

oil, which is called σφραγίς. The formula which is used is: Δεῖξ τὸ ἔργον ἵναμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος. Δεῖξ τὸ ἔργον ἵναμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀποστόλου καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ κυρίου καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.

(b) In ch. 121 Mygdonia is baptised in the trine name, and the Eucharist follows immediately.

(c) In chs. 131-133 is the account of the baptism of Siphor. Here we are given a valuable statement of the doctrine of baptism: τὸ βάπτισμα τοῦτο ἁμαρτιῶν ἐστίν ἀφεσις· τοῦτο ἀνεργεῖται κατὰ παρακλήσεως τοῦτο ἀνεργεῖται τὸν νεόν ἀφραπτόν τοῦ ἀφραπτοῦ μαργίτου πνεύμα κακοῦν ψυχῆν, ἀριστῶν τρισσῶν κακοῦν ἀφραπτοῦ καὶ ἐστὶ κακοῦν τὰς ἁμαρτιῶν ἀφίεσις. So far as the rite is concerned, it consists of unction with the formula: Σὺ δέξαι ἡ τὸν σπλάγχυν ἐπισηπ καὶ δέξαι τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα καὶ δέξαι ἡ τὸν Χριστὸν ἵναμα. After this follows baptism in water (for which purpose a basin (σκεῦλον) is used—so that submersion was not practised) in the trine name, and finally the Eucharist.

(d) In chs. 157-158 is the account of the baptism of Ouanes, Tertina, and Mnemara. The main features are the same: first, unction with oil (over which the name of Jesus has been invoked) with the formula—'Εν ὀνόματι σου, Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, γυνέσκου τὰς ψυχὰς ταύτας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ εἰς ἀνεργεῖν τοῦ ἀφραπτοῦ καὶ εἰς σωτηρίαν τῶν ψυχῶν αὐτῶν; secondly, baptism in water in the trine name; and, thirdly, the Eucharist. It is noteworthy, in view of Tertullian's protest against the custom of baptism by women, that Mygdonia, not Judas Thomas, anoints the women.

Thus it would seem that the circle of Christians whose practice is represented by the Acts of Thomas used a form of baptism in which unction with an elaborate formula of consecration preceded baptism, properly so called, in the trine name, and that the Eucharist always followed immediately. The unction with oil was more important than the water-baptism—so much so that in ch. 26 the latter is not mentioned at all. It is even possible that the references to water-baptism in the other passages are interpolations. The doctrinal ideas which play the greatest part are regeneration, forgiveness of sin, a new life, and the gift of the Spirit, which seem to be communicated directly through the unction. It is also noticeable that the Acts of Thomas regards baptism and married life as incompatible.

Summary of 1st and 2nd centuries.—The data supplied by the preceding paragraphs give the material for making certain generalizations as to the practice and doctrine of baptism, during the 1st and 2nd centuries. It is, of course, the special object of an Encyclopædia article to give information rather than draw conclusions; but attention may be directed to the following points, which seem to be cardinal:—

(1) The information given as to the practice of baptism is, as a rule, incidental, and never quite explicit; yet the main features are fairly clear. As might have been expected, the rite gradually became more and more complicated. The earliest form, represented in the Acts, was simple immersion (not necessarily submersion) in water, the use of the name of the Lord, and the laying on of hands. To these were added, at various times and places which cannot be safely identified, (a) the trine name (Justin), (b) a moral vow (Justin and perhaps Hermas, as well as already in the NT in 1 Peter), (c) trine immersion (Justin), (d) a confession of faith (Irenæus, or perhaps Justin), (e) unction (Tertullian), (f) sponsors (Tertullian), (g) milk and honey (Tertullian). There was also, no doubt, an infinite variety of expansion in detail, especially among heretical sects (cf. especially the Marcosians), and there were probably fixed forms for the administration of the sacraments, of which traces may be seen even in this period (Justin, Tertullian, and especially the Didache), but the existing baptismal services strictly belong to the 3rd century.

(2) As to the doctrine of baptism we have more information, though here also much of it is incidental. The dominant ideas were those of forgiveness of sin, regeneration, and the gift of the Holy Spirit. To some extent these three ideas may be fairly described as three ways of regarding baptism rather than as three separate benefits conferred by it. In baptism, the Christian passes from one sphere of life to another. He is born again to another world, and, whereas in the world which he leaves he was under the control of sin, evil spirits, and fate,* in the world which he enters he is under the control of the Holy Spirit. So far as this view carried, that baptism can be spoken of as a resurrection, though, as a rule, the gift conferred in baptism was regarded eschatologically so far as its complete realization was concerned (see the use of σφραγίς in II Clem., p. 385^b above).

The change effected by baptism was attributed to the 'name' and to the water, which were regarded as actually effective and not merely symbolic. This view is strange to modern minds, especially to Protestants, but it was part of the common stock of ideas of the 2nd cent., among heathen and Christians alike. A somewhat subordinate part is usually played by the laying on of hands and by unction; but probably both of these were regarded as cardinal in some places (see especially Tertullian and the Acts of Thomas). The general theory which underlies these views seems to be the well-known belief that by using the correct name it was possible to exercise the power of the bearer of the name. By this means the Spirit was brought into the water (in the Acts of Thomas into the oil) and thus communicated to the baptized person. The clearest expression of this view is found in Tertullian, but in a more or less developed form it was no doubt universal, except among a few heretics (e.g. Tertullian's opponents, and some of the Marcosians).

As the rite became more complicated, there was a tendency to connect various details with various sides of the doctrine. Especially was this so with regard to the laying on of hands; this, at least sometimes, was peculiarly connected with the gift of the Spirit, and the effect of the immersion in water was limited to the forgiveness of sins (see especially Tertullian, and compare the same tendency even earlier in the Acts). But this distinction was probably never universal, or to any large extent the subject of discussion.

In its crudest form the theory of baptism was quite unethical; and there are many traces among early writers that they were aware of this difficulty. None of them, however, really succeeded in doing more than putting ethical requirements side by side with their sacramental theories, and demanding both without really co-ordinating them intelligibly (cf. Hermas and the development of the moral vow of which the first traces can probably be found in 1 Peter).

In connexion with the name (which may mean one or more names) the question of formula arises. The earliest known formula is 'in the name of the Lord Jesus,' or some similar phrase; this is found in the Acts, and was perhaps still used by Hermas, but by the time of Justin Martyr the trine formula had become general. It is possible that the older formula survived in isolated communities, but there is no decisive contemporary evidence. The tendency was all the other way, and it is probable that there were in use many formulæ of an elaborate nature (see the Marcosians and the Acts of Thomas). The difficulty is to distinguish between

* The question of Fate will receive a full treatment in a separate article. Justin and orthodox writers generally were inclined to deny its influence, but some Gnostics recognised its supremacy over the unbaptised (Theodotus in Clement of Alexandria).