

# REBAPTISM

IS

SIN



by

Francis Nigel Lee (Ph.D., Th.D., *etc.*),

Professor of Theology and Caldwell-Morrow Lecturer in Church History,  
Queensland Presbyterian Theological College,  
Brisbane, Australia, 1998.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction to <i>Rebaptism is Sin</i> .....	p. 4
<b>REBAPTISM IS SIN</b> .....	5
Irrepeatability of Circumcision as the forerunner of Baptism .....	6
Irrepeatable Circumcision was replaced by irrepeatable Baptism .....	7
Baptism administered to Christ and to or by Apostles is irrepeatable ..	7
Irrepeatability of the Baptism administered to Simon the sorcerer .....	8
Apollos was never rebaptized after receiving "the Baptism of John" .....	9
Unitarians whom Paul baptized in Ephesus never baptized previously ....	10
Acts 19:1's "disciples" not those of John but of some Non-Christian ...	11
Unitarians in Ephesus did not believe what John the Baptizer taught ...	12
Paul explained John's true Baptism to the unbaptized Unitarians .....	14
Paul did not re-baptize but only first-baptized Ex-Unitarians (Acts 19)	15
Baptism irrepeatable not only at Ephesus but also in Ephesian <i>Epistle</i>	16
Baptism irrepeatable not only at Corinth but also in <i>First Corinthians</i>	17
Baptism irrepeatable in the Apostle's <i>Epistle to the Hebrews</i> .....	18
Baptism irrepeatable in the <i>First Epistle</i> of the Apostle Peter .....	19
Baptism irrepeatable in Christ's <i>Book of Revelation</i> to the Apostle John	20
Church History corroborates the irrepeatability of all Triune Baptisms	21
The clear-cut antirebaptism of the first-generation Apostolic Fathers	22
The baptized ex-sorcerer Simon of Samaria's lapse from Christianity ...	23
The Proto-Anabapticism of the apostate Marcion and his Marcionites ....	23
Neo-Marcionism and the continuing Proto-Anabapticism of the Montanists	25
The Church Universal's appropriate baptismal re-action to Montanism ...	26
The grave menace to the Church of de-trinitarianized Hyper-Montanism ..	26
Clement of Alexandria: Trinitarian Baptism is valid and irrepeatable ..	27
Tertullian of Carthage: Baptism is Trinitarian and irrepeatable .....	28
The first sinful rebaptisms in the Church Universal: circa 220f A.D. ...	28
Hippolytus upheld Triune Baptism against Modalism's "Second Baptism" ..	29
Hippolytus opposed Triune Baptism to Montanism's rebaptistic fruits ...	30
Rebaptist Hypermontanism detritarianizes into Patripassianism .....	30
Origen on the irrepeatable Baptism also of infants by sprinkling .....	30
Syrian <i>Didaskalia</i> : person's head anointed in Baptism once and for all	32
Summary of the rebaptismal over-reaction to Montanism and Novatianism	32
The increasing aversion in Dionysius of Alexandria to rebaptizings ....	33
Dionysius's hardening opposition to rebaptism of trinitarian sectarians	34
The vindication of the Anti-Catabaptists against the Cyprianists .....	35
Dionysius of Rome antirebaptistically rejects Cyprian on rebaptism ....	36
Free Church's Professor Cunningham rejected the rebaptistic Cyprian ...	37
Excursus on Biblical Baptism by sprinkling & its decline after Cyprian	37
The ongoing sacramentalization of Baptism and the road to Donatism ....	39
The Diocletian persecution as the background for the rise of Donatism	40
Athanasius required no (re)baptism of converts from moderate Arianism	42
Athanasius championed orthodox Triune Baptisms by way of sprinkling ...	43
Antirebaptist Cyril of Jerusalem opposed antitrinitarian washings .....	44
<i>Apostolic Constitutions</i> : reclaimed backsliders not to be rebaptized ...	45
Ambrose promoted Baptism by sprinkling and opposed all rebaptisms .....	45

Augustine: irrepeatable Circumcision replaced by irrepeatable Baptism	p.	46
Augustine: Simon Magus proves Baptism itself should never be repeated		47
Chrysostom: sealing power of Baptism refutes any later rebaptisms .....		48
The <i>Apostolic Canons</i> stipulate irrepeatable threefold Triune Baptisms		49
John the Damascene: all rebaptisms are sinful (Hebrews 6:1-6) .....		50
Biblical sprinklings replaced by unbiblical mediaeval submersions .....		50
The Waldensians baptized infants and recognized Baptisms by Romanists		51
The submersionistic impact on Baptism of Thomistic Roman Catholicism ..		52
Wycliffe and his followers on the irrepeatability of infant baptism ...		53
The influence of antirebaptistic Wycliffe through Huss upon Luther ....		54
The rebaptismal error of the Bohemian 'Minor United Brethren' .....		55
The rebaptismal recantation of these Bohemian 'Minor United Brethren'		56
The anti-rebaptismal <i>Bohemian Confession(s)</i> from 1504 onward .....		57
Babylonian Captivity of baptizing Church right before her Reformation		58
Luther: Water-Baptisms irrepeatable because in Name of the Triune God		59
Baptism, adult faith, infant faith, and Donatism according to Luther ..		59
Luther's powerful antirebaptistic work titled <i>Concerning Rebaptism</i> ....		60
The earliest German Anabaptists: the anti-Protestant 'Zwickau prophets'		61
Ulrich Zwingli's first contact with the antipaidobaptistic Anabaptists		61
The Anabaptists rebaptize defiantly by 'pouring again' in Switzerland		62
Calvin on the irrepeatability of Baptism according to Genesis seventeen		63
Calvin on the irrepeatability of Baptism according to Exodus 4:24f ....		63
Calvin on valid 'Romish baptisms' in his 1555f <i>Sermons on Deuteronomy</i>		64
Calvin: Baptism and Circumcision irrepeatable according to Joshua 5:2f		65
Calvin: Baptism/Circumcision irrepeatable according to Ezekiel sixteen		66
Calvin: sinful if babies of believers stay unbaptized since Calvary ...		66
Calvin: Baptism irrepeatable according to Acts eight and eleven .....		67
Calvin: Acts nineteen teaches Baptisms by John are irrepeatable .....		68
Calvin's antirebaptistic explanation of baptismal passage Acts 19:1-7		69
Calvin on Romans four and First Corinthians ten against rebaptism .....		70
Calvin on Hebrews chapters six and nine and ten against rebaptism .....		71
Calvin on First Peter chapters one and three against rebaptism .....		73
Calvin's baptismal assessment of the Anabaptists' baptismal errors ....		73
Calvin on validity of Baptisms made by Rome despite their mutilation ..		74
Calvin says Baptism by Romanists and also by Donatists is still valid		74
Calvin's repudiation of all catabaptistic attempts to repeat Baptism ..		75
Baptisms by Rome recognized as valid in Calvin's <i>French Confession</i> ....		76
Calvin: a baptizee's lack of faith does not invalidate that Baptism ...		77
Calvin: onefold sprinklings or submersions do not invalidate Baptism ..		77
Calvin assures Knox that Baptisms performed by Romanists are valid ....		78
The Council of Trent (1545-63) never changed Rome's baptismal doctrines		79
Also Calvin's successor Beza upheld Baptism by Romanists as valid .....		79
Knox's anticatabaptistic Scottish writings even from 1560 onward .....		80
The <i>Belgic Confession of Faith</i> clearly condemns all rebaptisms .....		81
The antirebaptism of the 1566 <i>Second Helvetic Confession</i> .....		82
The Synod of Dordt on Baptisms in the Church of the papal antichrist ..		83
1626 Rev. Professor Dr. Johann Wolleb(ius): no rebaptisms in Acts 19 ..		84
Modern Baptists as the very Stepchildren of the Anabaptists .....		84
<i>Westminster Standards</i> : Johannine Baptism irrepeatable Christian Baptism		87
<i>Westminster Confession</i> : Baptism irrepeatable; by sprinkling; for babies		87
<i>Westminster Larger Catechism</i> : Baptism a seal for infants unto adulthood		87
<i>Westminster Directory for Worship</i> : Baptism a seal also for infants ....		88

Faithful Theologians after Westminster on irrepeatability of Baptism .. p.	89
Francis Nigel Lee: importance of Acts 19:1-7 to modern Church Practice	90
Lee: modern Catabaptists draw quite the wrong conclusion from Acts 19	91
Lee: many fringe fanatics after the death of John the Baptizer .....	92
Lee's own appreciative evaluation of Calvin's view of Acts 19:1-7 .....	93
Conclusion: Christian Baptism always valid thus absolutely irrepeatable	95
All people that on Earth do dwell -- recant and repent; then unite! ...	96
Footnotes to <i>Rebaptism is Sin</i> .....	96
Select Bibliography on <i>Rebaptism is Sin</i> .....	113
About the Author of <i>Rebaptism is Sin</i> .....	114
Postscript on (Ana)Baptism -- by Rev. Prof. Dr. John Calvin .....	115

### INTRODUCTION TO REBAPTISM IS SIN

To consistent Christians -- namely strictly-confessional Presbyterians -- all rebaptism is sin. Triune Baptism, instituted by Christ Himself, is indeed to be administered to every human creature. Matthew 28:19; Mark 16:15f; Ephesians 4:4-6. Yet it depicts identification with His once-for-all death and resurrection. So all rebaptisms portray a blasphemous 'recrucifixion' of Christ. Romans 6:1-4; Colossians 2:11-13; Hebrews 6:1-6.

The *Westminster Confession of Faith* (10:3 & 12:1 & 25:2-6 & 28:3-7) says: "Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit.... Those that are justified, God vouchsafeth...to make partakers of the grace of adoption.... They are taken into...the children of God; have His Name put upon them...and [are]...sealed to the day of redemption...."

"The Visible Church...consists of all those...that profess the true religion, together with their children.... The Pope...is that antichrist...that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ.... Baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling.... The infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized.... It be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance.... Baptism is but once to be administered to any person."

The *Westminster Assembly's Directory for Publick Worship* says: "The Minister...is to say (calling the child by his name): 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost'.... As he pronounceth these words, he is to baptize the child with water...by pouring or sprinkling of the water on the face...without adding any other ceremony" like immersion.

The *Westminster Larger Catechism* (108 & 166f & 177) enjoins keeping God's Ten Commandments. This is done also by: correctly "receiving the Sacraments"; affirming that "infants descending from parents...professing faith in Christ and obedience to Him...are...within the covenant and to be baptized"; by "improving our Baptism...all our life long...by serious and thankful consideration of the nature of it"; and by agreeing "that Baptism is to be administered but once with water -- to be a sign and seal of our regeneration and ingrafting into Christ, and that even to infants."

REBAPTISM IS SIN -- by Rev. Professor Dr. N. Lee

The Anabaptists reject all infant baptisms. They purport to baptize their post-infant converts -- by pouring water over them. Most modern Anabaptists among the Amish and the Mennonites, still do.

The Baptists too reject all infant baptisms. They purport to baptize their post-infant converts -- specifically by submerging them in water.

The Catabaptists (including Adventists and Campbellites) question all Baptisms performed in denominations of which they disapprove. They purport to baptize their converts -- by themselves applying water to them (at whatever age and by whatever method). Thus they often "rebaptize" even Baptists.

Catabaptists include also such Hyperpresbyterians who, against Calvin, insist on 'rebaptizing' converted Romanists. Here, unlike the Puritan Fathers and Jonathan Edwards and Samuel Miller and the Hodges *etc.*, some 19th-century American Presbyterians lapsed into Catabaptism. But Classic Presbyterians have never 'rebaptized' Ex-Romanists or Ex-(Ana)-Baptists.

Now all "ABCs" -- Anabaptists, Baptists and Catabaptists -- wrongly regard certain Christian Baptisms as not being Baptisms. In such cases, whenever ABCs purport to baptize those in actual fact already baptized -- they are sinfully applying water to their candidates. They are not thereby actually baptizing or rebaptizing them. In such cases, ABCs are really only pseudo-baptizing (or pseudo-rebaptizing) those previously quite validly baptized.

Baptism, once administered, can never be repeated. ABCs are unbiblical and therefore wrong to think that they are baptizing those baptized persons they wrongly deem have never previously been baptized. This can easily be seen from both Holy Scripture and Church History. For:

First, recircumcision is impossible -- Genesis 17:10-27. Second, Baptism replaces Circumcision -- Colossians 2:11f. Third, the Baptism administered to John's disciples and to Christ and to all of His Apostles was irrepeatable -- John 1:25-33 & 3:22f and Acts 18:25. Fourth, so too was the Baptism administered by Christ's Apostles before Calvary -- John 4:1f. Fifth, so too was the Baptism administered to Simon the sorcerer of Samaria -- Acts 8:12-22. Sixth, the Unitarians Paul baptized in Ephesus had never previously been baptized -- Acts 19:1-5. Seventh, First Corinthians 1:14f & 10:2 and Hebrews 6:1-6 and First Peter 1:2 & 3:18-21 and Revelation 7:3 & 19:16 & 22:3f all presuppose Baptism cannot be repeated.

Last, also the entirety of Church History upholds the irrepeatability of Triune Baptism. This is so, whether administered by Evangelical Anglicans or Baptists or Presbyterians; or by Baptismal Regenerationistic Romanists or the Eastern-Orthodox or Campbellite 'Churches of Christ' or by Gnesio-Lutherans. See: Augustine; Luther; Zwingli; Calvin; Beza; etc.

## Irrepeatability of Circumcision as the forerunner of Baptism

When Adam fell, also his children fell. The Last Adam Jesus reverses the fall, and includes **both believers and their babies** in that reversal. There never could be any re-circumcising of such babies when they grew up. For all the foreskin is removed, at the very first circumcision.<sup>1</sup>

Circumcision -- like Baptism which has now replaced it -- was only rarely postponed till an age beyond infancy. Such postponement was sinful, meriting a very severe punishment. Genesis 17:14 *cf.* Exodus 4:24f.

Thus, at the very institution of the ordinance of Circumcision in Genesis 17:10-14, God ordered Abraham and his household: "He who is eight days old, shall be circumcised among you.... He who has been born into your home, and he who has been purchased with your money, must needs be circumcised -- and My Covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting Covenant. But the uncircumcised male child whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised -- that person shall be cut off from his people."

The implication is clear. To God and His ancient people, there was no such a thing as being 'half-circumcised.' Either one was circumcised; or one was not circumcised. Genesis 17:14; Exodus 12:44f; Ezekiel 44:9.

If circumcised, even later unbelief could not 'de-circumcise.' So if a circumcised person then backslid, but yet later got (re-)converted from such backsliding -- that person could never again outwardly be 're-circumcised.' *Cf.* Leviticus 26:41; Deuteronomy 10:16 & 30:1-6 and Jeremiah 4:4 & 9:24f.

Though himself without doubt circumcised in the flesh during his own infancy, even Moses later backslid. He then admitted that (not his generative organ) but his lips were still uncircumcised. Exodus 6:12.

In that backslidden condition, he had very reproachably neglected to circumcise one of his own sons. Yet, after his unordained wife Zipporah then performed a highly-irregular 'emergency circumcision' on the little lad -- there was no possibility of later getting the boy regularly (re-)circumcised. To the contrary, God Himself then immediately recognized the validity -- and hence the irrepeatability -- of that irregular Circumcision.

This is clearly seen in Exodus 4:20-26. There, "Moses took his wife and his sons, and...returned to the land of Egypt.... Then it came to pass by the wayside, in the inn, that the Lord met him [Moses] and sought to kill him. Then Zipporah took a sharp stone, and cut off the foreskin of her son, and cast it at his feet and said: 'Surely, you are a bloody husband to me!'"

Immediately this Circumcision had thus been performed -- God quit attacking and threatening to kill Moses. God released him. "So He let him go. Then she said: 'You are a bloody husband!' -- because of the Circumcision."

Even Joshua never re-circumcised anybody. For, like every other circumciser, also Joshua circumcised only those who had never previously been circumcised at all.

Thus Joshua 5:2-9 says that he "circumcised the people of Israel at the 'hill of their foreskins' (*gib<sup>a</sup>ah-haa'a:raalooth*)." That once again refers to the Israelitic practice of complete and thus irrepeatable circumcision.<sup>1</sup>

"All the people that came forth from Egypt who were male...had died in the wilderness...after they came out of Egypt.... They had not circumcised, for...forty years, all the people who had been born in the wilderness."

The Exodus Generation had indeed been circumcised. "But their children, whom He [the Lord] raised up in their stead, them Joshua circumcised -- because they were uncircumcised." Indeed, they were "uncircumcised" precisely through the reproachable neglect of their own backslidden parents. Cf. Exodus 4:24f with Hebrews 3:8f.

### Irrepeatable Circumcision was replaced by irrepeatable Baptism

In the New Testament, it is seen that Baptism replaces Circumcision. Romans 4:11f teaches that Abraham and his infant children received the faith-sign of Circumcision. Romans 4:22f teaches these things were written also for the sake of those who believe Jesus died but then got resurrected from the dead. And Romans 6:3f teaches that Church Members were baptized once and for all into Christ's irrepeatable death and resurrection.

Galatians 3:6-29 clarifies that (the circumcised) Abraham was justified through faith in Christ. It also teaches that those who have been baptized and who belong to Christ, are children of Abraham.

Similarly, Ephesians 4:4-6 proves that there are no such entities as Adventist Baptisms and Baptist Baptisms and Campbellite Baptisms and Presbyterian Baptisms and Romish Baptisms. It declares that there is but "one Baptism" -- viz. that in the Name of the Triune God (Matthew 28:19).

Also Colossians 2:11f teaches that even uncircumcised Gentile Christians have been 'circumcised' with the Circumcision made without hands. That occurred when they were baptized. Then, the 'Circumcision of Christ' (or His once-only 'Calvary Circumcision') was depicted for and upon them -- irrepeatably.

Finally, Hebrews 6:1-6 teaches that Baptism is quite foundational -- once and for all. So attempting to repeat it, is really tantamount to recrucify-ing Christ. See: Ambrose, Chrysostom, John of Damascus, Beza, & Gravemeijer.

### Baptism administered to Christ and to or by Apostles is irrepeatable

It needs to be noted that the Apostles received their own Christian Baptism from John the Baptizer, before they themselves started administering the same Christian Baptism also to others. John 3:22-26f. None of Christ's Apostles was ever rebaptized -- least of all by Jesus Himself. Also, those John the Baptizer baptized and who later became disciples or even Apostles of Jesus Christ -- were never baptized or rebaptized either by the Saviour or by His disciples. John 1:15f,25f,35f,40f & 4:1f.

The Lord Jesus, Himself baptized only by John the Baptizer, was never rebaptized. His heavenly Father regarded as valid the Baptism which He Himself had received from John. Similarly, when today also we are baptized into Christ -- we are baptized into His Baptism, and hence also into the one and only valid Baptism which He Himself received from John.

Nor did Jesus Himself ever baptize anyone. John 4:1f. Thus, He never re-baptized those already baptized by John the Baptizer. Instead, He accepted the validity of the Baptism which He had received and also His Apostles had received from John the Baptizer. Too, not only did John the Baptizer believe he was validly baptizing people -- once and for all. So too did all of those whom John the Baptizer baptized.

Now we should never call John the Baptizer: 'John the Baptist.' For John the Baptizer was no Baptist! We might far rather call him 'John the Presbyterian.' For he was, in fact, a Presbyterian -- and he baptized by pouring or sprinkling water upon professing penitents and their children. First Kings 18:30-33; John 1:25-33; 3:22-25f; Acts 1:5; 2:17f; 2:38f.

Moreover, also the Apostle John equated 'Johannine Baptism' (*sic*) with Christian Baptism -- once and for all. For that Apostle regarded all those baptized by John the Baptizer, including Jesus Himself, as having been baptized validly and therefore also irrepeatably. John 1:25-33.

After he baptized Jesus, the baptizings of John the Baptizer decreased -- while the baptizings of Jesus (through the agency of His Apostles) increased. John 3:22-30 & 4:1f. Very significantly, both before and after that, not the Trinitarian People of Israel but only their rotten unitarianized leaders refused Baptism precisely from John the Baptizer. Luke 7:29f.

None of those baptized by John the Baptizer or by the Apostles before Calvary -- was ever 're-baptized' (in any way and in any name whatsoever). Nor was anyone else who was baptized since Calvary in the Name of the Triune God (Matthew 28:19) -- ever rebaptized for any reason whatsoever. Indeed, nobody who was water-baptized 'rainlike-ly' on Pentecost Sunday (Acts 2:17f *cf.* 2:38f) -- had ever been baptized previously. The same applies to those baptized by Philip in Samaria *etc.* (Acts 8:12f *cf.* Isaiah 52:13f & 53:1-10); by Peter at Caesarea (Acts 10:47f); or by Paul at Ephesus (Acts 19:1-6).

#### Irrepeatability of the Baptism administered to Simon the sorcerer

In Acts 8:12f, we are told that the Evangelist Philip preached the Gospel in Samaria. He then baptized those who professed thus to have come to faith in Christ -- including even Simon, the city's leading sorcerer.

Here the Bible does not say that Simon was presumed, rebuttably, to have been baptized, after he submitted to Christian Baptism. God's Word actually says: "Simon himself...was baptized."

However, even after that Baptism, it soon became clear to the Apostle Peter that Simon the ex-sorcerer was still imprisoned in "the gall of bitter-

ness and the bond of iniquity." Indeed, Peter then told Simon: "Your heart is not right in the sight of God." Acts 8:21.

Peter then went on to command Simon: "Repent, therefore, of this wickedness of yours!" And: "Pray to God, if perhaps the thought of your heart may be forgiven you!" Acts 8:22.

Not once did Peter suggest that Simon needed to be (re)baptized. All Simon needed to do -- and really needed to do! -- was to repent. If ever he did this, in so doing -- he would be 'improving his Baptism.' For then, he would be starting to live in the way a baptized person should live. Romans 6:3f. Compare too *Westminster Larger Catechism* -- Questions and Answers 167, 171, 173 & 177.

If Simon never so repented -- after dying he went to hell despite his having been baptized. But even if he were to repent -- there is no hint whatsoever that he should then ever be 're-baptized.' Thus too Augustine.

#### Apollos was never rebaptized after receiving "the Baptism of John"

Apollos was an Alexandrian Jew. Even before arriving in Ephesus, he had already been "instructed in the Way of the Lord" alias Christianity -- "kateechemenos teen hodon tou Kuriou." Acts 18:25. Cf. too Luke 1:1f & 1:63-79 & 3:2-4 & 7:24-27 and Acts 1:1f & 9:1f & 16:17 & 19:4-9 & 19:23 & 22:4 & 24:14 & 24:22.

Furthermore, and again even before arriving in Ephesus, Apollos was "eloquent" and "mighty in the Scriptures" -- or "dunatos oon en tais Graphais." Indeed, even then, Apollos was already "fervent in the Spirit" -- or "zeoon too; Pneumati." See Acts 18:24.

Yet again, both before arriving and while lodging in Ephesus, Apollos "diligently spoke and taught the things of the [Lord] Jesus" alias "ta peri tou [Kuriou] Ieesou." Acts 18:25a. For Apollos already understood or "knew the Baptism of John" -- alias "epistamenos...to Baptisma Iooannou."

Once more. Both before arriving, and also while lodging, in Ephesus -- Apollos already "perfectly" understood "the Way of God" alias "teen Hodon tou Theou." What then did Aquila and Priscilla thereafter do for him while he was in Ephesus? They "expounded to him the Way of God more perfectly" -- alias "akribesteron autoo; exethento teen Hodon tou Theou." Acts 18:26.

Thereafter, when Apollos wished to go to Achaia alias Central Greece, he was quite rightly and writtenly commended by the Ephesian Christians to the Christians in Corinth. Then, leaving Ephesus and going to the Corinthians, he there "much helped those who had believed through grace. For he mightily convinced the Jews, and publicly -- showing from the Scriptures that Jesus was Christ" the Messiah. Acts 18:27f.

Throughout, then -- Apollos was already a convinced Christian, even before he had arrived in Ephesus. For even before then, he had been "instruct-

ed in the Way of the Lord"; was "fervent in the Spirit"; "mighty in the Scriptures"; and "understood...the Baptism of John." So, he already understood quite "perfectly...the Way of God"; and already "taught the things of Jesus."

Paul's friends Aquila and Priscilla, after hearing Apollos in Ephesus, simply "expounded to him the Way of God more perfectly." Acts 18:24-26. For, as one reads in the Proverbs (9:9): "Give [further] instruction to a wise man -- and he will be yet wiser. Teach a just[ified] man -- and he will increase in learning" yet more.

When did Apollos first become "wise"? When "justified" by grace through faith in the Messiah! Apollos became a Christian probably long before his earlier Baptism (in Alexandria or wheresoever). Indeed, he already understood and received "the Baptism of John" when the Baptizer "John the son of Zacharias...came...preaching the Baptism of repentance." Luke 3:2f.

Preaching thus, John then declared: "One mightier than I is coming... I am not worthy to loosen His shoes.... He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." Thus "John indeed baptized with the Baptism of repentance, saying to the people that they should believe in Him Who would come after him -- that is, in Christ Jesus." Luke 1:1f & 3:16; Acts 1:1f & 19:4.

One should therefore again carefully note it was indeed true Triune Christian Baptism which was administered by John the Baptizer himself -- on behalf of God the Father, pointing to Christ the Son, Who would baptize with the Holy Spirit. Luke 3:8-16. So too, when John the Baptizer (for the sake of God's true people) gave also to Jesus true Christian Baptism -- "the Holy Spirit descended...upon Him, and a voice came from heaven saying: 'You are My beloved Son in Whom I am well-pleased!'" Luke 3:22.

Similarly, also Apollos was "instructed in the Way of the Lord" -- at the time when he too understood and received "the Baptism of John." Acts 18:25. He therefore already understood "the Way of God...perfectly" even before he had arrived in Ephesus. See Chrysostom on this (at note 139).

This is why Apollos was never 're-baptized' -- after receiving even "more perfect" explanations about the Way from Aquila and Priscilla while he was in Ephesus. Centuries later, neither was the deromanizing Spirit-filled Calvin 're-baptized' after reading Luther -- though he did thus get "more perfect" explanations about "the Way" than he had previously acquired.

#### Unitarians whom Paul baptized in Ephesus never baptized previously

Now Apollos had already left Ephesus for Corinth, before twelve confused Non-Christian disciples of some or other heretic themselves even arrived in Ephesus. Acts 18:24 to 19:1f. It is therefore bizarre to assume -- as some have -- that the godly Christ-preaching and Spirit-filled Trinitarian Christian Apollos exerted any influence whatever on those Unitarian Non-Christians.

Those approximately twelve Non-Trinitarians who arrived in Ephesus, although previously indeed washed with water by their fellow Unitarians, had --

very unlike the Christ-preaching Apollos who was "fervent in the Spirit" -- never even heard as to "whether there is a holy spirit" or even "any Holy Ghost" (KJV). Acts 18:25, *per contra* 19:2.

That they learned, only when they first met Paul -- after he subsequently arrived back in Ephesus. Consequently, they then still needed to receive Biblical Baptism -- for the very first time.

It seems this occurred after Paul had first preached the Triune Gospel to them. For only thereafter, apparently, did he give any of them Christian Baptism. Acts 19:1-7.

God Himself has given us elsewhere a vital and an inspired comment on this "Ephesian" passage Acts 19:1-5. As the Holy Spirit, through Paul himself, later declared -- and precisely when writing specifically to the Ephesians -- there can be only "one Baptism." Ephesians 1:1 & 1:13 & 4:5 *cf.* 4:30 & 5:36 & 6:1-4.

This one Baptism, is Triune Baptism. For, as far as Christianity is concerned, there is only "only Father"; "one Lord" Jesus; and "one Spirit." There is only "one God" -- the Triune God. There is only "one body" -- the Christian Church. There is only "one Faith" -- the Trinitarian Faith. Thus Ephesians 4:4-6. Therefore there is also only "one Baptism" -- *viz.* Triune Baptism "into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Matthew 28:19 *cf.* Genesis 1:1-3 & 1:26-28.

That Triune or Trinitarian Baptism is administered in the Name of the one and only Triune God. He, as "Father of all, is above all"; He, as Son, is "through all"; and He, as Holy Spirit, is "in you all" -- in all of you who believe. The trinitarian rite is thus the only Baptism which can validly ingraft into the Christian Church. *Cf.* Matthew 3:11f with 28:19.

#### Acts 19:1's "disciples" not those of John but of some Non-Christian

Acts 19:1-7 is absolutely crucial as to the impropriety and indeed the impossibility of 'rebaptism.' Accordingly, this is now the appropriate place to clarify that it was not John's disciples whom Paul now met.

"Paul...came to Ephesus. Then, finding **certain** disciples" there -- he sensed that they were quite devoid of the Holy Spirit of God the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. So "he said to them: 'Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you started to trust?'"<sup>2</sup>

Many have misassumed that these "certain disciples" professed to be true 'believers in Christ' or at the very least to be true followers of John the Baptizer. Yet such assumptions are quite erroneous. For, according to Holy Scripture, also the Anti-Christian Pharisees had their "disciples." Yet such had fallen away from the Old Testament's Trinity.

Luke states that the twelve ignoramuses Paul now met in Ephesus were "disciples" -- alias "*matheetas*" or 'taught ones.' This word "disciples"

does refer elsewhere to Judaistic Unitarians such as the "disciples of...the Pharisees."<sup>3</sup> It probably applied also to Gentile infidels,<sup>4</sup> as well as to the disciples or 'taught followers' of Syncretists like the Necrobaptists and the Hemerabaptists.

The Necrobaptists, said Paul -- though opposed to Christianity -- yet (*sic*) 'baptized' "for the dead."<sup>5</sup> The Hemerabaptists were semi-paganized Essenes, who got themselves (*sic*) 're-baptized' every day of their lives.

The Non-Christian Hemerabaptists never tired of repeating one another's "baptisms" (*sic*). They were infected with: Neo-Pythagoreanism; magical mysticism; mandatory vegetarianism; self-lustration alias so-called 'se-baptism'; naked resubmersionism -- and many other aberrations.<sup>6</sup>

Certainly the unitarian "disciples" of the Pharisees denied the deity of the Messiah as well as both the deity and the personality of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, it is very significant that the twelve "certain disciples" in Ephesus even admitted to Paul: "We have not so much as heard whether there is "a holy spirit."

#### Unitarians in Ephesus did not believe what John the Baptizer taught

So, when Paul returned to Ephesus, he found that these twelve ignorant Unitarians had arrived there during his previous absence. Obviously, the ignoramuses had been altogether uninfluenced by (and were probably not even aware of) the very instructive Spirit-filled Scripture-preaching of that eloquent and learned Christian, Rev. Apollos. Indeed, those ignorant Unitarians seem to have arrived in Ephesus -- only after Apollos had departed thence for Corinth. Acts 18:24 to 19:3.

Some twenty-five years had elapsed since Christ's trinitarian forerunner, John the Baptizer, had been martyred. The Christian Church Universal knew that John had baptized especially the Lord Jesus as the central Person of the Trinity and the Only-begotten and Spirit-anointed Son of God the Father.

Very surprisingly, a group of ignorant Unitarians was now making the claim to Paul -- that its approximately twelve members had priorly been initiated "into John's Baptism." Still more remarkably, each of them was apparently altogether ignorant about the very existence of any holy spirit. Perhaps each was further ignorant even of the Spirit-anointed Jesus Christ Himself -- and, even more probably, ignorant of His Lordship and Deity too.

Now John the Baptizer, while baptizing people, had always pointed his baptizees (and prospective baptizees) away from himself -- and toward the coming Messiah (Jesus Christ). In so doing, John had always told them how that Spirit-anointed One would soon Himself endue them -- not with water, but indeed with the Holy Spirit. Matthew 3:3-11f and John 1:25f -- *cf.* Isaiah 11:1-10f & 61:1f with Acts 19:1-6.

Yet those twelve Unitarians in Ephesus did not even allege they had received their 'Baptism' from John himself, nor even at his direction. They

only claimed -- and even that claim itself is suspect -- to have been initiated "into John's Baptism."<sup>7</sup> Indeed, they frankly told Paul that they themselves had never even "heard whether there is 'a holy spirit'"(sic).<sup>8</sup>

This "John's Baptism" (sic), which these Unitarians here alleged they had received -- was therefore quite devoid of "the Holy Spirit." Paul had sensed this from the very outset. That is why he had asked them: "Did you receive the Holy Spirit, when you started to trust?"

The twelve then confirmed that Paul's hunch was correct. For they truthfully answered him: "We have not so much as heard whether there is "a holy spirit" -- or "any Holy Spirit" (as the *King James Version* renders it).

Whatever this "John's Baptism" was which these Unitarians claimed they had received -- it had not been administered to them by the Trinitarian John. For he was a Spirit-filled Christ-believer, ever since his conception.

Also as an adult, John still testified about Christ and the Spirit. He did so, during his own Spirit-filled preaching -- also while baptizing. Luke 1:15-17,41-44,80; 3:3-16f; Matthew 3:2-11f cf. 28:19; Acts 10:37f; 13:24f.

Hence, this 'Spirit-less' rite referred to in Acts 19:3 by the twelve Unitarians -- was certainly not Johannine. Nevertheless, an important question must still be asked. What had happened to those Unitarians -- before they met Paul in Ephesus?

It seems certain that, earlier, yet other Unitarians -- people like the syncretistic Essenes -- had misled the twelve Paul now met in Ephesus. It is possible that even those earlier Unitarians had never actually seen or heard the Trinitarian Preacher John himself. It is certain those earlier Unitarians had quite misunderstood John's teachings -- perhaps encountering them by hearsay, or even third-hand. They had then, conceivably even inadvertently, gone and started yet one more judaistic sect. Compare Mark 2:18 & 7:1-7; Acts 5:36f & 23:6-9; and First Corinthians 15:29.

The men Paul met in Ephesus were apparently members of precisely such a sect. For it seems that after John's death, syncretizing Unitarians had themselves started initiating people "into John's Baptism." By this, they probably meant they were purporting to initiate 'in the name of John' -- or perhaps even 'into the name of John.' But John himself would very firmly have discouraged both of those initiations!

This 'Spirit-less' rite was certainly not the Christian Baptism John himself had administered. For even while baptizing with water -- John had urged his baptizees right then to be disciples of the Spirit-baptizing One soon coming after him -- viz. Jesus Himself. John's disciples were never expected or supposed to be 'rebaptized' either by Jesus or by anyone else.

Yet some of the followers of John became confused, especially after his violent death. Matthew 11:2f,11f & 14:10-12. Instead of then following Jesus, they themselves might have spread their confusion to others. Those others might then very well have started teaching erroneous doctrines. Un-

like John himself (Mark 1:4-11), they then apostasized from the Triune God. Like the Judaists who had apostasized from Old Testament Trinitarianism -- they too were Unitarians. Yet, unlike those Judaists, they seem also to have begun to deify even John himself -- at least incipiently.

For after John's death, these erring teachers did not baptize (as had John): from the Father, toward the Son, and with the Spirit. Quite wrongly, these erring teachers then started to 'baptize' their 'disciples' apostately, "in the name of John" -- weirdly dispensing what they then falsely called: "John's Baptism." Cf. Acts 19:3. Also Simon the sorcerer, and his later disciple Menander, are likewise reputed to have misbehaved similarly.<sup>9</sup>

It is quite inconceivable that anyone could have been baptized by John himself without, right then, hearing about the Holy Spirit from the Spirit-filled and Spirit-witnessing John himself. However, the devotees of the 'Spirit-less' rite referred to in Acts 19:3 -- were quite devoid of the Holy Spirit. Indeed, they did not know even of "a holy spirit" -- or, as the *King James Version* puts it, of "any Holy Spirit" whatsoever.

So this alleged "John's Baptism" was not Johannine. This Spirit-less water-rite so named "John's Baptism" -- previously received, if at all, by the twelve Spirit-less men who now met Paul in Ephesus -- could itself have started probably only in the confusion some time after John's death.

#### Paul explained John's true Baptism to the unbaptized Unitarians

It was therefore incumbent on Paul now to explain,<sup>10</sup> to those ignorant Unitarians at Ephesus, the nature of the true Christian Baptism which John himself had indeed administered. So "then Paul said: 'John truly baptized with the Baptism of repentance, while saying to the people that they should believe in Him Who would come after him' -- that is, in **Christ Jesus**" the Spirit-anointed One.

The twelve Unitarians in Ephesus then heeded this, and repented. Consequently, "when they heard this -- they were baptized into the Name of the Lord Jesus."<sup>11</sup>

Some think Paul baptized them only with the Spirit but not with water at all -- after just telling those men John himself had indeed baptized people with water into the Name of the then-coming Messiah -- that is, the Spirit-anointed Jesus. Thus: Calvin, Beza, Wolleb, the 1637 *Dordt Dutch Bible*, Calixtus, Lightfoot, Budde, Rambach, Gravemeijer, Hoeksema, and others.<sup>12</sup>

Yet the above Scripture more probably means that after those men repented, they were then baptized with water into the Name of the Lord Jesus. This would then be because, as former Unitarians, they had previously never been baptized by John or his disciples at all -- and also never yet, by whomsoever, been baptized into the Name of Jesus Christ as God the Son (and as quite the most central Person in the Holy Trinity). Thus not only Chrysostom (see at note 168f below), but also: the *Old Syriac Version* and Jerome's *Vulgate*;<sup>13</sup> Abraham Kuyper Sr.;<sup>14</sup> and Francis Nigel Lee.<sup>15</sup> Luke 3:3-22 cf. Acts 19:3.

Either way. The indisputable fact is that, against Romanism, according to both Luther and Calvin and all Classic Lutherans and all Classic Calvinists -- 'Johannine Baptism' is 'Christian Baptism.' Thus, on this identification particularly in this very passage Acts 19:1-7, see specifically: Calvin, Beza, Wolleb, the 1637 *Dordt Dutch Bible*, Lightfoot, Cocceius, A Marck, De Moor, J.H. Heidegger, J.H. van der Palm, H. Heppe, H.E. Gravemeijer, A. Kuyper Sr., and H. Hoeksema Sr. *etc.*<sup>16</sup>

In Acts 19:4, "*Iooanees ebaptisen Baptisma metanoias*" clearly means: "John really baptized -- with a Baptism of repentance." For here, the expression "*ebaptisen Baptisma*" is probably the Greek-language version of a Hebrew infinitive absolute -- such as *taabool taabal*. It would then mean: 'John thoroughly baptized unto repentance.'

The great truth that "John really baptized" in Acts 19:4, is not at all annulled but rather strengthened also by the following verse. That states: "When they [the twelve Unitarians] heard this, they were baptized into the Name of the Lord Jesus." For they had never been baptized previously.

At Ephesus, Paul therefore re-baptized nobody. Acts 19:1-5. Indeed, also and precisely at Ephesus: there was only "one Baptism." Ephesians 1:1 & 1:13 & 4:5 & 4:30.

#### Paul did not re-baptize but only first-baptized Ex-Unitarians (Acts 19)

The twelve Unitarians in Ephesus claimed to be baptized "disciples." So "Paul said: 'Into what, then, were you baptized?' And they replied: 'Into John's Baptism' -- '*eis to Iooannou Baptisma*.'" Acts 19:3.

Notice that this expression "Into John's Baptism" or "*eis to Iooannou Baptisma*" -- as used by the uninspired Unitarians in Acts 19:3 -- is rather different from the other expression "the Baptism of John" or "*to Baptisma Iooannou*" as used by the inspired Luke at Acts 18:25. For this reason too, it is illegitimate to assume that Apollos the Trinitarian Christian and later Apostle (First Corinthians 4:6-9) -- either before he arrived in or stayed at or even after he left Ephesus for Corinth -- had any influence at all on the twelve Unitarians either before they arrived or while they stayed in Ephesus.

"Paul then said [to the twelve Unitarians in Ephesus]: 'It is indeed with a Baptism of repentance that John baptized! He said to the people, that they should trust in the One coming after him' -- that is, in Christ" the Messiah Whom God the Father had anointed by the Spirit. John's was Triune Baptism!

"Now when they heard this, they were baptized into the Name of the Lord Jesus [Christ].... Paul laid his hands on them."

There is even some evidence (in *P<sup>38</sup>* & *D* and other manuscripts) for the reading: "they were baptized into the Name of the Lord Jesus Christ unto the taking away of sins." Yet either way, it seems very clear that these twelve men -- now Ex-Unitarians -- were precisely then "baptized" with water.

Thereby they received the same "Baptism of repentance" which John's disciples and Jesus and His Apostles all received -- when 'John thoroughly baptized unto repentance.' Whence it appears that Paul baptized them precisely because he concluded that John the Baptizer had never baptized them at all, and also because they had never before repented and believed what John had been preaching.

Paul drew these conclusions for two reasons. First, when he met the twelve Unitarians -- he was unable to discern the fruit of any work of the Holy Spirit in their lives. Second, they themselves admitted to him that -- unlike John the Baptizer and the latter's baptizees -- they themselves had never even heard whether there is such a 'thing' as 'a holy spirit.'

It also seems clear that it was probably Paul himself who then so baptized them. For the very next verse, Acts 19:6, then immediately states: "And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came on them" *etc.*

So these twelve men were baptized only once -- and indeed right then, and probably by Paul. It is true that they claimed already to have received what they called "John's Baptism" (whatever that might be). But it is not true they claimed John himself, or even a disciple of John, had baptized them.

Paul clearly concluded that John had not baptized them. Paul knew that whenever John had baptized, he had truly baptized with the Baptism of repentance -- by then urging the people to believe in Christ, the Spirit-anointed One. For the same reason, Paul also concluded the twelve Unitarians had never before received Christian Baptism -- at all.

It was precisely because the twelve Unitarians had no concept of repentance nor any knowledge at all that even 'a holy spirit' so much as existed, that Paul then explained this to them -- and also explained that John had preached repentance through Christ the Spirit-anointed Messiah. Then, after the twelve started to believe this -- they were baptized, for the very first time in their lives.

#### Baptism irrepeatable not only at Ephesus but also in Ephesian Epistle

Even the twelve Ex-Unitarians were baptized but once and for all -- and probably by Paul at Ephesus, around 52 A.D. Acts 19:1-7. So, it is not surprising the same Paul would -- about eight years later -- once again remind the Christians in the same city of Ephesus that there is only one irrepeatable Baptism. Ephesians 1:1f; 1:13; 4:4f; 4:30; 5:25-29 & 6:1-4.

Thus, in his *Epistle to the Ephesians*, Paul told "the saints who are at Ephesus" that they had been once and for all irrepeatably "sealed with the Holy Spirit...unto the day of redemption." He said those "saints" include also "children" who "obey" their Christian "parents." For their fathers were to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

The beginning of the nurture of those "children" was their engrafting into the same Ephesian congregation of the Visible Church of Christ, by giving

them the Sacrament of Baptism. For "there is one body and one Spirit, even as you have been called in one hope of your calling; one Lord [Jesus], one faith, one Baptism; one God and Father." In other words, there is but one (and only one) Christian Baptism -- viz. Triune Baptism.

At the beginning of the nurture of those "children" by baptizing them into the Triune God's Visible Church, they were thus sealed with the mark of Christ "Who loved the Church and gave Himself for her." And then, "having 'cleansed' her with the washing of the water," He "keeps on sanctifying her by the Word...[and] keeps on nourishing and cherishing...the Church." So, having by Baptism ingrafted their infants into the Visible Church -- Christian fathers are never to re-baptize them but instead then to "bring them up in [or with-in or in-side] the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

As Rev. Dr. H.E. Gravemeijer rightly remarks in his *Reformed Doctrine of Faith* (III:20:25): "In Ephesians 4:5, Paul urgently warns Christians unto mutual peace and unity.... All Christians of whatever nation or station had received one and the same seal of the Covenant...."

"Baptism therefore has one and the same meaning for them all. It does not mean one thing for some, and something else for others. Thus, it does not mean that there are various kinds of Baptism."

"From this it necessarily follows that Baptism cannot be administered more than once to one and the same person. For that would indicate two or more kinds of Baptism.... It would not be 'one Baptism' -- if somebody were baptized first one way, and then again otherwise."

#### Baptism irrepeatable not only at Corinth but also in *First Corinthians*

We find the same antirebaptistic teaching also given to the Church in Corinth. There, "the Church of God" includes "the household of Stephanas" which Paul himself had "baptized" as "the firstfruits" of that harvest. Cf. First Corinthians 1:2; 1:16; 16:15.

Paul reminds the Church that its Members "have been washed." He also tells them: "By one Spirit, we were all baptized into one body." Cf. First Corinthians 6:11 & 12:13. This means with water (thus Luther & Calvin).

Now those "all" who "were baptized" -- included also babies born of only one parent who professed faith in Christ. Discussing holy sexual intercourse and the holy babies which sometimes result therefrom, Paul explains: "For the unbelieving husband was sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife was sanctified by the husband. Otherwise your children would be unclean. But now, they are holy." First Corinthians 7:14.

Paul does not here wish that such infants might only later hopefully become holy. Instead, Paul assures the Corinthian Christians that such infants are already holy. He declares: "Now, they are holy" -- even from the holy womb; and therefore to be given Holy Baptism, already as infants.

Indeed, the position of such children is quite analogous to those of the Israelites as the ancient People of God. Their males were all to be circumcised even while infants.

This is why the Hebrew-Christian Paul tells the Corinthian Christians: "Brethren, I don't want you to be ignorant of how all our forefathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea." For then, they "all were baptized unto Moses with the cloud." First Corinthians 10:1f.

Such "forefathers" included also the male infants then being carried by their parents out of Egypt. Those male infants too were then and there "all baptized unto Moses with the cloud" and "under the cloud" even when they "all passed through the sea" -- namely "upon the dry ground." See: Exodus 14:22f & 15:19 *cf.* Hebrews 11:29.

They were then "all baptized...with the cloud" and "under the cloud." That was when "the clouds poured out water"; and when "He divided the sea, and caused them to pass through" on dry land. Psalms 77:17-20 & 78:13.

The wicked Egyptians who followed them through the sea, were not baptized. They were only totally submersed. Hebrews 11:29.

So too were those wicked Non-Christians who "were baptized for the dead." Their situation was very analogous to that of the twelve Unitarians in Ephesus who dubiously claimed to have received "John's Baptism." For "they" were not "we." First Corinthians 15:29f & Ephesians 19:1-3.

If "they" ever later repented -- also those Necrobaptists would still need to receive Christian Baptism, as did "we." That would then not be re-baptism. For to real Christians ("we"), the Necrobaptists ("they") -- unless they are apostates from Christianity -- have never yet received Holy Baptism.

#### Baptism irrepeatable in the Apostle's Epistle to the Hebrews

Also in the *Epistle to the Hebrews*, it can be seen that Baptism is ir-repeatable. At the Red Sea in the time of the Exodus, Baptism was administered for all of the children of Israel not by submersion but by sprinkling from a raincloud. Psalms 77:17-20 & 78:13. But all of the wicked adult Egyptians there, were destroyed by way of total submersion.

The Apostle reminded the early Hebrew-Christians: "By faith, Moses kept the Passover, and the sprinkling of the blood.... By faith they [the Israelites and their infants] passed through the Red Sea as by dry land -- which the Egyptians assaying to do, were drowned." Hebrews 11:28f.

This is fully in agreement with the Biblical method of ritual cleansing. As one reads in Hebrews 9:13 & 9:19, "the blood of bulls" were for "sprinkling the unclean" -- and that blood "sprinkled both the book and all the people."

Moreover, the high priest "sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels." Hebrews 9:21. All these sprinklings were "baptisms" or

"baptismois" or "divers washings...until the time of reformation" at Calvary when Jesus would sprinkle us with His blood. Hebrews 9:10 *cf.* 9:14 & 9:22f.

Hence the holy writer urges: "Let us keep on drawing near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having had our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and having had our bodies washed with pure water! Let us hold fast to the professing of our faith without wavering!" Hebrews 10:22f.

At the Red Sea, the children of Israel were baptized but once -- and so indeed precisely by way of sprinkling. So too, also the early Hebrew Christians. They were justified once and for all, through "the blood of sprinkling" -- by the Triune God: alias by the Father of the Son Jesus Christ and through His Spirit. Hebrews 11:28f *cf.* 12:24.

Just as Christ sprinkles Christians once and for all with His blood, so too does He depict that -- with once-and-for-all irrepeatable Baptism. This is one of the first "principles of the doctrine of Christ" -- so that we must "not be laying again the foundation of repentance" and of "faith toward God" and "the doctrine of Baptisms." For those who do such things, "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh." Hebrews 6:1-6.

The implication is clear. Baptism depicts the irrepeatable death and resurrection of Christ. Thus, re-peated-ly to seek a Baptism or Baptisms -- is in effect to re-cruci-fy Christ, Who died and rose again but once. Thus Ambrose, Chrysostom, John of Damascus, Beza, and H.E. Gravemeijer.

Dr. Gravemeijer (*op. cit.* III:20:11) rightly says: "In Hebrews 6:2" (*cf.* 6:6), "the 'teaching of Baptisms' is mentioned among the first principles of Christian doctrine.... That is not repeated." For Baptism "was administered to everybody once only" -- lest by 'rebaptism' one 're-crucify' Christ!

#### Baptism irrepeatable in the First Epistle of the Apostle Peter

Peter was never rebaptized with water -- not even after repenting for having renounced the Lord Jesus he had previously followed! He was, however, baptized with the Spirit -- during that great outpouring on Pentecost Sunday, soon after which 3000 adults and their children were baptized with water. Acts 1:5 and 2:14f,28f,41.

Also later, Peter did not "withhold" the baptismal water. When the Holy Spirit cam down upon them, he baptized the entire household of Cornelius -- as the first Gentiles to join the Christian Church. Acts 10:46-28 & 11:15-17.

In First Peter 1:2, the Apostle reminds his addressees that they are once and for all triunely elect. This is "according to the foreknowledge of God the Father...unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus" precisely "through sanctification of the Spirit."

In First Peter 3:18f, it is stated: "Christ has suffered once [and for all] for sins..., having been put to death in the flesh [once and for all] -- but having been brought back to life [also once and for all], by the Spirit."

Also through that same Spirit (*cf.* First Peter 1:11f & 4:6), "He went and preached to the spirits in jail who once were disobedient when the patience of God waited during the days of Noah while the ark was being prepared -- in which few persons, namely eight, were saved through water.

"Even Baptism is a similar figure of this. It too now heals us -- not as the thrusting away of the filth of the flesh, but as the answer of a good conscience toward God, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Here Peter compares the sprinkled blessings of Triune Baptism, to the rain on Noah's family in the flood. Just as that flood was once and for all, and never to be repeated -- so too is Christian Baptism once and for all, and never to be repeated. For both the flood and Baptism point to the irrepeatable salvation wrought at Calvary. Genesis 6:18 & 7:4f & 8:21f & 9:9-12.

Just as Noah and his entire family were saved inside the ark (Genesis 6:18f & 7:7f) -- so too did Peter baptize adult penitents together with their children (Acts 2:38f *cf.* First Peter 1:2). Just as God saved Noah's family by pouring rain upon the top of the ark, even while the wicked were being totally submersed one at a time outside (Genesis 7:4-11f) -- so too did Peter witness the Spirit's Baptism as a once-and-for-all out-pour-ing also upon the sons and daughters of God's Covenant of Grace. Acts 2:18f *cf.* First Peter 3:20f.

#### Baptism irrepeatable in Christ's Book of Revelation to the Apostle John

The last book of the Bible is "the Revelation of Jesus Christ...to His servant John" the Apostle. Revelation 1:1. John wrote it down -- mindful of what he had already written down about the baptismal sprinkling of the People of God in his Gospel. John 1:15f,25f,32f & 3:23-25f & 4:1f *cf.* First Kings 18:30-33.

Rev. Professor Dr. Abraham Kuyper Sr. states in his famous volumes *From the Decrees of Dordt*<sup>14</sup> that the Apostle John wrote: "'I heard the number of those who had been sealed.' Revelation 7:4." Kuyper himself then explains: "This idea of understanding the Sacraments as a seal is taken from Scripture itself. In Romans 4:11 we read the following of the patriarch Abraham: 'He received the sign of Circumcision as a seal of the righteousness of faith'.... As soon as the realization revives that in the Sacrament of Holy Baptism we are dealing with a sign that seals, the unholy representation is amputated for ever -- as if the Sacrament were only a ceremonial matter....

"In Second Corinthians 1:21-22, we read that 'it is God Who has anointed us and confirmed us with you in Christ. He has also sealed us and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts' [once and for all].

"Ephesians 1:13 is similar: 'Christ...has sealed you with the Holy Spirit of promise.... What we read in Ephesians 4:30 has similar implications: 'Do not grieve the Holy Spirit of God, by Whom you have been sealed unto the day of redemption'.... These statements refer to, and are connected with, Holy Baptism.... When one thinks about this deeply, one then also realizes how it can be said in Revelation 7:2 that even God the King has such a seal."

Also in his work *On the Sacraments*,<sup>14</sup> Kuyper argues: "The effect of Baptism, is the seal of the living God as the sign of incorporation into the Covenant of Grace.... Baptism seals incorporation...into the Church of Christ as it is visibly expressed here on Earth.... Baptism is and always remains the sealing of incorporation into the Covenant of Grace, and therewith into the Church Universal.... This incorporation into the Covenant of Grace or of reconciliation, is one and the same in the Baptism of adults and in that of the young children of believers...."

"The chief aspect of Baptism, is that it is the seal of the living God unto incorporation in the Covenant of Grace.... God indeed has just such a seal. Revelation 7:2. And with Him it also operates to publish His authority, and to cause action to proceed from Him.... This seal is stamped upon the elect.... Revelation 7:2.... Thus in Ephesians 1:13 [*cf.* 4:5] persons are addressed who first stood outside of Christ but who received knowledge of the truth and were baptized."

Now in Revelation 7:3-8, not just adults but indeed every Member of all of the Church alias the tribes of the New Israel are sealed upon their foreheads. In Revelation 19:13 (*cf.* Isaiah 63:2f), Jesus Christ is portrayed as clothed with a vesture baptized or sprinkled in blood. And at the very end of the Bible, in Revelation 22:3f, one reads that all of whatever age who get to glory, have on their foreheads the Name "of God and of the Lamb" -- the Name of the Triune God. *Cf.* Matthew 28:19-20 & Ephesians 4:4-6.

#### Church History corroborates the irrepeatability of all Triune Baptisms

We have seen from the Bible: that recircumcision was and is impossible; that Baptism replaces irrepeatable Circumcision; that the Baptism administered by John to Christ and all of His Apostles was irrepeatable; that Baptisms administered by Christ's Apostles before Calvary were irrepeatable; that the Baptism administered to Simon the sorcerer was irrepeatable; that the Acts 19:1-5 heretics Paul baptized in Ephesus had never previously been baptized; and that texts like Ephesians 4:4f & 6:1-4 and First Corinthians 1:14f & 7:14 & 10:1f & 12:13 and Hebrews 6:1-6 & First Peter 1:2 & 3:18-21 and Revelation 7:3 & 19:16 & 22:3f all presuppose that Baptism is irrepeatable.

All this would be upheld also in Church History. The orthodox would do so -- especially when these facts were ignored by heretics!

No Apostolic Fathers or Apologists countenanced rebaptism. Especially Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and Hippolytus condemned as rank heresy -- all repetitive water-rites of judaizing Hemerobaptists, gnosticizing Marcionites, pseudo-pentecostalizing Montanists, and modalistic Sabellians.

The later rebaptismal errors of Cyprian and Novatian were successfully combatted in Rome by Stephen and Dionysius, and later condemned as heresy at the Synod of Arles (314), the Synod of Nicea (325), by the *Apostolic Constitutions* (325f), and at the Synod of Laodicea (360). Rebaptism was also condemned by Post-Nicene Church Fathers such as Athanasius, Cyril, Hilary, Basil, Jerome, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine and John of Damascus.

The Protestant Reformation rightly rejected the false and mediaeval error of baptismal regenerationism. It also re-affirmed the Early Church's rejection of rebaptism. Thus Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, the *French Confession*, Knox, Guido de Bres, the *Belgic Confession*, Beza, the *Second Swiss Confession*, Bullinger, Laski, Polan, Wolleb -- and therefore also the *Westminster Standards*, as the official symbols of worldwide Presbyterianism.

### The clear-cut antirebaptism of the first-generation Apostolic Fathers

The *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* enjoins: "Thus must you baptize.... Baptize into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, with living water [*en hudati zoonti*].... Pour out water thrice upon the head into [*eis*] the Name of Father and Son and Holy Spirit!"<sup>17</sup>

This pouring of water which is running [*zoonti*], over the head, "into the Name" of the Triune God -- cf. *Matthew 28:19's* "*eis to Onoma*" -- was the old apostolic practice. Also the Apostolic Fathers reflect this. The latter are those Early-Christian Leaders who knew the Apostles and outlived them. As a group, they practised paidobaptism trinitarianly -- and irrepeatably.

Thus in the *Epistle of Barnabas*, compare Acts 14:14f, one reads:<sup>18</sup> "A command was given to Israel that men...should sprinkle the people one by one [*Numbers 19:2-20 cf. Hebrews 9:9-13f*].... They that sprinkle, are those that have proclaimed to us the remission of sins and purification of heart....

He [the Lord] has circumcised both their and our heart.... Abraham, the first who enjoined Circumcision, practised that rite -- looking forward in spirit to Jesus.... The Israelites...forsook Me, a Living Fountain, and have hewn out for themselves broken cisterns." Genesis 17 & Jeremiah 2:12f cf. Romans 4 & Galatians 3.

Also Clement of Rome (cf. *Philippians 4:3*) implies the irrepeatable baptizing also of covenant infants by the rainy mode of pouring. He shows how "Noah...preached regeneration to the world," and how "the Lord saved by him" all those (his family) who "entered into the ark."<sup>19</sup> First Peter 3:20f.

Clement of Rome also enjoins: "Let us train up the young in the fear of God! ... Let your children be partakers of true Christian Training!"<sup>20</sup> For "the Spirit of grace was poured out" upon those who "from infancy to old age have walked among us unblameably."<sup>21</sup> Acts 2:17f & 3:38f and Ephesians 1:1f & 4:5 & 6:1-4.

Starting already with the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*,<sup>22</sup> specifically the trinitarian formula was maintained also by the Ante-Nicene Church Fathers. Indeed, those Ante-Nicene Church Fathers also believed that even in Acts 2:38 & 8:16 & 19:5, Baptisms seem to have been administered in accordance with the full formula prescribed by Jesus Himself in *Matthew 28:19* -- "baptizing into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Thus Justin Martyr,<sup>23</sup> Tertullian,<sup>24</sup> Clement of Alexandria,<sup>25</sup> Origen<sup>26</sup> and Cyprian.<sup>27</sup>

Certainly after Nicaea (321f), the trinitarian baptismal formula was the only one recognized. Thus Athanasius,<sup>28</sup> Didymus,<sup>29</sup> and Augustine.<sup>30</sup> So too the entire Mediaeval Church and all the Protestant Reformers without exception. Athanasius says the fourth-century extreme Arians alias 'Ariomaniacs' seem to have been the very first post-apostolic heretics to abandon the trinitarian baptismal formula and to opt for single submersion alone.

### The baptized ex-sorcerer Simon of Samaria's lapse from Christianity

According to the 180 A.D. Church Father Irenaeus, after being rebuked by the Apostle Peter in Acts 8:9-21 the Samaritan magician Simon "set himself eagerly to contend against the Apostles." He then "applied himself with still greater zeal to the study of the whole art of magic....

"He taught that it was himself who appeared among the Jews as the Son; but descended in Samaria as the Father; while he came to other nations in the character of the Holy Spirit."<sup>31</sup> This, of course, is a Pre-Sabellian type of Unitarian Modalism.

Yet even after that, Augustine still insisted Simon's initial baptism (at Acts 8:13) remained valid and irrepeatable. For the Apostle Peter did not urge that the lapsed Samaritan Simon be re-baptized, but only that he should re-repent. Acts 8:22f. So, if he ever did re-repent -- Simon of Samaria would never have been 'rebaptized.'<sup>32</sup> For, as Paul told the Ephesians (4:5), there is only "one Baptism." That is irrepeatable,<sup>33</sup> and Simon the Samaritan had already received it from Philip. Acts 8:12f.

"Now from this Simon of Samaria," continues Irenaeus, "all sorts of heresies derive their origin.... Cerdo was one who took his system from the followers of Simon.... He taught that the 'god' proclaimed by the law and the prophets was not the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."<sup>34</sup> Without doubt, Cerdo later perverted Marcion.

Tertullian, in his *Prescriptions Against All Heresies*, calls the Samaritan Simon the first heretic.<sup>35</sup> Referring "to those who have chosen to make the Gospel the starting-point of their heresies," Tertullian says: "The first of all, is Simon Magus.... After him Menander, his disciple (likewise a magician).... Whatever Simon had affirmed himself to be, this did Menander equally affirm himself to be -- asserting that none could possibly have salvation without being baptized in his name." Cf. Acts 8:13-19f & 19:3!

### The Proto-Anabapticism of the apostate Marcion and his Marcionites

So like Menander, also Cerdo took his own system from the followers of the apostate Simon of Samaria. Cerdo was a Jew-hating Syrian Gnostic. He later became also a Docetist, and finally he infected also Marcion.

Now just before 140 A.D., the wealthy shipowner Marcion of Pontus had joined the Church. However, once he fell under the influence of Cerdo, he developed a hatred of the Old Testament.

Marcion then syncretized Cerdo's false teachings with only parts of the New Testament -- to the exclusion of the whole of the rest of Holy Scripture. Marcion also rejected the Trinity -- by teaching that the Father within the Older Testament's Triune God 'Elohiym', was not the Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. "Jesus only" Unitarianism -- here we come!

Soon Marcion was excommunicated for heresy, around 144. He then started his own rival religion. He purported to baptize those he perverted to his heresy -- and even to rebaptize them repeatedly!

Of Marcion, the Historian Professor Philip Schaff writes<sup>36</sup> that "he excluded wine from the eucharist but 'retained'...Water-Baptism." He even practised "'anointing'...the newly-baptized.... Epiphanius reports that he permitted females to baptize. The Marcionites sometimes practised vicarious baptism for the dead.... So they understood -- First Corinthians 15:29."

Marcionism erroneously taught "it is lawful to give three baptisms"<sup>37</sup> -- repeatedly, from time to time. At first, each of these may still have been done by the Biblical mode of sprinkling; but later, by unitarian submersion.

Thus, Marcion was a Rebaptist. The line of the heretical Rebaptists runs from Acts 8 and 19 to Marcion. From him, it runs on to the Montanists, the Donatists, the Petrobrusians, the Anabaptists, the Baptists, the Campbellites, the Mormons, and the Seventh-day Adventists -- to the Jehovah Witnesses *etc.*

Marcion was promptly opposed by the 150 A.D. Justin Martyr.<sup>38</sup> All of Marcion's followers were later rebuked also by Clement of Alexandria.<sup>39</sup>

Incidentally, it was not just the antitrinitarian apostate Marcion whom the Trinitarian Justin opposed. For Justin told also the unitarianized Jew Trypho that Christians worship the true God -- the Older Testament's Triune God 'Elohiym' Whom also the Judaists should worship. Genesis 1:1-3f & 1:26f.

Said Justin to Trypho about Jesus: "We who have approached God through Him, have received not carnal but spiritual Circumcision.... We have received it, through Baptism.... Why do I need Circumcision? I...have...been baptized!" On the other hand, Justin insisted that the Judaists still needed to "be circumcised with the true Circumcision" -- viz. Baptism.<sup>40</sup>

Also the great Tertullian spurned the Marcionites' pseudo-baptisms. He saw their god as a "kidnapper" of the baptismal water which even they admitted belongs to the matter-creating 'Old Testament God' Whom they hated. For the convert to Marcion, held Tertullian, is "'baptized' to his god -- in water which belongs to Another." Thus: submersion into and under Unitarianism!

Explains Tertullian of Marcion:<sup>41</sup> "Up to the present time he has not disdained the water made by the Creator, with which He washes His People.... I wish to examine whether you are at least honest in this.... You hypocrite! However much of abstinence you use to show yourself a Marcionite, that is, a repudiator of your Maker..., you will have to associate yourself with the Creator's material production." For the Marcionites needed water (created by the Creator) even for their own pseudo-baptisms.

Regarding Marcion, Tertullian further asked of the Marcionites: "For what end does Baptism serve, according to him?" Tertullian then argued that Baptism could have no real meaning to the Marcionites. For they purport to baptize into the name of their god which they allege neither creates nor sustains anything. For "no farmer will irrigate ground that will yield him no fruit in return -- except he be as stupid as Marcion's god!"

This strongly impacts on Baptism. For, as Tertullian explains also of the Marcionites:<sup>42</sup> "Heretics have no fellowship in our discipline.... They and we do not have the same God!" Cf. First Corinthians 15:29's "we"/"they."

### Neo-Marcionism and the continuing Proto-Anabapticism of the Montanists

Montanus was the founder of the A.D. 150f proto-pentecostalist sect of the Montanists. Prior to his own Baptism into the Church Universal, he had been a pagan priest practising the ecstatic pseudoglossolic rites of the false religion devoted to the earth-goddess Cybele. Some time after his Baptism, he started to combine Cybele's religion with Christianity -- into his own syncretism now known as 'Montanism.'

This Montanist view of Baptism was syncretistic. It combined Biblical Baptism on the one hand -- with a combination of the *taurobolium* of Montanus's Cybele-worship and "baptism for the dead" on the other hand. The *taurobolium* involved burying the candidate in a grave, and then drenching him or her with the blood of a sacrificial bull. The "baptism for the dead" noted by Paul with disapproval in First Corinthians 15:29, was even further perverted by the Montanists into sometimes 'baptizing' even dead people.<sup>43</sup>

Montanism soon clashed with the Church. For the Early Montanists in Phrygia were rebaptistic and pseudopentecostalist schismatics.

Perhaps initially influenced by the nearby Anti-Oldtestamentistic yet also Pseudo-Newtestamentistic apostasy of the rebaptistic Marcionites at Pontus, many of the Montanists themselves ceased baptizing infants. Certainly the Neo-Montanists purported to baptize adults only -- and, as a result of syncretism with paganism and dynamism, by way of the unbiblical mode of submersion.

Neo-Montanism's view of Baptism is the first real evidence of that rite purporting to be administered by way of total submersion. Since the rise of Montanism from A.D. 150 onward, it seems even the Unitarian Marcionites abandoned sprinkling. Both Neo-Marcionites and Montanists, perhaps mutually influencing one another, were certainly submersing their converts by 200 A.D.

In addition, even the early Montanists 'rebaptized' at least certain adults. Such were they who became Montanists after having already been baptized previously -- whether in infancy or thereafter -- either by the Church Universal, or by some other Christian group.

Together with the rise of such Montanistic rebaptizings (*sic*), also other arcane practices (like Neo-Cybelic or Proto-Pentecostalist pseudoglossolaly)

rapidly proliferated among the Montanists. Many slid also into apostate Non-Trinitarian Hypermontanism and even Sabellianism.

Philaster states<sup>44</sup> that the Montanists were in the habit of baptizing even the dead themselves. This echoed the not-"we"-but-"they" errors of the infidels mentioned in First Corinthians 15:29. Such Necrobaptism was kept alive by Marcionites, Montanists and other heretics<sup>45</sup> -- and presaged the later similar practices of the submersionistic and polytheistic Mormons.

As the renowned Church Historian Rev. Professor Dr. Philip Schaff observes:<sup>46</sup> "In doctrine, Montanism...opposed infant baptism." Indeed, also Rev. Dr. Henry Percival has noted<sup>47</sup> that "the Montanists...rebaptized Catholics who 'apostasized' to them."

The Montanists then more and more 'rebaptized' other Christians whom they perverted to Montanism. Finally, many of the latter later devolved into non-trinitarian pseudo-glossolalists -- akin to their modern Unitarian 'Jesus-only Pentecostalist' stepchildren.

#### The Church Universal's appropriate baptismal re-action to Montanism

Increasingly, the Montanists denied the validity of Baptisms performed in the Church Universal. So, they more and more 'rebaptized' such Christians as became perverted to Montanism.

The reverse, however -- at least for very many decades -- was not the case. For the Church Universal strove for the uniformity of "one Baptism." Ephesians 4:5. So it was only when schismatics became so heretical that they no longer administered triune baptism at all -- or when apostates denied the one and only true Triune God altogether -- that the Church Universal pronounced them to be Non-Christian. Only then did she repudiate the validity of their alleged 'baptisms.'

Of the heretics and the apostates, the Church herself baptized only those she converted from Non-Trinitarianism. She did so only after they got converted to the Triune Christian Faith -- and only provided they had never formerly receive Triune Baptism anywhere else. Matthew 28:19 cf. Ephesians 4:5.

#### The grave menace to the Church of de-trinitarianized Hyper-Montanism

Significantly, even the schismatic Montanists generally remained Trinitarian -- and themselves practised Triune Baptism (or at least triune re-baptism). Yet such was not the case with those Phrygian Hyper-Montanists known as the Pepuzites.<sup>48</sup>

They proclaimed their own town of Pepuza the 'New Jerusalem' (complete with 'patriarchs'), and falsely predicted the soon return of Jesus to set up His 'Millennial Kingdom' there. Meantime, they apparently started 'baptizing' people "into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Paraclete speaking through Montanus" (or alternatively through "Priscilla") -- rather than,

as Christ Himself had enjoined in Matthew 28:19, 'in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' (alias the Ontological Trinity).

At first, they orthodoxly still admitted that 'the Paraclete' alias the Holy Spirit as such was the sovereign Third Person of the Trinity -- undivorceable from the Father and the Son. Later, however, they began divorcing the Spirit from the Father and the Son -- and alleged that the Spirit spoke principally through Montanus and Priscilla. Finally, they concluded that the Spirit spoke only through Montanus and Priscilla. Thenceforth, they changed the Christian baptismal formula. Therein, they blasphemously substituted 'Montanus' or 'Priscilla' -- for 'the Holy Spirit.'

This is why groups like the above were not only ex-communicated as heretical schismatics. They were also virtually 'anathematized' as apostates. Thus the Church Universal--at its Regional Synod of Carthage in A.D. 200, and at its 235 Regional Synod of Iconium in Phrygia. So too by the Council of Constantinople -- in 381.

For Hypermontanist 'Baptisms' were soon no longer being administered (as required by Jesus Christ) "in the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit." Instead, they were now being administered 'in the Name of the Father and the Son and the Paraclete' -- this 'Paraclete' apparently being taken to mean not the Holy Spirit as such, but instead specifically the ravings of the heretics Montanus or Priscilla<sup>49</sup> misattributed to the Holy Spirit.

#### Clement of Alexandria: Trinitarian Baptism is valid and irrepeatable

The great Church Father Clement of Alexandria wrote around 190 about the irrepeatability of Biblical Baptism.<sup>50</sup> That, implies Clement, was administered by sprinkling<sup>51</sup> -- and given also to covenant infants.<sup>52</sup> It apparently used the triune formula,<sup>53</sup> and it was executed by employing the triple mode.<sup>54</sup>

Especially against Montanism,<sup>55</sup> Clement taught that Baptism is irrepeatable. "We who have been baptized, have wiped off the sins which obscure the light of the Divine Spirit.... We have all been baptized into one body [First Corinthians 12:13]."<sup>56</sup>

"What place is there any longer for the [rebaptismal] repentance of him who was once an unbeliever? ... So, [re]baptism is neither rational nor a blessed seal.... He who has sinned after this -- on his [re-]repentance, though he obtain pardon, ought to fear as one no longer [to be] washed."

To Clement, unrepeatable Baptism should use the triune formula. He explains:<sup>57</sup> "What a 'treasure in an earthen vessel' we bear -- protected as it is by the power of God the Father, and the blood of the Divine Son, and the dew of the Holy Spirit!" For "the Three [are]...the mystery of the seal.... The glory of Baptism...is the mystery of the Trinity -- which is the seal impressed on those who believe."

Christ's "lambs of the royal flock" alias His "pure fishes" are brought to life from "the billowy strife" of sin. They are "nourished by...a dewy

Spirit," even while "sucklings.... He invites to the laver.... Receive, then, the water of the Word! Wash, you polluted ones! Purify yourselves from custom, by sprinkling yourselves with the drops of truth!"<sup>58</sup>

### Tertullian of Carthage: Baptism is Trinitarian and irrepeatable

According to Tertullian's great tract *On Baptism*, that ordinance -- once administered -- should never be repeated.<sup>59</sup> "Happy is our sacrament of water.... We [are] little fishes, after the example of our *ICHTHUS* Jesus Christ.... The primary principle of Baptism...was even then fore-noted by the very attitude assumed for a type of Baptism -- that the Spirit of God, Who hovered over (the waters) from the beginning, would continue to linger over the waters of the baptized." Genesis 1:2 cf. Luke 3:16-22.

"The Holy Spirit...is about to come upon us.... Faith [is] sealed in (the Name of) the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.... Where there are three (the Father, the Son, and the Holy S[pirit]) -- there is the Church....

"I will reply to them who affirm that the Apostles were 'unbaptized'.... They had undergone the human Baptism of John.... The Lord Himself had defined Baptism to be one [Ephesians 4:5], saying to Peter who was desirous of being thoroughly bathed: 'he who has once bathed, has no need to wash a second time' [John 13:9f].... Others make the suggestion... 'that the Apostles then served the turn of Baptism when in their little ship they were sprinkled' [Matthew 8:24 & 14:28f]....

"There is to us one, and but one, Baptism both according to the Lord's Gospel, as well as according to the Apostle's letters -- inasmuch as he says, 'one God and one Baptism' [Ephesians 4:5].... We enter, then, the font once. Once are sins washed away, because they ought never to be repeated."

Also in Tertullian's tract *On Repentance*, he states<sup>60</sup> that "all who are given up to the Lord..., compete for salvation.... Young novices...only just beginning to bedew their ears with divine discourses [Deuteronomy 32:2 cf. Isaiah 44:3f & Acts 2:17-39], and who as whelps in yet early infancy...[sometimes] neglect to improve it.... A presumptuous confidence in Baptism introduces all kind of vicious delay...with regard to repentance.... For who will grant to you, a man of so faithless repentance -- one single sprinkling of any water whatever?"

Tertullian concludes<sup>61</sup> that "with Baptism...we are thrice tinged...when we are taken up as new-born children." And that is "never to be repeated."

### The first sinful rebaptisms in the Church Universal: circa 220f A.D.

Thus Tertullian admitted that the Church Universal had constantly practised Infant Baptism. Yet he ultimately rejected it -- after falling under the influence of Semi-Montanism, around 200 A.D. This led him to secede from the Church Universal and to join the antipaidobaptistic Semi-Montanists. Yet they kept the Apostles' practice of Triune Baptism -- albeit only of adults.

It was not till almost a quarter of a century after the time of Tertullian's secession, and indeed apparently after his death, that the first intra-ecclesiastical baptismal controversy erupted. Only then did the matter of rebaptizing first raised its head inside the Church Universal herself.

What brought this about was not the activity of the Montanists, and still less that of the Semi-Montanists -- both of whom, though schismatic, were very clearly trinitarian. Detrinitarianizing Hypermontanism, however, was paving the way for new theories about the nature of God Himself -- and therefore also of Baptism into His Name.

A sudden though localized baptismal crisis near Rome was precipitated by the de-trinitarianized Callistus, who apostasized into Modalistic Unitarianism alias Patripassianism. This held it was God the Father Himself Who suffered the human agony endured by Jesus. It alleged the Father died on the cross.

Under Callistus, a modalistic 'second baptism' was for the first time presumptuously attempted in Rome.<sup>62</sup> Yet Callistus was exposed by his leading opponent -- that great orthodox-trinitarian Church Father Hippolytus. He too flourished in the vicinity of Rome, circa 210f A.D.<sup>63</sup>

#### Hippolytus upheld Triune Baptism against Modalism's "Second Baptism"

Now Hippolytus clearly links the Christian Baptism also of infants to the Judaic 'Proselyte Baptism' which preceded it. Remotely, he links it also to the Old Testament's Circumcision of infants which paved the way for both.

The link between New Testament Baptism and Hippolytus, seems to be the *Old-Egyptian Ordinance* (from no later than the last part of the second century). That *Ordinance* declares:<sup>64</sup> "The children are to be baptized. Those able to speak for themselves, are to speak. But the parents or next-of-kin are to give the answers of those who are not able to do so themselves."

Around 215, Hippolytus compiled his work *Apostolic Tradition*. He did so apparently from the above-mentioned (Old-)Egyptian Church Order.

The latter too may have been authored by him. Certainly he incorporated it into his book *On the Apostolic Tradition of Gracious Gifts*.<sup>65</sup> For in his *Apostolic Tradition*, he writes:<sup>66</sup> "You should baptize the little ones. All who can speak for themselves, should speak. But for those who cannot speak -- their parents should speak, or another who belongs to their family."

Needless to say, in his *Refutation of All Heresies*,<sup>67</sup> Hippolytus opposes the pseudo-sacramental sorceries of Simon and his disciples [Acts 8:9-23f]. He also opposes the pseudo-sacramental 'rebaptisms' of the gnostic Marcites.

"Marcus, an adept in sorcery -- carrying on operations partly by sleight of hand, and partly by demons -- deceived many.... After the (first) Baptism...they [the Marcites] promise another.... By this (other), they wickedly subvert those that remain with them in expectation of redemption; as if persons, after they had once been baptized, could again obtain remission!"

### Hippolytus opposes Triune Baptism to Montanism's rebaptistic fruits

To Hippolytus, even the Montanists themselves and much of what they did -- remained unworthy in the sight of God. Though he sympathizes with their rigorous discipline, he rightly opposes them as schismatics.<sup>68</sup> Yet he is even more critical of their far more radical Hypermontanist successors.

Thus, Hippolytus insists<sup>69</sup> that the Hypermontanistic "Phrygians" are "heretical" alias doctrinally heterodox -- if not indeed apostate. "These have been rendered victims of error, from being previously captivated by [two] wretched women called a certain Priscilla and Maximilla -- whom they supposed [to be] prophetesses...."

"They in like manner consider Montanus as a prophet.... They [the later Hypermontanists] allege that they have learned something more through these [Montanus and Priscilla and Maximilla] -- than from the Law and the Prophets and the Gospels.... They magnify these wretched women above the Apostles."

### Rebaptist Hypermontanism detrinitarianizes into Patripassianism

Hippolytus further demonstrates how a detrinitarianizing Ultramontanism -- had influenced the views of the anti-trinitarian patripassian apostate Callistus. Explains Hippolytus:<sup>70</sup> "Others of them, being attached to the heresy of the Noetians, entertain similar opinions to those relating to the silly women of the Phrygians and to Montanus....."

"In like manner also, Noetus..., a fellow addicted to reckless babbling as well as crafty withal, introduced [among us] this heresy.... Callistus corroborated the heresy of these Noetians.... Callistus himself produced likewise a heresy, and derived its starting-points from these Noetians."

Callistus seized Rome's Overseership from 217f A.D. Hippolytus then records it was precisely "during the episcopate of this one -- that [modalistic] 'second baptism' was for the first time presumptuously attempted"<sup>71</sup> within the Church herself. It was attempted, of course, not by the orthodox -- but only by the heterodox and apostasizing party that was then within the Church.

Against this modalistic 'second baptism' Hippolytus continued to maintain that Trinitarian Baptisms are valid -- because rooted in Christ's. He rightly explains:<sup>72</sup> "Christ, the Maker of all, came down as the rain [Hosea 6:3] and was known as a fountain [John 4:14]...and was baptized [Matthew 3:13].... The Holy Spirit descended in the form of a dove -- and the Father's voice spread everywhere.... A voice was heard saying, 'This is My beloved Son in Whom I am well pleased!'" This was Triune Baptism.

### Origen on the irrepeatable Baptism also of infants by sprinkling

In 225, Origen succeeded his mentor Clement as head of the Catechetical School in Alexandria. Eusebius says<sup>73</sup> Origen's ancestors had been Christian

"from his forefathers." Rufinus remarks Origen had inherited his Christianity "from his grandparents and forefathers."<sup>74</sup> Apparently, then, Origen was baptized in earliest infancy.

Now Origen maintains<sup>75</sup> that Elijah -- that earlier 'John the Baptizer' -- had 'baptized' the twelve stones on Mt. Carmel's altar. Those stones represented the twelve tribes of Israel -- and their infant children. Elijah then thrice gave the command to "pour" water over those stones. So too that later Elijah, John the Baptizer -- apparently thrice sprinkled each of the penitent Israelites and their infants, while baptizing them once and for all.

Origen says: "The Church received from the Apostles the tradition of baptizing infants too."<sup>76</sup> Also elsewhere<sup>77</sup> he states that "children too are baptized for the remission of sins.... That is the reason why infants too are baptized."

In yet another place,<sup>78</sup> Origen maintains that Baptism is given "according to the custom of the Church to infants also." Says Origen: "Job 14:4f and Psalm 51:5-7 show that a child who has only just been born..., has sin.... For this reason, the Church received from the Apostles the tradition to administer Baptism to the children also.... Infants are baptized for the remission of sins.... No one is free from defilement (Job 14:14).... That is the reason why infants too are baptized."<sup>79</sup>

Continues Origen:<sup>80</sup> "Christ did not Himself baptize; but His disciples" did. Elijah likewise. "He did not [himself] baptize the logs upon the altar in the times of Ahab.... No, he commands the priests to do this for him. And that not only once! For he says, 'Do it a second time!'...and 'Do it a third time!'"

No wonder, then, that John the Baptizer was asked by the Pharisees if he himself was not Elijah. John 1:25f. For it seems that John too, like Elijah before him, must have been administering trinitarian baptism to his converts precisely by way of 'triple pourings.' First Kings 18:33f. The Pharisees would have seen John doing likewise. Hence their above question to him.

Origen concludes:<sup>81</sup> "Those Paul speaks of, were baptized in the cloud and in the sea [First Corinthians 10:1f].... The children of Israel -- since the children of those who came out of Egypt had not received Circumcision -- were circumcised by Joshua.... The Lord declares that He takes away the reproach of Egypt, on the day of Joshua's baptizing" in the Jordan on dry land. Joshua 3:8-17 cf. 5:8f.

"All this has been added -- not without appropriateness to our study of the Baptism at the Jordan administered by John.... Paul [in First Corinthians 10:1-2] gives the name of 'Baptism' to such a remarkable passage through the water." Indeed:<sup>82</sup> "The Apostles on this account left Israel [solely], and did that which had been enjoined on them by the Saviour -- 'Make all the nations into disciples!'" Matthew 28:19.

### Syrian Didaskalia: person's head anointed in Baptism once and for all

In the earlier part of the third century, the so-called *Didaskalia* alias the 'Teaching of the Apostles' emerged in Northern Syria. This is an important document. It needs to become better known especially among Catabaptists.

It states:<sup>83</sup> "As of old the priests and kings were anointed in Israel -- you must do in like manner.... Anoint the head of those who receive Baptism!"

Needless to say, such priests and kings were anointed precisely by way of sprinkling liquid over their heads. Exodus 29:4,7,12,21; Leviticus 21:10; Numbers 8:5f; First Samuel 10:1-24 & 16:13. So too were prophets. First Kings 19:16 and Second Kings 2:9f & 9:1-3.

Indeed, all of God's People, whether infants or adults, are to be baptismally anointed precisely as prophets and priests and kings. First Kings 18:30-38 cf. John 1:25-33 & 3:22-26. See too Francis Nigel Lee's *Sprinkling is Scriptural*.<sup>84</sup>

The *Didaskalia* continues: "As for Baptism also, one Baptism is enough for you. Since one Baptism has perfectly forgiven you your sin. For Isaiah said not only 'Wash!' -- but 'Wash and be cleansed!'"<sup>85</sup>

The conclusion is clear. Before the rise of Cyprian's rebaptism controversy only in the middle of the third century A.D., the Early Church had never rebaptized those who had already received Trinitarian Baptism. It had not done so ever since John gave Trinitarian Baptism to Christ, and Christ Himself had given His apostolic Great Commission -- to go forth and, by preaching, to bring the nations unto Baptism and to obey the Triune God which it depicts.

### Summary of the rebaptismal over-reaction to Montanism and Novatianism

Iconium in Phrygia was an area plagued with increasingly detrinitarianizing Montanism, and even with detrinitarianized Hypermontanism. So, in 235, the Church Universal's Regional Synod there -- resolved that only Baptisms performed in the local congregation of the Church Universal would henceforth be regarded as valid. This view soon spread also to the Phrygian colony of Carthage in Africa, and to some extent to Alexandria -- but not elsewhere.

Anti-Montanists like Firmilian and Cyprian at first held that those who had received their first Baptism even from trinitarian Montanists -- should be rebaptized upon later entering into communion with the Church Universal for the very first time. Yet the rest of the Church Universal disagreed.

A little later, as long as the pagan Roman Emperor Decius viciously persecuted Christians (from 249-251) --- some of them tried to escape by renouncing their Baptisms. After the termination of those persecutions, some of those baptizees who had renounced Christ and then sacrificed to the name of the pagan emperor -- repented. In most cases the Christians who had stood firm, then received such persons back into their fellowship.

Yet the highly orthodox Novatian of Rome (himself previously baptized by sprinkling) refused to restore penitent Ex-Lapsists back into communion. He was opposed, for his misplaced rigour, by most in the Church Universal. So Novatian then went into schism -- and then demanded that all those from the Church who wished to novatianize -- needed to be rebaptized into his sect.

After a while, some of the Novatianists who had previously been baptized in the Church Universal before seceding to Novatianism -- wished to return to their ancient mother, the Church Universal. The latter as such soon saw the folly of herself rebaptizing such Ex-Novatianists who later re-joined the Church Universal.

Even the extreme Anti-Montanists Firmilian in Phrygia and Cyprian in Carthage saw this. Yet the latter did not see what the rest of the Church Universal clearly saw -- the impropriety of 'rebaptizing' those **born and baptized and bred in the sects** of either Trinitarian Montanism or Trinitarian Novatianism.

Especially the silly attempts of Firmilian and Cyprian to invalidate the trinitarian Baptisms of the godly though rigorous Novatianists, consolidated the Christian Church Universal against the Firmilianic and Cyprianist rebaptizings. So too did Cyprian's apparent capitulation on the main issue. This came about when he finally waived rebaptizing, once they successfully sought communion with his own party, to such freshly-penitent ex-heretics who had been baptized only in the trinitarian sect to which they had belonged.

Against the initial views of Cyprian, the Antirebaptist Stephen of Rome rightly saw that Trinitarian Baptism derives its validity not from the Church Universal -- but from the Triune God alone. Consequently, all Christian Baptisms were valid -- even those performed by someone such as Judas Iscariot. Stephen attacked the rebaptist views of all of the ancient Rebaptists (irrespective of whether they were Montanists or Firmilianists or Cyprianists or Novatianists). Yet consistently, Stephen also recognized all Triune Baptisms -- not only when performed by the Firmilianists and the Cyprianists, but also when administered even by the Montanists and the Novatianists.

After the death of Cyprian in 258, the controversy rapidly died down. Stephen's successor Dionysius of Rome finally won the day against the remnantal catabaptistic Cyprianists in 261f. He did so, by showing that the firm ir-repeatability of Triune Baptism is indissolubly connected to the immutability of the Triune God Himself.

It seems, however, that perhaps the key role in the above important controversy was played by Dionysius of Alexandria. We must now follow his theological thought-processes. These finally led him to reject all rebaptisms, and to influence the rest of the Church Universal to do likewise.

#### The increasing aversion in Dionysius of Alexandria to rebaptizings

Dionysius of Alexandria wrote letters to Stephen.<sup>86</sup> Eusebius refers to another "epistle on Baptism which this same Dionysius wrote to Philemon."<sup>87</sup>

That was apparently directed against anti-trinitarian Sabellianism.<sup>88</sup> Dionysius stated<sup>89</sup> in that epistle: "I received this rule and ordinance from our blessed father Heraclas" who had been Assistant to the great Origen himself.<sup>90</sup>

According to Eusebius, Dionysius had explained that "those who came over [to the Church] from heresies [such as Montanism or Novatianism]...had [before that] lapsed from the Church.... [They then] were charged with resorting to some false teacher.... When he [Heraclas] had expelled them from the Church, he did not receive them back...until they had publicly reported all things.... But [then,] he did receive them -- without requiring of them another Baptism."

Eusebius continues:<sup>91</sup> "Again, after treating the question thoroughly" -- Dionysius dealt with the Carthaginian baptismal practice within the Church Universal, during the time of Cyprian's earliest phase. This was the time the Cyprianists 'rebaptized' all converts from schisms and sects.

Thus, records Eusebius, Dionysius the Great added: "I have learned also that this is not a novel practice introduced [around 251f] in Africa alone.... Even long ago in the times of the Overseers before us, this opinion had been adopted." That occurred around 235, "in synods of the brethren in Iconium and Synnada" (a city of Phrygia).

Very significantly, however, Dionysius (according to Eusebius) did **not** claim that this practice was **apostolic**. To the contrary, he said it "had been **adopted**" -- indeed, adopted precisely at the time of the (235 A.D.) Phrygian synods of "Iconium and Synnada."

On the other hand, the same Eusebius had just previously recorded<sup>92</sup> that such 'rebaptism' was nevertheless an "innovation." For it was, he had just declared, "quite **contrary** to the tradition which had been held from the **beginning**." That, of course, was the well-established tradition of never rebaptizing converts to the Church Universal, when coming over from any sect whatsoever -- provided of course that such sect were indeed trinitarian.

#### Dionysius's hardening opposition to rebaptizing trinitarian sectarians

Finally, Dionysius also wrote a fifth epistle on Baptism -- this time to Xystus Bishop of Rome. Records Eusebius:<sup>93</sup> "After saying much against the heretics, he [Dionysius] relates...that...one of the brethren" in Alexandria -- whom we shall call brother 'X' -- had "long been considered a believer." Yet that brother had never been baptized in the Church Universal.

Dionysius, claims Eusebius, had left this following record: "Before my ordination, and I think before the appointment of the blessed Heraclas" around 232 A.D.,<sup>94</sup> this brother 'X' was already "a member of the congregation." That same brother -- now an old man -- "was present with those who were recently baptized" around 257.

According to Eusebius, Dionysius then continued his story about that old brother ('X'). "Now when he heard the questions and answers, he came to me weeping.... He acknowledged and protested that the Baptism with which he had

been baptized among the heretics -- was not of this character [of the Baptisms he had just witnessed].... He besought that he might receive this most perfect purification.... But I did not dare to do this; and said that his long communion was sufficient....

"For I should not dare to renew from the beginning one who...had stood by the table and had stretched forth his hands to receive the blessed food...and partaken for a long while of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. But I exhorted him to be of good courage, and to approach the partaking of the saints with firm faith and good hope. But he does not cease lamenting, and he shudders to approach the table."

This is an excellent case history. For it shows what a havoc the Post-Iconian doctrine of rebaptizing converts from trinitarian sects unleashed.

The aged brother 'X' was doubtlessly aware of the relatively-new Firmilianic and Cyprianistic doctrine of rebaptism, then raging there in the East. Yet the old man unfortunately had no knowledge of the Pre-Iconian doctrine even there -- which had, of course, been anti-rebaptismal. That earlier doctrine was still paramount everywhere else. It had been handed down (so both Stephen and Eusebius claimed) even "from the beginning."<sup>95</sup>

Clearly, the old man had joined the Church Universal in Alexandria years earlier -- and before the 235 decision of the Synod of Iconium in Asia Minor (anent rebaptism). His own yet-earlier error, would probably have been that of (trinitarian) Montanism.

Consequently, Dionysius would here be claiming to the old man in 257 -- that (Triune) Baptisms previously administered by Montanists are irrepeatably valid.<sup>96</sup> They were certainly valid, even in 257 -- if administered before 235. But then, by implication, they must also be valid -- and for all time -- even if administered after 235 (and also in and after 257).

Eusebius goes on:<sup>96</sup> "Besides these, there is also extant another epistle of the same man [Dionysius] on Baptism." It is "addressed by him and his parish to Xystus and the Church at Rome."

Both from the above information about the baptismal views of the writer Dionysius, as too from what we know of the baptismal views of its addressee (Stephen's successor) Xystus -- we can make a confident conjecture. For Dionysius certainly seems to have become fully supportive of the ancient doctrine of never rebaptizing converts to the Church Universal -- whenever such came over from a trinitarian sect.

### The vindication of the Anti-Catabaptists against the Cyprianists

An '*Anonymous Treatise on Re-Baptism*' -- probably written by a Church Overseer (thus the later Gennadius)<sup>97</sup> and ostensibly directed against Cyprian, also appeared at this time.<sup>98</sup> It rightly explains<sup>99</sup> that "all the disciples" were "already baptized" -- namely by John the Baptizer -- when Jesus told them that "all of you shall take offence at Me." Mark 14:27. Yet none of them

was ever [re-]baptized -- after they had all been restored to fellowship with Christ. Luke 22:31-32.

Anticipating objections from Rebaptists -- such as the Cyprianists who wrongly appealed to Acts 19:1-6 -- the *Treatise* next<sup>100</sup> addresses the Rebaptists directly. "As you are wont to do, you will contradict these things -- by objecting to us that when they were baptized, the disciples were baptized perfectly and rightly, and not like these heretics" baptize today.

Yet this objection of the Rebaptists is refuted very easily. For no disciples have ever been baptized "perfectly" -- by any fellow sinner. Not even Jesus received His own Baptism from the hand of a sinless human baptizer!

The *Treatise on Re-Baptism* apparently also anticipated the increase of ritualistic rebaptism even by the **unbiblical superstition of immersion** -- as pioneered first by the Montanists, and then (by way of competing against them) by the baptismal regenerationist Cyprian. For the *Treatise* next goes on to link **Biblical** Baptism -- precisely to the mode of affusion or **pouring**.<sup>101</sup>

#### Dionysius of Rome antirebaptistically rejects Cyprian on rebaptism

The great Trinitarian Athanasius, of Nicene fame, himself preserved<sup>102</sup> a vital fragment from around 261f A.D.<sup>103</sup> That fragment from the pen of Dionysius of Rome, clearly shows that the Church Universal had even then rejected Cyprian of Carthage's earlier policy of 'rebaptizing' all heretics and schismatics subsequently recruited into the Church Universal.

Writes Dionysius of Rome:<sup>104</sup> "It would be [very] just to dispute against those [such as the Proto-Arians and the Tritheists] who, by dividing and rending the monarchy [or the undivided divine rule]...into as it were three powers and distinct substances and three deities, destroy it." Yet also "Sabellius [the Unitarian Modalist]...blasphemes, in saying that the Son Himself is the Father and *vice versa*...."

"But neither are they [the Proto-Arians] less to be blamed, who think that the Son was a creation, and decided that the Lord was made just as one of those things which really were made. Whereas the divine declarations testify that He was begotten, as is fitting and proper -- but not that He was created or made...."

"That admirable and divine unity, therefore, must neither be separated into three divinities, nor must the dignity and eminent greatness of the Lord be diminished, by having applied to it the name of 'creation' [or 'creature']. But we must believe on God the Father Omnipotent, and on Christ Jesus His Son, and on the Holy Spirit.... Thus, doubtless, will be maintained in its integrity the doctrine of the divine Trinity."

This, then, is the bottom line. The divine doctrine of God's Own Trinity, is inseparably linked to the Church's use specifically of the trinitarian baptismal formula. Matthew 28:19. All attempts to 'rebaptize' by administering a second trinitarian baptism to anybody whatsoever -- thus insults the

integrity of the Triune God Himself (in Whose Name the first and only valid trinitarian Baptism was previously performed). It also amounts to a blasphemous attempt to 'recrucify' the Lord of glory. Hebrews 6:1-6.

The antirebaptistic and historic practice of the apostolic age -- thereafter transmitted through Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Ignatius, Hermas, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, and Stephen -- was now confirmed. Stephen Bishop of Rome was succeeded by Sixtus, and he in turn by Dionysius of Rome -- in 261. Indeed, it seems that also Dionysius of Alexandria came down against rebaptism -- also as a result of the influence of his namesake Dionysius Bishop of Rome.

#### Free Church's Professor Cunningham rejected the rebaptistic Cyprian

In assessing the above baptismal controversy, we find ourselves in complete agreement with the Free Church of Scotland's Theological Seminary Principal, Rev. Prof. Dr. William Cunningham. In his 1862 book *Historical Theology*, he says:<sup>105</sup> "The Church of Rome and most of the Western Churches...maintained that the Baptism of heretics was valid, and that those who had received it should not be re-baptized. Cyprian took the side of the Eastern Churches [in Phrygia], and strenuously supported the necessity of re-baptizing those who had been baptized in the communion of the heretical sects....

"Cyprian, maintaining in these circumstances the necessity of rebaptizing, was led into some notions about the unity and catholicity of the church which are of an unscriptural and dangerous character -- and which...have since been employed very largely by that [Romish] Church in the construction and defence of her hierarchic and exclusive system.... This was Cyprian's grand contribution to the progress of error and corruption in the Church, and the ultimate growth of the Papacy [and especially baptismal regenerationism]....

"Cyprian's views about the re-baptizing of heretics did not generally prevail in the Church but, on the contrary, soon lost ground.... The general feeling and practice of the great body of the Church, has been decidedly opposed to re-baptizing -- both in ancient and in modern times.... Upon the particular topic of re-baptizing, Cyprian's views have been generally rejected -- both by Papists, and Protestants."

#### Excursus on Biblical Baptism by sprinkling & its decline after Cyprian

As pointed out in detail in our essay *Sprinkling is Scriptural*,<sup>6</sup> back 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.

Thus the Older Testament. There, first in the Law, just compare: Genesis 1:2 & 6:3f & 6:17f & 7:4 (*cf.* First Peter 3:20f); Genesis 28:18 & 35:14; Exodus 4:9 & 9:8f,33 & 12:7,21-23,37 & 14:21-29 & 15:8-10 & 24:6-20 & 29:7-21 & 30:9f; Leviticus 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; Numbers 8:6f & 18:17 & 19:4-21; and Deuteronomy 12:16,24,27 & 15:23. In the Writings, compare:

Joshua 3:13-17; First Kings 18:5,31-33,44f (cf. John 1:21f & 3:23-26 & Matthew 11:13f & 17:11-13 & Luke 7:28-33); Second Kings 5:1-3,10,14 & 9:1-6 (cf. Leviticus 14:3-7); Psalms 77:16f & 78:13-16; Proverbs 1:23; and Song 1:3. And in the Prophets, compare: Isaiah 21:4 & 32:15 & 44:1-4 & 45:8 & 52:15 & 53:12 & 63:3; Ezekiel 11:5 & 36:18,25f & 39:29; Daniel 4:15,23,33 & 5:21 & 7:14,22 & 9:24-27; Hosea 6:1-3; Joel 2:16f & 2:23-28; Zechariah 12:10; and also Malachi 3:1-3,10 & 4:5f.

The above-mentioned last verses of the Old Testament on Biblical sprinkling are continued in the first verses of the New. There, consult: Matthew 3:1-17; Mark 7:1-8; Luke 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 & 10:37f,44-48 & 11:15-17f & 19:5f; First Corinthians 1:16 & 3:6-8 & 6:11 & 7:14 & 10:1-2; Ephesians 4:4-8; Hebrews 6:1f & 9:10-21 & 10:22 & 11:28f & 12:22-25; First Peter 1:2 & 3:20f; and Revelation 7:3f & 9:4 & 14:9f & 19:13 & 20:3f & 22:2-4.

Very significantly, all of the Early Patristic Fathers upheld Christian **Baptism by sprinkling**. Thus, in the second century, we find it in the *Epistle of Barnabas*,<sup>106</sup> in the *Didache* alias the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*,<sup>107</sup> and in Justin Martyr.<sup>108</sup> We also find it in Irenaeus,<sup>109</sup> in Tertullian I,<sup>110</sup> and in Basilides.<sup>111</sup>

In the third century, we find **Baptism by sprinkling** in Clement of Alexandria<sup>112</sup> and in Hippolytus.<sup>113</sup> We also encounter it in Origen,<sup>114</sup> in Cyprian,<sup>115</sup> and in Dionysius Alexandrinus.<sup>116</sup>

In the fourth century, we find **Baptism by sprinkling** in: Eusebius;<sup>117</sup> Lactantius;<sup>118</sup> Athanasius;<sup>119</sup> the *Apostolic Constitutions*.<sup>120</sup> and Cyril of Jerusalem.<sup>121</sup> We also find it referred to in: Hilary;<sup>122</sup> Basil;<sup>123</sup> Gregory Nazianzen;<sup>124</sup> Gregory of Nyssa;<sup>125</sup> the Second Council of Constantinople;<sup>126</sup> Ambrose;<sup>127</sup> Didymus of Alexandria;<sup>128</sup> and Jerome.<sup>129</sup>

Finally, in the fifth century -- just before the Church's **submersion** into the Dark Ages -- we still find **Scriptural sprinkling** in the Baptisms administered by Cyril of Alexandria<sup>130</sup> and Theodoret.<sup>131</sup> Sprinkling is also the sole baptismal practice upheld in the Ancient-Armenian *Liturgical Codex*.<sup>132</sup>

Only from about 350 A.D. onward, did deformation in the **mode** of baptism increasingly take root. This was the result of the then-very-great influx into the Church -- of paganizing heresies in general, and of the 'regenerational' 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.

There were also further deformations which took place at the time of administering Baptism. Such included: consecration of the water; baptismal regenerationism; transferring a 'kiss of peace'; immediate post-baptismal communion (including even paidocommunion); and, finally, transubstantiation.<sup>133</sup>

Of all the above errors, the paganistic and paganizing heresy of baptismal regenerationism was probably the most dangerous. Especially this insidious evil, particularly from about A.D. 350 onward, rapidly promoted further evils.

Thus the A.D. 250f Cyprian's theory of baptismal regenerationism and its accompanying post-apostolic and Neo-Montanistic heresy of total submersionism -- quickly expanded even inside the Church Universal. Right down till the Protestant Reformation, both in Romanism and in the Eastern Churches, the bald and atrocious assumption seems to have been that the more water used for baptizing -- the more effectively does the latter wash away sins.

Only at the advent of the Protestant Reformation in general, and specially 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.

As Rev. Professor Dr. Jay Adams states in his book *The Meaning and Mode of Baptism*: "Immersion...must be discounted." It is a "custom not only lacking Scriptural support, but completely out of accord with the Scriptural mode of Baptism"<sup>134</sup> -- even as antipaidobaptism is out of accord with the Scriptural requirement to baptize also the infants of believers.

#### The ongoing sacramentalization of Baptism and the road to Donatism

Before 235 A.D., the Early Church universal regarded all Triune Baptisms as valid. There was then a localized over-reaction to the plague of submersionistic Hyper-Montanism.

From 250 onward, there was a larger reaction -- to Novatianism; especially after its merger with rebaptistic Montanism. Yet, after the death of the ritualistic and rebaptistic Cyprian in 258, the antirebaptismal views of the Church Universal were re-established more firmly than ever before. Already by the time of Dionysius of Rome (A.D. 261f), the rebaptismal controversy was buried and settled.

It had been touched off by: the fanaticism of the Montanists and of the Hyper-Montanists in Phrygia; the apostasy of the anti-trinitarian Sabellians in Rome; the rebaptizings by the Novatianists in many places; and the over-reaction of the Cyprianists in Carthage. Yet all of these issues had now been addressed. So the Church Universal now recommitted itself even more than ever before -- to its historic and Biblical position against rebaptism. For she now again recognized the validity of all Trinitarian Baptisms -- also when performed by schismatics, or even by heretics.

Cyprian thus failed to get the Church Universal as such to require, or even to permit, the rebaptizing of converted schismatics and trinitarian heretics. He did, however, indeed succeed -- in getting the Church Universal more and more to adopt his new sacramentalism in general. In particular, he managed to get more and more Christians to embrace the false doctrine of baptismal regenerationism.<sup>135</sup>

This pagan and false notion of baptismal regenerationism increased dramatically from the middle of the third century onward. It was also accompanied by the rise of submersionism, which the Church Universal seems to have taken over from Montanism. This new view, gradually, had by the Early Middle Ages become dominant even in the Church Universal. For it came to be assumed that the more water used during Baptism, the more effective the alleged cleansing.

This too led, in Baptisms, to a gradual decline in the use of the Biblical mode of **sprinkling**. For the latter was increasingly replaced by a dramatic rise in the new and 'christianized' (*sic*) use of paganistic magical immersionism. The latter soon became the preferred, and later even the dominant mode of baptizing even in the Late-Patristic Church herself. This was very unfortunate. However, it did not affect the validity (and therefore the irrepeatability) even of these novel immersionistic Baptisms. Nor did it invalidate the then-diminishing Baptisms the Church Universal still administered by way of Biblical **sprinkling**.

In his important book *The Sacrament of Baptism*, even the Romanist Dr. J.P. Murphy (D.D. and Ph.D.) accurately says:<sup>136</sup> "Many people, including some Catholics, believe that **Baptism** by **submerging** the body in water was the **only method** followed in the **early Church**. Such a belief is quite **groundless**.... Where Baptism **was** given by **submerging** the body, this was usually done **three times**" (when the **Church Universal took this over from trinitarian Montanism**).

"The custom of **submerging** the body **once only**," Murphy says, "appears to have arisen [in the **Church**] in Spain" -- where its **non-threefold** or **single method** was derived from **Arians**. Yet "Pope St. Gregory the Great (590f A.D.) informed Leander Bishop of Seville...that such a **method** was valid...."

"From...Constantine...the...custom...arose of postponing one's Baptism until the last moment. This custom was largely due to a desire to have all guilt and punishment remitted at the opportune time of one's last illness."

Clearly, ever since the Re baptist Cyprian, even the Church Universal would be inundated more and more by irregular views about Baptism. This was to be seen especially fifty years later, at the rise of Donatism.

### The Diocletian persecution as the background for the rise of Donatism

The last great persecutions of Christians by the Pagan Romans under their Heathen Emperor Diocletian -- from 303 onward -- were particularly severe. They were the immediate cause of the rise of a rebaptistic Donatism.

The latter had its earlier roots in African and Phrygian rebaptizings. Yet its own rise and progress occurred under Donatus (from A.D. 303 onward). His schism and exodus from the Church Universal around 313 -- was due to the latter's decision that penitents who had betrayed Christ during the Diocletian persecutions, should be (re)communicated (and, if clergy, even re-instated).

Just as formerly during the 250f Decian persecution, so too under that of Diocletian (303f). Many harried Christians had 'lapsed' from the Faith into

which they had previously been baptized. After the earlier Decian persecution, there had been those like Novatian who refused to recommunicate the penitent Lapsists. Again, after the Diocletian persecutions, some refused to recommunicate penitents who had lapsed during those difficult times.

Formerly, the anti-lapsist purist Novatian had then gone into schism and started rebaptizing even such from the Universal Church who had followed him. So too the anti-lapsist purist Donatus now went into schism -- and similarly started rebaptizing such upset Church Members as now joined the Donatists.

They had good grounds to feel upset -- even if not to separate and to get themselves rebaptized into that new sect. For, during Diocletian's persecutions, some Christians and even some clergy -- in order to try and save their own skins -- had 'betrayed' their Lord. They had done so, especially by surrendering their copies of the Holy Scriptures to pagan magistrates. The latter had ordered this -- in order to burn them. For thus did they endeavour to obliterate Christianity -- for ever!

Yet even that was not all that grieved the Donatists. For, upon the accession of Constantine the Great as the first Christian Roman Emperor<sup>137</sup> in 312, some of those 'traitors' in the clergy were restored to ecclesiastical fellowship -- and sometimes even to their previous church office. This was achieved by imperial edict. The same (and more) was repeated -- in a second edict, dated 313.

The Donatists considered such clergy so "unworthy" -- that they concluded such could no longer perform valid Christian Baptisms. Consequently, Donatism regarded all such ministrations as useless -- and itself 're-baptized' all such baptizees who themselves became Donatists.

Rebaptistic Donatism was condemned by the Church Universal -- as early as 314. Yet it continued to dominate especially North Africa, until 410f. Even thereafter it still lingered on in that region -- until well after the triumph of Islam, right down into the eighth century.

From 313 onward, the Church Universal became more antirebaptistic than ever before. The 314 Western Synod of Arles condemned all trinitarian rebaptisms. So too did Lactantius and Eusebius -- the latter even preparing the draft for the anti-rebaptismal 325 Council of Nicea itself.

The first Christian Emperor Constantine himself granted toleration to rebaptistic trinitarian Donatism. Yet Nicea, while satisfied with the validity of the Triune Baptisms of Novatianism (and of Donatism), rejected all rebaptizings of Trinitarians. It also rejected all the non-triune water-rites of Paulianism. Indeed, Dr. Bingham's assessment of Nicea's non-ecclesiocentric maintenance of all triune baptisms (wheresoever and by whomsoever administered) -- in his famous *Antiquities of the Christian Church* (ten volumes) -- is basically correct.

Although Donatist rebaptisms of converts from the Universal Church did advance until and even beyond the time of Augustine, they were not only ontologically but also morally indefensible. For Donatus himself recommunicated

penitent Mauretanian 'traitors to Christ' -- even without rebaptizing them! Though Donatism declined slowly over the next centuries, its ultimate eclipse was therefore certain.

#### Athanasius required no (re)baptism of converts from moderate Arianism

The great Athanasius rightly evaluated Nicea and its Triune Baptisms. He stoutly championed Triune Baptism administered especially by the mode of sprinkling. Indeed, he again touched on Triune Baptisms -- in his four Anti-Arian *Discourses*.

Evaluating both the earlier and the later Post-Nicene Synods, he distinguished ignorant heretics from harmful heretics. Among the latter, were the Ultra-Arians (alias the Ariomaniacs). They apparently 'baptized' not 'in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' but only 'in the name of the Creator and the creature.' To Athanasius, such latter 'baptisms' were (of course) quite invalid.

Most significantly, however, Athanasius required no (re)baptism of converts from the more moderate Arians (who themselves used the triune formula). For the more moderate Arians were still within the Visible Church (widely so construed). They themselves vocally used the trinitarian terminology of Matthew 28:19. Yet they needed to profess faith in the Ontological Trinity -- as a precondition for communion with true Members of the Church Universal.

At the accession of a new Emperor in 362, the previously-exiled Athanasius was heroically welcomed back in Alexandria. In mid-year, he and his fellow-Trinitarians convened a Council there -- and issued a *Tome* to determine the terms on which communion could be offered to those Arians who desired to re-unite with the trinitarian Church Universal. According to Rev. Prof. Dr. Archibald Robertson,<sup>138</sup> "they were to be asked for nothing beyond the Nicene test -- and [themselves then to give] an express *anathema* against Arianism (including the doctrine that the Holy Spirit is a creature)."

In 362, Athanasius and his trinitarian colleagues themselves then declared:<sup>139</sup> "We rejoice...and pray that even if any be left still far from us, and if any appear to be in agreement with the Arians -- he may promptly leave their madness. So that for the future all men everywhere may say -- 'One Lord, one Faith'" and also 'one Baptism' in the Name of the one and only Triune God! Ephesians 4:4-6, compare Matthew 28:19. Thereinafter followed a short exposition of the Nicene teaching anent the Triune God.

The above *Tome* was then signed by Athanasius, Eusebius, Asterius, Gaius and others.<sup>140</sup> It was received by their Antiochian "fellow-Ministers"<sup>141</sup> in Syria, and counter-signed on their behalf by one Paulinus.<sup>142</sup> "I Paulinus hold thus -- as I received from the fathers -- that the Father perfectly exists and subsists, and that the Son perfectly subsists, and that the Holy Spirit perfectly subsists.

"Therefore also I accept the above explanation concerning the Three Subsistences, and the one Subsistence or rather Essence, and those who hold thus.

For it is pious to hold and confess the Holy Trinity in one Godhead.... I anathematize those who say that the Holy Spirit is a creature made through the Son. Once more, I anathematize the heresy of Sabellius...and every heresy -- walking in the Faith of Nicaea, and in all that is above written!"

A citation from the great Anglican Scholar Dr. William Wall's massive four-volume *History of Infant Baptism*<sup>143</sup> will be very helpful at this point. "The Arians," explains Wall, "are by some old writers called 'Anabaptists.' But that was because they rebaptized all that had been baptized by the Catholics [alias the Church Universal] in infancy or in age, [yet] not that they dislike Infant Baptism."

Consequently, the Arians rebaptized in infancy (or thereafter) those already baptized by the trinitarian Church Universal in infancy (or thereafter). Yet, much to her own credit, the Church Universal never retaliated by purporting to rebaptize converts to the Church Universal previously baptized by those Arians who used the Biblical formula of Matthew 28:19.

Around 372 -- one year before his death -- the aged Athanasius wrote to Epictetus Bishop of Corinth:<sup>144</sup> "From Mary, the Word Himself took flesh, and proceeded forth as man. He was by nature and essence the Word of God -- but after the flesh, man, of the seed of David. He was made of the flesh of Mary, as Paul said [Romans 1:3 & Galatians 4:4]. Him the Father pointed out, both in Jordan and on the Mount, saying, 'This is My beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased!'" Matthew 3:17 & 17:5 -- both asserting the Ontological Trinity.

#### Athanasius championed orthodox Triune Baptisms by way of sprinkling

So Athanasius rightly linked a Christian's profession of his faith in the Trinity, to his upholding of Trinitarian Baptism alone. He also expressed the latter only by way of **sprinkling**. He observed that even many of the heretics used **sprinkling** as their mode when they 'baptized.'<sup>145</sup> In addition, Athanasius also had the following to say about orthodox Baptisms.

"God has given to man's nature three 'Baptisms' to purify him from all manner of iniquity -- that by water, and again that by the testimony of His own blood, and thirdly that by tears."<sup>146</sup> Again: "The crossing of the Red Sea by the people of Israel was a sign of Baptism."<sup>147</sup> First Corinthians 10:1f.

Indeed, Athanasius's predecessor -- Bishop Alexander of Alexandria -- testified he had seen Athanasius when the latter was himself still but a small child. Even then, Athanasius was observed to 'baptize' (in sport) a tiny playmate of his -- precisely by **sprinkling** (or throwing water over him).<sup>148</sup> This is evidence not only that the thus-imitated genuine Baptisms themselves took place by way of **sprinkling** -- but further, that they too were administered also to children.

Finally, Athanasius's remarks in his treatise *On Holy Baptism* are also very instructive. For there, he writes:<sup>149</sup> "The first Baptism was that of the Flood [First Peter 3:20f]...."

"The second [Baptism, is], that of Moses -- when he crossed the Red Sea [First Corinthians 10:1f].... In Baptism, there is the water.... As there was the cloud there [with Moses], so here is the Holy Spirit.... Behind them went the cloud which over-shadowed them [Psalm 77:16-20]....

"The third [Baptism] is that of the Law, which the Hebrews held. For every one who was unclean, was washed with water [Hebrews 9:10,13,19,21]....

"The fourth Baptism was that of John [John 1:25f & 3:23-25].... The fifth [Baptism] is that through our Lord Jesus Christ, with which He also was baptized [John 1:26f & 4:1f]....

"The sixth [Baptism] is by tears..., as in the case of one who washes (*holoon*) his bed nightly [*cf.* Daniel 4:23-33f].... The seventh is the Baptism of martyrdom and blood with which our Lord Himself was baptized [Luke 12:50 *cf.* Matthew 20:22f & Mark 10:38f].... The eighth and last is not to save but to burn, and to punish sinners without end and everlastingly [Matthew 3:11f]."

On the above, Ayres rightly comments:<sup>150</sup> "Here are eight Baptisms -- but not eight dippings [or submersions]. The first was by the water coming upon the sinners of the old world in rain. The second was a passing over from bondage to liberty. They 'were all baptized' &c., but not one of them dipped. The Egyptians were immersed; but it was fatal to them. The third evidently refers to the cleansing of the leper and of those polluted by the dead -- by sprinkling the water of purification upon them. Leviticus 14:4-9; Numbers 19:13,18.

The fourth and fifth are clearly trinitarian sprinklings. Continues Ayres: "The sixth is not a dipping, for no one can be dipped in his own tears. The seventh is similar: the martyr was wetted with his own blood, but not dipped into it [Daniel 4:23f; Isaiah 63:3; Revelation 19:13]. Wetting with the element was, therefore, real Baptism." This, says Ayres, was so "in the estimation of Athanasius and his contemporaries whose mother-tongue was Greek."

#### Antirebaptist Cyril of Jerusalem opposed antitrinitarian washings

In Jerusalem, during the second half of the fourth century, the famous Catechist Cyril gives striking expositions of the essence of Baptism in the Church Universal. "We are adopted into the sonship of Abraham," he writes.<sup>151</sup> "We receive, like him, the spiritual seal -- being circumcised by the Holy Spirit through Baptism [Jeremiah 4:4 & Colossians 2:11f].... Christ came, so that He might be baptized and might sanctify Baptism [Luke 3:16-22 & 7:28-30]."

Cyril distinctly declares as regards Trine Baptism:<sup>152</sup> "we must not receive Baptism twice or thrice. Else it might be said: 'Though I have failed once, I shall set it right a second time'.... There is 'one Lord and one Faith and one Baptism' [Ephesians 4:5]. For only the [water-washed] converts from the ranks of the [non-trinitarian] heretics are '(re-)baptized'; because the former [washing by such Non-Trinitarians] was no Baptism."

### Apostolic Constitutions: reclaimed backsliders not to be rebaptized

The *Apostolic Constitutions*, progressively compiled from between A.D. 275 and 350 onward, also prohibit rebaptism. They state that "he who sins after his Baptism, unless he repent and forsake his sins -- shall be condemned to hell-fire."<sup>153</sup>

They then enjoin: "Be content with one Baptism alone... 'in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost' [Ephesians 4:5 cf. Matthew 28:19].... Those who attempt to [re-]baptize those already initiated -- crucify the Lord afresh; slay Him a second time [Hebrews 6:1-6].... You must baptize your infants, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of God [cf. Ephesians 4:4f & 4:30 & 6:1-4]. For He says 'Permit the little children to come to Me, and do not forbid them!'"<sup>154</sup> Matthew 19:14.

### Ambrose promoted Baptism by sprinkling and opposed all rebaptisms

The great Ambrose of Milan, mentor of the even greater Augustine, rightly supported the Infant Baptism of covenant children -- by appealing to the Older Testament's ordinance of Infant Circumcision. He also linked Infant Baptism to John 3:5. Indeed, he even rebuked all unbaptized adults -- who continued to postpone their own Baptisms.<sup>155</sup>

Ambrose was thoroughly trinitarian in his understanding of Baptism.<sup>156</sup> "Grace witnesses there is one Spirit, all holy -- because there is one Baptism in the Name of the Trinity."

Ambrose urges all baptizees: "May your triple confession absolve you from the manifold offences of your former life!"<sup>157</sup> Significantly, also Ambrose thus favoured a triple baptismal action -- and grounds Triune Baptism in the baptizing of Jesus Himself by John the Baptizer. Explains Ambrose:

"Jesus born of the virgin...it is...Whose coming down was being waited for -- of Whom the Father said to John the Baptizer: 'Upon Whom you shall see the Spirit descending and abiding -- this is He Who baptizes with the Holy Spirit!' [John 1:33].... Those who are baptized...replied to the questions that they believe in the Father, that they believe in the Son, that they believe in the Holy Spirit."

Hence, Johannine Baptism is Christian Baptism. As such, it was as ir-repeatable as are all later Christian Baptisms.

It is clear that to Ambrose sprinkling was the preferred mode of Baptism. "Solomon too says: 'Your Name is ointment poured out' [Song 1:3].... The ointment flows down to the beard [Psalm 133:2].... The prophet said: 'You shall sprinkle me with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed' [Psalm 51:9].... He who is baptized, is seen to be purified....

"Moses sprinkled the blood of the lamb with a bunch of hyssop [Exodus 12:22]... The Church has put on these garments through the laver.... 'You have anointed my head.'"<sup>158</sup> Psalm 23:1-5.

Last, Ambrose gives a magnificent argument against rebaptism -- in his own explanation of Hebrews 6:1-6. There, he says<sup>159</sup> that "the Apostle...could not be silent as to those who thought that Baptism was to be repeated..., lest a false belief in a reiterated Baptism should lead astray.... Baptism is not to be repeated...."

"That the writer was speaking of Baptism, is evident [Hebrews 6:2].... Here as elsewhere, he teaches one Baptism. 'One faith,' he says; 'one Baptism' [Ephesians 4:5]...."

"In him who is [re-]baptized, the Son of God is [re-]crucified [Hebrews 6:2-6].... 'All we who were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death' [Romans 6:3]... And to the Colossians [2:12] he says, 'Buried with Him by Baptism'...."

"That which he says in this Epistle to the Hebrews -- that it is impossible for those who have fallen [away] to be 're-newed unto repentance, crucifying again the Son of God and putting Him to open shame' [Hebrews 6:6] -- must be considered as having reference to [re-]baptism [Hebrews 6:2]. Therein we [re-]crucify the Son of God in ourselves.... But Christ was crucified once.... So there is but one, not several, Baptisms.... The reiteration by anyone of the Sacrament of Baptism, is not permitted."

#### Augustine: irrepeatable Circumcision replaced by irrepeatable Baptism

Ambrose's best student was an (Ex-Manichaeon) Christian -- Augustine. The latter declared to Faustus the leading Manichaeon:<sup>160</sup> "What was pre-figured by Circumcision, is fulfilled in Christ.... This Sacrament [of Circumcision] has been improved, by the substitution of Baptism for Circumcision."

In 392, five years after his own Baptism in the Church Universal, Augustine wrote a very respectful yet serious letter to the Donatist leader Maximin. Declared Augustine:<sup>161</sup> "When I was in your district...I expressed my abhorrence of the sad and deplorable custom followed by men who, though they boast of the name of Christian, do not hesitate to rebaptize Christians...."

"A few days ago, it was reported to me that you had rebaptized a deacon of ours.... I was deeply grieved both for his melancholy fall and for your sin, my brother.... To rebaptize even a heretic who has received in Baptism the seal of holiness which the discipline of the Christian Church has transmitted to us, is unquestionably a sin...."

"Do not rebaptize! ... You should abstain from dispensing a second Baptism.... Go forth...saying -- 'I know but one Baptism, consecrated and sealed with the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost! This Sacrament, wherever I find it, I am bound to acknowledge and approve...."

"If I had been a Jew in the time of the former dispensation, and there had come to me a Samaritan who was willing to become a Jew..., a Samaritan whom Samaritans had circumcised..., there would have been no scope for the boldness which would have insisted on the repetition of the rite.... We

would have been compelled to approve of that which God had commanded -- although it had been done by heretics....

"In the flesh of a circumcised man -- I could not find place for the repetition of the Circumcision.... There is but one member [or body-part] which could be circumcised.

"Much less is place found...for the repetition of Christian Baptism. You therefore who wish to baptize twice, must seek as subjects of such 'double Baptism' -- men who have double hearts.... May others be ashamed to be re-baptized!"

#### Augustine: Simon Magus proves Baptism itself should never be repeated

According to Augustine,<sup>162</sup> "the Church had herself given 'birth' to Simon Magus." Acts 8:13,21. Nevertheless, that Baptism always retains its validity. For "in the case of him who had approached the Sacrament in deceit, there is no second Baptism." Should Simon ever repent, "he is purged by faithful discipline and truthful confession" -- without re-baptism.

Meantime, what about the validity of any Baptisms Simon himself may have performed after being separated from the Church Universal? Answers Augustine: "A man may, while an enemy to the peace and love of Christ, receive in any heresy or schism the Baptism of Christ which the schismatics in question had not lost.... When he corrects his error and comes over to the communion and unity of the Church -- he ought not again to be [re-]baptized."

"Which is the worse," asks Augustine<sup>163</sup> -- "not to be baptized at all, or to be twice baptized? It is difficult to decide.... Our Lord...said to Peter: 'He who has been washed, has no need of washing a second time' [John 13:10]."

Rebaptists object: "How does a murderer cleanse and sanctify the water?" Augustine replies<sup>164</sup> that the Baptism is not invalidated even if the baptizer or the baptizee or both are involved in such falsehood. For if then such a baptizee "afterward fulfil with truth what he promised in falsehood -- he does not receive a second baptism but only an amended life.... What he has received, is not repeated. For 'there is one baptism' [Ephesians 4:4f]."

Explains Augustine: "It is Christ's, by whomsoever it be given.... Those who 'drink strange water out of a strange fountain' are found not only among heretics, but among all who do not live according to the teaching of God.... Also Simon Magus was 'born of water' [when at Acts 8:13 he joined the Church Universal].... Yet he did not enter into the kingdom of heaven.... A man may be baptized with water, and not born of the Spirit.... Those who are polluted through their covetousness, may not have the same Spirit -- but yet have the same one Baptism."<sup>165</sup> Cf. Romans 6:1-4f.

Augustine then refutes<sup>166</sup> the proud donatistic objection that a baptizer must himself be a Christian in order to give valid Baptisms. "Baptism is not administered according to yourself.... That which was given by Paul and that

which was given by Peter, is Christ's.... Judas gave Baptism; and after his Baptism, it was not repeated.... Baptism given by Judas...was the Baptism of Christ....

"Those, then, whom Judas baptized -- were not again baptized.... Plainly, there was...not a repetition of the same Baptism.... Those whom Judas baptized -- Christ baptized [through Judas]. In like manner, then: those whom a drunkard baptizes; those whom a murderer baptizes; those whom an adulterer baptizes -- if it is the Baptism of Christ, are baptized by Christ."

#### Chrysostom: sealing power of Baptism refutes any later rebaptisms

The great John Chrysostom of Constantinople teaches:<sup>167</sup> "We baptize little children also." He also calls Baptism painless Circumcision. Cf. Colossians 2:11. Indeed, he further says it may be received by covenant infants -- who have the inward seal of the Spirit.<sup>168</sup>

Chrysostom does not fail to address the issue of the validity of Baptisms purportedly administered by John the Baptizer. He says that in first-century Ephesus, there was no re-baptism of the Spirit-filled Apollos -- who had very clearly already been baptized elsewhere either by John himself or alternatively by one of John's disciples. Chrysostom declares that at Ephesus "he does not receive baptism.... Why did Apollos not receive Baptism?" -- he asks. Because, answers Chrysostom, "'he was fervent'...in the Spirit, **knowing...the Baptism of John!**" Acts 18:24f.

However, what about the twelve Unitarians devoid of the Spirit, who later arrived in Ephesus? They, insists Chrysostom, "were baptized" **there and then**. Just before that, they had admitted to Paul: 'We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost!' Acts 19:2. Indeed, according to Chrysostom, these men previously "did not even know Jesus" -- and "did not even believe in Christ." Nor had they previously received Christian Baptism. Acts 19:1f.

Chrysostom's antirebaptistic comments on Paul's words in Romans 6:1-10 are short and sweet. "'How shall we,' he says [in Romans 6:2], 'we that are dead to sin -- live any longer therein?' ... We became dead to it -- by believing and being enlightened.... For this, Baptism effected once for all. It made us dead to it.... 'He died to sin.'" 'Died' -- past tense! Romans 6:10. "For if He [Jesus] does not die again -- then there is no second laver."<sup>169</sup>

On Ephesians 1:14, Chrysostom remarks<sup>170</sup> that "there is not another Baptism -- nor is there a second reconciliation again." On Ephesians 2:13-16, he explains<sup>171</sup> that to apostates there is "no fresh Baptism -- but hell itself awaits." For on Ephesians 4:4-7, he remarks<sup>172</sup> that "there is 'one Lord, one faith, one Baptism'" only.

On the crucial Hebrews 6:1-6, Chrysostom makes copious remarks.<sup>173</sup> "If one who has been catechized and baptized, is [later bent on] going to hear again about the Faith [say] ten years afterwards..., he does not still need to have the foundation" -- that is, he does not still need to have the foundation relaid.

"What is 'the doctrine of baptisms' [Hebrews 6:2]? There were not many Baptisms -- but one only. Why then did he [the holy writer, here] express it [the word 'Baptisms'] in the plural? Because he has said 'not laying again a foundation of repentance' [Hebrews 6:1]. For if he again baptized them and catechized them afresh -- and having been baptized 'at the beginning' [Hebrews 6:1], they were again taught what things ought to be done and what ought not -- they would remain perpetually incorrigible....

"'The resurrection of the dead' [Hebrews 6:2]...is both effected in Baptism and affirmed in the confession.... It is not open to them to say: 'If we live slothfully -- we will be baptized again; we will be catechized again; we will again receive the Spirit! Even if now we fall from the faith -- we shall be able again, by being baptized, to wash away our sins and to attain to the same state as before!' You are deceived, he says, in supposing these things.

"'For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened..., if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance -- crucifying to themselves the Son of God afresh.'" Hebrews 6:4f. "'We were buried therefore with Him by Baptism into death' [Romans 6:4]....

"It is not possible that Christ should be crucified a second time.... He then that baptizes [himself] a second time, crucifies Him again! But what is 'crucifying afresh' [Hebrews 6:6]? It is crucifying over again. For as Christ died on the cross, so do we (in Baptism): not [dying] as to the flesh, but as to sin.

"Behold two deaths! He died as to the flesh. In our cause, the old man was buried and the new man arose -- made conformable to the likeness of His death. If therefore it were necessary to be baptized [again] -- it would be necessary that this same [Christ] should die again! For Baptism is nothing else than the putting to death of the baptized, and his rising again.

"And well did he say 'crucifying afresh unto themselves.' For he that does this, having forgotten the former grace and ordering his own life carelessly -- acts in all respects as if there were another Baptism.... How could he again be baptized? On two grounds, then, he said that the thing was impossible.... First, because he who has been deemed worthy of such [blessings] and who has betrayed all that was granted to him -- is not worthy to be renewed again. Neither is it possible that [Christ] should again be crucified afresh. For this is to 'put Him to an open shame' [Hebrews 6:6].

"There is not, then, any second laver. There is not! And if there should be -- there would also be a third, and a fourth! For the former one would be disannulled continually, by the later -- and this continually by another, and so on -- without end.... What then, you say? Is there no repentance? There is repentance -- but there is no second Baptism."

#### The Apostolic Canons stipulate irrepeatable threefold Triune Baptisms

The first compilation of the *Apostolic Canons* was made apparently by Dionysius Exiguus around 500 A.D.<sup>174</sup> They declare:<sup>175</sup>

"If an Overseer or Presbyter rebaptizes him who has had true Baptism -- or does not baptize him who has been polluted by the ungodly -- let him be deprived [of his overseership or presbyterhood], as ridiculing the cross and the death of the Lord [Hebrews 6:1-6].... The Lord did not say 'Baptize into My death'; but 'Go and disciple all nations, baptizing them into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost!' [Matthew 28:19]. O Overseers, you must therefore baptize threefoldly -- into one Father and Son and Holy Ghost, according to the will of Christ and our constitution, by the Spirit!"

The original Greek of the *Apostolic Canons* here<sup>176</sup> avoids the Arian and Eunomian word *katadusis* (meaning 'submersion'). Instead, it uses the word "*Baptismata*" or 'Baptisms' -- in its expression "*tria Baptismata mias mueeseos*" alias "the three[fold] Baptism(s) of the one initiation."<sup>177</sup>

*Per contra*, however, note the onefold submersion (*mian katadusin*) of the Arian Eunomians.<sup>178</sup> Also note that the Greek *mian katadusin* alias 'one submersion' describing the Arian rite -- is here different to the orthodox Church Universal's Triune *tria Baptismata* alias "the 'threefold Baptism'...of the one initiation" mentioned in the *Apostolic Canons*. But only till 590 A.D.<sup>179</sup>

#### John the Damascene: all rebaptisms are sinful (Hebrews 6:1-6)

In the eighth century John of Damascus, the greatest of all of the Eastern-Orthodox Theologians, standardized their baptismal doctrine for all subsequent centuries. Our Baptism into Christ's own Baptism, signifies our death with Him. Consequently, rebaptism is a most fearful sin.

Thus John of Damascus declares:<sup>180</sup> "Those then who get rebaptized, after being baptized into Father and Son and Holy Spirit -- and after having been taught that there is one divine nature in three subsistences -- these, as the divine Apostle says, 'crucify the Christ afresh.... It is impossible for those who were once enlightened &c...to be renewed unto repentance.... They crucify to themselves the Christ afresh, and put Him to an open shame.'"

"We confess one Baptism for the remission of sins.... For Baptism declares the Lord's death. We are indeed 'buried with the Lord through Baptism' [Colossians 2:12].... As our Lord died once for all, we also must be baptized once only, and baptized according to the Word of the Lord 'in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit' [Matthew 28:19]....

"But those who were not baptized into the Holy Trinity, these must be baptized.... Baptism signifies the three days of our Lord's entombment.... We are baptized also into the perfect Baptism of our Lord -- the Baptism by water and the Spirit.... The Holy Spirit descended in bodily form as a dove -- indicating the firstfruits of our Baptism.... He is God."

#### Biblical sprinklings replaced by unbiblical mediaeval submersions

Although ritualistic submersionism had now swallowed up the Churches of the East, primordial sprinkling did not vanish totally. Not even there.

In the Ancient and 'Orthodox' Church of Armenia, for example, children were pronounced baptized only after pouring water on their heads thrice -- before their parents themselves sometimes subsequently submersed them once. This latter was apparently a relic of an Arian custom which, unsuccessfully, had attempted to de-trinitarianize the ancient Armenian Church.<sup>181</sup>

Wildcat sects arose.<sup>182</sup> At the end of the seventh century, Paulicians in Armenia combined Marcionism and Neo-Manichaeism. All of them rejected Infant Baptism, and most rejected both Christian Sacraments altogether.

Bogomils and Albigensians rejected both Baptism and the Supper as "Satanic," inventing the *consolamentum* as their own 'sacrament.' Athingians observed all the Old Testament rituals except Circumcision (for which they substituted Baptism).

The Church Universal over-reacted to sects like the above. In 816, the Council of Calcuith or Chelsea forbade priests any longer to pour water upon the infants' heads. Instead, it ordered them to be immersed.<sup>183</sup> Baptismal regenerationism, with accompanying submersion to increase the 'sin-erasing' effectiveness of such 'magical' water, was now all but universally triumphant.

In the Slavic lands, Baptism became administered solely by way of submersion -- and that, fully three times by way of a triple submerging. States the *Russian Catechism*: "Baptism is a Sacrament in which one who believes -- having his body thrice plunged in water in the Name of God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost -- dies to the carnal life of sin and is born again." For "trine immersion in water...is most essential in the administration of Baptism."<sup>184</sup>

Yet, apparently even as regards Baptism administered elsewhere by way of pouring or sprinkling, the same *Russian Catechism* also rightly states: "Baptism cannot be repeated.... A man is born but once. Therefore, he is also baptized but once." Again rightly, it also insists on Infant Baptism.<sup>185</sup>

In Western Europe around 1105, Peter de Bruys and his 'Petrobrusians' rejected Infant Baptism and practised rebaptism. Yet, unlike the modern Baptists, they held that infants are incapable of being saved. The Petrobrusians also revived the Donatistic view that piety is essential for the valid administration of a Sacrament.<sup>186</sup>

Fortunately, around 1150 the great Scholastic Theologian Peter Lombard rightly stated the historic position. Persons baptized even by heretics with the Christian formula of Matthew 28:19 -- are later to be received into the Church Universal not by rebaptism, but only with imposition of hands.<sup>187</sup>

#### The Waldensians baptized infants and recognized Baptisms by Romanists

Ritualistic Rome, with her rigid heresy of baptismal regenerationism, in the Middle Ages increasingly practised Baptism specifically by submersion. Yet from at least 1180 onward (if not even before that time), we encounter also the protests of the proto-Protestant Waldensians.

While rejecting the various ritualistic additions to Baptism, these disciples of the Bible Student Peter Waldo did not repudiate the validity of Infant Baptisms as such -- not even when performed in the Church of Rome. Indeed, when unable to avail themselves of the scarce services of their own very itinerant pastors, some of them permitted their own children -- rather than remaining unbaptized -- to be baptized even by Romish priests.

Thus, among the Waldensians -- observes Wall<sup>188</sup> -- "there is no certain evidence of...[any] men that opposed Infant Baptism.... The present Waldensians or Vaudois in Piedmont, who are the posterity of those old, do practise Infant Baptism...."

"They were also found in the practice of it when the Protestants of Luther's Reformation sent to know their state and doctrine.... They themselves do say that their fathers never practised otherwise.... They give proof of it from an old book of theirs called the *Spiritual Almanack*, where Infant Baptism is owned.... There is a *Catechism* of theirs...composed out of this old book, that does expressly mention and own Infant Baptism...."

"None of those whom we now denote by the name 'Waldenses'...held anything against Infant Baptism.... Pilchdorf writes against them...anno 1395.... He says the Waldenses...from their beginning...had been free from any false doctrine about the Sacraments."

After investigating their doctrines, Martin Luther rightly wrote<sup>189</sup> that "the Waldensians baptize little ones.... They proceed, then, to baptize little children." So too the Baptist A.H. Newman, in his own *History of Antipedobaptism*. He too rightly insists:<sup>190</sup> "The early Waldensian pastors...had scarcely anything in common with Baptists."

The famous Presbyterian Rev. Professor Dr. Samuel Miller rightly points out<sup>191</sup> that "the Waldenses in their Confessions of Faith and other writings drawn up between the twelfth and sixteenth centuries...for several hundred years before the Reformation...speak on the subject." The evidence leads to only one conclusion: "The Waldenses were Paedobaptists."

Miller then cites from Waldensian historians themselves: "'Baptism, say they, 'is administered in a full congregation of the faithful, to the end that he who is received into the church may be reputed and held by all as a Christian brother.... We present our children in Baptism...upon the head or forehead of the infant.'"

Note these Waldensian words: "We present our children in Baptism...upon the head or forehead of the infant." Note again: "upon the head or forehead of the infant." Revelation 7:3f & 12:17 & 22:4.

Later, under the influence of Calvinism, the Waldensians linked up with the Reformed Faith. The Waldensians' own historic adherence to Infant Baptism is clearly seen in their 1655 *Waldensian Confession*. For there, they state<sup>192</sup> "that we do agree in sound doctrine with all the Reformed Churches of France, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland...and others as it is set forth by them in their confessions."

### The submersionistic impact on Baptism of Thomistic Roman Catholicism

However, it was the magical view of Baptism which predominated in the Late Middle Ages. For around 1250, Thomas Aquinas programmed 'baptismal regeneration' as the only view which would soon be standardized officially -- in the Roman Catholic Church.<sup>193</sup>

Thomas's theology is often faulty. Thus:<sup>194</sup> "A Sacrament...sanctifies a man." By the latter he meant, wrongly, that Baptism itself regenerates. Again wrongly, he also held that it was originally administered by submersion.<sup>195</sup>

Indeed, centuries of baptismal regenerationism had by this time made submersionism very popular. "Baptism is given this ability -- so that anybody is regenerated through it itself":<sup>196</sup> *ex opere operato*.

Baptismal regenerationism was by now practically universal. Submersion (whether triple or single) was then thought to be a "safer" mode of Baptism than sprinkling. No doubt "safer" -- because the more water used, the more effectively one's many sins were deemed to be washed away thereby!

Indeed, this superstition of submersionism can also be seen -- to this very day -- especially throughout ritualistic Eastern 'Orthodoxy' as well as in the entire Eastern Rite of Romanism. However, even in the times of the mediaeval Romanists Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura -- submersion was the most common baptismal mode even in Italy. "It is the safer way to baptize by immersion" (Thomas).<sup>197</sup> "Dipping into the water is the more common...and the safer" (Bonaventura).<sup>198</sup>

Over the next decades, the Pre-Reformers and especially the Protestant Reformation, would ereelong restore the Biblical mode of Baptism -- namely **head-sprinkling** -- to its rightful place. Indeed, under pressure from the Pre-Reformation and the Reformation, by 1551 even the Church of Rome had by and large returned to the Biblical **sprinkling** of infants.

### Wycliffe and his followers on the irrepeatability of infant baptism

Yet in the meantime, the Christian Gospel was still preserved -- especially in Northern Europe. In 1377, the English Pre-Reformer John Wycliffe (1324-84) assailed the Romish mass. In 1402, the Wycliffite John Huss did the same in Bohemia.

Neither ever questioned the suitability of sprinkling; nor the practice of Infant Baptism; nor the validity of Baptisms by Romanists. Says Wycliffe in his *Trialogue* and his *On Baptism* -- about baptizees: "Nor is it material whether they be dipped once or thrice, or water be **poured** on their **heads**."<sup>199</sup>

He says: "On account of the words in the last chapter of Matthew [verse 19], our church introduces believers who answer for the infant.... The **child** of a **believer** is carried into the church to be **baptized**, according to the rule of Christ.... Without a doubt, infants are **duly** baptized **with** water."<sup>200</sup>

Wycliffe and his English followers, the Lollards, rejected baptismal regenerationism. Hear Wycliffe's student Walter Brute before the Bishop of Hereford in 1393: "I greatly marvel at that saying...that little children who have not been baptized, shall be tormented with eternal fire although they were born of faithful parents.... How shall the infant be damned that is born of faithful parents who do not despise but rather desire to have their children baptized?"

Indeed, the Norfolk and Suffolk followers of the 1424 Wycliffite William White were constantly "speaking against women baptizing new-born infants in private houses." They also stated: "Wycliffe had said that the water itself, without the Baptism of the Spirit, is of little efficacy.... He and his followers had said that if the parents be good Christians and pray for their child -- there is hope that it may be saved, though it by some sudden chance die before it can be baptized."<sup>201</sup>

England's great 'Pre-Reformer' John Wycliffe was thus not only a convinced paidobaptist, but apparently also an antirebaptist. England's King Richard II's Queen Anne was herself a Wycliffite -- and the sister of Wenceslaus King of Bohemia (in the modern Czech Republic). It was probably chiefly through her agency that Wycliffe's views were taken over almost without amendment by the Bohemian 'Pre-Reformer' John Huss -- and also by Huss's friend Jerome of Prague, who had become a Wycliffite while at Oxford University before returning to his native Bohemia.<sup>202</sup>

#### The influence of antirebaptistic Wycliffe through Huss upon Luther

Jan Huss of Bohemia translated Wycliffe's *Dialogue* into Czech, and defended his treatise on the Trinity at Prague University. In due course, the Wycliffite Huss would influence Martin Luther himself -- and thus launch the Protestant Reformation. Rome's 'Holy Council' itself pronounced "John Huss to have been and to be...the disciple...of John Wycliffe."

Thus the Romish controversialist Eck, Luther later exclaimed, "vilifies me as a 'heretic' and a Bohemian" -- even "publicly accusing me of the heresy of and support for the Bohemian 'heretics.'" For Eck was accusing Luther: "Many of the things which you adduce, are heresies of...Wycliffe and Huss!"

Luther himself, however, insisted that "John Huss and Jerome of Prague were good Christians." Luther also insisted that "Paul and Augustine are in reality Hussites." And again: "All this is not Luther's work. The credit belongs to John Huss." Thus, "it is high time that we seriously and honestly consider the case of the Bohemians, and come into union with them.... I have no desire to pass judgment...upon John Huss's articles.... I have not yet found any errors in his writings."

Luther even went back behind the Wycliffite Huss -- to the Englishman Wycliffe himself. Declared Luther: "As far as the [papal] 'decretals' are concerned..., they are...things it is not necessary to believe -- as John Wycliffe said." Indeed, in 1520 Luther boldly admitted: "I shall be called a Wycliffite!"<sup>203</sup>

It is clear that Huss never thought of rebaptizing any Romanist who embraced his own pre-reformational views. The followers of Huss were called the Hussites. Indeed, "the Hussites of Bohemia" -- according to the great Anglican Baptism Scholar Rev. Dr. Wall,<sup>204</sup> were of the "opinion...that infants dying unbaptized, may be saved by the mercy of God.... Indeed, they were disciples of our Wycliffe."

However, after the Romanists treacherously murdered Huss in 1415, they viciously persecuted his followers. Therewith, there was a breakdown of the proper relationship between Rome and the Pre-Reformation especially in his native land Bohemia.

Particularly after the next one or two generations, all of the Bohemian Romanists and some of the Bohemian Hussites lost much perspective regarding one another's Baptisms. This is seen especially in the disregarding by the Bohemian Romanists of the validity of Baptisms administered by the Hussites -- and in the disregarding by that portion of Hussites known as the 'Minor United Brethren' of the validity of Baptisms administered by Romanists.

#### The rebaptismal error of the Bohemian 'Minor United Brethren'

Now after some Romanists murdered Huss, his numerous followers unfortunately soon split up three different ways. Thus arose the Partially-Reformed Calixtines; the militant Proto-Protestant Taborites; and finally, the separatistic 'Bohemian Brethren' (alias the later 'Moravians'). Both the Calixtines and the more radical Taborites, it seems, still repudiated rebaptism (even as Huss himself had done).

The third group, the "Bohemian Brethren" -- as the great Church Historian Schaff has explained<sup>205</sup> -- rightly "denounced the Pope of Rome as Antichrist." Yet it also wisely recognized that something of the historic Christian Church, though grossly deformed, was still to be found even within Romanism -- despite its numerous papal perversions. "At first," all the "Bohemian Brethren" still "received the Sacraments from Calixtine and Romish priests who joined them."

However, just over half a century after the death of Huss, these "Bohemian Brethren" branched out into two groups. The larger was called the 'Major United Brethren.' It continued to recognize other Baptisms -- even those performed by detested Romanists. The smaller group was called the 'Minor United Brethren.' Albeit for just one generation, it catabaptistically repudiated Trinitarian Baptisms administered in the Church of Rome. Romish Bohemians too rejected Baptisms performed by the Bohemian Brethren -- and for even longer.

In 1467 -- explains Schaff -- the 'Minor United Brethren' arose from the Bohemian United Brethren alias the *Unitas Fratrum*. The smaller group itself "effected an independent organization...under the lead of Michael, formerly a Catholic priest." This was the 'Minor United Brethren' -- a minority party within the antirebaptist Bohemian Brethren as a whole.

Then, however, the minority party over-reacted. It forgot that in Biblical times Josiah and Paul had not recircumcisingly or rebaptizingly repudi-

ated -- but rather reformed -- the deformed Church of God. For ex-priest Michael and his 'Minor United Brethren' now went and "elected by lot...three priests out of their number -- and laid hands on them. Then they were all solemnly rebaptized."

This latter act, of course, was a Neo-Donatistic catabaptist error. It was itself not devoid of sacramentalism. Never, however, did these Bohemian Brethren behave anabaptistically. For they neither abandoned Infant Baptism as such -- nor rebaptized as adults those they deemed to have been baptized in infancy. Thus, these Bohemians were not antipaidobaptistic Anabaptists. Still less were they adult-submersing Baptists.

As even the modern maverick but Pro-Anabaptist<sup>206</sup> Dr. Leonard Verduin has admitted:<sup>207</sup> "The Brethren did practice Infant Baptism in the case of children born to 'believing parents'.... Here the point was not anti-pedobaptism, but anti-Constantinianism."

#### The rebaptismal recantation of these Bohemian 'Minor United Brethren'

Fortunately, some of the later and better-trained leaders of the Bohemian 'Minor United Brethren' soon repudiated the sect's own catabaptistic position. They then abandoned that 'rebaptismal' radicalism -- perhaps still during the fifteenth century.

Certainly this 1467f 'minor party' within the Bohemian Brethren had quite abandoned its catabaptistic doctrines by 1504. No doubt its leaders informed the anti-rebaptistic Luther about this, before he supported them in 1520. At any rate, in their 1504 *Bohemian Confession* -- as well as in its later (1535) *Prologue* -- they courageously distanced themselves from the previous rebaptistic lapse of their own immediate ancestors.

Thus, in the 1535 *Prologue*, the Ministers of the Church of the Bohemian Brethren assured the King of Bohemia and Hungary (Ferdinand I) that they were certainly not Anabaptists. This disclaimer was necessary. For their Romish opponents were then quite falsely alleging that very thing.

Explained these 'Bohemian Brethren':<sup>208</sup> "It is not unknown to anybody that we do not belong to the party of the Anabaptists. For we take our origin from the Church of the Bohemians.... We had already existed many years before them [the Anabaptists], and we do not defend their error-filled teachings.

"We have nothing in common with the Anabaptists...and have taken over nothing from them.... Our association has been in existence for much longer -- from before anyone ever first heard anything about the Anabaptists....

"Although our ancestors were wont to rebaptize those who had been baptized by Romish priests in former years -- they [our ancestors] still had an altogether different viewpoint and another purpose and an entirely other reason than the Anabaptists. Now, however, even this rebaptism has been abolished completely among us. Pre-eminently about this, a short account will be given in this writing -- by the most excellent men of our Church....

"Whenever because of this rebaptism we are regarded as Anabaptists -- by the very 'sophisticated' [Romish] priests of Bohemia -- even this weapon is necessarily turned against them. For their ancestors too 're-re-baptized' those who had been baptized by papal priests, but who had thereafter been dedicated in [re]baptism" by the Bohemian Brethren.

For the Romish priests then, "by way of reprisal, once again repeated the Baptism [already given] by the Bohemian Brethren -- to those [re-]renewed as papists." The Romish priests in Bohemia thus "rebaptized those baptized by both us and by our ancestors -- and they forced people, even with violence, to receive their baptism...."

"Yet the priests maintain they had not faltered nor erred when they rebaptized those baptized by us! For they regarded us as heretics, sectarians and ecclesiastical excommunicatees. Thus it also seemed very right to them -- that our Baptism was of no significance, effect and power. This is why they rebaptized...."

"We answer that we..., just like they, give nothing to Baptism...among ourselves.... We used to regard the Baptism administered by them as invalid and void.... It is therefore clear that they have just as much guilt toward us, as we have toward them -- in rebaptizing the baptized."

#### The anti-rebaptismal Bohemian Confession(s) from 1504 onward

Thus the 1535 *Prologue* to King Ferdinand. However, even earlier -- also before Luther's conversion to Protestantism -- we already encounter another (1504) *Bohemian Confession* to King Vladislav (which was thereafter constantly updated). We now cite from the 1535 version thereof.

Article 12 states "children are baptized...and dedicated to Christ...according to His words: 'Permit the children to come to Me, and do not hinder them; for of such is the Kingdom of heaven.' Therefore, we baptize ours."

For we all "rest upon the words of the Lord for children, in the Name of the Holy Trinity. Indeed, this statement [Matthew 28:19] is general: 'Teach all nations, inasmuch as you baptize them in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit!' We do not baptize them again thereafter; and we no longer rebaptize....

"They [a former generation of 'Bohemian Brethren'] previously rebaptized those who wished to be taken up into our churches from others.... When the Romanists violently fought against the 'Bohemians' in matters of faith and religion, the leaders of both Churches clashed with Scripture...."

"In several localities the one repeated the Baptism of the other, for as long as they persevered in the greatest hatred. For the ancestors of our faith, who then completely separated themselves from them [and indeed from all others], had their own particular association, and administered the Sacraments -- and rebaptized all who wished to join their churches...."

"This kind of rebaptism existed in our churches -- until we acquired a better insight about this. However, in the course of time -- after through the goodness of God the light of truth illuminated our men more brightly, and after they had investigated the Scriptures more carefully, and after they had at the same time been supported by the help of several learned men -- they realized that rebaptism is not necessary for the Church. And they then immediately discontinued and abolished it, with the approval of all.

"Hence, with the general agreement of our men, every repetition of Baptism was abolished... Nowhere is Baptism any longer repeated among us. Yet some priests of the so-called Bohemian-Romish Party -- just as in former times, even now still rebaptize our people -- although for the most part quite against their wishes, and in opposition to the parents."<sup>209</sup>

### Babylonian Captivity of baptizing Church right before her Reformation

So, with Wycliffe and Huss and the Bohemians, Christianity continued in Northern Europe. To a lesser extent, and in a more deformed manner, Christianity had continued even in Southern Europe; not only in the stagnant south-east, but also (in spite of the papal tyranny) in the southwest too.

In 1520, Germany's Luther called this *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church.*<sup>210</sup> Also France's Calvin, himself to settle in free Switzerland in 1536, described the oppressive papal antichrist with great precision.

For, as the Genevan genius explains,<sup>211</sup> even as regards "the papists" there were and are "vestiges of a Church which the Lord has allowed to remain among them.... The Lord...deposited His covenant in Gaul, Italy, Germany, Spain and England. When these countries were oppressed by the tyranny of [the Papal Romish] Antichrist -- He [the Lord God], in order that His covenant might remain inviolable, first preserved Baptism there, as an evidence of the covenant. Baptism...consecrated by His lips retains its power -- in spite of human depravity. He did not suffer Antichrist either to subvert His Church from its foundation [Hebrews 6:1f], or to level it with the ground....

"It is obvious that we do not at all deny that churches remain under his tyranny; churches, however, which by sacrilegious impiety he has profaned.... I call them churches, inasmuch as the Lord there wondrously preserves some remains of His people, though miserably torn and scattered [by the Papal Romish Antichrist].... Some symbols of the Church still remain -- especially symbols whose efficacy neither the craft of the devil nor human depravity can destroy!"

Under "some symbols" -- Calvin here obviously includes especially the Sacrament of Holy Baptism in the indestructible Name of the Eternal One, the Triune God. For, as Calvin had remarked just previously: "Baptism...consecrated by His lips retains its power -- in spite of human depravity. He did not suffer Antichrist either to subvert His Church from its foundation [Hebrews 6:1f], or to level it with the ground."

### Luther: Water-Baptisms irrepeatable because in Name of the Triune God

The Protestant Reformation re-affirms the above antirebaptistic teaching of the Waldensians, the Wycliffites, the Early Hussites, the Calixtenes, the Taborites, and the earliest ~~and~~ well as the latest Bohemian Brethren. For even the latter linked up first with Luther and later with Calvin.

In 1520, Luther published his famous anti-papal essay on the *Babylonian Captivity of the Church*.<sup>212</sup> There, he quotes Augustine with approval -- that "it is not the Sacrament but the 'faith of the Sacrament' which justifies"<sup>213</sup> -- meaning by this, the Christian Faith sealed by the Sacrament.

Luther rightly considers it is very remarkable that "Satan, though he could not quench the power of Baptism in little children -- nevertheless succeeded in quenching it in adults. Consequently, there are scarcely any who call to mind their Baptism -- and still fewer who glory in it."<sup>214</sup>

Luther then continues: "Now the first thing in Baptism to be considered -- is the divine promise which says 'he that believes and is baptized shall be saved' [Mark 16:16].... For unless this faith be present..., Baptism will profit us nothing.... Baptism is the beginning and foundation....

"We ought to receive Baptism...just as if Christ Himself...were baptizing us with His Own hands. For it is not man's Baptism but Christ's...which we receive.... This, the words themselves indicate -- when the priest says: 'I baptize you in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen!'" Matthew 28:19. For the priest says "not: 'I baptize you in my own name!' It is as though he said: 'What I do, I do not by my own authority but in the Name and stead of God!' Consequently, you should regard it just as if our Lord Himself had done it in a visible manner."

Luther rightly realized that not qualities in the water but the Name of the Triune God (and His qualities) is the very essence and *sine qua non* of Christian Baptism. Thus he declares: "To be baptized in the Name of God, is not to be baptized by men but by God Himself. Therefore, although it is administered by the hand of man -- yet it is to be regarded as the proper work of God alone."

### Baptism, adult faith, infant faith, and Donatism according to Luther

Well-known is Luther's emphasis on 'infant faith' at, and even before, Infant Baptism. For, he insists, "children must themselves believe -- lest the majesty of the Sacrament and Word be obscured."<sup>215</sup> So "we are of the opinion, and the expectation, that the child should believe -- and we pray that God give it faith. Yet we do not baptize it for that reason, but because God has so commanded."<sup>216</sup>

Already in 1521, Luther clearly stated<sup>217</sup> that "without faith no Sacrament is of any use.... The Sacrament of Baptism is a divine sign or seal given by virtue of the promise and Word of Christ in the last chapter of Mark [16:16]. 'He that believes and is baptized, shall be saved'....

"In olden days, there were heretics called Donatists. They taught that nobody could truly receive Baptism...unless the priest or bishop who administered it, was holy. St. Augustine vanquished them. He proved that the Sacraments belong not to man but to God alone, Who administers them through good servants -- and through bad servants."

Luther castigated the pope for sinfully maladministering valid Christian Baptism. "The Donatists," continues Luther,<sup>218</sup> "were nevertheless much more tolerable than the pope and his bishops -- who wish to bind the Sacraments to rank and authority...."

"I ask further..., pope, whether you also have a Sacrament of Baptism differing from that which all priests and Christians have -- and whether by virtue of your exalted rank, when you baptize you do more than does a chaplain, a layman, a woman.... Speak up! Have you lost your voice? If you have a different Baptism -- then St. Paul condemns you in Ephesians 4, when he says: 'one Faith, one Baptism.'"

In 1523, Luther published his *Germanized Little Baptismal Book*.<sup>219</sup> In his *Address* to that work, he rightly insists that the baptizers should be godly men. Nevertheless, he there also correctly asserts that the validity of the Baptisms no way depends upon that. Luther assumes the validity of all Pre-Reformation Baptisms administered in the Roman Catholic Church. He even states he was not striving to change those Baptisms in any way whatsoever.

### Luther's powerful antirebaptistic work titled *Concerning Rebaptism*

In his own work *Concerning Rebaptism* (1528), Luther thrashes the Anabaptists. They had over-emphasised the subjective and downgraded the objective side of the rite. Yet, Luther retorts, important as faith is -- the Word and not faith is the basis of Baptism. Any would-be baptizer who regards faith on the part of the baptizee as essential for the validity of the Baptism -- can never consistently administer Baptism. For he can never be certain that faith really is present.

It is possible, concedes Luther, that some might conceivably doubt the validity of their own Infant Baptisms. For they might well have no irrefutable evidence that they even then already truly believed. Then, they might perhaps further request (re-)baptism -- when adults.

Yet that request should not be granted! Instead, says Luther, the one so requesting should be told that even if he were thus to be 'rebaptized' -- Satan might well soon trouble him again, as to whether he then too really had faith. Then he would have to be 'baptized' yet again -- a third time -- and so on *ad infinitum*, for just as long as any such doubts kept recurring.

The fact is that in the very first decade of the Protestant Reformation, the 'Big Three' among the Protestant Reformers -- Luther and Zwingli and Calvin -- all wrote against the views of the Anabaptists. We have already noted Luther's book *Concerning Rebaptism*. From a Reformed viewpoint, classic works against the Anabaptists include Zwingli's *Concerning Baptism, Rebaptism, and*

*Infant Baptism -- and Calvin's Brief Instruction to Arm those of Good Faith against the Errors of the Common Sect of the Anabaptists.*

Also important are: Bullinger's work *The Origin, Progress, and Sects of the Anabaptists*; and Guido de Bres's book *The Root, Origin and Foundation of the Anabaptists*<sup>220</sup>. The latter also wrote the *Belgic Confession*, which itself condemns Anabaptism (in its articles 18 & 34 & 36).

### The earliest German Anabaptists: the anti-Protestant 'Zwickau prophets'

Wall explains<sup>221</sup> that the heretical Petrobrusians, who taught soul-sleep, denied Infant Baptism -- because they rejected even the possibility of infant salvation. Apart from those heretics, however, "there is no certain evidence of any church or society of men that opposed Infant Baptism -- till those in Germany, [the Anabaptists,] A.D. 1522."

The modern British Baptist Erroll Hulse points out:<sup>222</sup> "Late in December 1521, a small group of radical prophets arrived from Zwickau at Wittenberg. The leaders of this group were Storch, Stubner and Muenzer -- the latter of ill-fame because of his...claim of prophecy: the ability of inspired speech similar to the claims of Neo-Pentecostals today...."

"Stubner was particularly impressive. He succeeded in winning Luther's disciples Cellarius and Westerberg to the Anabaptist cause.... Carlstadt, a well-known personality in the town, was much influenced by the visitors. Eventually, he [too] came to the position where he refused to administer Infant Baptism."

What Hulse here neglects to tell us, is that neither Thomas Muenzer nor Nicholas Storch are known themselves to have been rebaptized. Moreover, they themselves never rebaptized others. Yet they both most certainly rejected Infant Baptism as such. They also insisted that the administration of the ordinance to adults should be conducted precisely by the mode of sprinkling.

The famous Swiss-American Church Historian Rev. Prof. Dr. Philip Schaff rightly states<sup>223</sup> that the 'Zwickau prophet' Thomas Muenzer was the 'evangelist of the social revolution' -- a forerunner of modern socialism, communism and anarchy. When Muenzer's attempted revolution failed in Wittenberg itself -- he hated Luther worse than the pope. Anticipating bolshevism, he signed his pamphlets "Muenzer with the hammer!" Devoid of mercy, he harangued: "Look not on the sorrow of the ungodly! Let not your sword grow cold from blood! Strike hard upon the anvil of Nimrod!" Genesis 10:6-10 and 11:1-8.

### Ulrich Zwingli's first contact with the antipaidobaptistic Anabaptists

For a year or two before the Anabaptists unleashed their bloody revolution in Germany, the Swiss Reformed Theologian Ulrich Zwingli was initially surrounded by apparently pleasant Anabaptists in Zurich. They arrived there in 1523. At first, they had presented their Anti-Romish and Anabaptist views persuasively -- and winsomely. Nevertheless, Zwingli still maintained: "I

leave Baptism untouched.... We must practise Infant Baptism -- so as not to offend our fellow men."<sup>224</sup>

So Zwingli then invited the Anabaptists to have private discussions with him! In vain. A public disputation followed -- by order of the magistrate -- in January 1525. The Anabaptists said infants cannot believe. But Ulrich Zwingli countered with Genesis 17 and First Corinthians 7:14. And subsequently, he published his arguments (five months later) in a book: *On Baptism, Rebaptism, and Infant Baptism*.

Now Zwingli believed First Corinthians 7:14 implies eligibility for visible church membership also for the children -- of Christian parents.<sup>225</sup> So he launched a vigorous attack on the Anabaptists.

Zwingli said: "Their rebaptism is a clear sign that they intend to create a new and a different Church. Biblical Baptism, however -- just like Circumcision -- can be performed once only. Once in the covenant, a man remains there. The New Testament knows only one Baptism. Neither Christ nor the holy Apostles ever repeated it or taught that it needed to be repeated."<sup>226</sup>

Zwingli also points out that "the soul is cleansed by the grace of God -- and not by any external thing whatever." So "Baptism cannot wash away sin." He rightly saw that "the children of Christians are not less the children of God than their parents are -- or than the children in Old Testament times were." So, seeing they "belong to God -- who will refuse them Baptism?"<sup>227</sup>

#### The Anabaptists rebaptize defiantly by 'pouring again' in Switzerland

Within days, in February 1525 -- at one of their sectarian meetings in Switzerland, the Anabaptist Blaurock defiantly asked his colleague Grebel to rebaptize him there. Blaurock then in turn rebaptized all the others present. The next week at Zollikon, thirty-five adults were rebaptized (by the mode of pouring), after profession of repentance.

By Easter 1525, after not baptizing but merely 'dedicating' infants, rebaptism was introduced in Waldshut -- by the Anabaptist Huebmaier. He had been a Roman Catholic priest who had studied under Luther's implacable opponent, Dr. John Eck.

Huebmaier himself had persecuted Jews -- and helped promote the burning down of their synagogue in Regensberg.<sup>228</sup> He himself alone rebaptized some three hundred Christians. This he did by sprinkling or pouring, but not by immersion.<sup>229</sup>

Huebmaier treated the Baptism of John and that ordained by Christ as being radically different to one another. "Notice," he proclaimed, the "difference between the two Baptisms. John leads his hearers to a recognition of sin.... He baptizes them and makes them his disciples.... Christ pardons their sins.... All who believe in this pardon, are re-baptized by the Apostles of Christ. That is real Re-baptism.... The sprinkling of infants... is no Baptism, nor is it worthy of such a name."<sup>230</sup>

In 1527, Zwingli wrote his refutation of the Anabaptist Balthazar Hübmaier's little book *Concerning the Christian Baptism of Believers*.<sup>231</sup> In that same year, Zwingli also published his own Anti-Anabaptist and Anti-Catabaptist *Polemic against the Catabaptistic Catastrophe*.

In that work, he rightly remarked that "the Hebrews' children, because they with their parents were under the covenant, merited the sign of the covenant [Circumcision]. So also Christians' infants -- because they are counted within Christ's Church and people -- ought in no way to be deprived of Baptism, the sign of the covenant."<sup>232</sup>

#### Calvin on the irrepeatability of Baptism according to Genesis seventeen

Genesis seventeen refutes both Anabaptism and Catabaptism. It refutes Anabaptism -- by threatening to punish all those among God's People who withhold the Sacrament from their own infants. It refutes Catabaptism -- in that Circumcision, as well as the Baptism which replaced it at Calvary, can be administered but once to anybody.

Comments Calvin:<sup>233</sup> "As God adopts the infant son in the person of his father -- so, when the father repudiates such a benefit, the infant is said to [be] cut...off from the Church.... God indeed will not acknowledge those as among His people, who...[do] not bear the mark and token of adoption...."

"God will take vengeance on every one who despises to impress the symbol of the Covenant on his child (Genesis 17) -- such contempt being a rejection and as it were abjuration of the offered grace." Yet, once this symbol of the Covenant has been impressed upon the candidate -- it is irrepeatable.

#### Calvin on the irrepeatability of Baptism according to Exodus 4:24f

Exodus 4:24-26 relates how Moses temporarily lapsed from strict obedience to God -- by becoming a *de facto* antipaidocircumcisional or 'antipaidobaptistic' "Baptist." He himself neglected to circumcise his infant son. Yet his 'presbyterianized' wife -- though herself overenthusiastically administering the Sacrament -- commendably remained a paidocircumcisional 'Paidobaptist.' Calvin, while admitting the great irregularity of the Circumcision performed by Zipporah, nevertheless clearly implies its validity.

Asks Calvin:<sup>234</sup> "Why should Zipporah have taken a sharp stone or knife, and circumcised her son -- had she not known that God was offended at his uncircumcision? ... Moses had provoked God's vengeance.... He was terrified by the approach of certain destruction...."

"The cause of His affliction was shewn him.... It would otherwise never have occurred to himself or his wife to circumcise the child to appease God's wrath.... Let us then learn from hence, to use reverently the Sacraments which are the seals of God's grace -- lest He should severely avenge our despoliation of them...."

"Certainly the child was not duly [or regularly] circumcised.... Yet it is plain from the event that the ceremony -- thus rashly performed -- pleased God. For it is immediately added that 'He let him go' [Exodus 4:26].... The scourge of God ceased or was removed -- because He was pacified by the repentance both of Moses and of Zipporah, even though it [the Circumcision] was improper"<sup>235</sup> or irregular but not invalid.

Consequently, concludes Calvin: "The confusion of Zipporah and the stupor of Moses were pardoned."<sup>236</sup> The fact is, Zipporah clearly knew that her second son Eliezer<sup>237</sup> needed to be circumcised. This suggests she had previously noted the prior circumcising of her first-born son Gershom.<sup>238</sup>

So, also to Calvin, the Circumcision irregularly performed by Zipporah was certainly valid. For God then immediately ceased threatening the delinquent Moses. Being valid, even this irregular Circumcision was not to be repeated later -- in a more regular way. Circumcision -- once performed -- is irrepeatable, anyway. So too -- *mutatis mutandis* -- is the Baptism which has replaced it.<sup>239</sup> Romans 4:11f & 6:1f; Colossians 2:11f; Hebrews 6:1-6.

#### Calvin on valid 'Romish baptisms' in his 1555f *Sermons on Deuteronomy*

On 7th October 1555, Calvin preached on Deuteronomy 12:8-14 that "God is contented with few ceremonies.... It is...His will that in our Baptism we shall have such an assurance of our...cleansing by the grace that is purchased for us in our Lord Jesus Christ, as should continue with us for ever....

"'Yes, but we must have a taper,' say the Papists,' to represent the Holy Ghost!' 'We must have salt, to represent the heavenly wisdom and the grace of God!' 'We must have divers other things, and we must have spittle to make infants and dumb folks to speak!'"

To these Popish objections, Calvin immediately responded: "They can serve for nothing but to make Christianity a laughing stock to the Jews and the Turks.... The Papists have broken and transgressed God's order by adding...to things which He had set down certain, and in such measure as He would not have men to go beyond them."

On 23rd October 1555, Calvin preached on Deuteronomy 14:21-23 that "the Papists have shaken off the yoke of our Lord Jesus Christ.... True it is that they have Baptism, which is the sign of Christianity. But they have utterly abolished the true use of Baptism, and we see that they have no skill at all either of God or of His Word."

On 15th July 1556, Calvin conceded, in a sermon on Deuteronomy 34:7-12, that "in the Popedom they have many signs.... We ourselves do see that they have defiled Baptism. True it is that they could not utterly despatch it out of the way.... Our Lord Jesus Christ has brought to pass that His Baptism continueth still in His Church."

"But we see how it is infected with many spots among the Papists.... For they esteem not a child to be baptized with the water [as it is of itself];

but the water must be 'charmed' beforehand, and it must have 'conjurations' made over it. And then must other inventions be mingled with it -- as spittle, salt, and tapers....

"Let us learn to discern the things which God ordaineth and alloweth by His Word -- from the things that men have put forth at adventure and after their own fancies! And let us understand that as God's truth is always certain and infallible, so those things that are brought up by men cannot proceed but of untruth and falsehood."

These are truly withering condemnations of Rome's perversion of Baptism. Yet even in the same breaths, Calvin also stresses: "the Papists...have Baptism"; and that "in the Popedom, Christ has brought to pass that His Baptism continueth still in His Church"<sup>240</sup> -- unreformed, but His Church nevertheless!

#### Calvin: Baptism and Circumcision irrepeatable according to Joshua 5:2f

It was in the very last year of his life, 1564, that Calvin completed and published his *Commentary on Joshua*.<sup>241</sup> There, he showed the need of being circumcised -- before one might partake of the Passover. Cf. Exodus 12:44f.

So too, explained Calvin, "in the present day the ordinance of the Supper is common only to those who have been admitted into the Church by Baptism." For respectively Baptism and the Lord's Supper -- in New Testament times -- replaced Circumcision and the Passover.

The Israelites deteriorated -- during the forty years after their exodus from Egypt. Calvin has the following to add about those backsliding Israelites, as they slowly lapsed from Infant Circumcision into their apostate and anabaptizing ways:

"They did not desist from circumcising their children the very first day after their departure [from Egypt] -- but only after they had been obliged to retrace their steps through their own perverseness.... None were circumcised on the way, [from some time] after they had set out.... For it is said that their sons...were circumcised by Joshua, in order that their uncircumcision might not pollute the holy land.

"The real object of Joshua was...to renew and confirm the Covenant which had already been made with God.... To impress them with a feeling of shame -- he declares that he and his house will persevere in the worship of God." At least he and those in his home would uphold Paidocircumcision -- even when surrounded by only nominally-'Presbyterian' but in fact antipaidocircumcisionists, alias *de facto* apostate 'Anabaptists.'

Let us put the above in church-historical terms. After the exodus, the previously Presbyterian people of God had lapsed into an 'Anabaptistic' anti-paidocircumcisionism or 'antipaidobaptism' -- and had thus become *de facto* Baptists. But the faithful and paidocircumcisional or 'paidobaptistic' Joshua now represbyterianized them.

He did so not by impossibly attempting to recircumcise the circumcised -- but by circumcising all of those of them and of their infants who had grown up uncircumcised. He also did so -- by declaring that, whatever the people themselves would do from then on, at least he and his household would paidocircumcisionally and presbyterianly serve the Lord.

#### Calvin: Baptism/Circumcision irrepeatable according to Ezekiel sixteen

Calvin's last work was his 1564 unfinished *Commentary on Ezekiel*.<sup>242</sup> It was published only posthumously, in 1565 -- by Calvin's successor Beza. Thus it was both written and published a considerable time after the cessation of the last session of the Romish Council of Trent in 1563. So, its clear teaching as to the mature Calvin's conviction recognizing the irrepeatable validity of Baptisms performed in the deformed Church of Rome -- is irrefutable.

Commenting on Ezekiel 16:20f (*cf.* 44:9), Calvin clearly states:<sup>242</sup> "The Jews were naturally accursed, through being Adam's seed. But by supernatural and singular privilege, they were exempt and free from the curse -- since **Circumcision** was a testimony of the adoption by which God had consecrated them to Himself....

"The same thing ought at this time to prevail in the Papacy. For we are all born under the curse. And yet God acknowledges supernaturally as His sons all who spring from the faithful -- not only in the first or second degree, but even to a thousand generations.... Paul says that the children of the faithful are holy, since **Baptism does not lose its efficacy** and the adoption of God remains fixed. First Corinthians 7:14....

"In the Papacy, such declension has grown up through many ages that they have altogether denied God.... And yet, it is certain that a portion of God's Covenant remains among them..... Hence it arises that our **Baptism [previously received in the Papal Church] does not need renewal**.

"Because, although the Devil has long reigned in the **Papacy**, yet he could not altogether extinguish God's grace. Nay, a **Church is among them**. For otherwise, Paul's prophecy would have been false when he says that antichrist was seated in the **Temple [or Church] of God**. Second Thessalonians 2:4."

#### Calvin: sinful if babies of believers stay unbaptized since Calvary

In the Great Commission, Jesus commands his Ministers until the very end of world history to keep on going forth into all the world -- preaching and baptizing all who submit (together with their households). In Matthew 28:19, He enjoins: "Keep on turning all nations into disciples, baptizing them!" Because nations cannot exist without their infants, Christ's command implies that not just adults but infants too should become Christ's disciples and be baptized. It is a presumptuous sin not to baptize covenant babies.

Mark 16:15f adds: "Preach the Gospel to every creature" -- alias to all human creatures (including human infants). This preaching is first to be

done prenatally; next, paidobaptistically; and then, during all of the later periods of human life. "He who believes [including infants] and is baptized [including infants], shall be saved. But he who does not believe [including infants], shall be damned [including infants]." Cf. Second Timothy 3:14-17.

Comments Calvin<sup>243</sup> "It is said in Mark, 'he that shall believe and be baptized -- shall be saved'.... Christ enjoins them [His Ministers] to 'teach' before 'baptizing' -- and desires that none but believers shall be admitted to Baptism. It would appear that Baptism is not properly [alias regularly] administered, unless when it is preceded by faith....

"On what condition does God adopt as children, those who formerly were aliens? It cannot indeed be denied that, when He has once received them [the penitent aliens] into His favour, He continues to bestow it -- on their children and their children's children.... It is not rash to administer Baptism to infants -- to which God invites them [the infants of believers], when He promises that He will be their God." Genesis 17:7f cf. Colossians 2:11f.

In Luke 24:47 Christ again insists "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in His Name among all nations." Indeed, in Acts 2:38f, God again through Luke commands the penitent: "Be baptized every one of you..., for the promise is unto you and to your children!"

Here Calvin comments:<sup>244</sup> "This passage therefore sufficiently refutes the Anabaptists, who deny Baptism to the children of the faithful while they are still infants, as though they were not Members of the Church.... This gross presumption is of no profit to them" (the Anabaptists). Presumption is sin!

#### Calvin: Baptism irrepeatable according to Acts eight and eleven

In his *Commentary on the Book of Acts* (first edition 1552), Calvin makes a very important remark about Simon the sorcerer. When he first heard the Gospel, Simon professed belief in Christ -- and was baptized. Acts 8:13. Later, it seems he again began to act like one who was still an unbeliever. So Peter then cursed him: "May your money perish with you!" Acts 8:20.

Peter urged him again to "repent," so that his sin might be forgiven him. Acts 8:22. It is not known if Simon did so re-repent. Yet if he did, said Calvin, his earlier Baptism would suffice. He should not be rebaptized.

For on Acts 8:13, Calvin argued:<sup>245</sup> "The receiving of Baptism was of no use to him at that time. Yet -- if conversion followed afterwards, as some conjecture -- the benefit was not terminated or wiped out. For it often happens that, after a long time, the Spirit of God is at last active -- so that the Sacraments may begin to realize their efficacy" -- then.

In Acts 11:16f, Peter saw his baptizing of the entire household of Cornelius as a fulfilment of Christ's prediction that people would be baptized with the Holy Spirit at and after His outpouring. Peter added "What was I, that I could withstand God?" Comments Calvin:<sup>246</sup> "Those who are opposing Infant Baptism, are waging war against God."

Calvin: Acts nineteen teaches Baptisms by John are irrepeatable

Whose 'disciples' -- asks Calvin -- were the approximately twelve men whom Paul encountered at Ephesus? Acts 19:1 & 19:7. In commenting, Calvin first of all quite rightly denies that they were 'disciples' of Apollos.

Says Calvin<sup>247</sup> of those twelve: "It is not likely that so few disciples were left at Ephesus by Apollos." For then, "they would have been instructed more correctly by him -- seeing that he himself had learnt the way of the Lord [Jesus Christ] precisely [Acts 18:26].... The 'brethren' [in Ephesus] whom Luke mentioned previously [in Acts 18:27], were different from these particular men" -- namely the approximately twelve 'certain disciples' of Acts 19:1f.

Now Luke records<sup>248</sup> that Paul told those twelve: "John indeed baptized with the Baptism of repentance." Here Calvin comments<sup>249</sup> "that the Baptism of John was a sign of repentance.... Today, there is no difference between it and our own Baptism" -- even though Romanism wrongly so alleges.

For, continues Calvin, "the Baptism of John...was a token and pledge of the same adoption and the same newness of life which we receive in our Baptism today. Therefore, we do not read that Christ baptized afresh those who came over to Him from John [John 3:22f & 4:1f].

"In addition, Christ received Baptism in His own flesh; so that He might associate Himself with us by that visible symbol. But if that fictitious difference be admitted [which Rome falsely imagines to exist between Baptism by John and our own Baptism today], there will vanish and be lost to us this unique favour -- that we have a common Baptism with the Son of God."

So Calvin insists that Baptism by John "is the same Baptism" as today's Christian Baptism. "But now, the question is asked whether it was right to repeat it....

"Fanatical men of our day, relying on this 'evidence' [cf. Acts 19:3-5], have tried to introduce Anabaptism.... Some take the word 'Baptism' [namely at Acts 19:5's word 'baptized'] for new instruction.... I do not agree with them.... I do deny that the Baptism of water was repeated" there.

Calvin goes on to refute the futile attempt of Rebaptists to ground their views in Acts 19:3-5. The very question of even the possibility of rebaptism here, rests upon a misinterpretation of Acts 19:1-5. As Calvin rightly goes on to observe, "others deny that Baptism was repeated" here.

Calvin explains<sup>250</sup> that the 'rebaptizing' Anabaptists of his day "seem to think the weapon which they brandish irresistible -- when they allege that Paul rebaptized those who had been baptized 'with the Baptism of John.' Acts 19:3-5." Against that erroneous view, however, Calvin upholds his own correct conviction and "confession [that] the Baptism of John was the same as ours."

Precisely here -- continues Calvin -- the Anabaptists maintain that the twelve 'certain disciples' at Ephesus "had been trained improperly" elsewhere,

both before and after receiving their previous water-rite which they called "John's Baptism." Subsequently, however, "they learned the True Faith" from Paul -- and then they were "(re-)baptized into it." This was necessary, say the Anabaptists, because the previous 'baptism' these 'certain disciples' had received, was indeed no Baptism. It had occurred "without true doctrine" and should therefore "be accounted as nothing.... Hence, we ought to be baptized anew into the true religion with which we are now for the first time imbued."

Thus say the Anabaptists -- relates Calvin. Similarly, add the Anabaptists, those born and baptized and raised in the erroneous Church of Rome -- were never, there either, truly baptized at all.<sup>251</sup>

### Calvin's antirebaptistic explanation of baptismal passage Acts 19:1-7

Our own concern with Acts 19:1-7 here, is to deal only with its bearing on the impossibility of rebaptism (whether by Anti-Romish Catabaptists or by Anti-paidobaptistic Anabaptists or even Baptists). With that alone now in view, let us look at the relevant portion of Calvin's discussion thereof.

The French Reformer states:<sup>252</sup> "Our Catabaptists...deny that we are duly baptized, because we were baptized in the Papacy by wicked men and idolaters. Hence they furiously insist on anabaptism.... They seem to think the weapon which they brandish, irresistible -- when they allege that Paul re-baptized those who had been baptized with the Baptism of John. Acts 19:3-5."

Yet, Calvin goes on, as regards Anti-Anabaptists and Anti-Catabaptists, "it seems to some that it was a foolish imitator of John who by a former 'baptism' [*sic*] had initiated them [the twelve ignorant Unitarians who then went to Ephesus] into vain superstition. This, it is thought, may be conjectured from the fact that they acknowledge their entire ignorance of the Holy Spirit -- an ignorance in which John never would have left his disciples."

The above long-held view mentioned by Calvin, was elaborated later and well by the great Rev. Professor Dr. Abraham Kuyper Sr.<sup>253</sup> We ourselves also hold it.<sup>254</sup> Calvin did present this view very fairly (though all too shortly). Indeed, he forthrightly acknowledges that "some" indeed hold it.<sup>255</sup>

Magnificently, Calvin then goes on to insist:<sup>256</sup> "John's Baptism was a true Baptism -- and one and the same with the Baptism of Christ. But I deny that they [the approximately twelve 'certain disciples'] were re-baptized" at Acts nineteen. "Luke's words, [in Acts 19:5] imply nothing else but that they were baptized with the Spirit"<sup>257</sup> -- viz. then; in front of Paul; Acts 19:6.

"It is no new thing for the name of 'Baptism' to be transferred to the gifts of the Spirit, as we have seen in chapters 1 and 11 [1:5 & 11:16].... There, Luke...called it 'Baptism'...when the Spirit descended." Indeed, at Acts 19:5-6, "the Baptism of the Holy Spirit, in other words the visible gifts of the Holy Spirit, were given." Thus Calvin.<sup>258</sup>

Geneva's genius thus strongly opposes the repetition (or repetitions) of Water-Baptism. Especially does he oppose this, whenever (re-)baptism is mis-

alleged to be necessary because of intervening ignorance (or ignorances). For that reason, he rightly concludes:<sup>259</sup>

"If ignorance vitiates a former [Baptism], and requires to be corrected by a 'second baptism' -- the Apostles should first of all have been rebaptized! Since for more than three full years after their Baptism [by John], they scarcely received any slender portion of purer doctrine" -- even from their new mentor Jesus Himself. Yet they were never rebaptized.

"However, even if they had been, and even if we were to be rebaptized, and even repeatedly, it would still be of no avail." For "then, so numerous being the acts of ignorance which by the mercy of God are daily corrected in us -- what rivers would suffice, for so many repeated Baptisms?!"

Elsewhere, Calvin indicates<sup>260</sup> that "the ministry of John was the very same as that which was afterwards delegated to the Apostles. For the different hands by which Baptism is administered do not make it a different Baptism. But sameness of doctrine proves it to be the same.... John baptized in the Name of Him Who was to come; the Apostles in the Name of Him Who was already manifested. Luke 3:16; Acts 19:4.....

"Baptism, administered by the Apostles [even] while He was still on the Earth, was called His Baptism.... [Romish] writers...say that the one Baptism [of John the Baptizer] was only preparative to the other [Baptism in the Name of the Triune God]..., because they read that those who had received the 'Baptism of John' were again baptized by Paul (Acts 19:3-5 & Matthew 3:11). How greatly they are mistaken in this!"

#### Calvin on Romans four and First Corinthians ten against rebaptism

In Romans 4:11, Paul calls Circumcision "a seal of the righteousness of the faith" which Abraham had before he was circumcised. Since Christ's advent, Christians have been baptized -- in the place of such Circumcision. In Romans 6:3, Paul insists of Christians: "We who were baptized into Christ Jesus, were baptized into His death. We were buried, therefore, with Him -- through Baptism, into death."

Here Calvin remarks:<sup>261</sup> "Abraham possessed righteousness, before he had Circumcision.... Although it did not justify, Circumcision...had another very excellent use, viz. the office of sealing and as it were ratifying the righteousness of faith....

"There is now no necessity for Circumcision, where Baptism exists.... Circumcision does not justify, because Abraham was justified by faith. The same argument also holds good for us. We deny therefore that men are justified by Baptism, since they are justified by the same faith as that of Abraham." See too Colossians 2:11-13.

In First Corinthians 10:1-11, Paul tells those Christians: "Brethren, I would not have you ignorant that all our forefathers were under the cloud; and all passed through the sea; and all were baptized into Moses with the cloud

and in the sea.... All these things happened to them, as examples. And they are written, for our admonition."

Comments Calvin:<sup>262</sup> "Paul says...there is no point of difference between the Israelites and us.... The Church of God was in their midst.... They had the same Sacraments....

"Paul deals first with Baptism, and he teaches that the cloud...was indeed like Baptism in their case.... He says: they 'were baptized into Moses'.... How? 'In the clouds and in the sea.' 'Therefore,' someone will say, 'they were baptized twice.' To that I reply that two signs...effect one Baptism, corresponding to ours....

"Throughout the Scriptures," explains Calvin, "the cloud is called the sign of His presence. It was the same with the crossing of the sea. For the way was opened up for them through the middle of the sea" -- on dry land, when only "the clouds poured out water." Psalm 77:15-17 cf. 78: 12f.

#### Calvin on Hebrews chapters six and nine and ten against rebaptism

In Hebrews 6:1-6, the Apostle urges Christians never more than once to be "laying again the foundation" of "the doctrine of Christ" as symbolized in "the doctrine of Baptisms." For to do so, would be to "crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh."

The mode of Baptism, should be by way of sprinkling. For that was the mode of all "divers washings" or "various kinds of Baptisms" or "*Baptismois*." Hebrews 9:10. As one reads in Hebrews 9:13 & 9:19 & 9:21, "the blood" was for "sprinkling the unclean" -- and that blood "sprinkled...all the people" and "sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle and all the vessels."

Hence the Apostle urges: "Let us keep on drawing near with a true heart, in full assurance of faith, having had our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and having had our bodies washed with pure water!" Hebrews 10:22f.

In 1549, Calvin wrote<sup>263</sup> in his *Commentary on Hebrews* (6:2-4 & 9:21 & 10:22) that also in apostolic times "the children of believers were baptized as infants, since they were adopted from the womb." The Romanists, however, "have invented the fiction that it is a Sacrament by which the Spirit of regeneration is conferred. By this invention, they have mutilated Baptism.... They have planned nothing less than the destruction of the force of Baptism" -- by making it, the seal of prior regeneration, its manufacturer!

Yet even the Romanists had not succeeded in destroying Baptism -- but only in polluting it somewhat with Romish impurities. So "today, we" Protestants -- explains Calvin -- "must retain the institution [of Baptism] -- in its purity. But we must correct the [Romish] superstition....

"This passage also tends towards the approval of paidobaptism.... Why should the same doctrine be called Baptism for some, and the imposition of hands for others -- except because the latter were instructed in the faith

after Baptism, so that nothing remained but [later] to lay hands on them? ... Baptism could not be repeated....

"There was a sprinkling of hyssop and scarlet wool. There is no doubt that this represented the mystical sprinkling that comes by the Spirit.... Christ uses His Spirit, in place of sprinkling, to wash us with His blood.... The Apostle is alluding to the old ceremonies of the Law; and by the word 'water' means the Spirit of God. As Ezekiel says (36:25), 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you.'"

### Calvin on First Peter chapters one and three against rebaptism

First Peter 1:2 says God elects "according to the foreknowledge of God the Father...unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus" precisely "through sanctification of the Spirit." Note: "unto...sprinkling" etc.

Then, in 3:18f, it is stated: "Christ has suffered once [and for all] for sins..., having been brought back to life [also just once and for all], by the Spirit." Through that Spirit "He went and preached to the spirits...who once were disobedient when the patience of God waited during the days of Noah while the ark was being prepared -- in which few persons, namely eight, were saved through water.... Baptism is a similar figure of this."

Comments Calvin:<sup>264</sup> "By the sprinkling of the blood of Christ...God then sanctifies us by an effectual calling.... When we are sprinkled by the blood of Christ...there seems to be an implied allusion to the ancient rite of sprinkling used under the Law.... As formerly under the law the sprinkling of blood was done by the hand of the priest, so now the Holy Spirit sprinkles our souls with the blood of Christ."

Now many "in the time of Noah were unbelieving.... They were drowned [through submersion and without Baptism] by the deluge.... Peter ascribes salvation...to the family of Noah...within the ark.... Our Baptism is an antitype of the Baptism of Noah.... Noah obtained life.... In the ark...he was preserved together with his small family. So today, the death which is set forth in Baptism, is to us an entrance into life" once and for all.

"Fanatical men like [the Anabaptist] Schwenckfeld pervert this testimony ridiculously, by wanting to take away from Sacraments all their power and effect.... At the same time, we must beware of another evil, such as prevails among the Papists.... In not distinguishing as they ought between the thing [signified] and the sign [which signifies], they stop at the outward element and fix on that their hope of salvation....

"What then ought we to do? Not to put asunder, what has been joined together by the Lord! We ought to acknowledge in Baptism a spiritual washing. We ought to embrace therein...the pledge of our renewal.... We cannot otherwise derive benefit from Baptism, except by having all our thoughts fixed in the death and the resurrection of Christ": once and for all, irrepeatably!

### Calvin's baptismal assessment of the Anabaptists' baptismal errors

The American Baptist Rev. Dr. W.J. M'Glothlin, sometime Professor of Church History at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in Louisville (Kentucky), authored an important study titled *Anabaptism*. There,<sup>265</sup> he showed that it was not till 1527 that the first Anabaptist *Articles of Confession* were drawn up -- inculcating, however, not only antipaedobaptism but also the teachings of communism.

This was done by the ex-priest Michael Sattler -- at Schleithem, on the border of Germany and Switzerland. The full title of that document is *The Brotherly Union of a Number of Children of God Concerning Seven Articles*.

Those *Seven Articles* of Schleithem were the ecumenical 'basis of agreement' defining the Brotherly Union of German and Swiss Anabaptists. They consisted of: (1) the total rejection of infant baptism; (2) the rigid affirmation of the mandatory ban; (3) a heretical view of the Lord's supper; (4) an unbiblical doctrine of ministry; (5) a statement on the need to separate from political 'abominations'; (6) rejection of the state's sword; and (7) repudiation of the oath.<sup>266</sup>

In Calvin's 1544 *Treatise Against Anabaptists*, he refutes the Anabaptistic contention that Acts 19:1-5 sanctions 'rebaptism' and requires the rejection of what the Paidobaptistic Reformers Luther and Calvin called 'Infant Baptism.' Calvin does this, while refuting 'Article One' of *The Schleithem Confession* of Michael Sattler and his Anabaptists. Explains Dr. Calvin:<sup>267</sup>

"These poor fanatics cite the usage and practice of the Apostles [Acts 19:2f].... But of children who belong to the Church before they depart their mother's womb..., their fathers and forefathers received the promise on which their Baptism is founded....

"Peter testifies to the Jews that they are children of the promises...inasmuch as they are descendants of Abraham's race (Acts 2:39 & 3:25).... Otherwise, it would be in vain for Saint Paul to say that a child of a believing father or mother is sanctified -- who would be impure, if he were born of and descended from unbelievers (First Corinthians 7:14).

"Seeing then that the Holy Spirit, Author and Source of all sanctification, testifies that the Christians' children are holy -- is it our business to exclude them from such a benefit? Thus, if [saving grace,] the truth of Baptism, is in them [already] -- how can we dare deprive them of the sign, which is less significant and inferior?

"But the Anabaptists reply that the custom and practice of the Apostles was to the contrary.... They think they have a passage that is precisely in their favour in Acts 19:2f -- where [they wrongly conclude] it is written that Saint Paul, having discovered certain disciples who had not yet received the Holy Spirit, 'rebaptized' them....

"They [the Anabaptists] cannot accept anything other than that Saint Paul rebaptized these disciples -- owing to their ignorance. But if it is neces-

ary for Baptism to be repeated on these grounds, then why weren't the Apostles re-baptized -- who three years after their Baptism were so filled with errors and misleading opinions as to think that Jesus Christ's Kingdom was earthly, understanding nothing of His death and resurrection and many other things?" Thus Calvin, referring to Acts 1:5-8.

"As for ourselves," he concluded, "we would constantly require a lake or river in readiness -- if it were a matter of receiving Baptism anew, every time our Lord should purge us of error!" But, of course, it is not.

#### Calvin on validity of Baptisms made by Rome despite their mutilation

In 1549, the Italian Unitarian Laelius Socinus came to Geneva. Soon afterwards he wrote Calvin, asking him whether it was lawful for Protestants to marry Romanists -- and whether popish baptism was efficacious.

The Trinitarian Calvin answered<sup>268</sup> on 26th June 1549 that though marriages to Romanists were reprehensible -- popish Baptism was valid and efficacious, and should be resorted to where no other can be had. For Roman Catholicism, although corrupt, still retains marks of the Christian Church -- as well as a scattered number of elect persons. Baptism was not a papal invention, but -- even in spite of Rome's perversions of it -- a divine institution and gift of God Who fulfils His promises.<sup>269</sup>

In two of his letters<sup>270</sup> to the catabaptistic Unitarian Socinus, Calvin opposed the latter's purported rebaptizings of Ex-Romanists. For the Reformer insists to Socinus that there is still in trinitarian "Rome a remnant of the Church." Consequently, "Baptism there is still valid" etc.

Indeed, adds Calvin, "it matters not to me whether he who performs the Baptism is a diabolical man -- or even the devil." For even Satan would then still have to baptize us not in his own wretched name, but only in the fully trustworthy Name of the Triune God!

In 1552, Calvin claimed: "The Papists are in great error" in many of their doctrines anent Baptism -- but not for administering still-valid Triune Baptisms! The Papists err in that "they restrict Baptism to the time of birth and the life that went before -- as if the significance and power of it did not even extend until the time of death!"<sup>271</sup>

This implies, as Rev. Prof. R.S. Wallace has maintained regarding Calvin -- that Baptism, once administered by whomsoever, is never to be repeated. For in later years, it still remains continually efficacious.<sup>272</sup>

#### Calvin says Baptism by Romanists and also by Donatists is still valid

Again, in 1553 Calvin restated the obvious conclusion. "If the Baptism administered by man is Christ's Baptism -- it will not cease to be Christ's, whoever the Minister may be.

"This suffices to refute the Anabaptists. They maintain that Baptism is vitiated by the vice of the [Roman Catholic] Minister -- and [they] disturb the Church with this madness." This is absurd. Indeed, "Augustine has aptly used this argument against the Donatists."<sup>273</sup>

Thus, to consistent Calvinists, even Baptisms performed by groups just inside the very fringes of Trinitarianism -- are valid for the same reason. Such include Adventists, Baptists, and 'Church of Christ' Campbellites.

Calvin also observed: "We hold the ordinance of God to be too sacred to depend for its efficacy on man. Be it then that Judas or any other epicurean contemner of everything sacred is the administrator -- the spiritual nourishment of the body and blood of Christ are conferred through his hand, just as if he were an angel come down from heaven."<sup>274</sup>

Around 1557, Calvin commented on Amos 5:25-26 that "Baptism is a sacred and immutable testimony of the grace of God -- though it were administered by the devil; though all who partake of it were ungodly and polluted as to their own persons. Baptism ever retains its own character, and is never contaminated by the vices of men."<sup>275</sup>

#### Calvin's repudiation of all catabaptistic attempts to repeat Baptism

We now refer to at least twenty-three of his writings<sup>276</sup> where Calvin insists on the validity and irrepeatability of all Triune Baptisms, even when performed in the Romish Church. Below, we quote from just one of them.

Strenuously, Calvin insists<sup>277</sup> that "a Sacrament is not to be estimated by the hand of him by whom it is administered, but is to be received as from the hand of God Himself.... Its dignity neither gains nor loses by the administrator.... Among men, when a letter has been sent, if the hand and seal is recognized, it is not of the least consequence who or what the messenger was. So it ought to be sufficient for us to recognize the hand and seal of our Lord in His Sacraments -- let the administrator be who he may!"

Calvin compares the Catabaptists of his own day to the earlier Donatists -- the 313f A.D. sectarians who rebaptized Ex-Catholics who donatized. After confuting "the error of the Donatists," Calvin adds: "Such in the present day are our Catabaptists, who deny that we are duly baptized -- because we were baptized in the papacy...."

"Against these absurdities, we shall be fortified sufficiently if we reflect that by Baptism we were initiated not into the name of any man, but into the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and therefore that Baptism is not of man but of God -- by whosoever it may have been administered. Be it that those who baptized us were most ignorant of God and all piety, or were despisers -- still they did not baptize us into a fellowship with their ignorance or sacrilege, but into the faith of Jesus Christ. Because the name which they invoked was not their own, but God's. Nor did they baptize into any other Name...."

"Thus it did not harm the Jews that they were circumcised by impure and apostate priests. It did not nullify the symbol, so as to make it necessary to repeat it. It was enough to return to its genuine origin. The objection that Baptism ought to be celebrated in the assembly of the godly, does not prove that it loses its whole efficacy because it is partly defective....

"We do not abolish the institution of God -- [even] though idolaters may corrupt it. Circumcision was anciently vitiated by many superstitions, and yet ceased not to be regarded as a symbol of grace. Nor did Josiah and Hezekiah, when they assembled out of all Israel those who had revolted from God, call them to be circumcised anew." Nor would the execution of such a call even have been possible.

Calvin thus approved of the **antirebaptism** taught by the Romish Council of Trent. He opposed Rome's ritualistic additions to Baptism, and her *ex opere operato* theory. Yet he asserted the **validity** of all Triune Baptisms, even when administered by heretics (such as Anabaptists and Romanists). For he insisted that Rome, impure and dilapidated indeed, was still a big part of the Christian Church Visible -- even in spite of her being oppressed for many centuries by the papal antichrist. Hence, Calvin decisively rejected the Catabaptists' rebaptizing of all converted Ex-Romanists previously "baptized in the papacy."<sup>278</sup>

#### Baptisms by Rome recognized as valid in Calvin's *French Confession*

This is why, even in 1559, Calvin stated in his *French Confession of Faith*:<sup>279</sup> "We condemn the papal assemblies -- as the pure Word of God is banished from them; their Sacraments are corrupted or falsified or destroyed; and all superstitions and idolatries are in them.... Nevertheless, as some trace of the Church is left in the papacy and the virtue and substance of Baptism remain, and as the efficacy of Baptism does not depend upon the person who administers it -- we confess that those baptized in it, do not need a second Baptism....

"Baptism is given as a pledge of our adoption.... We are baptized only once.... The benefit that it symbolizes to us, reaches over our whole lives and to our death -- so that we have a lasting witness that Jesus Christ will always be our justification and sanctification."

Also in 1563, Calvin replied for the Pastors and Professors of Geneva to the National Synod of the French Reformed Church. Calvin wrote: "'Popish' Baptism is grounded upon the institution of Christ -- because the priests, perverse as they are and utterly corrupt, are yet the ordinary Ministers of that Church in which they tyrannically demean themselves."<sup>280</sup>

Too, in 1581 not just the Dutch Reformed Synod (in a then overwhelmingly Calvinistic country) but also the French Reformed Synod (in a then preponderantly Romish land) recognized the validity of Baptisms performed by Romish priests. Declared the French Reformed Synod: "Since authority to baptize belongs to them according to the order of the Romish Church, Baptism administered by them is not to be repeated."<sup>281</sup>

### Calvin: a baptizee's lack of faith does not invalidate that Baptism

Calvin also states<sup>282</sup> that Rebaptists sometimes "ask us what faith for several years followed our Baptism, so that they may thereby prove that our Baptism was in vain -- since it is not sanctified unless the word of the promise is received with faith. Our answer is that, being blind and unbelieving, we for a long time did not hold the promise which was given us in Baptism. But that still, the promise -- as it was from God -- always remained fixed, and firm, and true....

"We acknowledge therefore that at that time, Baptism profited us nothing -- since in us the offered promise, without which Baptism is nothing, lay neglected.... But we do not believe that the promise itself has vanished. We rather reflect thus: God in Baptism promises the remission of sins, and will undoubtedly perform what He has promised to all believers. That promise was offered to us in Baptism. Let us therefore embrace it in faith! In regard to us, indeed, it was long buried on account of unbelief. Now, therefore, let us with faith receive it!

"Wherefore, when the Lord invites the Jewish people to repentance -- He gives **no injunction concerning another Circumcision**. Though (as we have said) they were circumcised by a wicked and sacrilegious hand, and had long lived in the same impiety. All He urges, is conversion of heart. For how much soever the Covenant might have been violated by them -- the symbol of the covenant always remained, according to the appointment of the Lord: firm and inviolable.

"Solely therefore on the condition of repentance, were they restored to the Covenant which God had once made with them in Circumcision. Though this which they had received at the hand of a covenant-breaking priest, they had themselves -- as much as in them lay -- polluted and extinguished."

### Calvin: onefold sprinklings or submersions do not invalidate Baptism

Minor variations within the trinitarian baptismal ceremony itself -- such as sprinkling or even immersing onefoldly, rather than threefoldly -- do not invalidate the Sacrament. Thus Calvin insists: "Whether the person [getting] baptized is to be immersed wholly, and that whether once or thrice; or whether he is only to be sprinkled with water -- is not of the least consequence." Yet, he soon adds: "We maintain...that in Baptism...the forehead is sprinkled with water."<sup>283</sup>

As Calvin states also elsewhere:<sup>284</sup> "The Church allowed itself freedom, from the beginning, to have slightly different rites. For some used to immerse [meaning not to submerge but to 'intinct'] three times, while others did it only once. Accordingly, there is no call for us to be too particular about things that are not so necessary.... Sins are effaced by the mere remembrance of Baptism...conjoined with faith and repentance.... We ought to turn our thoughts not only to the sprinkling of water.... The Spirit of God...sprinkles our soul with the blood of Christ. First Peter 1:2."

Thus, to Calvin, also the "children of papists" (and even of backslidden non-papist Christ-professing parents), once baptized -- even if in the Romish Church -- "are validly baptized." This is so -- as Calvin assured Knox -- even unto the thousandth generation. So, they should never be rebaptized -- if and when they become Protestants. Indeed, Triune Baptism administered even in the Church of Rome, is without question thoroughly valid.<sup>285</sup>

#### Calvin assures Knox that Baptisms performed by Romanists are valid

In 1559, we see Calvin writing<sup>286</sup> to the Scottish Reformer John Knox: "God's promise comprehends not only the offspring of every believer in the first line of descent, but extends to thousands of generations. Whence it has happened that the interruption of piety which has prevailed in Popery, has not taken away from Baptism its force and efficacy.... Offspring descended from holy and pious ancestors [such as godly mothers and grandmothers], belong to the body of the Church -- though their fathers and grandfathers may have been apostates.... It is unjust, when God three hundred years ago or more has thought them worthy of His adoption -- that the subsequent impiety of some of their progenitors should interrupt the course of heavenly grace."

Thus it is. True, "Baptism is prostituted" in Romanism. But it is also prostituted elsewhere too. Here one thinks of those so-called 'Protestant' churches especially in America, where baby girls are baptized with water shaken off of white roses -- and baby boys baptized with water shaken off of purple roses. One also thinks of those Submersionists who baptize only in rivers or oceans. Such Baptisms, though very irregular, are hardly invalid.

For even a "prostituted" Baptism in the Vatican, is still a Baptism -- just as a prostituted woman is herself still a woman. For a woman does not cease to be a woman -- nor one's "Mother Church" to be one's mother -- even if she becomes a prostitute. Hosea 2:2. Neither does Triune Baptism lose its validity even if given by the great whore of Revelation 17:5 itself.

It may well be true that, even before the Protestant Reformation, the whorish Roman Church had already become that very mother of harlots. Perhaps -- already in Calvin's time -- "upon her forehead a name was written: 'Mystery Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth.'" But it was not so then, nor is it yet so, that Rome baptizes in her own name. Still less has she ever or does she then proclaim: "I baptize you in the name of Romish Babylon the great, the mother of harlots!"

To this very day, Rome has always -- and only -- baptized solely "in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Hence, as Calvin informs Knox, "the interruption of piety which has prevailed in Popery, has not taken away from Baptism its force and efficacy."

The same is true also of other deformed denominations -- even those which used to be Protestant. Their own decline from God's Word, is reminiscent of Rome's -- before them. In that sense, the Romish whore is the "mother of harlots" -- the latter being those daughter-denominations which follow in her footsteps and depart from Protestantism (alias the proclamation of the written

Word of the Lord and the Biblical use of the Sacraments as His visible Words). Yet, there too -- as long as those deformed denominations yet baptize in the Name of the Triune God, such Baptisms are still fully valid and irrepeatable.

### The Council of Trent (1545-63) never changed Rome's baptismal doctrines

All the canons of Trent -- from those of 13th December 1545 to those of 4th December 1563 -- were on that latter date finally re-affirmed.<sup>287</sup> That, of course, was long after her Seventh Session on 3rd March 1547 -- when Trent finished expounding her doctrine of Baptism.<sup>288</sup>

Since 1547, Trent merely re-iterated her previously-expressed erroneous view that "Baptism itself is for those who have not as yet been regenerated" -- and that baptized "little children" who have "been regenerated by the laver of baptism...cannot at that age lose the grace which they have already acquired of being the sons of God." Those re-iterations were given only under her doctrine of penance, expounded on 25th November 1551; and under her doctrine against paidocommunionism, expounded on July 16 1562.<sup>289</sup>

Those re-iterations, and so too the entire baptismal regenerationistic teaching of Trent, represent **no change** from Rome's teachings on this matter before Trent. For Romish doctrine is "*semper eadem*" -- always the same.

American Catabaptists in particular, like the generally-calvinistic<sup>290</sup> Thornwell and his modern 'Quasi-Calvinian' admirers, have postulated: that Calvin authored his 1536 *Institutes* before the 1545f Romish Council of Trent; that Trent then worsened Rome's baptismal doctrines; and that Calvin would not have maintained his anticatabaptism thereafter. Significantly, however, Calvin's anticatabaptism is still found in the last and definitive edition of his *Institutes* (that of 1559). It is also found, as already seen,<sup>291</sup> in more than twenty of his other writings first written between the years 1547 and 1564!

Radically false, therefore, are the catabaptistic allegations of these 'Ultra Anti-Romanists' that Trent changed Rome's Pre-Tridentine doctrine of Baptism -- or that Trent subsequently harshened it after Calvin had finished evaluating it. Radically false also is the modern catabaptistic conclusion drawn herefrom: viz., that protestantized Ex-Romanists now need (re)baptizing.

For that sinful suggestion (*cf.* Hebrews 6:1-6) is predicated on the inaccurate inference that Calvin affirmed the validity only of the Romanists' Pre-Tridentine Baptisms -- but not that of their Tridentine or Post-Tridentine sacramentology.<sup>291</sup> However, even after the Decrees of Trent were totally terminated on 4th December 1563, Calvin still went on -- both implicitly and explicitly -- to **oppose** Catabaptism and to vindicate the validity of Baptisms performed by Rome in at least three subsequent writings.

### Also Calvin's successor Beza upheld Baptism by Romanists as valid

Rev. Dr. Theodore Beza succeeded Calvin as Professor of Theology in Geneva. He too upheld Baptism by Romanists as valid. So too did every Calvin-

istic Theologian without exception throughout the World -- right down to Rev. Professor Dr. Charles Hodge in the middle of the nineteenth century.

Wrote Beza in his 1558 book *The Christian Faith*:<sup>292</sup> "Baptism is the Sacrament of our entry into the [Christian] Faith.... It is sufficient to have been received once. We do not agree with those who rebaptize persons who have been baptized by heretics or bad Ministers....

"We have no doubt that true Baptism may also take place in the Roman Church -- although it be administered by Ministers who are neither qualified nor lawful, and be polluted with innumerable corruptions.... It has pleased God to preserve by His mercy some remnant of His Church within the Papacy.... He has not willed to loosen the reins of Satan to the point where he comes to reverse and abolish there completely the Baptism by which all the elect are united to one another.

"Yet it does not follow that those who now present their children to the priests of the Papacy for Baptism, do well. For they cannot do it, without defiling themselves with the sacrileges and corruptions of these priests." Nevertheless: "Is it necessary for us then to re-crucify Jesus Christ, and give assent to the Anabaptists?" No! Hebrews 6:1-6!!!

#### Knox's anticatabaptistic Scottish writings even from 1560 onward

In 1560, Knox himself wrote a considerable treatise with the title: *An Answer to a Great Number of Blasphemous Cavillations Written by an Anabaptist and Adversary*. There, he told the Anabaptists that "with the Pelagians and Papists, you have become teachers of free will and defenders of your own justice.... Your poison is more pestilent than that of the Papistry was in the beginning!"<sup>293</sup> Indeed, he adds elsewhere: "We damn the error of the Anabaptists who deny Baptism to appertain to children."<sup>294</sup>

Knox did declare: "The Baptism now used in the Papistry is not the true Baptism which Christ Jesus did institute.... It is an adulteration and profanation of the same, and therefore to be avoided by all God's children."<sup>295</sup>

This certainly implies that Protestants should no way receive Baptism for their own children from the hand of the deformed Church of Rome. Yet it hardly implies that Baptisms administered by Rome are invalid -- and are therefore to be repeated as soon as Romanists becomes Protestants. For Knox himself was never rebaptized -- after his once-and-for-all Baptism in the Roman Catholic Church, when still an infant.

Those who later come to faith after formerly being baptized by Romanist priests, Knox insists, should never be rebaptized. "For the Spirit of regeneration...hath purged us from that poison which we drank in the days of our blindness.

"The fire of the Holy Ghost hath burnt away whatsoever we received at their hands [besides] Christ Jesus' simple institution.... The malice of the devil could never altogether abolish Christ's institution; for it was minist-

ered to us in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.... The seal once received, is durable -- and needeth not to be iterated. Lest, by iteration and multiplication of the sign, the office of the Holy Spirit -- which is to illuminate, regenerate and to purge -- be attributed to it" (as in baptismal regenerationism).

In December 1560, the first Scottish General Assembly of the Reformed Church asked the authors of the *Scots Confession* -- Knox and others -- to prepare also a practical supplement. This was the *First Book of Discipline*. It was submitted by May 1561, and declared: "Papists, Anabaptists...or others...are deceived, thinking that children be damned if they die without Baptism."<sup>296</sup>

The *First Book of Discipline* merely endorses<sup>297</sup> the Calvinist Knox's *Order of Geneva* as regards its own section on the administration of Baptism. Knox's own *Order of Geneva* assumed the validity of Baptisms administered in the Romish Church. Indeed, that *Order* says that by "Baptism, once received, is signified that we (both infants and those of age and discretion)...are received into His family and Congregation with full assurance."<sup>298</sup>

Extremely interesting is a Reference which came before the Tenth General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, which was opened in prayer by John Knox himself. The Reference asked:<sup>299</sup> "If Baptism be administered by any papist priest, or in the papistical manner, shall it be reiterated?"

To this Reference, the General Assembly gave the following answer: "When such children come to years of understanding, they should be instructed in the doctrine of salvation. The corruption of the papistry might be declared to them, which they must publically condemn before they be admitted to the Lord's Table. Which, if they do, the external sign need not be reiterated."

#### The Belgic Confession of Faith clearly condemns all rebaptisms

With all its corrections of Rome's baptismal errors -- the *Belgic Confession of Faith* never rejects the validity of Baptisms administered by Rome. While asserting that all should join the true Church [Protestantism] and leave the false Church [Romanism],<sup>300</sup> the *Belgica* never asserts that the Baptisms of the false Church are invalid.

To the contrary. It berates "the false Church" for "ascribing more power and authority to herself and her ordinances than to the Word of God" -- and for neglecting to "administer the Sacraments as appointed by Christ in His Word." But Rome is not here stated to have invalidated Baptism. Consequently, the *Belgica* says of Protestants: "We are satisfied with the number of Sacraments which Christ our Lord has instituted, which are two only."

Indeed, the *Belgica* then proceeds to attack not the Romanist but rather precisely the Immersionist doctrine of Baptism. "We believe and confess that Jesus Christ..., having abolished Circumcision which was done with blood -- hath instituted the Sacrament of Baptism instead thereof...."

"This signifies to us that as water washes away the filth of the body when poured upon it, and is seen on the body of the baptized when sprinkled upon him, so does the blood of Christ by the power of the Holy Ghost internally sprinkle the soul." It does so, "by the sprinkling of the precious blood of the Son."

Against submersionism, the *Belgica* here hammers home the Biblical mode of Baptism. So it insists that the baptismal water is "poured upon" [and "poured upon"] or "sprinkled upon" [and "sprinkled upon"] the believer -- to show how the Holy Spirit does "internally sprinkle" and save the soul precisely "by the sprinkling" of the blood of Jesus *etc.*

Further: "We believe that every man who is earnestly studious of obtaining life eternal, ought to be but once baptized with this only Baptism, without ever repeating the same. Mark 16:16; Matthew 28:19; Ephesians 4:5; Hebrews 6:2. Since we cannot be born twice.... Therefore we detest the error of the Anabaptists who are not content with the one only Baptism they have once received.... The infants of believers..., we believe, ought to be baptized and sealed with the sign of the Covenant,... What Circumcision was to the Jews -- that, Baptism is to our children."<sup>301</sup>

The original version of the above then ran on as follows: "We detest the error of the Anabaptists.... Otherwise we would always have our head in the water." Only from 1566 onward, was this portion omitted.

Article 36 of the *Belgica* certainly mentions "the kingdom of antichrist" with an eye on the papal tyranny in the Romish Church.<sup>302</sup> Yet, there is no attempt in the *Belgica* to try to invalidate the Christian Baptisms administered within the Church of Rome. Quite the contrary. However, the author of the *Belgica* -- Guido de Bres -- indeed attacks rebaptism in his other work: *The Radical Origin and Foundation of the Anabaptists*.<sup>303</sup>

### The antirebaptism of the 1566 Second Helvetic Confession

The *Roman Catechism* with its baptismal regenerationism appeared in 1566. In the same year, it was decisively repudiated by the famous *Second Helvetic Confession* of the Swiss Reformed Churches. That was written by Calvin's associate, the great Reformed Theologian Henry Bullinger.

"The Sacraments," it declares,<sup>304</sup> "are Baptism and the Lord's Supper.... There is but one Baptism in the Church of God.... It is sufficient to be once baptized or consecrated unto God. For Baptism, once received, continues for all of life and is a perpetual sealing of our adoption....

"We are baptized...or sprinkled with visible water.... Those things therefore which by man's device were added afterward and used in the Church, we do not consider necessary to the perfection of Baptism. Of this kind is exorcism, the use of...oil, salt, spittle, and such other things....

That one Baptism of the Church has been sanctified in God's first institution.... It is...effectual today, in virtue of God's first blessing....

Baptism should not be administered in the Church by women.... We condemn the Anabaptists who deny that newborn infants of the faithful are to be baptized."

#### The Synod of Dordt on Baptisms in the Church of the papal antichrist

Just three years after the publication of the *Irish Articles*, occurred the greatest international gathering of Calvinists ever held up to that time. It convened in Holland, as the 1618f Synod of Dordt.

In the *Preamble* to the *Decrees of Dordt*, one reads that "our faithful Saviour has...shown His gracious presence to the Church of Holland after it had been persecuted heavily for a good few years.... This Church was indeed redeemed by the mighty hand of God from the tyranny of the Romish antichrist and the terrible idolatry of the papacy."<sup>305</sup>

Then, in its *Postscript*, the Synod of Dordt decrees that "the Baptisms of the vagabond papist priests and of the Mennonites were not to be repeated.... One must diligently investigate whether the form and the substantial aspects of Baptism had been observed. If this is found to be so, the Baptism may no way be repeated."<sup>306</sup> Specifically, the Acts of the Synod of Dordt "forbid Romish Baptism to be repeated" in Reformed churches, because: "The form and substance of the rite have been retained" also in the Church of Rome.<sup>307</sup>

Moreover, the Synod of Dordt also commissioned the writing of the *Dordt Dutch Bible*.<sup>308</sup> That appeared in 1637. It contains strongly antirebaptist footnotes.

It makes some very interesting observations about Acts 19:1-7. First, it comments on the words which "Paul said" in Acts 19:4. ("John indeed baptized with the Baptism of repentance, saying to the people that they should believe in Him Who came after him -- namely in Christ Jesus.")

Here, the *Dordt Dutch Bible* states that John the Baptizer "preached conversion, and obligated the baptizees to repent. Hereby, and also by what follows, he [Paul] indicates that as regards its essence the Baptism of John in itself is the same as the Baptism of the Apostles. It has one and the same sign and one and the same signified matter. The [one only] difference is that John with his doctrine and Baptism pointed to Christ Who came after him and Who would still accomplish all things, while the Apostles pointed to Christ Who had come and Who had completely accomplished everything necessary for our salvation."

The *Dordt Dutch Bible* comments on the word "him" in Acts 19:5 (in the phrase "and those who heard him were baptized"). It then and there further notes that "him" here refers not to Paul but to "John the Baptizer."

It then states: "For these are the words of Paul, relating how John baptized his disciples. This is clear from the Greek text in which the two words 'men' (or 'indeed') in verse 4 and 'de' (namely 'but' or 'and') in verse 5, indicate that the things stated in these two verses must be combined, and that it is one and the same person and matter being discussed. Consequently, it

cannot be proved from this that these disciples would have been rebaptized by Paul."<sup>309</sup>

Also at Ephesians 4:5, the inspired Paul declares that there is only "one Baptism." There, the footnote in the *Dordt Dutch Bible* comments that this is so "not only as to number, but also as to administration."<sup>310</sup>

#### 1626 Rev. Professor Dr. Johann Wolleb(ius): no rebaptisms in Acts 19

The Frenchman Calvin's view of Acts 19:1-5 was followed in essence, during 1626, also by the famous German-Swiss Theologian Rev. Professor Dr. Johann Wolleb(ius). He rightly points out: "The Papists maintain that certain persons whom John had baptized, were rebaptized (Acts 19:1f)" -- namely by the Apostle Paul.

Wolleb(ius) himself then adds:<sup>311</sup> "If they were 'rebaptized' by the Apostle -- it could only have been because previously [Acts 19:3] they had improperly been 'baptized' by some imitators of John." However: "It ought not to be concluded from this text [Acts 19:5] that they were [then] 'rebaptized'" by Paul.

"For the words in verse 5 ['they were baptized into the Name of the Lord Jesus'] are not spoken by Luke concerning Paul, but by Paul concerning John and his disciples. They lend no support, therefore, to either the Papists or the Anabaptists."

Wolleb conclusively proves that Johannine Baptism is indeed Christian Baptism -- and that Romanists are wrong in their teaching that those baptized by John the Baptizer all needed to be 'rebaptized' with a 'Christian' Baptism. For in that case -- who then 'rebaptized' Jesus; and who then 'rebaptized' His Apostles?

Wolleb also states<sup>312</sup> that it is "Baptism by which the elect are received...and sealed to the remission of sins and rebirth through the blood of Christ and through the Holy Spirit." This occurs not by submersion but "by external sprinkling (*aspersio*) with water." Indeed, this "is the first Sacrament of the New Covenant...."

"Children are not without faith and reason. Although they do not have those things fully developed, yet they have them in seed and root.... If Baptism is once received with the essentials of Baptism performed, it is not to be repeated. For this reason, our Church accepts Roman Catholic Baptism -- not on account of the abuses which are combined with it, but because the child has been baptized into the Name of the Holy Trinity."

#### Modern Baptists as the very Stepchildren of the Anabaptists

The word "Anabaptists" describes various sixteenth-century sects. They all repudiated infant baptism. Nearly all of them baptized -- and often rebaptized. Those who were Trinitarian, usually baptized by pouring. Those

who were Unitarian, generally practised a single submersion. Many denied the incarnation; condemned the solemn swearing of oaths; and promoted soul-sleep, annihilationism, false prophecy, pseudo-glossolaly, polygamy, communism, and -- and/or -- revolution.

The modern pro-Mennonite<sup>313</sup> Leonard Verduin has written a book on the Anabaptists with the very misleading title: *The Reformers and their Stepchildren*. There, he misrepresents them as but the disinherited children of Luther and Calvin -- and, more remotely, of Waldo and Wycliffe.

Yet the Anabaptists themselves disclaimed dependence on the Reformers. The pro-Mennonite Verduin and especially the Baptist Erroll Hulse like to view the Anabaptists as the ancestors of the Baptists. Frankly, their modern stepchildren include also the more radical contemporary ecclesiastical revolutionaries such as the Christadelphians, the Mormons, the Seventh-day Adventists, the Jehovah witnesses, and the Pentecostals.<sup>314</sup>

Were we to wish, we could dwell for a long while on some of the quainter views of many of the more sectarian Anabaptists. We could point to the naked submersions of some; and the forward-leaning triple immersions of others within groups of German Baptists.<sup>315</sup> However, instead of examining those extraordinary eccentricities, we rather proceed straight to the British and Anglo-American Baptists -- who finally invented and adopted the then-novel baptismal mode of backward-leaning and fully-clothed onefold submersion.

In light of all the above, the esteem of certain modern Baptists for the apostate Anabaptists -- is absolutely appalling. Thus, the modern British Baptist Historian Erroll Hulse insists<sup>316</sup> that "we should call the orthodox evangelical Anabaptists of the Reformation 'Baptists' and not 'Anabaptists.'"

Hulse continues: "The General Baptists...had their origin in John Smyth (d. 1612).... His study of the Scriptures brought him to practise believers' baptism" -- by which latter term Hulse means the Baptism of adults *only*.

More revealingly, English Baptist Rev. Prof. Dr. West draws our attention to "the first statement by an Englishman arguing for believers' baptism. It is Smyth's pamphlet *Character of the Beast*" (the '666' of Revelation 13:18) -- a vicious diatribe against the historic Christian Church's apostolic practice of infant baptism.<sup>317</sup>

It should be noted Smyth 'baptized himself' -- or rather 're-baptized' himself; and 're-baptized himself!' He did so, by way of pouring. Thereafter, he then got himself 're-re-baptized' -- by the Dutch Mennonite Anabaptists (and again by way of pouring). Thus, Britain's first Baptist was never submersed.

Scottish Baptist J.G.G. Norman reminds us that John Smyth, "father of English General Baptists..., baptized himself." This he did in 1609; by affusion; and on foreign soil.<sup>318</sup>

After Smyth's death in 1610, his colleague and successor Thomas Helwys in 1611 drew up the first English *Baptist Confession*. That too, while con-

fining Baptism only to those who have confessed Christ, says nothing about submersion.<sup>319</sup>

Smyth and Helwys were both Arminian<sup>320</sup> (Ana)Baptists -- and non-immersing baptismal pourers. Indeed, it was not till 1641 that Edward Barber became the first English Arminian or General Baptist to advocate dipping.<sup>321</sup>

The above 'dipping' means Baptism by way of submersion. As the very Pro-Anabaptist Scholar G.H. Williams admits in his text-book *The Radical Reformation*,<sup>322</sup> "the adoption by English Baptists of the practice of immersion ultimately derived from the Minor Church of Poland...introduced into Holland by the Socinians" or the Unitarian Anabaptists. Such were the kin of the notorious Anabaptist Servetus himself. See Calvin's *Institutes* I:13:32 & IV:16:31.

The first so-called 'Calvinistic' or Particular Baptist congregation was formed, in England, only in the 1630s. Yet it was not till 1644, that the particular Baptists issued a Confession (of limited authority)<sup>323</sup> -- alleging a single submersion to be the only valid form of Baptism.

This was immediately repudiated by the 1645 *Westminster Confession of Faith*. That responded:<sup>324</sup> "Baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling water upon the person. Hebrews 9:10,19-22; Acts 16:33; Mark 7:4." It could also have added: Acts 1:5; 2:1f,17f,38f; 10:44f; 11:15-17; etc.

It is worth noting that the famous Baptist John Bunyan wrote against those submersionistic Ultrabaptists who make Baptism "a substance" rather than "a circumstance." It needs to become better known that Bunyan once pastored a Congregationalist Church, and that his own infant son was baptized in 1672. See too his 1673 book *Difference in Judgement About Water-Baptism No Bar to Communion*.<sup>325</sup>

Only in the 1677 *London Baptist Confession*, was it for the first time declared (with an abiding authority among Baptists) that "immersion or dipping of the person in water" -- was "necessary to the due administration of this ordinance."<sup>326</sup> The rest of this 1677 *Confession* -- also known as the 1688 *Philadelphia Confession* -- was plagiarized from the Presbyterians' *Westminster Confession* of 1645.

The modern Baptist writer Erroll Hulse here pontificates. "March 1639" -- he asserts<sup>327</sup> -- Mr. Roger "Williams and eleven others were baptized, and the first Baptist Church in America was constituted."

Much more precisely, the famous American-Swiss Church Historian Rev. Professor Dr. Philip Schaff informs us<sup>328</sup> this "Roger Williams...was immersed by Ezekiel Hollyman -- and, in turn, immersed Hollyman and ten others.... But a few months afterwards, he renounced his rebaptism -- on the ground that Hollyman was unbaptized [at that time], and therefore un-authorized to administer the rite to him."

Enough, then, of all such Baptist bedlam! Let us next note the wisdom of the Westminster Assembly which repudiated it.

Westminster Standards: Johannine Baptism irrepeatable Christian Baptism

The *Westminster Standards* support Scripture (Mark 10:39 & Ephesians 4:5) and therefore also the Bible-believing Luther and Calvin -- in regarding so-called 'Johannine Baptism' as irrepeatable Christian Baptism. This they do, against Romanism and Catabaptism -- both of which regard Johannine Baptism as merely pre-Christian.

The *Westminster Confession of Faith* normatively cites the Johannine Baptism's Matthew 3:11. It does so, to prove that the efficacy of a Sacrament does not depend upon the piety or intention of him who administers it.<sup>329</sup>

It cites the Johannine Baptism's Mark 1:4 to prove that Baptism is a Sacrament of remission of sins,<sup>330</sup> and Matthew 3:11 & John 1:33 to prove that [Johannine] Baptism should be administered by a Minister of the Gospel.<sup>331</sup> It also cites the Johannine Baptism's Luke 7:30 to prove that it is a great sin to contemn or neglect Baptism,<sup>332</sup> and John 3:3f to prove that the efficacy of Baptism is not tied to that moment of time when it is administered.<sup>333</sup>

The same teaching is encountered in the *Westminster Larger Catechism* too. There, the Johannine Baptism's Mark 1:4 is cited to prove that Baptism is a Sacrament of the New Testament and a sign and seal of remission of sins by the blood of Christ.<sup>334</sup> And there, the Johannine Baptism's Matthew 3:11 is cited to prove that "Baptism is to be administered but once -- with water -- to be a sign and seal of our regeneration and ingrafting into Christ."<sup>335</sup>

Westminster Confession: Baptism irrepeatable; by sprinkling; for babies

The *Westminster Confession of Faith*<sup>336</sup> rightly declares: "Elect infants dying in infancy are regenerated and saved by Christ through the Spirit.... All those that are justified, God vouchsafeth...to make partakers of the grace of adoption.... They are taken into...the children of God; have His Name put upon them...; are pitied...and...sealed to the day of redemption...."

"The Visible Church...consists of all those throughout the World that profess the true religion, together with their children.... The Pope of Rome...is that antichrist...that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ.... Baptism is rightly administered by pouring or sprinkling.... Also the infants of one or both believing parents are to be baptized.... It be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance.... The Sacrament of Baptism is but once to be administered to any person."

Westminster Larger Catechism: Baptism a seal for infants unto adulthood

The *Westminster Larger Catechism* declares:<sup>337</sup> "The Sacraments become effectual means [not of justification but] of salvation [alias preservation] -- not by any power in themselves...but only by the working of the Holy Ghost.... A Sacrament is an holy ordinance instituted by Christ in His Church to signify, seal and exhibit...the benefits of His mediation...."

"Baptism is a Sacrament...wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water...to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into Himself, of...regeneration by His Spirit.... Baptism is not to be administered to any that are out[side] of the Visible Church....

"The needful but much neglected duty of improving our Baptism is to be performed by us all our life long." This is to be done not by getting re-baptized, but "by serious and thankful consideration of the nature of it, and of the...benefits conferred and sealed thereby."

This is also to be done by constant reflection on "our solemn vow made therein" and "by growing up to assurance of pardon of sin and of all other blessings sealed to us in that Sacrament." For the baptized, are "those that have therein given up their names to Christ" -- having been "baptized by the same Spirit into one body.... The Sacrament...of Baptism...is...to be a sign and seal of our regeneration and ingrafting into Christ, and that even to infants."

Indeed, the *Westminster Larger Catechism*<sup>338</sup> requires that "infants descending from parents either both or but one of them professing faith in Christ...are...to be baptized. Genesis 17:7f; Galatians 3:9f; Colossians 2:11f; Acts 2:38f; Romans 4:11f; First Corinthians 7:14; Matthew 28:19; Luke 18:15f; Romans 11:16."

Consequently, the *Catechism* also requires<sup>339</sup> "that baptism is to be administered but once with water -- to be a sign and seal of our regeneration and ingrafting into Christ. Matthew 3:11 & Galatians 3:27."

#### Westminster Directory for Worship: Baptism a seal also for infants

The *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God* well states:<sup>340</sup> "Baptism, as it is not unnecessarily to be delayed -- so it is not to be administered in any case by any private person but by a Minister of Christ called to be the Steward of the Mysteries of God. Nor is it to be administered in private places, or privately, but in the place of publick worship and in the face of the congregation where the people may most conveniently see and hear.....

"The child to be baptized...is to be presented by the father.... The promise is made to believers and their seed.... The seed and posterity of the faithful..., born within the Church..., by Baptism are solemnly received into the bosom of the Visible Church.... They are Christians and federally holy before Baptism and therefore are they baptized.... The inward grace and virtue of Baptism is not tied to that very moment of time wherein it is administered.... The fruit and power thereof reacheth to the whole course of our life" -- without ever being repeated.

For at the administration of Infant Baptisms, the Minister is "to admonish all that are present to look back to their Baptism...; to improve and make right use of their Baptism, and of the Covenant sealed thereby betwixt God and their souls. He is also to...demand the name of the child; which, being told

him, he is to say (calling the child by his name): 'I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'

"As he pronounceth these words, he is to baptize the child with [not in] water. Which, for the manner of doing it, is not only lawful but sufficient and most expedient to be, by pouring or sprinkling of the water on the face of the child without adding any other ceremony" -- such as salt or submersion.

### Faithful Theologians after Westminster on irrepeatability of Baptism

Many modern Pseudopresbyterians are not strict subscriptionists. They do not uphold all of the above statements -- even though they have sworn to defend the *Westminster Standards*. Such men, though perhaps evangelical, are revisionists -- and need to be rebuked by their denomination. If they then refuse to reform -- they should be censured and urged to go elsewhere.

Significantly, all of the mainline Reformed Theologians since the 1643-49 Westminster Assembly until Thornwell<sup>341</sup> in 1845, have defended its Classic Calvinian anticatabaptism. Such include: the great Westminster Assembly Theologian Rev. Prof. Dr. Samuel Rutherford;<sup>342</sup> John Cocceius;<sup>343</sup> John Owen;<sup>344</sup> Mark Frederick Wendelin;<sup>345</sup> David Dickson;<sup>346</sup> Francis Turretin;<sup>347</sup> Leonard Riissen;<sup>348</sup> Benedict Pictet;<sup>349</sup> Peter a Mastricht;<sup>350</sup> Matthew Henry;<sup>351</sup> Bernard de Moor;<sup>352</sup> and Jonathan Edwards.<sup>353</sup>

Classic Calvinian anticatabaptism was upheld also by the 1717 & 1729 & 1736 Synods of the American Presbyterian Church, before the creation of the 1788 Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. That latter body in 1786f slightly amended the *Westminster Confession* (yet not with regard to Baptism). That was, of course, before its notorious Plan of Union with the Congregationalists was adopted by the 1801 Presbyterian General Assembly.<sup>354</sup>

Yet even as late as 1790, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. still resolved against the rising tide of revivalism that "the unworthiness of the Ministers of the Gospel does not invalidate the ordinances of religion dispensed by them."<sup>355</sup> Even that late, there was not the slightest objection to the statement in the *Westminster Confession* (28:7) that "Baptism is but once to be administered to any person."

However, as Charles Hodge points out in his 1851 *Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*, the arminianizing 'Great Awakening' had greatly weakened even Presbyterianism in America.<sup>356</sup> Also he again rightly adds:<sup>357</sup> "The effects of the revolutionary war [1776-88f] on the state of our Church, was extensively and variously disastrous."

George P. Hays, in his book *Presbyterians*, further observes:<sup>358</sup> "It is certain that the great revival of 1800 entirely changed the moral aspect of the country" -- the U.S.A. Indeed, even the decidedly 'Old School' Reformed Presbyterians alias the American Covenanters -- who as late as 1806 were still taking the orthodox position that "Baptism is not to be repeated"<sup>359</sup> -- subsequently capitulated to the catabaptistic heresy<sup>360</sup> purportedly invalidating Triune Baptisms administered by the Church of Rome.

Yet even since 1845, the Classic-Calvinist and anticatabaptist position of the Westminster Assembly has been re-asserted by many Reformed Theologians. Such include: Charles Hodge;<sup>361</sup> R.L. Dabney;<sup>362</sup> Philip Schaff;<sup>363</sup> A.A. Hodge;<sup>364</sup> Heinrich Heppel;<sup>365</sup> William Cunningham;<sup>366</sup> H.E. Gravemeijer;<sup>367</sup> W.G.T. Shedd;<sup>368</sup> Abraham Kuyper Sr.;<sup>369</sup> Jan Bavinck Sr.;<sup>370</sup> Louis Berkhof;<sup>371</sup> James Oliver Buswell Jr.;<sup>372</sup> Herman Hoeksema Sr.;<sup>373</sup> Johan Heyns;<sup>374</sup> James Montgomery Boice;<sup>375</sup> The Reformed Presbyterian Church Evangelical Synod;<sup>376</sup> Dr. Rowland Ward;<sup>377</sup> and Francis Nigel Lee.<sup>378</sup> In what follows, we here give the anticatabaptistic views only of the latter.

### Francis Nigel Lee: importance of Acts 19:1-7 to modern Church Practice

For at least the last millenium, Acts 19:1-7 has been very widely yet wrongly understood -- by some Paidobaptists and by all Antipaidobaptists -- to imply a fresh Baptism. Romanists, Anabaptists, Baptists, Adventists, Campbellites, Eastern-Orthodox hardliners, and even some Hyperpresbyterian Catabaptists -- have all misinterpreted that passage, catabaptistically.

Romanists like Thomas Aquinas<sup>379</sup> say Johannine Baptism was not Christian Baptism. They misconclude that even Jesus Himself never received Christian Baptism. They also say that His disciples previously received only (*sic*) 'Johannine Baptism' -- and later submitted to the 'brand-new' water-rite of 'Christian Baptism.' This they did -- alleges Rome -- if not before Calvary, then certainly thereafter (and in some cases possibly both before and then again after Calvary).

So too, the Christian Apostle Paul is held to have 're-baptized' at Ephesus in the Name of Christ. He is alleged to have rebaptized -- or rather to have given their first ever 'Christian Baptism' -- to twelve men previously 'baptized' in Palestine by the 'Pre-Christian' John the Baptist. Thus Romanism -- whose views here are frankly 'Rebaptist' to all true Protestants (*viz.* Lutherans and Calvinists).

Sub-Protestant Anabaptists (and also many Baptists) misconclude from the passage Acts 19:1-7, that all of those 'allegedly baptized' in infancy, before making a personal 'profession of faith' -- still need (re)baptizing, after making such a 'profession' when older. For the (Ana)baptists deny 'infant baptism' to be Biblical Baptism. Instead they assert that each, personally -- for himself alone -- is first to be required to give a credible profession of faith, before ever being baptized.

Anabaptists and Baptists say that such (re)baptism is therefore to be urged not just upon converted Ex-Romanists. They urge it also upon those converts who previously received merely(!) 'infant baptism' even in Lutheran or Calvinistic denominations.

Curiously, antipapal paidobaptistic and even some hyperpresbyterian Catabaptists here frequently follow the Romanists and the Anabaptists in their misinterpretation of Acts 19:1-7. For even paidobaptistic Catabaptists argue that this passage applies also to protestantized Ex-Romanists (and other Trinitarians who were formerly ritualists) after their conversion to Protestant-

ism. From this, such Catabaptists then misconclude that protestantized Ex-Romanists (and Ex-Campbellites or Ex-Adventists *etc.*) all need (re)baptism.

Once more. Even 'Eastern-Orthodox' hardliners appeal to Acts 19:1-7. They give their own mandatory triple submersion to all of their converts who earlier had received Baptism differently (by way of single sprinkling or single submersion or even triple sprinkling). Such 'Eastern-Orthodox' hardliners thus insist on 'rebaptizing' all previously-baptized persons who convert to them from the Adventists, from the Baptists, from the Campbellites, from the Protestants, and even from the Romanists, *etc.*

Thus, Papists and Anabaptists and Catabaptists (and also the 'Eastern-Orthodox' denominations) have all made Acts 19:1-7 their own happy hunting ground. A very careful consideration of the exegesis of this passage, is therefore quite essential.

Yet when that is done, it can be seen quite clearly that the passage neither mentions nor sanctions any kind of rebaptism whatsoever. To the contrary, it instead implies the obvious need to receive a specifically Trinitarian Baptism -- and that, irrepeatably.

#### Lee: modern Catabaptists draw quite the wrong conclusion from Acts 19

Regarding the baptizing of the approximately twelve 'disciples' Paul encountered in Ephesus, some Catabaptists claim that Paul baptized them with water. They say even if those twelve had been 'baptized' with water priorly by John the Baptizer himself -- such a Baptism was 'pre-Christian' and thus invalid. So Paul now gave them the one and only truly 'Christian Baptism' with water which they ever received. Acts 19:1-7.

Yet other Catabaptists argue that even if the water-rite those twelve had received and here called "John's Baptism" was still deemed by them to be valid -- Paul still rightly decided to 're-baptize' them. They say he did so -- in much the same way Baptists think they rightly (re)baptize those who previously received only in infancy what was then merely alleged to be valid Baptism.

Catabaptists clutch at these two events -- at the twelve disciples' earlier reception of "John's Baptism"; and at the twelve's subsequent reception of Christian Baptism with water from Paul. For Catabaptists regard this as justification for their own practice others would condemn as rebaptistic.

Some Catabaptists insist on (re)baptizing all previously baptized in infancy (whether in a Romish or in a Protestant Church). Other Catabaptists insist on (re)baptizing all previously purported to have been baptized (at whatever age) in the Church of Rome and sometimes even in one of the Eastern-Orthodox Churches or the Campbellite 'Church of Christ' (*sic*).

Still other Catabaptists, such as certain Campbellites, take great delight in themselves re-submerging such of their converts as join them from the Baptist Churches. For to those Campbellites, "Baptist Baptism" is a misnomer -- and is not really Biblical Baptism at all.

Yet other Catabaptists, such as Seventh-day Adventists, prefer to re-baptize (by submersion) all their converts. This is so, even if previously submerged by Non-Adventist Trinitarians.

However, in actual fact -- the twelve heretics whom Paul encountered at Ephesus, being Unitarians (like our modern Jehovah Witnesses), had never previously received Trinitarian Baptism at all. They had previously received only a Unitarian water-rite which they quite wrongly termed: "John's baptism." Acts 19:3 cf. First Corinthians 15:29.

When Baptists or Eastern-Orthodox hardliners submerge previously-baptized but subsequently confused Presbyterians or Romanists, they are neither baptizing nor rebaptizing but only submerging them. When Romanists give 'conditional baptism' to previously-baptized but subsequently confused Presbyterians or Baptists, they are not baptizing nor rebaptizing but only sprinkling them.

Too, whenever offbeat Catabaptists (such as Seventh-day Adventists or Hyperpresbyterians) either submerge or sprinkle previously-baptized but subsequently confused Baptists or Presbyterians or Romanists, they are neither baptizing nor rebaptizing but only submerging or sprinkling them. For 'once baptized, always baptized.' Romans 6:3f; Ephesians 4:5 & 4:30; Hebrew 6:1-6.

Yet water-washed Unitarians (such as Jehovah Witnesses) and Polytheists (such as Mormons) still need Christian Baptism. For such non-trinitarian washings (executed by way of submersion) would never be regarded by Christ's Apostolic Church as Christian Baptisms. Cf. First Corinthians 15:29. So, those previously submerged or sprinkled non-trinitarianly -- but then subsequently converted to the Triune God -- still need(ed) valid Baptism, viz. the one-and-only Trinitarian Baptism. Cf. Acts 19:1-6.

#### Lee: many fringe fanatics after the death of John the Baptizer

To Lee -- as previously also to the great Rev. Professor Dr. Abraham Kuyper Sr.<sup>381</sup> -- it indeed seems that, at an earlier time than Paul's Acts 19 return to Ephesus, "some" of the followers of John had become confused. This probably occurred only after John himself, while imprisoned, had temporarily questioned Jesus' Messiahship. More particularly, it would have occurred especially after John's own violent death. Matthew 11:2f, 11f & 14:10-12.

Instead of then following Jesus, those confused followers of John had then started trusting in falsehoods. Thereafter, it seems even they themselves had then started teaching erroneous doctrines. Unlike John himself (Mark 1:4-11) -- they were not, or did not remain, Trinitarians. Like the Judaists who had apostasized from Old Testament Trinitarianism, they too were doubtlessly Unitarians. Yet, unlike those Judaists, they also seem to have begun to deify even John himself -- at least incipiently.

For after the death of John, it clearly seems that some of those of his disciples who had not followed Jesus -- did not continue (as had John) to baptize from the Father and toward the Son and with the Spirit. Quite wrongly, those confused men (or some even more confused onlookers) then started to

'baptize' heretically "in the name of John" -- weirdly dispensing what they then apparently called "John's baptism." Acts 19:3. Also Simon the sorcerer, and his disciple Menander, are reputed to have misbehaved similarly.<sup>382</sup>

Such "John's baptism" was of course not at all the Christian Sacrament which John himself had administered. Indeed, it seems to be precisely such a Christless and Spiritless 'baptism' which the twelve in Ephesus had received previously, and which they there miscalled: "John's."

For either such confused men or their even more confused pupils or onlookers, unauthorizedly and erroneously, had then themselves gone and started baptizing not just "in" but even "into the name of John" (after he had predeceased them). Compare First Corinthians 15:29. It was some such heretical onlookers or their pupils or 'disciples' who had been 'baptized' thus -- that Paul later encountered at Ephesus. Acts 19:1-3.

Very strongly, however, did Luke (in his inspired Book of Acts) identify true 'Johannine' Baptism<sup>383</sup> with the later 'Christic' Baptism. By the latter, we mean that administered in the Name of the Triune God and upon the authority of the Lord Jesus as the Central Person of the Trinity.<sup>384</sup>

Very strongly did also Paul wish to underline the irrepeatability of all Triune Baptisms. Consequently, he later reminded the saints in that same city of Ephesus that there was indeed only "one Baptism." There is only "one God and Father" and only "one Lord" Jesus Christ and only "one Spirit" -- into Whose Triune Name all Christians should be baptized, even with water.<sup>385</sup>

So at Ephesus, Paul gave Trinitarian Baptism "in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit" -- for their first time ever -- to the recently-converted Ex-Unitarians. Such, apparently, were previously altogether ignorant of the Spirit's very existence (and perhaps even of Christ Himself). Such would themselves, priorly, have been initiated probably with water -- but only "in John's own name" or even "into the name of John."

The latter initiation rite, of course, was not Christian Baptism at all. It was not -- precisely because not the same as the Johannine Baptism which Jesus Christ Himself had received. For Christ received true Baptism -- on behalf of all Christians everywhere. Thus: Irenaeus;<sup>386</sup> Hippolytus,<sup>387</sup> Lactantius;<sup>388</sup> Athanasius;<sup>389</sup> Basil;<sup>390</sup> Gregory of Nyssa;<sup>391</sup> Augustine;<sup>392</sup> and Calvin.<sup>393</sup> So too Post-Calvinian Calvinists -- like those who wrote the *Dordt Dutch Bible*;<sup>394</sup> like Kuyper;<sup>395</sup> and like Dr. J.W. Dale<sup>396</sup> etc.

The group of about twelve mentioned in Acts nineteen, therefore consisted exclusively of unitarian infidels -- before Paul met and evangelized them. He certainly did not re-baptize them. For, unlike trinitarian Romanists, they had never before been baptized in the Name of the Triune God -- at all.

#### Lee's own appreciative evaluation of Calvin's view of Acts 19:1-7

We ourselves agree with Calvin's views almost totally, even as regards Acts 19:1-7. However, with Gravemeijer, we disagree with Calvin that Acts

19:5 is describing a non-watery 'Spirit-baptism' administered by Paul. And with Kuyper, we disagree with Calvin's view that Paul did not give precisely Water-Baptism to the penitent Unitarians at Ephesus.

For we ourselves are inclined to think that Paul then indeed baptized those men with water -- and not just with the Spirit. If we are right in this, that would then have been the first and the only Christian Baptism those previously-ignorant Ex-Unitarians had ever received.

Calvin's chief reason for disagreeing with this, is his impression that "it is not probable that the Jews...would have been destitute of all knowledge of the Spirit." Calvin thus assumes that the twelve ignorant heretics in Ephesus were Jews. That, however, is not claimed in this passage (nor anywhere else in Holy Scripture). For Luke merely states they were "disciples" -- alias 'taught ones.'

Too, Luke's own word 'disciples' could apply to Gentile heretics just as much as it certainly could to Jewish heretics.<sup>397</sup> Moreover, even some Jewish heretics may very well have been ignorant about the Holy Spirit.<sup>398</sup> Calvin does not seem to have weighed sufficiently the clear difference between the statement in John 7:39 that "the Holy Ghost was not yet given" (*oupoo gar een Pneuma Hagion dedomenon*) -- and the different statement in Acts 19:2 where the Unitarians at Ephesus said: "We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost" (*all' oud' ei Pneuma Hagion estin eekousamen*).

For, in the Greek of John 7:39, quite apart from the disputed word for "given" (*dedomenon*), there is also the undisputed word for "was" -- namely the Greek word *een*. This word differs from the undisputed Greek word for "is" (*estin*), which the Holy Spirit Himself infallibly inscripturated at Acts 19:2.

Again, Calvin has gratuitously assumed that Paul in Acts 19:5 administered only a 'non-watery' and a purely 'spiritual' Baptism. Indeed, even unlike Gravemeijer, Calvin here takes the words "they were baptized" in Acts 19:5 to describe what Paul then did -- rather than as referring to what Paul then said John had done. Right after these very same words -- Calvin here assumes the implicit existence of the explicitly non-existent words: 'with the Spirit.'

There is also the question of the 'plural forms.' We should observe that the plural form "when they heard this" (*akousantes*) in Acts 19:5a, as well as the plural form "they were baptized" (*ebaptistheesan*) in Acts 19:5b, both seem to refer not to John's (singular) people but to Paul's (plural) listeners. That is certainly so, in the immediately preceding context of Acts 19:1-3.

For there, the consecutive corresponding plurals obviously refer not to John's singular people but to Paul's plural listeners. Thus, there we find: "certain disciples" (*tinas matheetas*); "them" (*autous*); "we have not...heard" (*oude...eekousamen*); "were ye baptized" (*ebaptistheete*); and "they said" (*hoi de eipan*).

This is also the case with the corresponding plurals in the immediately succeeding Acts 19:6-7. Thus, there we find: "upon them" (*autois*) and "on them" (*ep' autous*) and "they spake" (*elaloun*) and "they prophesied" (*eprophee-*

teuon) and "all the men were about twelve" (*eesan de hoi pantes andres hoosei doodeka*). All these plurals strongly suggest that Paul water-baptized them. Indeed, "when they heard this" explanation by Paul, "they were baptized" there and then by Paul -- who then "laid his hands upon them." Acts 19:5f.

Coupled with the above, it seems to us to be of some significance that in Acts 19:4a the inspired Luke differently refers in the singular number to "the people" (or *too; laoo;*) whom John had addressed and also "verily baptized" (or *ebaptisen*). This would then imply that in the next verse those (plural) who are there said to have been "baptized" (*ebaptistheesan*), thus received that Baptism not from John but from Paul.

Indeed, all the old versions -- including even the Syriac and the Vulgate -- seem to suggest that in Acts 19:5-6, Paul himself really did baptize his listeners with water. So to us (and also to the great Rev. Prof. Dr. Abraham Kuyper Sr.),<sup>399</sup> it certainly seems that Paul here really did give Water-Baptism to the approximately twelve confused men he encountered at Ephesus.

For the rest, however, we heartily concur with Calvin that the passage Acts 19:1-7 certainly precludes any repetition of Water-Baptism. Indeed, it so precludes all 're-baptism' -- whether in the Name of the Triune God (*cf.* Matthew 28:19), or whether 'in the Name of the Lord Jesus' (*cf.* Acts 8:16).

We conclude, then, that the words in Acts 19:5 ['they were baptized into the Name of the Lord Jesus'] were written by Luke apparently about what Paul the Apostle then went and did to them. For Luke does not say that Paul then simply concluded that the twelve he met at Ephesus had indeed received a valid Baptism previously, upon the authority of the Lord Jesus, when earlier they had received their previous water-rite which they called "John's baptism." Nor does Luke record that Paul concluded that John the Baptizer himself really had baptized them.

Instead, Luke infallibly records Paul told the twelve that while John was baptizing people, John had truly baptized with the Baptism of repentance -- and had at that time said that people should believe on the One coming after John, namely Jesus Christ. "When they" (the twelve) "heard" this from Paul, "they were [then] baptized into the Name of the Lord Jesus" (namely by Paul); and "when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them." Acts 19:4-6.

Indeed, the writer Luke himself actually eye-witnessed this behaviour of Paul.<sup>400</sup> That is why Luke then infallibly recorded exactly what he himself then heard Paul say and saw Paul do -- namely baptize the twelve. "When they heard this, they were baptized into the Name of the Lord Jesus."

#### Conclusion: Christian Baptism always valid thus absolutely irrepeatable

Christian Baptism is as irrepeatable as the Circumcision it replaced. Johannine Baptism is Christian Baptism. That is what Christ and His Own Apostles received, irrepeatably. Baptized into Christ, that is also precisely what we too receive. For neither Christ, nor His Apostles, nor their con-

verts, nor Simon the sorcerer, nor even the Unitarians at Ephesus -- were ever rebaptized with water.

There is only "one Baptism." It seals all adult baptizees together with their infants, just once and for all. Ephesians 1:13; 2:11f; 4:5f; 4:30. It is as irrepeatable as Noah's flood and the Red Sea which drowned the wicked -- while Noah's family and later all the Israelites and their babies were being saved by being sprinkled with the blood of Jesus depicted by the water then pouring down upon them. This it did at their Baptism, in the rain upon the roof of the ark above Noah and his family -- and when the cloud above poured its water out upon the Israelites and their babies. Genesis 6:18f; 7:4f; Psalm 77:15-20; Romans 6:1-4; First Corinthians 10:1-6 & First Peter 3:20f.

Because Baptism is foundational, any attempt to lay it down again -- is a sinful portrayal of recrucifying Christ. Hebrew 5:12 to 6:1-6. It seals not just adults but indeed every Member of all of the tribes of the New Israel upon their foreheads -- so that all, of whatever age, who get to glory, have the Name of the Triune God on their foreheads. Revelation 7:3-8 & 19:13 & 22:4.

All people that on Earth do dwell -- recant and repent; then unite!

The now disgraced Marx was a stepchild of the communistic Anabaptists. He loved to enjoin: "Workers of the world -- unite!" Cf. the last words of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels in their *Manifesto of the Communist Party*. Yet standing on Scripture, Christian Calvinists should say to all of the Creator's stepchildren: "Anabaptists, Communists, and Romanists of all lands -- repent!"

The Communists need to repent -- and to be baptized. Also Anabaptists need to repent of their sins, including their great sin of neglecting Infant Baptism (*Westminster Confession* 28:4-5). This is the sin of saved Baptists; of heretical Seventh-day Adventists; and of apostate "Jehovah witnesses." They need to bring their unbaptized babies to the great Jehovah-Jesus -- and to get them all baptized on their foreheads with the seal of the Triune God. Matthew 28:18f; Mark 16:15f; Acts 2:38-39; 16:31-34; Hebrews 5:12 to 6:6; First Peter 3:20-21; Revelation 7:2f & 9:4 & 12:17 & 14:1 & 21:24 & 22:4.

We also call upon all unreformed Catholics to repent. For they need to renounce their identification of Baptism with regeneration. Together with all nominal Protestants, they need to put their confidence in Christ alone to whom their Baptism points -- and vigorously to 'improve' their Triune Baptism.

For Jesus says to His Ministers: "Preach the Gospel to every creature! He who believes and is baptized, shall be saved! Disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost!"

#### FOOTNOTES TO REBAPTISM IS SIN

- 1) Josh. 5:2. The Hebrew has *Ba'eeth habiy, 'aamar J'hovaaah 'el J'hoshua'*: "'a:sseeh I'kaah charbooth tsuriym w'shoov mol eth B'neey-Jissraa'eel sheeniyth!" Here we have rendered *shoov*, as frequently throughout the Old Testament, "repent" (rather than simply duplicating the *King James Version's* obscure rendition: "again." Note that in Josh. 5:2, "*sheeniyth*" does not

mean 'the second time' but rather "changingly." The word is derived from *shaanaab*, which seems to have the primary meaning of 'to change.' Compare the primitive Chaldean verb *sh'naa'* which means: "I. to be changed, altered; II. to be different from." Thus B. Davidson: *The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon*, Bagster, London, 1959, pp. DCCXXIX-DCCXXX. The *LXX* at Josh. 5:3 has "*bouos*" (= "hill" or "mound"). This means the very base of the foreskin, so that after such a Circumcision, any later 'recircumcision' would be quite impossible. Cf. too Gen. 17:14 & 34:14f. See A.M. Hyamson & A.N. Silbermann: *Jewish Encyclopaedia*, Shapiro & Vallentine, London, 1938, p. 147. art. *Circumcision*: "Jewish circumcision is a complete and effective surgical operation. It consists of the amputation of the entire foreskin or prepuce; the splitting of the internal membrane which invests the glans; and peeling it off therefrom so as to expose completely this portion of the organ."

- 2) Needless to say, at Acts 19:2, "*ei Pneuma Hagion elabete pisteusantes*" should be translated: "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you started to trust" (in whosoever or whatsoever). It cannot mean, as Pentecostals and other 'Second Blessing' proponents insist: "Did you receive the Holy Spirit after you believed" in Christ. For that would require an altogether different Greek construction. Here, the weak translation given by the *KJV* ('since') has not been helpful.
- 3) Mk. 2:18 cf. 7:1-7 & Mt. 23:15 cf. Jh. 9:28. 4) Acts 17:18 & Tit. 1:12f.
- 5) I Cor. 15:29. There, Paul's twice referring to the Necrobaptists as "they" -- is in stark contrast with his calling Christians "we" in the very next verse at I Cor. 15:30, and also in stark contrast with "I" (repeatedly) in verses 31f. See too M. Rissi's *Baptism for the Dead*, Zwingle, Zurich, 1962.
- 6) Thus Josephus, Schuerer, Lightfoot, & Kittel. See F.N. Lee's *Sprinkling is Scriptural*, in *The Presbyterian*, Bristol, England, July, 1990, pp. 24f.
- 7) Acts 19:3 ("*eis to Iooannou baptisma*"). Note both the similarities and the differences between this expression and: "the Baptism of John" or "to *baptisma Iooannou*" in Mt. 21:35; "from the Baptism of John" or "*apo tou baptisματος Iooannou*" in Acts 1:22; "the Baptism which John preached" or "*to baptisma ho ekeeruxen Iooannees*" in Acts 10:37; and "John...preached beforehand...the Baptism of repentance" or "*prokeeruxantos Iooannou...baptisma metanoias*" in Acts 13:24.
- 8) Acts 19:2b ("*oud' ei pneuma hagion estin eekousamen*").
- 9) F.N. Lee: *The Anabaptists and their Stepchildren*, 3 Kenya St., Wavell Hgts, 4012, Australia, 1997 ed., p. 115 at n. 294.
- 10) Acts 19:4 ("*Eipen de Paulos Iooannees men ebaptisen baptisma metanoias, too; laoo; legoon eis ton Erchomenon met' auton hina pisteusoosin, tout' estin ton Christon Ieesoun.*") It is the *Textus Receptus* which here has "*men*." See Calvin's *Comm. on Acts 19:5* & *Inst. IV:15:18* & his *Treatise Against the Anabaptists* (Baker, Grand Rapids, rep. 1982). Note that "*Christon*" is omitted in *P<sup>38</sup>*, *Aleph\** & *A & B & E & 614 pc lat.* 13 & 25 & 40 & *Vulg. & Boh. & Syr. H. & Aethr<sup>ro</sup>*. Thus: Tisch., W.H., *RV*, Weiss, Wundt & Blass. *D* has "*eis Christon*." The reading "*eis ton Ieesoun Christon*" is found in: *Sah., Gig. & Pesch.* Other readings have: "*Christon Ieesoun*." On the Samaritan Simon's disciple Menander, see nn. 35 & 382.
- 11) Acts 19:5 ("*akousantes de ebaptistheesan eis to Onoma tou Kuriou Ieesou*"). Here, "*akousantes*" is the aorist participle of the Greek verb for 'hear' or 'hear-ken' (*akouein*). This, like the word for 'hearken' in the Germanic languages, cf. the German '*horchen*' ('hearken') and its cognate '*gehorschen*' ('obey'), usually means not merely to 'listen' but to 'hear well' and hence also to 'heed.' See too n. 10.
- 12) Thus R. Stier's *The Words of the Lord Jesus*, Clark, Edinburgh, 1970, VIII p. 292 n. 2. See too H. Heppe's *Reformed Dogmatics*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1978 ed., pp. 625f; and H.E. Gravemeijer's *Reformed Doctrine of Faith*, Wiarda, Sneek, Netherlands, 1888, III:20:25 p. 175 & nn. 1-3. After asserting cogently that Baptisms administered by John were irrepeatable Christian Water-Baptisms, Calvin himself went on to suggest Paul did not himself give Water-Baptism but only Spirit-Baptism to his listeners in Acts 19:1-7. See Calvin's *Comm. Acts Apost.* on Acts 19:1-6 and his *Inst. IV:15:18*. See too the *Dordt Dutch Bible (Statenvertaling)*, Kok, Kampen, III:244:7 on Acts 19:4. Cf. Wolleb in J.W. Beardslee's *Reformed Dogmatics*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1965, p. 132.

The great and godly Lutheran Rev. Dr. Rudolph Stier rightly states (*op cit.* VIII p. 292 n. 1) there is nothing said about re-baptism in Acts 19:4-7. Those who had been baptized by John the Baptizer, were not baptized again with water. See Acts 1:5. Here in Acts 19:5f, in the case of those who were already removed and estranged from the proclamation of John, it was needful that the law of the Kingdom should be maintained and attested. This was their first-ever Christian Baptism, right then administered by the Apostle Paul. Thus Stier, stating the Historic-Lutheran view against rebaptism. Cf. too Luther himself (at nn. 215-220).

The Lutheran Stier further argues (*op. cit.* pp. 292f) that in Acts 19:5, "*akousantes*" ['they heard'] refers back to *eipe te pros autous* ['he said to them' meaning 'Paul said to the twelve Unitarians'], verse 3; and "*ebaptistheesan*" ['they were baptized'] stands in parallel with "*kai epithentos autois*" or 'he had laid upon them' (meaning "when Paul had laid his hands upon them") in Acts 19:6. The text thus seems to mean that the Apostle Paul was here informing those men at Ephesus about what John himself had really taught. This would then show that those who previously heard John preaching and who had then heeded

John's message that they should believe in the One soon coming after him -- were there and then baptized by John into the Name of that then-coming Messiah (*viz.* Jesus Christ).

This historic Lutheran view is shared also by Historic-Calvinists. It is simply that Johannine Baptism is Christian Baptism -- so that none of John's baptizees should ever be re-baptized. Thus Gravemeijer's *op. cit.* III:20:10 pp. 76f & 81f. Yet in the same work (III:20:25 p. 175), Gravemeijer also argued that the verses Acts 19:4-6 do not teach that the Unitarians were then baptized by Paul with water. Gravemeijer reasons: Paul there merely told those men at Ephesus that after John himself had urged the people to believe in Christ alias the Spirit-anointed Messiah -- those who then heeded John's urgings were soon baptized by John himself in the Name of the One Who was then coming after him (*viz.* the Lord Jesus). After Paul had finished telling this to the twelve men at Ephesus, claims Gravemeijer, Paul simply laid his hands 'waterlessly' on them, so that they then received the Spirit *etc.*

Gravemeijer grounds this view on the fact that what he calls the "foundational text" has '*men...de*' at Acts 19:4-5. Thus the various editions of the *Textus Receptus*. Compare those of Stephens (1550), of Bloomfield (1843), and of Knowling even in the 1908 *Expositor's Greek Testament* (where however the '*men*' is noted as omitted in *Aleph, A B, D, Vulg., Sah., Ara., Tisch., W.R., PF, Weiss & Wendt*). Kuyper too emphasized this omission (see n. 14 below).

Gravemeijer thus reads Acts 19:4-6 as follows: "Then Paul said 'John truly (*men*) baptized with the Baptism of repentance, saying to the people that they should believe in Him Who would come after him,' that is, in Christ Jesus. When (*de*) they [John's people] heard [or heeded], they were baptized [by John and in Palestine] into the Name [unto the authority] of the Lord Jesus. Then, when Paul had laid his hands on them [the later Ex-Unitarians twenty-five years later in Ephesus], the Holy Spirit came upon them" *etc.*

According to Gravemeijer these Lukan verses are thus to be taken together as stating what Paul said, in corrective response to the Unitarians' statement anent "the baptism of John" at the end of Acts 19:3. Only after recording this statement of Paul to the Unitarians about what John had really taught, does Luke go on to mention what Paul the Apostle next did to them (in Acts 19:6). The Unitarians apparently repented under Paul's preaching, and thereby became Ex-Unitarian Trinitarians. Yet further -- Paul then applied no water whatsoever to those Ex-Unitarians, but simply laid his hands on them. They were, claims Gravemeijer, "baptized by John, and confirmed by Paul."

If Gravemeijer were to be right in all this, Calvin too (see at nn. 256 & 396-400) would be right in suggesting that Paul did not at all apply water to those Ex-Unitarians. This would be so, even though in the view of Gravemeijer (*op. cit.* III:20:25 p. 175 n. 3) Calvin "wrongly understands Acts 19:5 of Baptism with the Holy Spirit." Either way, however, to both Calvin and Gravemeijer there would then be no possibility of the Ex-Unitarians in Ephesus having been rebaptized with water by Paul. Too, also Acts 19:4b uses the plural '*pisteusoosin*' (apparently still in respect of the singular *too, laoo*; in 19:4a). This, also taken together with the possible reading '*men...de*' -- lends some credence to Gravemeijer's hypothesis.

- 13) Acts 19:5-6 (*Vulg.*): "*his auditis, baptizati sunt in nomine Domini Jesu. Et cum imposuisset illis manus Paulus.*" Either way, however, there is no re-baptism at Acts 19:5. Indeed, it says there: "they were baptized"; not "re-baptized."
- 14) A. Kuyper: *On the Sacraments* pp. 127f & 134f (in his *Dogmatic Dictations*, IV, Kok, Kampen, Netherlands, 2nd ed., I-VI). There, when discussing Acts 19:1-7, Kuyper rightly explains: "The twelve men had not been baptized by John. They themselves say: 'We have not heard whether there is a Holy Spirit!' So Paul explains to them what the Baptism of John meant.... One group of John's disciples had sought to perpetuate themselves; had gone astray. This is easily to be grasped. For John himself fell into doubt. Part of John's circle had [previously] joined Jesus. Another part perpetuated itself as a sectarian group."

Long before meeting Paul, "these twelve [Acts 19:1-7] had been 'baptized' *eis* to *Iooannou baptisma* -- into the 'baptism of John.' "This *eis* [or 'into'] indicates what was regarded as the highest within their group. For them, it was as if John was the revelation of God.... The preaching about Jesus and about the Holy Spirit fell away!" Kuyper concludes that "Paul did not here re-baptize. But he administered Baptism in the Name of Jesus." Acts 19:5f. That is to say, Paul then gave the Ex-Unitarians in that group the very first triune Water-Baptism they had ever received.

Kuyper continues: "Paul had asked them more closely: 'Into what were you baptized?' They modestly replied: 'Into John's baptism.'

"They had therefore been mised. They had apparently not been baptized by John himself. For then, they could not have expressed themselves thus. No, they had been 'baptized' by somebody who pointed them through that 'Baptism' to John -- as if he had been the highest teacher!

"What lurks behind this, is not unclear. Indeed, the Gospels report to us that -- after the actions of Jesus -- a certain competition began to occur with a few disciples of John who had refused to go to Jesus. They had not understood that the Baptism of John itself fell away when Jesus began to act. Therefore they continued John's work, after his decapitation.

In this way, the contrast arose automatically. They baptized into the name of John, while the disciples of Jesus baptized in the Name of the Messiah.

"Here one therefore encounters a false sect -- a sect of "John's men," who had not understood John himself. Wholly in conflict with his intention, they had gone and upheld his work as an independent revelation -- over against the Messiah... Shortly after John had undergone the martyr's death, it was far from unnatural that a few short-sighted persons among his disciples would start to honour this martyr excessively -- and place him wholly alongside and even above Jesus. In that way, this sect of John's disciples seems to have propagated itself. As then often happens, it falsified the true character of John's Baptism more and more. "John himself from the very beginning of his Water-Baptism pointed only to that greater Baptism with the Holy Spirit which Jesus would give. But the sect was silent about that! It ceased to refer to Jesus altogether, and did not even mention the Holy Spirit. Whereas the genuine disciples of John were led to Jesus automatically, these false disciples of John slid further and further away from Jesus. John himself became their one and all. And thus they had started 'baptizing' in the name of John!"

"For Paul, the matter was therefore very simple. All that he had to do, was to point these misguided men to the genuine John and his genuine preaching... This implies that Paul refuted them that they had indeed received Johannine Baptism. They had not been baptized by John himself, and none of John's disciples possessed the right or the power to baptize into his name... They had therefore not been baptized at all -- neither by John himself, [nor by the true disciples of John,] nor by the disciples of Christ. Therefore, they could not be regarded as anything other than unbaptized... They had not been baptized by John. For, says Paul, the Baptism of John pointed precisely to a promise in connection with the Messiah..."

"One therefore sees that even this episode does not support the assumption that those whom John baptized, only later received the actual Christian Baptism. To the contrary, it contradicts it as unfounded... Paul's pointing these so-called disciples of John to the genuine Baptism of John -- in contradiction to the pseudo-baptism which they had received from incompetents, indeed goes to prove precisely what the Reformed have always maintained. Namely, that he who had actually been baptized by John the Baptizer who pointed to the Messiah -- was rebaptized neither by Paul nor by any other Apostle."

See also A. Kuyper's *E Voto Dordraceno* alias *From the Decrees of Dordt* (Wormser, Amsterdam, 1892, pp. II:440-44 & 509f). In *ib.* p. 511 n. 1, Kuyper holds against Calvin and others that the Greek particle men, upon which the 1637f *Dordt Dutch Bible* had relied, does not occur in the most reliable manuscripts at Acts 19:4. See too at nn. 309 & 396-400.

- 15) P.N. Lee: *Rebaptism Impossible!*, STD dissertation, Whitefield Theological Seminary, Fla., U.S.A., 1991, pp. 540. See our main text at nn. 378-400.
- 16) See n. 12. Also consult: J.H. De Moor's *Perpetual Commentary on A Marck V:400f*; Gravemeijer's *op. cit.* III:20:25 p. 175 at its nn. 1-3; A. Kuyper Sr.'s *Sac.* pp. 134f (in his *Dog. Dict.* IV). Also see Wolleb(ius), in Beardslee's *op. cit.* p. 132. See too H. Hoeksema's *Reformed Dogmatics*, Reformed Free Pub. Assoc., Grand Rapids, 1966, pp. 670-74; and the *Acts of Reformed Ecumenical Synod*, RES Offices, Grand Rapids, 1953, p. 51.
- 17) *Didache*, ch. 7. 18) *Ep. Barn.* 8f & 11. 19) *Clem.: 1st Cor.* 9:4, *cf.* I Pet. 3:20f.
- 20) *Ib.* ch. 21, *cf.* I Cor. 1:16 & 2:10-12 & 7:14 & 12:13.
- 21) *Clem.: 1st Cor.* 46:5 & 63(53):3 & 65(55)1, *cf.* Acts 1:5 & 2:1-4,14-21,36-39. 22) See n. 17 and the citation quoted there.
- 23) Justin Martyr: *First Apology* ch. 66. 24) Tertullian: *On Baptism* ch. 6.
- 25) Clement of Alexandria: *Who Is the Rich Man that Shall be Saved?*, 34 & 40. 25) Origen on Romans 6.
- 27) Cyprian's *Epistle to Jubaius*. 28) Athanasius: *Epistle to Serapion*. 29) Didymus: *The Holy Spirit* II.
- 30) Augustine: *Against the Donatists*, V:25. 31) Irenaeus: *Heresies* I:23:1 to I 27:1ff & IV:8:1.
- 32) Augustine: *Fract on John's Gospel*, VI:9,12f,17f.
- 33) See Gravemeijer's *op. cit.* III:20:25 pp. 172f (cited in our main text above under the heading of "Baptism irrepeatable not only at Ephesus but also in Ephesian *Epistle*" at Eph. 4:5 (on p. 13 above).
- 34) See n. 31. 35) Tertullian: *Prescriptions Against All Heresies*, ch. 1.
- 36) P. Schaff: *History of the Christian Church*, Berdmans, Grand Rapids, 1970, II p. 486f.
- 37) Epiphanius: *Heresies* 42 (*Marcionistae*). 38) Just. Mart.: *1st Ap.* 26 & 58.
- 39) Clement of Alexandria: *Stromata* III:3. 40) Just. Mart.: *Dialogue with Trypho* chs. 43,14,29,18 & 19:2f.
- 41) Tert.: *Against Marcion*, I:14 & I:28. 42) Tert.: *Bap.* 15.
- 43) See arts. 'Great Mother of the Gods' alias 'Cybele' and 'Taurobolium' in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, New York, 1929; art. 'Taurobolium' in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, Chicago, 1974, *Macroaedia* IX:844; Sir J.G. Frazer's *The Golden Bough*, Macmillan, New York, 1983 rep., pp. 117,407-14; and P.N. Lee: *Pentecostalism -- New Outpouring or Ancient Heresy?*, Commonwealth Publishing, Dallas, 1986, pp. 14f & 18-26. 44) Philaster: *Heresies* 49.

- 45) Art. *Baptism for the Dead* in *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1960. See too Chrysostom's *Homily XL* on I Cor.; and Epiph. *Her.* 28:6. 46) P. Schaff: *Ch. Hist.*, II pp. 421.
- 47) H. Percival: *Notes*, in *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church* (hereinafter called *NPWF*), Second Series, Erdmans, Grand Rapids, 1971 ed., XIV, pp. ix & 20. 48) Epiph.: *Her.* 48-49.
- 49) Art. *Montanism* in (ed.) J.D. Douglas's *The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1974, p. 674; J.H. Kurtz's *Church History*, Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1894, I p. 201; Gravemeijer's *op. cit.* p. 178.
- 50) Clem. Alex.: *Paedagogue* I:5f; *Strom.* II:3,13 & IV:24f; *Who is the Rich Man?* 42.
- 51) *Paedog.* 3:12; *Exhortation to the Heathen* 10:12-23,59f; *Rich Man*, 34,40,42; compare *Protrepticus* 9:82.
- 52) *Paedog.* 1:5f; 3:12. 53) *Rich Man* 34 & 40. 54) *Strom.* V:11. 55) *Ib.* 1:16-17 & 8:18.
- 56) *Paedog.* I:5f & *Strom.* II:3,13 & IV:24f; cf. too his *Rich Man* 42.
- 57) *Rich Man* 34 (cf. 40); *Fragment XI*; *Oration on Luke 15*, 6-7. 58) *Paedog.* 3:12, and *Exhort. Heath.* 10:12-23 & 59f.
- 59) Tert.: *Bap.* chs. 1,4,6,12 & 15. 60) Tert.: *On Repentance* ch. 6. 61) Tert.: *Chaplet*, ch. 3.
- 62) J.D. Douglas (ed.) *New Int. Dict. Chr. Church*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1974, p. 176. There, Rev. Dean G.T.D. Angel observes: "Bishop Callistus...maintained...second baptism was permitted."
- 63) On Callistus, see Hippolytus's *Philosoph.*, referred to in Schaff's *Ch. Hist.* II:263 n. 2.
- 64) See J. Jansen's *Infant Baptism Justified*, Kok, Kampen, n.d., *in loco*.
- 65) See in J. Jeremias's *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries*, S.C.M., London, 1960, pp. 14f, 31f, 87f.
- 66) Hippolytus: *Apostolic Tradition*, 21:3. 67) Hippol.: *Refutation of All Heresies*, VI:1-8 & 34-38.
- 68) Schaff's *Ch. Hist.* II pp. 763-4. 69) Hippol.: *Refut. All Her.* 8:12. 70) *Ib.* 10:21f.
- 71) Hippol.: *Refut. All Her.* 9:7, in *Ante-Nicene Fathers* (hereinafter referred to as *ANF*), Erdmans, Grand Rapids, 1971, V p 160.
- 72) Hippol.: *Discourse on the Holy Theophany* 2,4-6,8-10. 73) Eusebius: *Church History*, 6:19:10.
- 74) See J. Jeremias: *Origins of Infant Baptism*, Allenson, Napierville Ill., 1962, p. 75.
- 75) Origen: *Commentary on John* VI:13, cf. I Rgs. 18:33f and Mal. 3:1-4 & 4:5-6 & John 1:25.
- 76) Orig.: *Commentary on Romans* V:9 (on 6:5-7). 77) Orig.: *Homilies on Luke* (XIV, on 2:22a).
- 78) Orig.: *Homilies on Leviticus* (VIII 3 on 12:2).
- 79) Cited in J. Bajis's *Infant Baptism?*, Conciliar Press, Mt. Hemon Ca., n.d., at nn. 18f.
- 80) Origen: *Commentary on John* VI:13 (cf. too VI:14 & VI:16). 81) *Ib.* VI:26f. 82) Orig.: *Commentary on Matthew* X:18.
- 83) *Didaskalia* 16 & 24. H.P. Stander & J.P. Louw: *Baptism in the Early Church*, Garsfontein, South Africa, 1988, pp. 81 & 86.
- 84) *Op. cit.*, p. 3 n. 18. 85) See n. 83. 86) *Ep.* VI in *ANF* VI p. 102. 87) Euseb.: *Ch. Hist.* VII:7:1.
- 88) Thus *Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers* (hereinafter referred to as *NPWF*) 2nd Ser. I p. 295 col. 2 n. 1.
- 89) Euseb.: *Ch. Hist.* VII:7:4. 90) *Id.*, & *ib.* VI:3:2 & ch. 15. 91) *Ib.* VII:7:5. 92) *Ib.* VII:3. 93) *Ib.* VII:9:1-6.
- 94) *Ib.* VI:3 (and *NPWF* 2nd Ser. I p. 251 n. 2). 95) Euseb.: *Ch. Hist.* VII:3:1.
- 95) Significantly, Basil (in his *Ep.* 188:1) implies Dionysius recognized as valid those baptisms which were administered by "the Pepuzeni." This probably means the more moderate (and clearly trinitarian) Montanists in Pepuza, as distinguished from the more radical and non-trinitarian Hypermontanists both there and elsewhere.
- 96) *Ch. Hist.* VII:9:6. 97) Gennadius: *Ecclesiastical Writings*, ch. 27. 98) *ANF* V p. 665. 99) *Op. cit.* 6, in *ANF* V p. 671.
- 100) *Op. cit.* 8, in *ANF* V p. 671. 101) *Op. cit.* 15 compare 6, in *ANF* V pp. 676 & 670.
- 102) Athanasius: *Decrees of the Nicene Synod* ch. 26.
- 103) *ANF* VIII pp. 363-5. See too VI pp. 78 & 92-94 = *II Ep. Dion. Alex.* 1-15 (to Dionysius of Rome).
- 104) Dionysius of Rome: *Against the Sabellians* 1-3.
- 105) W. Cunningham: *Historical Theology*, Banner of Truth rep., London, 1960, I pp. 167-69. 106) Chs. 8 & 11. 107) Ch 7.
- 108) *Tryph.* 46,66,86; *Prag.* 10 & 11; *1st Apol.* 62 & 64. 109) *Adv. Haer.* 3:17:1f cf. 4:22:1.
- 110) *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 200 A.D. onward, seems to have embraced the triple submersionism of that heterodox sect. See too, however, his *De Cor.* 3 & 4, in which latter chapter he admits that even Semi-Montanistic immersionism lacks "positive Scriptural injunction."
- 111) Cf. Eusebius: *Hist. Eccl.* 6:5.
- 112) *Strom.* 1:23 & 2:649 & 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.
- 113) *Refut. All Her.* 10:856.
- 114) *Comm. on John* 6:13-16,26f; *Hexapla* at I Rgs. 18:33f (*LXX* III Rgs. 18:33), rendering "pour it" as 'baptizing.' It should be recalled that Origen himself was an Alexandrian hellenist. Cf. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 6:19.

- 115) *Ep. to Magnus*, 12,13,16 (cf. Migne's *Patrologia Latina* III:1196-2000); *Eps.* 69 (citing Num 19:8f & 8:5f), 70, 72 & 73:17. Cf. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 6:5,43 & Petavius's *Opus de Theol. Dog.* & Wall's *History of Infant Baptism*, Oxford, 1844, I pp 142-160 & II p 386.
- 116) Cf. Moschus's *Prat. Spir.* 176. 117) Cf. Euseb. *Hist. Eccl.* 6:5; *On the Council of Nicaea* canon 12. 118) *Inst. Div.* 4:15.
- 119) *Quaest. ad Ant.* [in *Patrologia Graeco-Latina* 28:644C-D,760A-C]; cf. Sozomen's *Church History* 2:17 & *Cons. Epon.* 26.
- 120) *Apost. Const.* 6:15. 121) *Cat.* 3:4,15,16 & 16:30. 122) *Hilary Opera* 1:238. 123) *Opera* 3:428.
- 124) *Opera* 2:428,372; *Orations* 34:17 & 39:1-3,17; *Disc.* 40. 125) *In Bapt. Chr.* 126) *Canon* 7.
- 127) *Amb.*: *Opera* 1:727f & 3:399,424 & 4:827-9,875. 128) *Did. Alex.*: *Opera* 713.
- 129) *Opera* 5:341f; *Commentaries on the Psalms* 50(51):7 and *Ezekiel* 36:22f & 16:4 and *Zechariah* 13:1.
- 130) *Commentary on Isaiah* (4:4); *Polished Disc. on Leviticus* (14:1-7); and *Disc. on the Book of Numbers* (on ch. 19).
- 131) Theodoret: *Hist. Eccl.* 3:10-12 & 5:18 (on Ps. 51 [LXX = 50]: 1-7 & on *Ezk.* 36:25 & *Lech.* 13:1); *Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews* (9:10).
- 132) Cited in R. Ayres: *Christian Baptism*, Relly, London, n.d., pp. 620-34; cf. too pp: 268-70; 281-82,289; 50,103f,121f;292f; 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; 365-69; 375; 594-96; 385-8; 104f; 123f,383f; 93,379-82; & 620-26.
- 133) *Ib.*, pp 467-555f. 134) J. Adams: *The Meaning and Mode of Baptism*, Presb. & Ref. Pub. Co., Phillipsburg N.J., 1975, p. 8.
- 135) Thus S. Angus in his *The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World*, Murray London, 1929, pp. 166f & nn. 1: "The organization of the [Roman] Catholic Church was largely the creation of the genius of Cyprian, who was a firm believer in magic.... In several of the [Pagan] Mystery-Religions, 'baptism' was the means to the remission of the penalties of sin and of regeneration.... Cf. Tertullian...*Adv. Haer.* 40 [cf. ch. 7 in Eerdmans ed. of *ANF* III]. The baptism of the *taurobolium* was valid for twenty years." Compare too the Traditionalistic Romanist Prof. Dr. B.V. Miller's *The Eucharistic Sacrifice*, Burns Oates & Washbourne, London, 1930, p. 17: "All competent scholars are agreed that from the end of the third century the [Roman] Catholic theology...was fixed.... It is maintained by many that this is a perversion of the primitive doctrine, and the principal author of the innovation and of the change in the current of theological tradition is said to be St. Cyprian."
- 136) J.P. Murphy: *The Sacrament of Baptism*, Burnes Oates & Washbourne, London, 1929, pp. 11-14.
- 137) C. Petersen: *Constantine the Great and his Sons*, art. in Schaff-Herzog's *Encyclopaedia of Religious Knowledge*, Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1891, I p. 546.
- 138) *NPNF* IV pp. v & 481. 139) Athanasius: *Tome [Synodical Letter] to People of Antioch* 1. 140) *Ib.* 10. 141) *Ib.* 1.
- 142) *Ib.* 11. 143) Wall: *Hist. of Inf. Bapt.*, Oxford, 1862 ed., II:3:3. 144) *Ep.* 59:12 (to Epictetus), in *NPNF* IV p. 570 n. 1.
- 145) Athanasius: *Four Discourses Against the Arians* II:40f. 146) Ath.: *Questions to Antioch*, in Ayres's *op. cit.* p. 356.
- 147) Ath.: *Questions on Paul's Epistles*, in Ayres's *op. cit.* p. 357.
- 148) Sozomen: *Ch. Hist.* 2:17. See the discussion in Ayres's *op. cit.* pp. 359-363.
- 149) In Migne: *Patrologia Graeco-Latina* 28 col. 760 ABC. See too Ath.: *On the [Trinity and] the Holy Spirit*, comp. *NPNF*, 2nd Ser., IV, p. lxiv (35). See too John of Damascus: *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* (in *NPNF*, 2nd Ser., IX, p. 78 nn. 8-9f & p. 79 nn. 1-9f).
- 150) *Op. cit.* pp. 357f. 151) Cyril of Jerusalem: *Catechetical Lectures* V:6 & XII:15. 152) Cyr. Jerus.: *Procatechesis* 7.
- 153) *Apostolic Constitutions* II:3:7. 154) *Ib.* VI:3:15. 155) Ambrose's *On Elijah* 84-85 and *Exposition of Luke's Gospel* 1:37.
- 156) Ambrose: *Of the Christian Faith* 4:31. 157) *Amb.*: *On the Sacraments* 2:7. 157) *Amb.*: *On the Mysteries* IV:24 & V:28.
- 158) *Ib.* VI:29f & VII:34f & VIII:43. 159) *Amb.*: *Concerning Repentance* II:7-12.
- 160) Augustine: *Reply to Faustus the Manichaean* V:3 & XIX:9, in *NPNF*, 1st Ser., IV pp. 151, 163 & 242f.
- 161) Aug.: *Epistle* 23 (in *NPNF*, 1st Ser., I pp. 242f). See Douglas's *op. cit.* p. 229. See too Aug.: *Tract 67* (on *Holy Baptism*).
- 162) Aug.: *On Baptism Against the Donatists* I:10:13 to I:12:18. 163) *Ib.* II:15:220. 164) *Ib.* V:20 & VI:21:29. 165) *Ib.* VI:1:1.
- 166) Aug.: *Tract on John's Gospel* V:18.
- 167) John Chrysostom: *Homily to Neophytes*, cited in Augustine's *Against Julian the Pelagian* I:6:21f.
- 168) Chrys.: *Homilies on Genesis* (ch. 17) XL. 168) Chrys.: *Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles* (18:18f), XL:1f.
- 169) Chrys.: *Homilies on the Epistle to the Romans* (6:1-11) X-XI. 170) Chrys.: *Homilies on Ephesians* (1:14) II.
- 171) *Ib.* (2:16) V. 172) *Ib.* (4:5) XI. 173) Chrys.: *Homilies on Hebrews* (6:1-3), *NPNF*, 1st Ser., XIV, pp. 409-11.
- 174) *ANF* VII p. 388. Compare too L. Feehan's *Dionysius Exiguus (d. between 525-544)*, art. in ed. Douglas's *op. cit.* p. 300.
- 175) *Apostolic Canons* 47 & 50. 176) *Apostolic Canons* 50, according to Ayres's *op. cit.* p. 594.
- 177) Compare *Apost. Can.* XLII *ap. Cotel. Patres Apost.* i.449.
- 178) *First Ecumenical Council of Constantinople* (A.D. 381), can. 7; in *NPNF* XIV p. 185. 179) See n. 176.
- 180) John Damascene: *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* IV:9. 181) Ayres: *op. cit.* pp. 620f.

- 182) Schaff: *Ch. Hist.* IV pp. 574-79; Lee: *The Anabaptists*, pp. 9f.
- 183) J. Hefele: *History of the Councils*, 1st ed., I para. 17. See too G.E. Steitz: *Baptism* (in Schaff-Herzog's *Enc. of Relig. Knowl.* I:201). See too H.S. Burrage: *Act of Baptism*, American Baptist Pub. Soc., 1878, p. 99.
- 184) Philaret: *Russian Catechism* alias *The Longer Catechism of the Orthodox Catholic Eastern Church* QQ. 288 & 290 (in Schaff: *Creeds of Christendom*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1983 ed., II pp. 445 & 491). Compare too Schaff's *Ch. Hist.* II pp. 265.
- 185) Philaret: *Russ. Cat.* QQ. 292-94 & 303f (in Schaff's *Creeds* II p. 492f). Cf. too the *Orthodox Confession of the Eastern Church* QQ. XCIV-CII, and the *Confession of Dositheus*, Dec. XVI (in Schaff's *Creeds* II p. 371-76, & 423-37).
- 186) Schaff: *Ch. Hist.* V pp. 483-85; S. Miller's *Infant Baptism Scriptural and Reasonable*, Presb. Board of Pubs., 1835, p. 30.
- 187) Peter Lombard: *Sentences* (IV dist. 6A). 188) Wall: *op. cit.* I p. 497 & II pp. 240ff & 270f.
- 189) M. Luther's *Postille on Matthew 8:1*, in his *Works*, Weimer ed., I:172 pp. 81f (cited in L. Verduin's *The Reformers and their Stepchildren*, Paternoster, Exeter, 1964, p. 196).
- 190) A.H. Newman: *History of Anti-pedobaptism*, Philadelphia, 1897, p. 61.
- 191) S. Miller: *Infant Baptism*, in *Baptism and Christian Education*, Presb. Heritage, Dallas, 1984 rep., pp. 28-30.
- 192) 1655 *Waldensian Confession* art. 33 (cf. 29 & 31), in Schaff's *Creeds* III pp. 757 & 766-69.
- 193) Thomas Aquinas: *Summa Theologiae* III Q. 66-69. 194) *Ib.* Q. 60,2. 195) Schaff's *Ch. Hist.* V p. 671.
- 196) Thomas's *Summa* III Q. 68,1. 197) Thos. Aq.: *Summa* Part. iii, Quast. 66, Art. 7.
- 198) J. Bonaventura: *Sentences* IV:13:2:2.
- 199) See J. Wycliffe's *Trialogue* IV:11 & *Dialogues* IV:4 fol. 118f (ed. 1525). Cited in Wall's *op. cit.* II pp. 212f.
- 200) R. Vaughan *Tracts and Treatises of John de Wycliffe, D.D.*, Wycliffe Society, London, 1845, pp. 156 & 159 cf. p. 59.
- 201) J. Foxe: *Book of Martyrs*, 2nd ed., I, p. 485. See too Book II pp. 94-96 in the version edited by Rev. Dr. A. Clarke (Ward & Lock, London, n.d.).
- 202) P. Schaff: *op. cit.*, V pp. 258f, 370f, 381f, & 387f.
- 203) For proof of all these above claims, see the documentation given in F.N. Lee: *Antichrist in Scripture -- Luther and Calvin's Doctrine of Antichrist*, Pocus Christian Ministries Trust, Lewes, England, 1992, pp. 8f -- citing Schaff's *Church History* (VI p. 381); Luther's *Works*, Muhlenberg, Philadelphia, 1960, American ed., XXXI, pp. 307,313,321; XLVIII, p. 153; XXXII pp. 123, 128f,3,56,71,74f; *The Works of Martin Luther*, Holman ed., Philadelphia, 1915, II pp. 140f & 171; and Luther's *Writings*, Concordia, St. Louis, Walch ed., 1881, XV col. 1639, XIX cols. 70-71, & XV cols. 783-87.
- 204) Wall: *op. cit.* I p. 466 (& II p. 217). 205) *Creeds* I pp. 566f; *Ch. Hist.* VI pp. 397f.
- 206) See L. Verduin's *God's Stepchildren [The Anabaptists]*, Paternoster, London (see too n. 207); and, with J.C. Wenger, his *The Complete Writings of Menno Simons*, Herald, 1956. Also see Verduin's more recent *Anatomy of a Hybrid* and his *That First Amendment and the Remnant* (available 1998f from Carr Township Baptist Church, Borden, Ind., U.S.A.).
- 207) L. Verduin: *The Reformers and their Stepchildren*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1980, p. 197.
- 208) E.G.A. Boeckel: *Confessions of Evangelical Reformed Churches*, Brockhaus, Leipzig, 1847, pp. 779f, 789f. 209) *Ib.* pp. 811f.
- 210) M. Luther: *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church* (1520), Kok, Kampen, 1959, pp. 12. 211) Calv.: *Inst.* IV:2:11-12.
- 212) Luth.: *The Bab. Capt. of the Ch.* (in *Works* II pp. 170f).
- 213) Luth.: *The Bab. Capt. of the Ch.* (in Walch's *Luther's Collected Writings* XIX:76).
- 214) Luth.: *The Bab. Capt. of the Ch.* (in *Works*, Holman ed., II pp. 219f, 224f 230f & 235f).
- 215) Luther: "*Fides infantilis...ne illudatur majestas Sacramenti et Verbi.*" Cited in G.C. Berkouwer's *Karl Barth and Infant Baptism*, Kok, Kampen, 1947, p. 55.
- 216) Luth.: *Larger Catechism* 3. Cited in Berkouwer's *Karl Barth & Inf. Bap.* p. 56 & n. 11.
- 217) Luth.: *An Argument in Defence of all the Articles of Dr. Martin Luther wrongly condemned in the Roman Bull* (in *Works* III pp. 11, 20f, 50f & 60).
- 218) *Ib.* p. 62. 219) Luth.: *Germanized Little Baptismal Book* (in *Works*, ed. Muhlenberg, VI, p. 193).
- 220) G. Kramer: *The Connection between Baptism and Regeneration*, De Vecht, Breukelen, 1897, pp. 70f; Schaff: *Ch. Hist.* VII: pp. 59f & 606f and VIII pp. 584f.
- 221) Wall's *op. cit.* I p. 497 (cf. too Ayres's *op. cit.*).
- 222) E. Hulse: *An Introduction to the Baptists*, Carey, Sussex, 1976, p. 15. See too K. Holl: *Luther and the Anabaptists*, in *Collected Essays*, Tuebingen, 1932, I pp. 420f.
- 223) Schaff: *Ch. Hist.* VII pp. 442f. 224) L. Verduin: *God's Stepchildren*, Paternoster, London, p. 199.
- 225) L.B. Schenck: *The Presbyterian Doctrine of Children in the Covenant*, Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, 1940, p. 25.
- 226) O. Farner: *Hulrych Zwingli*, Zwingli Press, Zurich, 1943, I pp. 324 & 328; W. Koehler: *Hulrych Zwingli*, Koehler & Emelang, Leipzig, 1943, p. 64; J. Courvoisier: *Zwingli, a Reformed Theologian*, Epworth, London, 1964, p. 66.

- 227) Zwingli: *Concerning Baptism, Rebaptism and Infant Baptism*, in *Works*, ed. 1830, II:1, p. 301.
- 228) Hulse: *op. cit.* pp. 16f; W.M.S. West: *The Anabaptists and the Rise of the Baptist Movement* (in ed. A. Gilmore's *Christian Baptism*, Lutterworth, London, 1959, p. 244). 229) Schaff: *Ch. Hist.* VIII pp. 77f.
- 230) B. Hubmaier: *Works*, ed. G.D. Davidson, 1939, pp. 92f (referring to a discussion of Zwingli's *Little Handbook for Infant Baptism*).
- 231) B. Hubmaier: *Concerning the Christian Baptism of Believers*. Zwingli's own 1527 work was titled *Concerning Doctor Balthazar's 'Little Book on Baptism' Thoroughly Answered*.
- 232) U. Zwingli: *Polemic against the Catabaptistic Catastrophe* (1527), in *Works* III pp. 257f & 424.
- 233) J. Calvin: *Commentaries on the First Book of Moses called Genesis*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1948, I pp. 458f; and Calvin's *Inst.* IV:16:9.
- 234) J. Calvin: *Commentaries on the Four Last Books of Moses arranged in the Form of a Harmony*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1948, I pp. 105f.
- 235) Calvin says the Circumcision in itself was "praepostera" (Latin) or "viciouse" (French) -- not invalida or invalide!
- 236) See n. 234. 237) Ex. 18:1-5. 238) Ex. 2:16,21,22f & ch. 3 & 4:24f *cf.* Acts 7:8,20,29 & Gen. 17:14.
- 239) *Cf.* F.N. Lee: *Have You Been Neglecting Your Baby? The Serious Consequences of Withholding Baptism from the Infants of Christians*, Jesus Lives, Brisbane, 1981.
- 240) J. Calvin: *Sermons on Deuteronomy* (1583), Banner of Truth, Edinburgh, 1987 rep., pp. 505 & 564 & 1245.
- 241) J. Calvin: *Commentaries on the Book of Joshua*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, n.d., pp. v & 79f (on Josh. 5:2-8 & 24:15), Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1948, pp. 80f & 276f.
- 242) J. Calvin: *Commentaries on the First Twenty Chapters of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, n.d., II:3 & 122 & 120f.
- 243) J. Calvin: *Commentary on a Harmony of the Evangelists*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1965, III pp. 380f; *cf.* too *Inst.* IV:3:4.
- 244) J. Calvin: *The Acts of the Apostles*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1965, I pp. 19f. 245) J. Calvin: *ib.*, p. 233. 246) *Ib.* p. 325.
- 247) *Ib.* II p. 149. 248) Acts 19:4. 249) J. Calvin: *Acts* II pp. 150f. 250) *Inst.* IV:15:18.
- 251) Calvin himself takes the further position -- we think wrongly -- that the verses Acts 19:1-3 refer to true disciples of John. Very fallibly, Calvin here claims "Paul's words suggest that they were true and genuine disciples of John, and Luke does them the honour of calling them disciples of Christ" -- emphases mine (F.N. Lee). See Calvin's *Acts of the Apostles*, II:151 on Acts 19:5. Here, however, Calvin has somewhat misread the passage. For Luke does not, with Calvin, call the twelve in Ephesus either "genuine disciples of John" or "disciples of Christ." Instead, Luke infallibly calls them simply "certain disciples" who claimed to have been baptized "into the Baptism of John." Acts 19:1-3. See too our own further discussion of this at nn. 396-400.
- 252) J. Calvin: *Inst.* IV:15:16 & IV:15:18. See, however, our own n. 251. 253) See nn. 12 & 14. 254) See nn. 15 & 381f.
- 255) See at nn. 249 & 252. 256) J. Calvin: *Inst.* IV:15:18. 257) J. Calvin: *Acts* II pp. 151. 258) See n. 256.
- 259) *Id.*, and *cf.* too our text at n. 267. 260) J. Calvin: *Inst.* IV:15:7f.
- 261) J. Calvin: *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans and Thessalonians*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1961, pp. 88f (on Rom. 4:10f).
- 262) J. Calvin: *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1968 rep., pp. 200f.
- 263) J. Calvin: *The Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews and First and Second Peter*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963, pp. v & xiv and 73f (on Heb. 6:2-4).
- 264) *Ib.*, pp. 230f & 293f (on I Pet. 1:1f & 3:19f).
- 265) W.J. McGlothlin: *Anabaptism* (art. in ed. J. Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion & Ethics* I, pp. xii & 406).
- 266) B.W. Parley: *Introduction to J. Calvin's Treatises Against the Anabaptists and against the Libertines*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1982 rep., p. 15.
- 267) J. Calvin: *Brief Instruction for Arming All the Good Faithful Against the Errors of the Common Sect of the Anabaptists*, in his *Treatises Against the Anabaptists and against the Libertines*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1982 rep., *in loco*.
- 268) Calvin's *Epistles* (No. 1212), in his *Opera* VIII:307-11.
- 269) See Schaff's *Ch. Hist.* VIII:634f; and also Calvin's *Ep.* 1323 of Dec. 1549 in *Op.* XIII:484-87.
- 270) See in *Corpus Reformatorum* XIII:308 & 486, and Calvin's *Letter 6th Sept. 1554*.
- 271) Calvin: *Acts of the Apost.*, I pp. v & 80 (on Acts 2:38).
- 272) R.S. Wallace: *Calvin's Doctrine of the Word and Sacrament*, Geneva Divinity School Press, Tyler Tx., 1982, pp. 187f.
- 273) Calvin's *The Gospel according to St. John*, Grand Rapids, 1959. I pp. v & 88 (on John 4:2).
- 274) *Corp. Ref.* IX:26. Cited in Wallace's *op. cit.* p. 174.
- 275) J. Calvin: *Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, n.d., I pp. xxi-xxiii & II p. 295.

- 276) (1) 1542 *Brief Form of a Confession of Faith*, in *Tracts & Treatises*, Berdmans, Grand Rapids, 1958, II pp. 134;  
 (2) 1544 *Necessity of Reforming the Church*, in *Tracts & Treat.*, I pp. 121 & 137 & 166f;  
 (3) 1547 *Antidote to the Seventh Session of the Council of Trent*, in *Tracts & Treat.* III pp. 173 & 176 & 179f & 182;  
 (4) 1547 *Appendix to the Tract on the True Method of Reforming the Church*, in *Tracts & Treat.*, III p. 351;  
 (5) 1549 *Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Hebrews*, Berdmans, Grand Rapids, 1963, pp. v & xiv & 73f;  
 (6) 1549 *Letter* (26th June 1549), in his *Opera* VIII:307-11;  
 (7) 1549 *Letter* No. 1323, Dec. 1549, in his *Opera* XIII:484-87;  
 (8) 1550 *Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians* (2:3-11), Berdmans, Grand Rapids, 1961;  
 (9) 1553 *Gospel according to St. John*, Berdmans, Grand Rapids, 1959, I pp. v & 88;  
 (10-15) 1554f various *Letters* 6th Sept. 1554, 7th Oct. 1555, 23rd Oct. 1555, 24th June 1556, 15th July 1556, & 7th Nov. 1559;  
 (16-18) 1555f *Sermons on Deuteronomy* (chs. 12 & 14 & 34);  
 (19) 1559 *French Confession of Faith*, art. 28;  
 (20) 1559 *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, IV:2:11f & IV:15:16-18;  
 (21) 1559f *Corpus Reformatorum* XIII:308 & 486;  
 (22) 1563 *Reply to the French Reformed Church* (cited in Quick's *Synodicon* I p. 48, and requoted by Charles Hodge in his art. *The Value of Romish Baptism*, in his *The Church and its Polity*, Nelson, London, 1879, p. 204); and  
 (23) 1564 *Commentaries on the First Twenty Chapters of the Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (posthumously-printed 1565), Berdmans, Grand Rapids, n.d., II:3 & 122 & 120f.
- 277) *Inst.* IV:15:16. 278) See P.N. Lee's *Rehap. Imposs.* II p. 468.
- 279) J. Calvin (& J. Chandieu): *French Confession of Faith*, arts. 28 & 35; in Schaff's *Creeds* I pp. 493f & 497 and III pp. 356 & 376-79.
- 280) J. Calvin: *Reply to the French Reformed Church* (1563). Cited in Quick's *Synodicon* I p. 48, and requoted by Ch. Hodge in his art. *The Value of Romish Baptism* (in his *Ch. Pol.*, p. 204).
- 281) Ch. Hodge: *Ch. Pol.* p. 204 n. +. 282) J. Calvin: *Inst.* IV:15:17. 283) *Ib.* IV:15:19 & IV:19:11.
- 284) J. Calvin's *Comm. on Acts* 8:38; and *Tracts & Treatises* III pp. 182 & 253.
- 285) J. Calvin: *Append. Tract True Meth. Reform. Ch.*, in *Tracts & Treat.* III p. 351. See too his *Inst.* IV:15:16-18.
- 286) J. Calvin: *Letter to Knox* (1559), in *Selected Works of John Calvin*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1983, VIII, pp. 73f.
- 287) Schaff: *Creeds* I pp. 93f & II pp. 77f. 288) *Ib.* II pp. 118f. 289) *Ib.* II pp. 139, 141 & 143 & 174.
- 290) We ourselves have only the very highest respect for most of the famous Thornwell's *theologoumena*. However, his various departures from Classic Calvinism are clearly seen in his anti-calvinian and indeed catabaptistic rejection of the validity of Baptism performed by Romanists -- and also in his anti-calvinian and indeed neo-manichean view that covenant infants should initially be regarded as "baptized unbelievers" and "enemies of God." See J.H. Thornwell's arts. *The Validity of the Baptism of the Church of Rome* and *The Revised Book Vindicated* (in his *Collected Writings*, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, 1974 rep., III:283f & IV:348). For a thorough refutation of Thornwell's catabaptism, see P.N. Lee's *Rebaptism Impossible!*, STD dissertation, Whitefield Theological Seminary, Lakeland Fla.; 1991, esp. II:353-84.
- 291) See the *Minority Report* (by Dr. John Thompson), of the Committee To Study the Validity of Certain Baptisms, to the 1984 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA). There, he implies that the architects of the *Majority Report* (namely Barker, Bogue, Knight and Settle) had departed from Calvin's Calvinism and instead catabaptistically followed the arguments of the maverick Thornwell. See too our own main text above, between its nn. 242 & 292.
- Indeed, according to the *Minutes of the General Assembly* of 1984 (p. 408) the 1984 *Majority Report* itself clearly states: "One of the problems remaining is the fact that John Calvin resisted the urging of the anabaptists that he, having been baptized by the Roman Catholics, should be (re-)baptized.... The effect that this situation had upon him can be seen in his insisting that Paul did not really baptize the disciples of John the Baptist in Ephesus and in his insisting that the baptism of John the Baptist is Christian baptism. This insistence, contrary to the text of the Scriptures, is so that he can assert that those were not 're-baptisms' at all in opposition to the anabaptists. The denomination in which Calvin was baptized was a church in flux, and coming to but not yet beyond the crossroads (cf. *Institutes* 4.2.11). It is not yet the church of the counter-reformation, the Council of Trent and its anathemas on the doctrine of justification by faith alone. See H.J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 'Sixth Session, Decree Covering Justification' and particularly 'Canon 9' (1547).
- The *Majority Report* is here seriously in error, in pontificating that Calvin's "insisting that the baptism of John the Baptist is Christian baptism" -- is "contrary to the text of the Scriptures." *Per contra*, the *West. Conf.* 27:3<sup>n</sup> & 28:1<sup>f</sup> & 28:2<sup>i</sup> & 28:5<sup>n</sup> & 28:6<sup>q</sup> and the *Westminster Larger Catechism* 165<sup>q</sup> & 177<sup>r</sup>. This insistent denial by the *Majority Report* that the

baptism of John the Baptist is Christian baptism" -- is identical to that same denial by Romanism which all of the Protestant Reformers repudiated. See the *Decrees of Trent*, Seventh Session, March 3 1547, On Baptism, Canon I: "If any one saith that the baptism of John had the same force as the baptism of Christ -- let him be *anathema*! Astoundingly, both Rome and the *Majority Report* here imply that Christ and His initial twelve Apostles were never baptized with Christian Baptism. Furthermore, the statement in the *Majority Report* that the "denomination in which Calvin was baptized was a church in flux" -- is irreconcilable with its statement on p. 409 that the "Roman Catholic" is one of those organizations which are "no churches of Christ" (even though the 1645 *Westminster Confession of Faith* 25:6 & 27:3 & 28:7 specifically states that it is indeed "in the Church" that "the Pope of Rome... exalteth himself"; that "neither doth the efficacy of a Sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it"; and that "the Sacrament of Baptism is but once to be administered to any person").

The *Majority Report* refers, in H.J. Schroeder's *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, especially to the 'Sixth Session' (held on January 13 1547) -- and specifically to the 'Decree Covering Justification' (and particularly to its 'Canon 9'). The *Majority Report* could also have noted Trent's June 17 1546 Fifth Session's 'Decree Concerning Original Sin' -- which in its fifth *anathema* curses anyone who "denies that, by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ which is conferred in baptism, the guilt of original sin is remitted."

It could also have noted that in Trent's March 3 1547's Seventh Session 'On the Sacraments in General' -- its Canon I curses anyone who alleges that the Sacraments are more or less than "seven"; and that its Canon VIII curses anyone who denies they operate "*ex opere operato*." It could further have noted that 'On Baptism' its Canon IV curses anyone who "saith that the baptism which is even given by heretics in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost with the intention of doing what the Church doth, is not true baptism"; and that its Canon XI curses anyone who "saith that baptism which was true and rightly conferred, is to be repeated for him who has denied the faith of Christ amongst Infidels."

It could also have noted that in Trent's November 25 1551's Fourteenth Session, its Chapter II prohibits "a repetition of baptism" to "those who are of 'the household of the faith' whom Christ our Lord has once by the laver of baptism made the members of his own body" -- "as baptism itself is for those who have not as yet been regenerated."

In view of the Presbyterian Church of America's toleration of pro-paedocommunionistic Ministers who reject the *Westminster Larger Catechism* Q. & A. 177, the *Majority Report* could also have noted that in Trent's July 16 1562's Twenty-first Session, it at Chapter IV's Canon IV curses the Eastern-Orthodox doctrine "that the communion of the Eucharist is necessary for little children before they have arrived at years of discretion." For, as stated at the outset of Trent's Chapter IV, "this same holy Synod teaches that little children who have not attained to the use of reason are not by any necessity obliged to the sacramental communion of the Eucharist: forasmuch as, having been regenerated by the laver of baptism, and being incorporated with Christ, they cannot at that age lose the grace which they have already acquired of being the sons of God."

Very significantly, the *Majority Report* is totally silent about the Historic Calvinistic acceptance (from Calvin right down to Hodge), everywhere internationally and also in the U.S.A., of all Baptisms performed by Romanists. Instead, it absolutizes the maverick baptismal views of Thornwell and those who supported him in 1845. It also ignores the anticatabaptistic testimony of all other post-1845 American Presbyterian denominations -- except for simply noting the anticatabaptistic "action of the 1981 Synod of the Reformed Presbyterian Church Evangelical Synod (RPCES), espousing and reiterating the objections of Charles Hodge" *etc.* Interestingly, the RPCES later joined the PCA.

Mercifully, the 1984 General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America approved (by a vote of 346 to 251) to receive "as information" both the *Majority Report* and the *Minority Report* (of Dr. John Thompson and as summarized by Teaching Elder G. Brent Bradley) and to make them both "available to the local churches for their consideration as they seek to determine the validity of certain baptisms." *Minutes* 12-47 & 12-51.

Even more mercifully, the 1985 General Assembly (*Minutes* p. 350) was given *inter alia* also the following unanimous Recommendations: "1. That local sessions are the best equipped, as well as being accountable under God, for judging whether the necessary criteria for valid baptism are present in a particular situation. 2. That one presented for Christian baptism as an infant by parents who profess the Christian faith, which parents are later judged to be unregenerate, has nevertheless received Christian baptism and ought not to be re-baptized. 3. That one who is baptized as a supposed convert upon profession of the Christian faith, but who subsequently believes himself to have been unregenerate at the time of his baptism, has nevertheless received Christian baptism and ought not to be re-baptized."

The matter of Baptisms in the Romish Church *etc.* was deferred till 1986, and then again till 1987. Very mercifully indeed, "the *Minority Report*'s recommendations...were...then adopted"; the gists of the previous decisions of 1984 & 1985 were then re-affirmed; and it was decided "that the Assembly leave decisions in these matters to be made, on a case by case basis, by the lower courts, subject to normal review and control or judicial processes." 1987 *Minutes* 15:74.

- 292) T. Beza: *The Christian Faith* (1558), Focus Christian Ministries Trust, Lewes, 1992 rep., pp. 63f & 84.
- 293) J. Knox: *Works* V:121-22,189 (cited in K. Reed's *A Warning Against the Anabaptists by John Knox*, Presbyterian Heritage, Dallas, 1984, pp. 4 & 13).
- 294) J. Knox: *Works* II:117 (cited in Schenck's *op. cit.* p. 38 at its n. 121).
- 295) *Select Practical Writings of John Knox*, Edinburgh, 1845 ed., pp. 253f (as cited in R. Ward's *Baptism in Scripture and History*, Wantirna, Melbourne, 1990f, p. 69).
- 296) *First Book of Discipline* ch. II 2nd Hd. 1-3; cf. IV 4th Hd. (1) 1-3; cf. XI 9th Hd. (1) 4. In F.M. Bradshaw: *Basic Documents on Presbyterian Polity*, Christian Education Committee, Presbyterian Church of Australia, 1984, pp. 11, 14, 37.
- 297) Knox's *Works* II:186 (cited in Schenck's *op. cit.* p. 38).
- 298) Thus: *The Liturgy of John Knox Received by the Church of Scotland in 1564*, University Press, Glasgow, 1886, p. 13.
- 299) A. Peterkin (ed.): *Booke of the Universall Kirk*, Edinburgh Printing and Publishing, Edinburgh, 1839, pp. 32-42.
- 300) *Belgic Confession*, arts. 28 & 29.
- 301) *Ib.*, arts. 33-38. The original Walloon text at art. 34, has: "doit etre une fois baptise' d'un seil bapteme sans jamais la reiterer... Nous detestons l'erreur des Anabaptistes, qui ne se contentent pas d'un seul bapteme une fois recu... Nous detestons l'erreurs des Anabaptistes." The Latin text shows the dire important of this: "Qui id satagit ut vitam aeternam consequatur." Here, the phrase "otherwise we would always have our head in the water" ("anders moesten wij altijd het hoofd in het water hebben") is original. Only from 1566 onward, was it omitted. Thus Gravemeijer's *op. cit.* III:20:26 p. 184 & n. 1.
- 302) See Gravemeijer's *op. cit.* III:19:8 p. 41. Compare too the Lutheran *Articles of Smalcald*: "The Romish doctrine proves that the pope is the true antichrist who has elevated himself above and against Christ, inasmuch as he would not have Christians saved without his power. That is, to put it actually, he elevates himself above and against God; as Paul says in Second Thessalonians 2."
- 303) G. de Bres: *The Radical Origin and Foundation of the Anabaptists*, ed. 1608, Bk. III.
- 304) Schaff's *Creeeds* III p. 233; compare *Second Helvetic Confession* chs. 19-22.
- 305) C. van der Waal: *The Canons of Dordt Do Not Dry Up!*, De Jongh, Johannesburg, 1973, pp. 29, 134, & 31f.
- 306) Session 162.II of the *Nahandelingen* alias the *Post-Acta* of the Synod of Dordt state: "Men zal den doop der papen (*Sacerdotum Romanensium*) die in deze landen omzwerven, en der Mennisten, niet zonder merkelyke (gewichtigen) reden (*non absque ratione sentica*) herhalen, maar naarstelyk onderstaan (*onderzoeken*) of de vorm en de substantieele dingen des doops (*naemelyk het gebruik des waters en de woorden der instelling*) zijn onderhouden; hetwelk bevonden zijnde, zoo zal men den doop geenzins herhalen." Thus Gravemeijer's *op. cit.* III:20:25 p. 180.
- 307) See C. Hodge's *Church Polity*, p. 204 and its nn. \* & †.
- 308) See: *Het Nieuwe Testament of Alle Boeken des Nieuwen Verbonds onzes Heeren Jezus Christus door Last van de Hoog-Mog. Heeren Staten-Generaal der Vereenigde Nederlanden, en volgens besluit van de Synode Nationaal gehouden te Dordrecht in de Jaren 1618 en 1619 uit de Oorspronkelijke Talen in onze Nederlandsche Taal Getrouwelyk Overgezet, met Nieuwe Bijgevoegde Verklaringen op de Duistere Plaatsen en Aanteekeningen van de Gelykluidende Teksten*, Kok, Rampen, 1915 rep., III p. 244 nn. 7-9.
- 309) *Op. cit.* III p. 244 n. 9, at Acts 19:5. 310) *Op. cit.* III p. 386 n. 11, at Eph. 4:5.
- 311) J. Wollebius: *Compendium of Christian Theology*, Basel, 1636, XXIII:1:xxi.
- 312) *Ib.* ch. XXIII(1)I to XIX (cited in J.W. Beardslee's *op. cit.*, pp. 129-32). See too in Heppe's *op. cit.* pp. 614 & 713.
- 313) see n. 206. 314) See P.N. Lee: *The Anabaptists*.
- 315) See W.R. Estep's *The Anabaptist Story*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1975, p. 231; and R.G. Clouse's *Church of the Brethren*, in ed. Douglas's *op. cit.* p. 228. 316) E. Hulse: *op. cit.* pp. 21, 25 & 52.
- 317) J. Smyth: *Character of the Beast*, 1609, pp. 265f.
- 318) J.G.G. Norman: *Smyth, John (c. 1565 - 1612)*, in ed. Douglas's *op. cit.*, pp. x & 911.
- 319) A.M. Derham: *Helwys, Thomas (c. 1550 - 1616)*, in ed. Douglas's *op. cit.*, p. 459. See too T. Helwys's *Baptist Confession*, 1611, art. 10 (in Schaff's *Creeeds* I:857f).
- 320) Helwys: *Bapt. Conf.*, art. 3. 321) Derham's *Helwys*, in Douglas's *op. cit.* p. 459; cf. Ward's *op. cit.*, pp. 58f.
- 322) G.H. Williams: *The Radical Reformation*, Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1975, p. 788. 323) See n. 321.
- 324) *Westmin. Conf.* 28:3<sup>k</sup>.
- 325) R.S. Ward's *op. cit.* p. 59 (citing J. Bunyan's *Difference in Judgment About Water-Baptism No Bar to Communion*); and M.L. Loane's *Makers of Religious Freedom*, Grand Rapids, 1961, pp. 138-41.
- 326) *Baptist Confession of 1677*, art. 29. 327) Hulse: *op. cit.* pp. 21, 25 & 52. 328) See Schaff: *Creeeds* I pp. 849f.
- 329) *West. Conf.* 27:3<sup>n</sup>. 330) *Ib.* 28:1<sup>f</sup>. 331) *Ib.* 28:2<sup>i</sup>. 332) *Ib.* 28:5<sup>o</sup>. 333) *Ib.* 28:6<sup>q</sup>.

- 334) *West. Larg. Cat.* 165<sup>g</sup>. 335) *Ib.* 177<sup>r</sup>. 336) *West. Conf.* 10:3 & 12:1 & 14:1 & 25:2-6 & 28:3-7.
- 337) *West. Larg. Cat.* 161-167 & 177. 338) *Ib.* 166. 339) *Ib.* 177.
- 340) *Westminster Directory for the Publick Worship of God ('Of the Administration of the Sacraments')*.
- 341) For a complete refutation of the baptismally-deviationistic views of the otherwise orthodox J.H. Thornwell, see F.N. Lee's doctoral dissertation *Reb. Imp.* II, pp. 254-84.
- 342) States Rutherford: "Anabaptists prove no salvation...for the saving of the infants born of believing parents more than for the saving of pagans and their infants." He also firmly insists that "in a Church that is not a Church -- there cannot be a true seal of God's covenant. But in the Court of Rome, there is true Baptism. For we baptize not again, children once baptized therein." S. Rutherford: *A Peaceable, Temperate Plea for Paul's Presbytery in Scotland*, ch. 10 (p. 129). Cited in J. Tallach's *Pleas Against Extremism: The Views of Calvin, Hodge and Others on Some Aspects of the Roman Catholic Church*, Christian Pocus, Tain, Ross-shire, 1989, pp. 12-13. See too Rutherford's 1642 *The Covenant Opened* (Anderson, Edinburgh, 1655, I, chs. 13-14); and also his *Triumph of Faith* (in his *Sermons* VIII). In his *Due Right of Presbyteries* (Griffin, London, 1844, pp. 238f), Rutherford further states that though Romish priests have their callings unlawfully, "because they stand for the Church..., these who are baptized of them are not [to be] rebaptized. Cf. Rivetus in *Catholic Orthodoxy* II:2:7."
- 343) In 1648, the great German Reformed Theologian Rev. Prof. Dr. John Cocceius, 'the father of federal theology,' said of Heb. 6:1-6 and 10:22-27: "The reason why Baptism is not repeated, is to be sought not in the impression -- but in the thing signified.... If it were repeated, either it would not be teaching the ingrafting into Christ..., or it would be teaching the imperfection and weakness of the first ingrafting -- as if communion with Christ might be rescinded and begun afresh! But...Christ cannot die a second time. So if, once a man has been united to Christ, he could not be separated from Him -- there could be no reparation." Cocceius's *On the Covenants* XIII:449 (in his 1648 *Works* VI, Amsterdam, 1673 ed., as cited in H. Heppes *op. cit.*, pp. 619f & 715).
- 344) In Owen's tract *Infant Baptism and Dipping* (in his *Works*, Banner of Truth, London, 1968 rep., XVI:259f), Owen declares that "the children of believers are all of them capable of the grace signified in Baptism. And some of them are certainly partakers of it, namely such as die in their infancy.... Therefore, they may and ought to be baptized. For...unless they are regenerated or born again, they must all perish inevitably. John 3:3." In his *Exposition of the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Baker, Grand Rapids, 1980 rep., V pp. 17f & 20 & 28 & 30 & 57f & 73 & 87f and VI pp. 512-14), Owen states on the anti-catabaptistic passage Heb. 6:1-6 that "doctrine is compared to and called 'Baptism' [in] Deuteronomy 32:2. Hence, the people were said to be 'baptized unto Moses' when they were initiated into his doctrines. First Corinthians 10:1-2. The Baptism of John was his doctrine. Acts 19:3. And the Baptism of Christ was the doctrine of Christ, wherewith He was to 'sprinkle many nations.' Isaiah 52:15.... The controversy was not whether men falling into any sin...after baptism, might repent -- which none was ever so foolishly proud as to deny. But the question was...whether the Church had power to 'admit' them a second time to a public profession of their repentance of those sins.... Baptism be but one and the same -- never to be repeated or reiterated on the same subject.... They were *hapax photisthentes*, 'once enlightened.' Saith the Syriac translation..., [they were] 'once baptized.' It is very certain that in the Early Church Baptism was called *phootismos*, 'illumination'; and *phootizeein*, 'to enlighten,' was used for 'to baptize'.... Baptism was once only to be celebrated, according to the constant faith of the churches in all ages.... Hence it appears what it is *palin anakainizeein* -- 'to renew them again.' It is to bring them again into this state of profession by a second renovation -- and a second baptism as a pledge thereof. This is determined to be impossible -- and so, unwarrantable for any to attempt." Also the words "our bodies having been washed with pure water" in Heb. 10:22, refers back to the finality of a Christian's Baptism. Says Owen: "This at first view would seem to refer unto the outward administration of the ordinance of Baptism.... Baptism cannot be repeated."
- 345) In 1656, the famous German Reformed Theologian Rev. Prof. Dr. M.F. Wendelin of Heidelberg -- after helping gain the victory for Calvinism over Lutheranism in the German Palatine -- wrote his great work *Christian System of Theology* (cited in A. Kuyper's *On the Sacraments* p. 142 in his *Dog. Dict.* IV, and see too Heppes *op. cit.*, p. 714). There, Wendelin states that "the 'possessed faith' which we attribute to infants, we truly call either 'the root' or 'the seed' of faith." In his *Collation of Christian Doctrine from the Calvinists and the Lutherans* (Cassel 1660 pp. 352 & 365, as cited in Heppes *op. cit.* pp. 624 & 714), Wendelin states that "baptism is not absolutely necessary to salvation. Many are saved even without baptism, both children and grown-ups.... Return to grace lies open through repentance -- without repeated baptism."
- 346) The Scottish Presbyterian Commentator Prof. David Dickson -- see his *Class Lectures on the Westminster Confession* (28, ed. 1684) -- did not regard protestantized Ex-Romanists as needing to be (re-)baptized. Instead, he applied the prohibition against rebaptism in the *Westminster Confession* (28:7) -- as applying exclusively against the practice of the Anabaptists.
- 347) The great Genevan Rev. Prof. Dr. Francis Turretin writes in his *Institutes of Elenctic Theology* (Geneva, 1688, III pp. 135 & 265 & 442 & 448): "We admit the Church of Rome to be a Christian Church in...the administrations of...Baptism which, as to

- the substance, still remains entire.... Some heretics corrupt the very substance of baptism -- as the ancient 'Arians' [and the]...modern Socinians [or Unitarians], rejecting the doctrine of the Trinity. Others, retaining the essentials of the ordinance and the true doctrine of the Trinity, err as to other doctrines -- as formerly the Novatians and the Donatists, and now the Papists and Arminians. The Baptisms of the former class are to be rejected. Those of the latter, are retained -- although they err as to many doctrines, and their baptisms, in circumstantial, are polluted by various ceremonies."
- 348) The Dutch Reformed Theologian Dr. Riissen, in his *Francis Turretin's Compendium of Christian Theology* (Groningen, 1695, XVII p. 33) claimed "there are some heretics who corrupt the substance of baptism, and omit and change the form of institution -- such as were the early 'Arians'.... There are others who, while retaining the substantial points and observing the true doctrine of the Trinity, which is contained in the formula of Baptism, err in other heads of doctrine -- like the early Novatians and Donatists, and today the Romans and Arminians. As regards the former lot, we are of opinion that Baptism administered by them is null...because they clearly corrupt the essential form of baptism, to which the invocation of the Trinity belongs.... But...if heretics retain the fundamentals of Baptism which constitute its essence, and do not change or corrupt the form, we lay it down that Baptism administered by such -- is in order." See Heppes' *op. cit.* pp. 613f & 715.
- 349) B. Pictet: *Christian Theology Taken from the Pure Fountains of the Literal Holy Scriptures*, Geneva, 1696, XV cf. 13.
- 350) P. Mastricht: *Theoretico-Practical Theology*, Utrecht and Amsterdam, 1725 (1714), III, p. 619.
- 351) M. Henry's *Commentary on the Holy Bible* (Marshall Bros., London, n.d., VI pp. 1254 on Heb. 6:1f) states: "The doctrine of baptisms...is that of being baptized by a Minister of Christ with water, in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.... This ordinance of baptism is a foundation to be rightly laid and daily remembered, but not repeated."
- 352) States Rev. Prof. Dr. de Moor in his *Perpetual Commentary on John a Marck*, 1761-71, V pp. 448f: "Our theologians judge in passing that those who were previously 'baptized' in the antitrinitarian assembly of Socinians [alias Unitarians], need to be '(re-)baptized.... Our theologians were accustomed to judge mildly concerning those baptized in the Roman Church today -- that they had there retained the visible element of Water-Baptism; the trinitarian faith; and the administration of baptism in the Name of the Triune God." Explains Charles Hodge (in his own *The Church and its Polity*, Nelson, London, 1879, p. 204 and its nn. \* & +): "Morus [Bernard de Moor]...quotes the acts of the Synod of Dordt, which forbid Romish baptism to be repeated.... 'The form and substance' of the rite have been retained."
- 353) In his famous *History of Redemption* (Sovereign Grace Book Club, Evansville Ind., 1959, pp. iv & 230 & 237 & 236 & 267), Edwards states that Matthew 28:19 represents "Christ's appointment of the Gospel Ministry...to teach and baptize all nations.... Before the time of Constantine, the troubles of the Christian Church were from heathen Rome. Since that time, its troubles have been mainly from Antichristian Rome.... Antichrist rose. The Church was drive away into the wilderness and was kept down in obscurity and contempt and suffering for a long time under Antichrist -- before the Reformation by Luther and others." Yet elsewhere in his *Theological Questions* 83-86 (in *The Works of Jonathan Edwards*, Banner of Truth, Edinburgh, 1984 ed., I p. 691), Edwards still asks: "What is the nature of a Christian Church? Who are fit for communion therein? What is the nature and import of baptism? How do you prove infant baptism?" Again elsewhere (in his *Misrepresentations Corrected and Truth Vindicated in Reply to the Rev. Solomon Williams*, sect. XII-XIV, in *Works*, I pp. 521-23), Edwards implies that Baptism is just as unrepeatable as was circumcision. "God did expressly command all the nation of Israel to be circumcised." Similarly, covenant children are "admitted into the Church and made members after they are born, viz. by their baptism." He also states: "Very many Protestant divines suppose that the members of the Church of Rome, though they are brought up and live continually in gross idolatry and innumerable errors and superstitions that tend utterly to make void the Gospel of Christ, still are in the Visible Church of Christ.... I have no doubts about the doctrine of Infant Baptism." See his *Humble Inquiry into the Rules of the Word of God Concerning the Qualifications Requisite to a Complete Standing and Full Communion in the Visible Christian Church*, in his *Works* I pp. 431 & 434. See too his *Inquiry Concerning Qualifications for Communion*, Part I, the Question Stated (in *Works*, I p. 434).
- 354) See M.B. Smith: *Studies in Southern Presbyterian Theology*, Van Campen, Amsterdam, 1962, pp. 22 & 26. There, approvingly citing the statement in C. Hodge's *The Constitutional History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*, Presbyterian Board of Publication, Philadelphia, 1851, I:87, Smith rightly states that "there was not a single member of the Synod [of 1729] who objected to any one article in the *Confession of Faith*" etc. Smith also cites pp. 126f of the *Records* of the 1736 Synod, which state that "the Synod doth declare that the Synod have adopted and still do adhere to the *Westminster Confession, Catechisms, and Directory* without the least variation or alteration." Even after the division of the Church from 1741-58 into Old Side and New Side, Smith (pp. 28f) indicates that "the differences had been...not doctrinal," and that the basis of their 1759 reunion states "that no Presbytery shall license...any candidate until he...declare his acceptance of the *Westminster Confession* and *Catechisms* as the confession of his faith." On p. 32, Smith sadly notes: "This Plan of Union was adopted by the Assembly in 1801.... It resulted in the addition of a large number of congregations of mixed background

- of Congregational and Presbyterian elements. Not only were men who had never subscribed to the *Westminster Standards* allowed to sit and act in Presbyteries, but also many Congregational ministers united with the Church who, though subscribing to the *Standards*, did so only on the basis of a loose interpretation of them."
- 355) W.E. Moore: *The Presbyterian Digest: A Compend of the Acts and Deliverances of the PCUS*, Presb. Board of Pub., Philadelphia, 1873, p. 659; J.A. Hodge: *What Is Presbyterian Law Defined by Church Courts?* Presb. Bd. of Pub., Philadelphia, 1884, pp. 84f.
- 356) C. Hodge: *Const. Hist.*, II:1f. 257) *Ib.*, p. 419.
- 358) G.P. Hays: *Presbyterians -- A Popular Narrative of their Origin, Progress, and Achievements*, Hill, New York, 1892, p. 151.
- 359) Thus their *Declaration and Testimony*, adopted at their 15th May 1806 meeting in New York. Today, however, that denomination insists on rebaptizing converts from Romanism -- but inconsistently, not converts from the even more idolatrous Eastern 'Orthodox' Churches!
- 360) S. Miller: *Baptism and Christian Education*, Presbyterian Heritage, Dallas, 1984, pp. 12f.
- 361) Rev. Prof. Dr. Charles Hodge faulted the decision of the maverick 1845 General Assembly of the PCUSA in his article *Validity of Romish Baptism* in the July 1845 *Princeton Review* (p. 444, cited in Hodge's *Ch. Pol.* pp. 191f). There, Hodge asks: "What stern necessity had induced the [1845 PCUSA] Assembly to pronounce Calvin, Luther and all the men of that generation -- as well as thousands who with no other than Romish baptism have since been received into the Protestant Churches -- to have lived and died unbaptized? ... We only venture to question the wisdom of giving an answer suddenly, in opposition to all previous practice and to the principles of every other Protestant Church."
- Hodge next insists (pp. 197f & 204f.): "The error of the Romanists concerning the absolute necessity and uniform efficacy of baptism (in the case of infants), is very great. But it cannot invalidate the nature of the ordinance.... The Assembly [of 1845], therefore, has taken a position on this subject in opposition to the principles of the whole Protestant world. A fact which of itself creates a presumption almost overwhelming against their doctrine."
- 362) Rev. Prof. Dr. R.L. Dabney blasts Rome in his 1856 *Popish Literature and Education* (see his *Discussions Philosophical*, Sprinkle Pubs., Harrisonburg Va., 1980, pp. 70-75), and insists that "she has always been the enemy of a free Bible." He states that "to Rome belongs the diabolical pre-eminence above all pagan priesthoods and political despots." Correct! Yet, in his *Lectures on Systematic Theology*, Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1976 rep., pp. 746-49, he adds: "As regards baptism, it is never to be repeated.... It is the initiating sacrament, like circumcision. The man who is in the house, needs no repeated introduction into the house. It signifies our ingrafting into Christ. He who is grafted in once, is virtually united and requires no new union to be constituted."
- 363) Rev. Prof. Dr. Philip Schaff published the first edition of his *History of the Christian Church* in 1858. There (VIII:856 at n. 1), he refers to Calvin's *Inst.* IV:15:16f and states: "These passages...furnish arguments against the decision of the Old School Presbyterian General Assembly held at Cincinnati 1845 which...declared Roman Catholic baptism to be invalid, and thus virtually unchurched and unbaptized the greater part of Christendom, including the founders of the Protestant churches who were baptized in the Roman communion, as the Apostles were circumcised in the synagogue. But Drs. Charles Hodge of Princeton and Henry B. Smith of New York -- the two leading Presbyterian divines of that day -- vigorously protested against that anomalous decision; and when in the United Assembly held likewise at Cincinnati in the year 1885, an attempt was made to re-enact that decision, it failed by a very large majority."
- 364) Rev. Prof. Dr. A.A. Hodge declares: "Baptism is never to be administered more than once to any person." See his book *The Confession of Faith: A Handbook of Christian Doctrine Expounding the Westminster Confession*, Banner of Truth, London, 1958 rep., pp. XVI & 351f.
- In his *Outlines of Theology* (Nelson, London, 1879, orig. ed. 1860, pp. 8-10, 599, 605f, 616, 621 & 630) he cites art. 27 of the *Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England* (apparently with approval). States Hodge: "The *Gallic Confession* Article 28 states the common opinion and practice of all the Protestant Churches with respect to Romish baptism. 'Because, nevertheless, that in the papacy some scant vestiges of the True Church remain, and especially the substance of baptism, the efficacy of which does not depend on him that administers it -- we acknowledge those baptized by them, not to need to be rebaptized.'" Nor need those baptized by the 'papally-baptized' Luther and Calvin *etc.* be rebaptized!
- Finally, in his 1890 *Evangelical Theology* (Banner of Truth, Edinburgh, 1976 rep., p. 338), Hodge further recognizes: "All who are baptized into the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, recognizing the Trinity of Persons in the Godhead, the incarnation of the Son and His priestly sacrifice -- whether they be Greeks, or Arminians, or Romanists, or Lutherans, or Calvinists, or the simple souls who do not know what to call themselves.... Baptism is our common countersign.... There can be only 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism!'" Ephesians 4:4-6.
- 365) Prof. Dr. Heinrich Heppé stated in 1861 (*op. cit.* pp. XI & 613) that the 'baptism' alias the water-rites "of such heretics as do not acknowledge the basic dogmas of the Church -- especially the doctrine of the triunity of God -- is to be...emphatical-

- 365) Prof. Dr. Heinrich Heppé stated in 1861 (*op. cit.* pp. XI & 613) that the 'baptism' alias the water-rites "of such heretics as do not acknowledge the basic dogmas of the Church -- especially the doctrine of the triunity of God -- is to be... emphatically rejected and regarded as null." Not so, however, "the baptism of those heretics who confess these dogmas.... So also the baptism dispensed in the Romish Church must be considered as real baptism.... A repetition of the act of baptism would set forth the objectionable view that what should be sealed through the first act of baptism in virtue of divine appointment -- namely the implanting of the individual in the mystical body of Christ and his adoption into the covenant of grace -- was not true! If anyone has received baptism without faith -- the receipt of baptism has not, of course, for him been unto salvation. But if the baptized person converts, there is no need to repeat baptism. Because, for repentance -- the road to grace lies open all the time."
- 366) Rev. Prof. Dr. William Cunningham, Principal of the Free Church of Scotland's Theological Seminary, says in his 1862 *op. cit.* I p. 169 that "the general feeling and practice of the great body of the Church has been decidedly opposed to re-baptizing -- both in ancient and in modern times. And no Protestant Church had ever denied the validity even of popish baptism -- until this was done recently [1845] by the... section of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of North America."
- 367) Gravemeijer declares in his 1888 *op. cit.* III:19:6 pp. 13-15: "Our [Reformed] fathers regarded baptisms administered in the Roman Church to be valid -- because performed in the Name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit -- however much they rejected the accompanying Romish ceremonies."
- In a brilliant chapter under the heading *No Rebaptisms*, Gravemeijer next declares (*ib.* III:20:25f pp. 171-84) that "one may not baptize those who have been baptized. Baptism cannot and may not once again be administered.... Baptizees, who forsook their baptism in doctrine and in life, are not called upon to get themselves baptized anew -- but to turn themselves toward that God in Whose Name they had been baptized once and for all [*cf.* Romans 6:1-4f].
- "The Protestant Churches reject rebaptism, just as the Romanists do.... Previously, with the [Anabaptist and Non-Protestant] Mennonites, even those who had been excommunicated for a time -- were baptized anew [as a sign of their 're-communication' after their 're-repentance']. But now no more!
- "Even the rebaptism [by the Mennonites] of those who were already baptized as Christian children, but who joined their sect when adults, has not remained in general usage -- but has been abolished by them in many places. Even some 'Baptists' -- denying their own name! -- have sometimes not regarded submission to baptism as obligatory, when joining their congregation: but only profession of faith, together with a solemn acceptance into membership....
- "Even the [so-called 'Eastern-Orthodox' groups such as the modern] Greeks, notwithstanding their holding fast to submersion, do not [except for the extremists in their midst] insist upon rebaptizing those from other denominations who have been baptized [by sprinkling] in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit." Too: "Inasmuch as the Romish Church acknowledges the validity of baptism by heretics -- she could not reject baptism even by Protestants....
- "Conversely, Protestants have respected Romish baptism as Christian baptism -- from their very beginning. It had never ever occurred to them to baptize anew those Romanists who come over to their denomination. Hagenbach: *History of Doctrine* (section 270). Luther, Zwingli and Calvin never even considered getting themselves [re-]baptized....
- "The Reformed have never declared baptism by Romanists, who have constantly professed the Trinity, to be invalid. Still less [have Calvinists 'invalidated'] baptism by the Lutherans! It is 'unreformed' to wish to regard baptism solely by the Reformed -- as the only valid baptism."
- 368) Rev. Prof. Dr. W.G.T. Shedd declares in his 1888 *Dogmatic Theology* (Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1969 ed., II p. 574): "The sacrament of baptism is the sign and seal of regeneration.... It does not confer the Holy Spirit as a regenerating Spirit [as Rome teaches].... **Baptism, being the initiatory sacrament, is administered only once.**"
- 369) In his 1900f work *On the Sacraments* (pp. 133-35 in his *Dog. Dict.* V), Kuyper declares: "Rome's baptism is recognized by us; Rome's mass, we call an abominable idolatry.... Our churches have opposed rebaptism as an abomination to God.... With the Anabaptists, rebaptism rested not at all upon recognizing another baptism.... Today's Baptists have the same viewpoint as the Anabaptists. They are indeed the same sect, whose name has been changed solely because of the exigency of the times. Infant baptism is not recognized."
- 370) Explains Bavinck (in his *Reformed Dogmatics*, Kok, Kampen, 1930, IV pp. 484-86 & 514-15): "The battle joined by the Reformation against the Romish doctrine of the sacraments does not centre around baptism, but around the Lord's Supper.... However, the Reformed rejected most of the ceremonies which had gradually become connected with baptism -- and went back to the simplicity of the Holy Scripture.... Especially against the Anabaptists, but then further also against the Romanists and the Lutherans, they [the Calvinists] had to show that the children of believers were to be regarded as believers even before baptism, and that it is as such that they ought to be baptized....
- "This whole doctrine of baptism, as developed by the Reformed, illuminates how closely they linked up with Holy Scripture....

Precisely for this reason, they knew how to avoid all sectarianism -- in their acknowledgment and administration of baptism. They preserved a genuinely Christian largeness of heart and breadth of viewpoint. In agreement with the Church Universal in her struggle against the [Donatistic] African churches, also the Reformed unanimously taught that baptism by heretics -- provided administered in the Name of the Triune God -- should be recognized....

"The Reformed are sooner to be accused of having too broad than too narrow an acknowledgment & administration of baptism.... There is...only one Lord, one faith, one baptism [cf. Ephesians 4:4-6]."

- 371) Rev. Prof. Louis Berkhof stated in his 1941 *Systematic Theology* (Banner of Truth, London, 1959 ed., p. 631): "Roman Catholics...recognize the baptism of heretics, unless their heresy involves a denial of the Trinity. The Reformed Churches...have generally recognized the baptism of other Churches, not excluding the Roman Catholics and also of the various sects -- except in the case of...sects which denied the Trinity.... In general, they considered a baptism as valid -- which was administered by a duly accredited Minister, and in the Name of the Triune God."
- 372) Rev. Prof. Dr. J. Oliver Buswell Jr.'s *Systematic Theology of the Christian Religion* (Zondervan, Grand Rapids, 1963, II pp. 226-40) frankly states: "We reject therefore on the one side both the Roman Catholic and the Lutheran views that in the sacraments we have materials and actions which are of themselves efficacious.... We also reject the Romanist and Lutheran view that the physical act of baptism is in itself efficacious for the washing away of sin....
- "It is worthy of note that the most conspicuous religious group in America today vigorously teaching baptismal regeneration in the sense of the *ex opere operato* efficacy of baptism itself, is the so-called 'Christian Church' (sometimes called 'Campbellite') -- a church which vigorously denounces infant baptism and insists upon immersion....
- "Romanists now hold that there are seven sacraments.... Protestants reply that of these seven, only two -- baptism and communion -- are ordinances instituted by Christ." To Buswell, then, the Romish sprinkling of infants is valid and more Biblical than the 'magical' Campbellite submersions of adults alone.
- 373) Rev. Prof. Herman Hoeksema, in his *Reformed Dogmatics*, (Ref. Free Pub. Assoc., Grand Rapids, 1966, pp. 670-74), argues "that baptism is instituted instead of circumcision.... The *French Confession of Faith*, Article 35..., emphasizes that the grace of baptism is not limited to the moment when we are baptized but continues throughout our whole life." Too, the *French Confession* (art. 28) also recognizes that as regards "the papacy" -- "those baptized in it do not need a second baptism."
- "The Romish Church rejects the idea that the baptism of John is essentially the same as Christian baptism." Her theologians "point, for instance, to the 'fact' that Acts 19:1-6 clearly speaks of some that were baptized by John and were 'rebaptized' by Paul....
- "The text does not refer to any rebaptism [performed] by Paul, but rather tells us that Paul instructs those twelve men that the baptism of John had the same significance as the baptism of Jesus, and that therefore when they were baptized by John they were at the same time baptized in the Name of the Lord Jesus.... If the text had meant to teach that Paul rebaptized those men, it would undoubtedly have read as follows: 'And when Paul had thus spoken to them, he [re-]baptized them in the Name of the Lord Jesus.'" However, it does not!
- 374) Rev. Prof. Dr. Johan Heyns (in his *Dogmatics*, D.R.C. Bookroom, Pretoria, 1978, pp. 337-40), declares: "It is just as unnecessary [and impossible] for baptism to be repeated, as it is for a man's birth is repeated. And it is just as necessary for the Lord's Supper to be repeated, as it is for a man's nourishment to continue constantly. Irrepeatability belongs to the essence of baptism."
- 375) The famous Rev. Dr. James Montgomery Boice is now perhaps the most published theologian in the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA). Wrote Boice in his book *God and History* (IVP, Downers Grove Ill., 1981, pp. 101f): "Baptism indicates to the world and to ourselves that we are not our own but that we have been bought with a price and are now identified with Jesus.... That truth was a great comfort to Martin Luther, who had times when he was confused about everything -- no doubt because of the strain of being in the forefront of the Reformation for twenty-eight years. In those bleak periods, he questioned the Reformation itself. He questioned his faith. He even questioned the value of the work of the Lord Jesus Christ on his behalf. At such times, we are told, he would write on his table in chalk the two words *baptizatus sum* -- 'I have been baptized.' By this, he meant he had been engrafted into the Christian Church -- even when incorporated into the Catholic Church (of Rome) while still an infant. 'I have been baptized!' That would reassure him that he really was Christ's, and had been identified with Him in His death and resurrection."
- 376) The 1981 *Report of the Study Committee on Validity of Previous Baptism* was approved by the 159th General Assembly of the Reformed Presbyterian Church Evangelical Synod (RPCES) -- which in 1982 was 'received' by and 'entered into' the Presbyterian Church in America (PCA). This *Committee Report* (pp. 101f & 107f) stated *inter alia*: "God Himself cannot regenerate twice, without breaking His Word. First John 3:9. Christ cannot" -- indeed, does not -- "baptize twice.... Those disposed to second baptisms, may be susceptible to the logical consistency -- that the things signified are also repeatable....

- because baptism is God's institution.... We urge our pastors and sessions thus to avoid a subsequent baptism of those we believe to have been validly baptized."
- 377) Rev. Dr. R.S. Ward, the 1982 Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of Eastern Australia, wrote to Dr. F.N. Lee on 3rd July 1990: "I don't think the PCEA as a body holds RC baptism to be invalid.... One [apparently meaning a Presbyterian] would not be justified in receiving baptism at the hands of an RC priest; but the question of the validity or otherwise of RC baptism is another matter. If one has received RC baptism and subsequently comes to enjoy the benefits of the covenant of grace, I myself am loathe to say such a one should be baptised again."
- On 16th July 1990 Ward subsequently wrote to Lee, after the latter had sent Ward one of Lee's own anticatabaptist papers: "I was just a little worried that you were going to reject 'Roman Catholic' baptism! I agree with your paper.... The *Westminster Confession of Faith* does not explicitly reject 'Roman Catholic' baptism.... I know of no member of the [Westminster] Assembly who rejected 'Roman Catholic' baptism.... Judging from [the 1583-1663] David Dickson's comments on the *Westminster Confession of Faith* 28, in his class lectures published 1684, the main reference in [the *Confession* at] 28:7 was to the Anabaptists who rejected infant baptism."
- In his excellent book *Baptism in Scripture and History* (Wantirna, Melbourne, 1991, pp. 66-69), Ward clearly states that "the major groupings of [Protestant] Christians -- such as Lutherans, Presbyterians and Anglicans -- have accepted the validity of Roman Catholic (and Eastern Orthodox) baptism.... The Reformers of the sixteenth century, who had received baptism at the hands of priests of the Church of Rome, accepted the validity of such baptism and opposed any idea of rebaptism.... The position of the Reformers was to affirm the objective promise of God sealed in baptism.... While recognising that the simplicity of the baptismal rite had been almost buried by additions and so partly mutilated, yet...the additions did not invalidate the ordinance.... While there were many corruptions of doctrine in the Church of Rome, through God's faithfulness His covenant promise was not utterly obliterated. The papacy itself was utterly rejected, but a certain measure of soundness remained -- sufficient to preserve the validity of baptism as the witness of God's covenant.... Against the mindless anabaptism of his own day and the ultra-Protestantism of our own, Calvin's further comments are relevant.... The baptism of a denomination professing the doctrine of the Trinity, and thus the true deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit, is not to be doubted as valid -- despite many other errors.... The baptism of mainstream denominations of liberal or modernistic character is not to be held as invalid *per se*, unless the trinitarian formulation has been rejected by the body, so that the foundations of God's covenant are not retained."
- 378) F.N. Lee's *Rebapt. Imposs.* (STD dissertation), & n. 291. 380) T. Aquinas: *Summa Theologiae* III:38:7. 381) See n. 14.
- 382) After the rapid apostasizing of Simon the sorcerer (Acts 8:9-23), he too is said to have started 'baptizing' others in(to) his own name. Later, also his 'disciple' Menander did likewise. See Tertullian's *Against All Heresies* ch. 1 and his *On the Soul* ch. 50; Irenaeus's *Heresies* I:21; Epiphanius's *Heresies* 22; and Theodoret's *Heretical Fables* I:2 & II:7. Also the Montanists later invalidly 'baptized' "in the Name of the Father, Son and Montanus"; and/or "in the Name of the Father, Son and Priscilla"; and/or "in the Name of the Father, Son and Maximilla." See Basil's *Epistolary Canons* I:7; Theophylact's *On Luke* 24 p. 546; the *Council of Laodicea* (canon 8); the *First Council of Constantinople* (canon 7); and Jerome's *Epistle* 54 (to Marcella against Montanus). Also Marcus the sorcerer invalidly 'baptized' -- "in the name of the unknown Father of all things; in the name of truth, the mother of all things; and in the name of Jesus who descended for the union and redemption and communion of the principalities or powers." See Theodoret's *Heretical Fables* I:9 and Irenaeus's *Heresies* I:18 and Epiphanius's *Heresies* 34 and Eusebius's *Church History*. See too F.N. Lee's *The Anabaptists and their Stepchildren*, 1997 ed., pp. 77 & 155 at its n. 115.
- 383) Lk. 3:3-22 *cf.* Acts 19:3. 384) Mt. 28:18 *cf.* Acts 19:5-6. 385) Eph. 4:5 *cf.* Matt. 28:19.
- 386) Iren.: *Ag. Her.* III:17:1-4 & IV:22:4. 387) Hippol.: *Refut. all Her.* 9:7 and *Discourse on the Holy Theophany*.
- 388) Lact.: *Divine Institutes* IV:15. 389) Ath.: *On Holy Baptism*, in Migne's *Patrologia Graecina-Latina* 28:760 ABC.
- 390) Basil: *On the Holy Spirit* XII:28. 391) Gregory Nyssa: *On the Baptism of Christ*, in *NPWF*, 2nd Ser., V, pp. 522f.
- 392) Aug.: *Tracts on John's Gospel* IV:11-15f. 393) Calv.: *Comm. on Acts* 19:4-5.
- 394) *Dordt Dutch Bible*: comments at Acts 19:1-7. 395) A. Kuyper: *Sacraments* pp. 134f (in *Dog. Dict.* V).
- 396) J.W. Dale: *Baptism*, in Schaff-Herzog *Enc. Relig. Knowl.* I p. 197. See too his *Christic Baptism and Patristic Baptism* [1874], Bolchazy-Carducci, Wauconda Ill./Presb. & Ref. Pub. Co., Philipsburg N.J./Loewe Belfort Projects Inc., Toney Al., 1995 rep., pp. 27f & 30 & 209f: "Johannic Baptism concluded with a consideration of the place where the Lord Jesus was baptized by His forerunner.... Jesus came to the Jordan to be baptized by John.... The Bearer of sin must be baptized.... The water of baptism denotes the punishing justice of God.... This is the baptism of Christ concerning which He speaks (Matt. 20:22), and this was represented by the baptism of water which was administered to Him by John....
- "Paul finds at Ephesus a company of... 'disciples' apparently living apart from Heathenism, Judaism, and Christianity. These

persons remained (some score of years subsequent to the ministry of John) uninformed respecting the development of Christianity. They were especially without knowledge of Jesus as the Lord Messiah, and the gift of the Holy Ghost consequent upon His ascension to heaven.

"Apparently because of their long-isolated position and lack of knowledge, they are [by Paul now] both instructed in the knowledge of Jesus and of the gift of the Holy Ghost and are baptized with water into the Name of the Lord Jesus....

"Affirming the re-baptism of all John's disciples under widely diverse [or different] circumstances, would be unsafe. The disciples of John were 'baptized, with water, into repentance' -- and they were taught that real repentance-baptism insured 'baptism into the remission of sins'.... They were yet farther taught that this remission of sins came through 'the Coming One' Whom John pointed out in the person of Jesus, saying, 'Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world!' That they who immediately believed on Jesus and passed from the ministry of John into His discipleship were a second time baptized with water 'into repentance'...or 'into the Name of the Lord Jesus' -- there is no Scripture evidence."

397) Cf. Mk. 2:18; Jh. 9:28; Mt. 23:15; Acts 5:36f cf. 17:18; Tit. 1:12f.

398) Cf. Rom. 2:28f & 8:2-9; Jude 4 & 11-19; Rev. 2:9 & 3:9. 399) See nn. 12 & 14.

400) Luke 1:1-4 cf. Acts 1:1-4 & 19:1-8 & 20:1-6 & 21:1-5 cf. Colossians 4:14 & Philemon 24 & Second Timothy 4:11.

#### SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY ON REBAPTISM IS SIN

- Adams, J.: *Meaning and Mode of Baptism*, P. & R., Philipsburg N.J., 1975.  
*Ante-Nicene Fathers (ANF)*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1969f.  
Augustine: *On Baptism Against the Donatists* (in *NPNF*).  
Ayles, R.: *Christian Baptism*, Kelly, London, n.d.  
Beardslee, J.W. (ed.): *Reformed Dogmatics*, Baker, Grand Rapids, 1965.  
Calvin, J.: *Commentary on the Bible*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, ed. 1948f.  
Calvin, J.: *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Clarke, London, ed. 1957.  
Calvin, J.: *Tracts & Treatises*, I-III, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, ed. 1958.  
Calvin, J.: *Treatises Against the Anabaptists*, Baker, Grand Rapids, ed. 1982.  
Dale, J.W.: *Baptism*, in Schaff-Herzog's *Enc. of Relig. Knowl.*, 1891.  
Dale, J.W.: *Christic and Patristic Baptism*, Loewe Belfort, Toney Al., 1995.  
Gravemeijer, H.E.: *Reformed Doctrine of Faith*, Wiarda, Sneek, I-III, 1888.  
Heppe, H.: *Reformed Dogmatics*, Baker, Grand Rapids, ed. 1978.  
Hippolytus: *Discourse on Holy Theophany and Refutation All Heresies* (in *ANF*).  
Hodge, C.: *Validity of Romish Baptism (Church Polity)*, Nelson, London, 1879).  
Jeremias, J.: *Infant Baptism in the First Four Centuries*, S.C.M., London, 1960.  
Jeremias, J.: *Origins of Infant Baptism*, Allenson, Napierville Ill., 1962.  
John of Damascus: *Exposition of the Orthodox Faith* (in *NPNF*).  
Kramer, G.: *Connection of Baptism & Regeneration*, De Vecht, Breukelen, 1897.  
Kuyper, A.: *On the Sacraments* (in his *Dogmatic Dictations*, Kok, Kampen, n.d.).  
Lee, F.N.: *Have You Been Neglecting Your Baby? The Serious Consequences of Withholding Baptism from the Infants of Christians*, Brisbane, 1981.  
Lee, F.N.: *Rebaptism Impossible!*, I-II, S.T.D. dissertation, Whitefield Theological Seminary, Lakeland Fla., 1991.  
Lee, F.N.: *Sprinkling is Scriptural*, in *The Presbyterian*, Bristol, July, 1990.  
Lee, F.N.: *The Anabaptists and their Stepchildren*, 3 Kenya St, Brisbane, 1997.  
Luther, M.: *On Rebaptism (1528)*, in *Works*.  
Miller, S.: *Infant Baptism Scriptural and Reasonable*, Presb. Bd. Pubs., 1835.  
Murphy, J.P.: *Sacrament of Baptism*, Burnes Oates & Washbourne, London, 1929.  
*Nicene & Post-Nicene Fathers (NPNF)*, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, 1971.  
Rissi, M.: *Baptism for the Dead*, Zwingli, Zurich, 1962.  
Schaff, P.: *Church History*, I-VIII, Eerdmans, Grand Rapids, rep. 1969.  
Schaff, P.: *Creeds of Christendom*, I-III, Baker, Grand Rapids, rep. 1983.

Schaff-Herzog: *Encycl. Religious Knowledge*, Funk & Wagnalls, New York, 1891.  
 Schenck L.B.: *Presbyterian Doctrine of Children in the Covenant*, Yale Univ. Press, New Haven, 1940  
 Steitz, G.E.: *Baptism* (in Schaff-Herzog's *Enc. of Relig. Knowl.*), 1891.  
 Stander H.F. & Louw J.P.: *Baptism in the Early Church*, Garsfontein, RSA, 1988.  
 Tertullian: *Against All Heresies; Against Marcion; and On Baptism* (in ANF).  
 Thornwell, J.H.: *The Validity of the Baptism of the Church of Rome* (in his *Collected Writings*, Banner of Truth Trust, Edinburgh, 1974).  
 Ward, R.S.: *Baptism in Scripture and History*, Wantirna, Melbourne, 1990f.  
 Wall, W.: *History of Infant Baptism*, I-II, Oxford, 1844.  
 Wallace, R.S.: *Calvin's Doctrine of Word and Sacrament*, Tyler Tx., 1982.  
 West, W.M.S.: *The Anabaptists and the Rise of the Baptists*, Lutterworth, 1959.  
*Westminster Standards, 1643-48* (any ed.)  
 Zwingli, U.: *Concerning Baptism, Rebaptism & Infant Baptism* (1525), in *Works*.  
 Zwingli, U.: *Polemic against the Catabaptistic Catastrophe* (1527), in *Works*.

#### ABOUT THE AUTHOR OF REBAPTISM IS SIN

Dr. Francis Nigel Lee was born in Britain on December 5 1934, and baptized trinitarianly in the Catholic Church on January 6 1935. Lee is the great-grandson of a fiery evangelical Preacher who, after backsliding, produced two generations of unbelievers. Thus Dr. Lee's father, though formally baptized as an infant in the Methodist Church, grew up as an Atheist. Yet he married a Roman Catholic -- who raised her only child (Dr. Lee) as a Romanist.

At the onset of the Second World War, Dr. Lee's father was appointed by the Royal Navy as Chief Radar Officer (South Atlantic). So the family then moved to South Africa. There Dr. Lee became a Calvinist; had the great joy of leading both of his parents to Christ; and became Minister of God's Word and Sacraments in the Reformed Church of Natal.

Emigrating to the U.S.A., he attended the very first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America. Transferring his previous ministerial credentials to that denomination, he pastored congregations in Mississippi and Florida. He was also: Professor of Philosophy at Shelton College in New Jersey; Research Scholar-in-Residence at the Christian Studies Center in Memphis; and Academic Dean of Graham Bible College in Bristol Tennessee.

Dr. Lee's wife comes from a long line of covenant-keeping Christians; was baptized as an infant in the Reformed Church; and was given a godly education. Both of Dr. Lee's children Johanna and Annamarie were baptized as babies, and have served God all their lives. Their Baptism has always been meaningful.

In Australia, Dr. Lee is Professor of Systematic Theology and Caldwell-Morrow Lecturer in Church History at the Queensland Presbyterian Theological College. He has produced more than 330 publications and also a multitude of long unpublished manuscripts. Several are on Baptism.

Neither Dr. Lee nor any of his ancestors or descendants has ever been rebaptized. Despite their sins, the God of their Baptism always stays faithful.

## POSTSCRIPT ON (ANA)BAPTISM -- by Rev. Prof. Dr. John Calvin

The three chief Protestant Reformers -- Luther and Zwingli and Calvin -- themselves received Baptism, as infants, only in the Church of Rome. Understandably, Baptists deny that they were ever baptized.

As Protestants, Luther and Zwingli and Calvin baptized very many other persons, including also adults. Yet none of those baptizees can be regarded as having been baptized -- according to hardline (Ana)Baptists. For their baptizers were themselves never baptized as adults. To this Calvin replies:

"It is one of the characteristics of the Divine Word that whenever it appears, Satan ceases to slumber.... First he stirred up the hands of [Romish] men, so that by them he might violently suppress the dawning truth. But when this availed him not, he turned to snares -- exciting dissensions and disputes about doctrine by means of his Catabaptists....

"In our day have arisen certain frantic men, such as Servetus and others who by new devices have thrown everything into confusion.... The name 'Trinity' was so much...detested by Servetus, that he charged all whom he called 'Trinitarians' -- with being Atheists....

"John declares that before the World was created, the Logos was God (John 1:1).... That Logos Who was God, was with the Father and had His Own distinct and peculiar glory.... The external Spirit always existed in God [Hebrews 9:14].... He could not then be an image...of God, as Servetus dreams.... But the most execrable heresy of all -- is his confounding both the Son and Spirit promiscuously with all the creatures....

"I am unwilling to annoy the reader with the series of conceits which Servetus, not the least among the Anabaptists (nay the great honour of this crew), deemed.... He objects that...every one may remember that he was buried together with Christ.... We must wait the 'full time' for Baptism.... He adds another allegory -- viz. that the Apostles were fishers of men, not of children.... He denies that infants are included.... Infants, not being spiritual, are unfit for Baptism.... Baptism is to be denied to infants.... He at length calls in the assistance of Trismegistus and the Sybils, to prove that sacred ablutions are fit only for adults.

"See how 'honourably' he thinks of Christian Baptism, when he tests it by the profane rites of the Gentiles -- and will not have it administered except in the way pleasing to Trismegistus! We defer more to the authority of God, Who has seen it meet to consecrate infants to Himself and initiate them by a sacred symbol.... We do not think it lawful to borrow from the expiations of the Gentiles, in order to change in our Baptism that eternal and inviolable Law which God enacted in Circumcision.... These reprobate spirits, as if they were under the influence of frenzy, introduce the grossest absurdities in defence of their errors.... How feebly Servetus has supported his friends the Anabaptists!"

-- *Institutes of the Christian Religion* (Preface 7; I:13:22; IV:16:31)