

ish custom of washing before eating, Matthew uses the word *upto*, and speaks of it as a washing of the 'hands'; while Mark uses *baptizo* in speaking of the same custom. When Orientals come in from the street to a meal, they do not bathe all over; they simply have water poured over their hands by a servant. *Baptizo* does not mean 'dip,' It *never* means 'dip' as a primary and dominant sense. The three stages of the word are 'to merse'; 'to lave or bathe'; 'to bathe symbolically.' Now suppose Church historians say 'Yet nevertheless Christian baptism as a matter of fact was by dipping,' I say, Gentlemen what is your proof? Take the instances of baptism in the New Testament, and see if it is at all probable that 3000 men were dipped in Jerusalem in one day. Take the road on which the Eunuch almost certainly travelled, and ask yourselves whether he was probably dipped on that journey. Take the case of the jailor at Phillippi; was it probable that he was dipped that night in the precincts of the jail?

Go outside of the New Testament: Clement gives you no comfort. The Didache upsets the whole thing. It uses the word baptism in just the sense for which we contend. It says, for instance, you may baptize by *pouring*. Now how are you going to 'dip' by pouring?

Then take the Monumental testimony: Fresco in the Catacomb of Saint Callitus (200 A. D., according to De Rossi); Baptismat Font at Ephesus; Ravenna Mosaic, 5th century; Greek Fonts in Palestine. These all point not to submersion, as you go back; but it looks clearly as though deeper water was provided for as time went on.

If you ask 'How do you account for immersion, if it is not Apostolic?' I answer, How do you account for Episcopacy, if it is not Apostolic? Simply as an historical development.

All I contend for is that the idea of immersion exclusively is not in the Word, and that immersion exclusively is not in early Church History.

If any man says that dipping was 'the' primitive mode, I shall have to contradict him. If he will let me substitute 'a' for 'the,' we shall have no quarrel. It was a primitive mode—not necessarily the original mode, that it was so an unproved assertion.

The whole thing in a nutshell is this: *Baptismos* is generic; it is purification in any one of several ways: by sprinkling, by pouring, or by immersion (see Heb. vi. 2, ix. 10). The earliest representation we have (Fresco in St. Callistus) in-

dicates that the rite was then administered, in some cases at least, by standing in the water and having water poured over the head.

Confusion has arisen from the careless use of 'dip' in the secondary sense by lexicographers and others, as a sufficient rendering of *baptizo*, making it equivalent to 'immerse.' Now *dip* and *merse* are not equivalent terms in the primary sense of 'dip' This is the key to the whole thing. I do not mean to question the conscientiousness of scholars. I remember the words of Coleridge: 'Until you understand a man's ignorance, presume yourself ignorant of his understanding' But I must say that to write a word down, and to put 'dip' and 'immerse,' and plunge' in one line as its equivalents, seems to me not scholarly.

ETHIOPIAN JEWS.

One of the strangest peoples with whom missionary enterprise has to do are the Falashas, of Ethiopia. They are black Jews, about two hundred thousand in number, living west of Jordan, who have as their holy writings the Old Testament in an Ethiopic version, and who still rigidly adhere to the Mosaic ceremonies and laws. Undoubtedly they are not of pure Jewish descent, although to some extent they are the children of Jewish immigrants, who, in the time of the great Dispersion, settled in Abyssinia and married wives of that nation—something not strange, as the Ethiopians are Semitic in nationality and language.

A prominent German writer thinks that they are mostly the descendants of early Abyssinian proselytes—i. e. people who early, and before the introduction of Christianity, accepted the Mosaic system of religion, and who did not, like the majority of the Abyssinian people in the third century, adopt Christianity, but clung to their old faith. Their religious literature does not seem to be very extensive. Halvey, the French Orientalist, published, a few years ago, a collection of their liturgical formulas in Hebrew translation, entitled *Les prieres des Falashas*.

Missionary attempts were made among these peculiar people by the Jesuits as early as the seventeenth century, but with little success, and the recent endeavors of the Basle Evangelical Society have also been without tangible results. Twenty-five years ago, when Dr. Stern first visited the highlands of East Africa, there was scarcely a Falasha who did not look upon Christianity as a superstition, and upon Christians as idolaters? but to-day