principal of Dummer Academy, Byfield, Mass.

It has been common with those who have written on the nature of language to assert, that words are purely arbitrary signs of thought, that they have no natural relation with the things they signify, and that their propriety as expressions of thought is entirely the result of convention.

This assertion, if it is regarded only as a popular and general statement, may perhaps pass without criticism. It serves, with sufficient distinctness to separate the language of words from the language of signs, and of passionate cries. In a strict and scientific view, however, it cannot be regarded as any part of the definition of artificial language. To say, as is sometimes said in defence of this position, that the sound of a word has no resemblance to the object, or the thought, which it may be appropriated to express, amounts to nothing ; for sounds have resemblance to nothing but sounds ; and if this can prove their use in every sense arbitrary when applied to express other things than sounds, the argument would be equally valid against every sign in the whole range of natural language. The paleness of fear, the burning flush of insulted honor, the cold averted look, and the gently inclined attitude betokening invitation, would all be arbitrary signs, for they are not like the things they signify. In this way would all the objects in the realm of creation, that differ from each other, become isolated ; and nature herself would no longer be one. Her domain would no longer be pervaded by a common spirit, but would be rather a *hortus siccus*, from which the common life had fled, and each thing was there for itself