

Locutus est Iesus	ad turbas et ad discipulos suos dicens turbis Iudaeorum dicens
Loquebatur Iesus	principibus sacerdotum et Pharisaeis in parabolis dicens.

But, as stated in the body of the article, these more varied Western forms are all preceded by the invariable 'In illo tempore'.

Compare these with the opening of the Prayer Book Gospel for St Matthias' Day 'At that time Jesus answered and said'. Would it not be almost impossible, without referring to the A. V., to say offhand whether this were an application of the formula, remaining in the Prayer Book, or a direct quotation from the text itself?

BAPTISM BY AFFUSION IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

IN his Note I on the *Didache* in the July number of the *Journal of Theological Studies*, Dr Bigg has repeated the old arguments from literature in favour of the theory that for the first four or five centuries baptism by submersion was the usual practice. These seem to be based on the assumption that *καταδύειν* and *mergere* must necessarily mean to submerge. If this is assumed, it is of course easy to establish what has already been taken for granted.

He has, it is true, appealed to the witness of archaeology, which at least must be taken into account in considering the question. But he only refers to four out of the nine certain representations of the rite that have been found in the Catacombs, and these he dismisses in a somewhat summary manner. One of the Ravenna mosaics is mentioned, but no allusion is made to symbolic representations, or to the various baptismal scenes, on sarcophagi, ivories, medals, &c. The still more conclusive proof against the theory of submersion, that can be drawn from a consideration of the depth of ancient fonts, is entirely ignored.

I considered, I think, all the points that he mentions, in writing my *Baptism and Christian Archaeology*, published last year as part of *Studia Biblica* by the Clarendon Press, though it was not my object to collect passages which seemed to me from the ambiguity of the language to throw no real light on the question. The passage in Gregory of Nyssa, which Dr Bigg quotes, escaped my notice, but it describes baptism as being administered exactly as it is represented in early Christian art.

May I take this opportunity of correcting some errors, and adding a few points to what I then wrote?

In describing the fresco in the crypt of Lucina (c. 100 A. D.) I had originally written :

'The water flows over the feet of the Saviour. The horizon line of water runs behind His neck, but is not intended to represent water covering His body, as in that case the Baptist would be in the water too; nor can the water be intended to rise to the Saviour's waist, as in De Rossi's engraving, as then the land on which he stands would be submerged.'

In writing this I had followed De Rossi and Garrucci. I altered it on reading A. de Waal's article in the *Römische Quartalschrift*, to which I referred, and my outline illustration was taken from the half-tone block accompanying his text. Unfortunately owing to its high actinic power, the blue of the water did not come out in the photographic reproduction. The splashes of water round the head of the catechumen in the fresco in the Gallery of the Sacraments also disappeared in his picture, but I had observed them myself in the original, while I failed to see the fresco in the crypt of Lucina. The publication of Mgr. Wilpert's coloured illustration in his recent work *Die Malereien der Katakomben Roms* shews that Garrucci's engraving was more accurate on this point, and that my words as originally written were substantially correct.

Two entirely new examples from the Catacombs are published in this work. In one the water rises as high as the knees, but otherwise they present no variation of type, though they confirm the accepted interpretation of the fresco in the crypt of Lucina as really picturing our Lord's Baptism. They date from the first half, or the middle, of the third century.

The fresco in St Domitilla mentioned on my p. 245 is also published, as well as the painting in the same place, which, owing to Garrucci's incorrect copy (tav. xxxiii 3), has hitherto passed for a scene of benediction, but is now clearly proved to be a baptismal scene.

Of the other three doubtful representations given by me on p. 255, although interpreted by Wilpert as picturing the miracle of healing the blind, the first two seem to me more probably to be baptismal scenes, as in the healing of the blind the sufferer is represented kneeling (though not on sarcophagi, it is true); while I have no hesitation in adding the third to the list of baptismal scenes, as the fact that the catechumen is clothed is, as I have shewn, no objection to so interpreting it. Mr Bannister, in a notice in the *Historical Review*, July, 1904, p. 565, points out that another such example, in addition to those I have quoted, has been discovered by Mgr. Galante at Naples.

I much regret that my Exx. 11 and 12 from the gold treasure of

Sinigaglia are taken from a forgery. Of this I have no doubt after reading Grisar's *Il tesoro del Cav. Rossi* (Rome, 1895), which had escaped my notice. This, however, is of little importance, as the objects, even if genuine, would have been of the seventh or eighth century, and unique. They would have supplied little evidence as to the custom of the early Church.

In attributing the relief at Monza to c. 700 A.D. I followed, as I thought, Strzygowski's dating in his *Iconographie der Taufe Christi*. I have since had an opportunity of examining it, and see that it is obviously of a later period, probably of the fourteenth century. This brings it into line with many other mediaeval representations where the water rises in a heap, a feature which is possibly connected with the idea that grew up in later times that submersion was the more correct method of administration.

Much fuller information as to African fonts than was available when I wrote, can be found in S. Gsell's *Les monuments antiques de l'Algérie*. These are mostly of the fifth or sixth centuries, and are eleven in number. The following should be added to my list on p. 349 :

Place.	Shape.	Date.	Diameter.	Depth.
Ain Zirara	circular	c. 525	the bottom made of one block	?
Castiglione	square, with a circular basin	?	1.10 m.	.70 m.
Gouéa	circular	?	0.80 m.	1 m.
Matifou = Rusguniae	square	? c. 400	?	0.65 m.
Megsmeïa	circular	?	surrounded by a step 0.40 m. high	?
Morsott	square	?	0.93 m.	0.84 m.
Sidi Ferruch	square, with circular basin	?	1.50 m.	1.75 m. outside
Sillègue	circular	?	1 m.	?

Cp. also Cabrol's *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie*, Art. Afrique, XXI. Baptistères, p. 702.

Ruined baptisteries of an earlier date are mentioned by Strzygowski in his *Kleinasiens, ein Neuland der Kunstgeschichte*, p. 26, and on p. 14 Mr J. W. Crowfoot speaks of 'a small baptistery with a font and drain', among the ruins of Binbirkilisse, but no exact measurements are given. On p. 33 of Strzygowski's *Der Dom zu Aachen* he publishes a plan of the seventh-century church of St Gregory at Etszschmiadzin in which a small quatrefoil font of, apparently, a diameter of 1 m. lies behind a pillar to the right of the sanctuary.

The researches, of which he has published the results in the two above-mentioned works, seem to point to the fact that in art, as well as

in Church life, the part played by the East was far more important than we are apt to believe, and that the imperial art both of Rome and Byzantium was less primitive and less widespread in its influence. If this was so, it is remarkable that the fonts from Egypt, Palestine, and Asia Minor should be of the smaller square type, often made out of single blocks of stone, while the larger fonts, modelled on the analogy of the public baths, are found at Rome, Ravenna, and in the later churches of Africa built at the time of the Byzantine domination. Of course, even in these later fonts submersion would be at best awkward, and in most cases impossible.

Since baptism by affusion would seem to have been the universal practice in the early Church, its mention in the *Didache*, or rather the mention of the sufficiency of water poured on the head alone, of course throws no light on the question of its date.

CLEMENT F. ROGERS.

THE ETYMOLOGY OF BARTHOLOMEW.

CONSIDERING the number of monographs on proper names which have appeared within the last ten years or so, one naturally expects to find fresh light on the etymology of Bartholomew in the latest standard Bible Dictionaries. It is hard to understand why only the robber chief *Θολομαῖος* (*Joseph. Ant.* XX i 1) is still cited as an example of the name, when it occurs four times besides in the same author as borne by honest men (XIV viii 1, xv 6, *Bel. Iud.* I xvi 5 *bis*); for the alternative reading *Πτολομαῖος* in all these passages is not better attested than *Θολομαῖος* and is probably due to its greater fame in Hellenic history (see B. Niese's critical text, *Flavii Iosephi Opera*).

The name *למלח* occurs in three Nabatean inscriptions (*Lidzbarski Handbuch der nordsemit. Epigraphik* p. 386) and the radical letters *למח* in the Assyrian compound name *Nabūtalime* (*Delitzsch Assyri. Handwört.* p. 707). Whatever lexical obscurities may still be left in the language of the Samaritan Targum, it is certain that *לחמ*, fem. *לחמא*, is there used sixty-three times to translate the Hebrew *חָמ* and *חַמָּה* in cases where the original means half-brother, half-sister, fellow man, clansman, or fellow citizen (*Gen.* iv 2, 8-11, 21; ix 5; xvi 12; xvii 7; xx 5, 13, &c.). The word has been variously explained. Castello equates it with *ἀδελφός*, because *δ* and *ח* and *פ* and *ח* are homorganic; S. Kohn identifies it with Heb. *חֲמֵה*, *furrow*, which the Samaritan uses in