

Baptism: Meaning and Mode

by

Roger Smalling, D.Min

[Smalling's books, essays and study guides](#)

Table of Contents

[Baptism Is the External Sign and Seal of the Covenant of Grace Made with Abraham](#)

[Circumcision Changed to Baptism as the Sign and Seal of the Covenant](#)

[Family Nature of the Covenant: Who Receives the Sign And Seal?](#)

[Questions on Family Baptism](#)

[Old Testament Principles Governing the Circumcision Apply to Baptism](#)

[Water Symbolizes the Outpouring of the Holy Spirit](#)

[Baptism Originated in the Old Testament](#)

[The Correct Modes Are Sprinkling or Pouring](#)

[Immersion Is Not the Best Mode of Baptism](#)

[On Col 2:11-12 and Romans 6](#)

[Examples of Immersion Are Not Found in the New Testament](#)

[Summary](#)

Introduction

This study presents an overview of baptism, its meaning, modes and appropriate candidates. The format is a series of premises supported by the corresponding theological evidence.

[Baptism Is the External Sign and Seal of the Covenant of Grace Made with Abraham](#)

The covenant made with Abraham is the same believers enjoy today. No fundamental changes, except in the sign and seal of entry into it. Let's look at the elements in common:

1. The promises made to Abraham were intended for New Testament believers also. c4:16, 23, 24.
2. The Abrahamic Covenant is called *the gospel*. Gal 3:8
3. The blessing is the same: The Holy Spirit. Gal 3:14
4. The condition is the same: Faith alone. Gen 15:6 cf Rom 4:3.
5. The results of the blessing are the same: Justification, Rom 4:9 Gal 3:6.
6. The mediator is the same: Acts 4:12; 10:43; 15:10-12; Gal 3:16; 1Ti 2:5-6; 1Pe 1:9-12
7. The covenant is the grounds for regeneration: Jer 31:31-33
8. Supplants the Law: Gal 3:13-18; Rom 4:13-18 (It is called *the covenant...in Christ*.)
9. The covenant is unchangeable: Heb 6:13-20; Rom 11:25-27

[Circumcision Changed to Baptism As the Sign and Seal of the Covenant](#)

1. Both initiations into the same covenant:
Circumcision: Gen 17:7, 10-11; Rom 4:11

Baptism: Mat 28:19-20; Acts 2:38-39; 10:47-48

2. Both represent conversion and putting away of sin.

Circumcision: Deut 10:16; 30:6; Jer 4:4; 9:25-26; Ez 44:7,9;
Rom 2:28-29

Baptism: Acts 2:38-39; 22:16; Col 2:11; Gal 3:27, 29;
1Pe 3:21; Ti 3:5-6

3. Both are outward expressions of inward righteousness.

Circumcision: Rom 4:11

Baptism: Mat 3:13-17; Acts 22:16

4. Circumcision was viewed as spiritual in meaning: Deut 10:16;
30:6; Jer 4:4; 9:25-26; Acts 15:1; Rom 2:26-29; Col 2:11-12.

A good summary of this point follows: (Credit to John Sartelle in his booklet **BAPTISM**, P.10)

When a person believed God in the Old Testament, what happened? Answer: He was circumcised.

What was the outward event representing the clean heart in the Old Testament? Answer: Circumcision.

What was the outward sign that marked entry into the community of believers in the Old Testament? Answer: Circumcision.

Now replace the words *Old Testament* with *New Testament*, asking the same questions:

When a person believed God in the New Testament, what happened? Answer: He was baptized.

What was the outward event representing the clean heart in the New Testament? Answer: Baptism

What was the outward sign that marked a person's entry into the community of believers in the New Testament? Answer: Baptism.

Family Nature of the Covenant: Who Receives the Sign and Seal?

The *covenant of grace* was always viewed as a *family* Covenant and not just an individual one. Children of believers were *always* considered a part of the covenant and treated as members of the congregation of Israel in a *legal* sense, though not always in a saving sense. It is

unscriptural to view the children of believers as possessing no different status to the covenant than children of unbelievers.

The covenant with the elect normally includes their offspring. This idea is so prominent throughout Scripture it may be said to form the backbone of biblical theology. Scriptural examples of this principle follow below:

The covenant blessings included the children of believers

I will pour my spirit on your descendants, and My blessing on your offspring. Is 44:3
”As for Me,” says the Lord, “this is My Covenant with them: My Spirit who is upon you, and My words which I have put in your mouth, shall not depart from your mouth, nor from the mouth of your descendants, nor from the mouth of your descendants,” says the Lord, from this time and forevermore. Is 59:21

God normally chooses his elect from the children of the elect. Is 41:8-9; 59:21; 61:9; 65:22-23

Even when the covenant seed apostatize, God often shows them mercy because of their legal relationship to the covenant. Jer 31:36-37; Mal 3:6

Even without the covenant mentioned, promises abound to the seed of the righteous. Ps 25:13; 37:25; 102:28; 111:21; 14:26; 20:7.

- Covenant with David: 2Sa 7:12-16; Ps 18:50; 89:4; Jer 33:17-26.
- Covenant with Abraham: Gen 17:7; Is 41:8-9.

Because of this aspect of the covenant, God commanded adult believers to circumcise their children as a sign of participation in the covenant with their parents. Since the New Testament declares no fundamental change in the nature of the covenant, we must assume the children of believers today share the same *legal* standing those under the Old Testament. It is unthinkable children should now be denied the sign of their legal standing. Therefore the children of adult believers should be baptized also.

The burden of proof lies with opponents of infant baptism to provide texts showing when, why and how the status of believer's children was changed. No burden of proof is on us. If the relationship of the children to the covenant has not changed, then neither is there a change in the question of whether they receive the covenant sign, baptism.

[Questions on family baptism](#)

Why are there no examples in the New Testament of baptizing children?

Answer: The question could just as easily be asked, Why is there nothing in the New Testament forbidding it? If the apostles had believed the children of believers were no longer involved in the covenant, it would seem they would want to be sure children did not receive this sign and would have said so. After all, the Jews always assumed their children were covenant participants, at least in a legal sense, and therefore candidates for receiving the sign of it. Paradoxically, the argument from the silence of the New Testament on this point, works in favor of infant baptism rather than against.

Further, the question assumes examples of a doctrine or practice must be plainly stated in Scripture to be valid. But the concept of *inferential theology* has always been recognized in Christianity. This means a doctrine may be viewed as valid even though not directly stated, as long as sufficient evidence leads us to the conclusion. Christians hold to doctrines inferred in Scripture but not directly stated, such as the Trinity, chronology of end-time events and others.

Regardless of whatever view of baptism one holds, it will contain an element of inferential theology. It is irrational to reject a view the grounds it is an inference only, and then hold to another view also based on inferences. The issue is simply a matter of which inferences carry the main weight of Scripture. The whole weight of Biblical theology on the nature of the covenant of grace is behind us here. The absence of New Testament examples cannot outweigh this.

Doesn't the New Testament portray faith as a condition for being baptized, such as Acts 8:36-37?

*What hinders me from being baptized? And Philip said, 'if you believe with all your heart, you may.'*¹

This text, and similar ones in the New Testament are addressed to adult converts. They do not deal with the question of what should be done with their children. Adults have to believe to be baptized. But this is beside the point. The issue we are dealing with is not what should be done with adult converts, but what should be done with their children.

Second, it seems rather strange to use a Eunuch as an example of why the children of believers should not be baptized.

Third, infants were just as incapable of faith in the Old Testament as in the New. But God commanded their parents to give them the sign and seal of the covenant anyway. Yes, adults must believe in order to be baptized. But it does not follow logically from this their children must not be baptized.

Fourth, we must remember adults are no more capable of faith than infants. If this were not so, saving faith would not be a work of grace, (Acts 18:27) and we would have to throw out the Bible doctrines of *total inability* and *election*.

Lastly, the line of logic behind the question backfires. It goes like this:

People can't be baptized unless they believe. Small children can't believe. Therefore small children can't be baptized.

But observe the same logic applies to their salvation:

People can't be saved unless they believe.

Small children can't believe.

Therefore small children can't be saved.

Since small children are innocent, why do they need baptism?

Answer: The question assumes the purpose of baptism is purification. Baptism doesn't purify anyone, child or adult.

How do we explain some baptized children never get saved later on, thus never obtaining the reality of which baptism is a symbol?

Answer: Baptism guarantees the salvation of no one. Ishmael was the offspring of a believer. Esau was circumcised also, even though God said beforehand he would be a symbol of the reprobate. Why? He was a covenant child. The best reason for doing anything is because God commands it, regardless of the outcome.

Why does Acts 8:12 tell us only men and women were baptized, not children?

The contrast in this text is not between adults and children, but between sexes. In the Old Testament, women, only men were circumcised. Here, Luke indicates that for the first time, the female sex could also participate in the sign of the covenant.

The text says *BOTH men and women*, not *ONLY men and women*. The term *both* proves the correct contrast and indicates that Luke meant women were included also. We must be careful of our logic here. The mere lack of the mention of children is not proof children were absent. This is called the *fallacy of extension*, i.e., assuming what is not mentioned could not have taken place. It is contrary to logic as well as the intent of the text to use Acts 8:12 as evidence against infant baptism.

Can it be argued that the idea of “descendants” in the Old Testament may have only a spiritual significance in the New Testament?

That is, our *children* may simply mean the adults we win to Christ?

Answer: Yes, this can be argued because it is partly true. I say *partly* because the idea of spiritual offspring is certainly prominent in Scripture, especially in the teachings on the Abrahamic Covenant. But certain New Testament texts indicate it is not *limited* to that. These are:

For the promise is to you and to your children... Acts 2:39

It is inconceivable the Jews, considering their background and culture, would have understood this in any other terms than physical descendants. The examples are Lydia *and her household* and the Philippian jailer, *and his household*. Acts 16:15; 16:31-33

Some advocates of infant baptism have erred suggesting there were infants in these households. Nothing supports this nor do we offer these texts with that in mind. They do, however, indicate the Apostles were well aware of a covenant theology that included the families of believers.

This text implies a legal, though not a saving, sanctification of the children of a believing parent. It is hard to justify this apart from a covenant that includes the offspring of believers. (1Cor 7:14)

Though these texts are not examples of infant baptism, they are nonetheless show that blessing upon the *physical* offspring of believers carries through into the New Testament also.

Is it serious for parents to neglect to baptize their children?

Answer: According to Genesis 17:9-14, the children of believers who lack the sign of the covenant, are covenant breakers. They are not entitled to the covenant blessings nor may they be considered part of the congregation of the Lord. Parents who neglect the ordinance have no legal grounds for claiming covenant blessings for their children. Merely being children of believers is insufficient grounds for such a claim.

Nevertheless, we know God is merciful and overlooks the errors of His people. God frequently blesses the children of the righteous, covenant sign or not. Such mercy on God's part, however, must not be taken as an excuse for neglecting the ordinance.

The answer to the original question, as to who receives baptism as the covenant sign, is this: All adult converts to the Lord, and their children.

Old Testament Principles Governing the Circumcision Apply to Baptism

- As uncircumcised believers in the Old Testament were not allowed to partake of the Passover, so believers are not entitled to the Lord's Supper until baptized. Ex 12:48.
- As uncircumcised believers were not considered participating members of the congregation of Israel, so unbaptized believers must not be considered functioning members of the local church. Baptism is a condition for entry into functioning membership.
- The grace this sign represents is not necessarily linked to the time the sign is administered. Though Jews received the sign of the covenant as infants, their personal encounter with God came later. Jacob, Samuel, and many others are examples. Likewise, it is unnecessary to re baptize people who were baptized before they were

saved, as long as the baptism was performed in good faith by a legitimate minister of the biblical gospel of grace.

Water symbolizes the outpouring of the Holy Spirit

His cleansing work makes us acceptable participants in the covenant. Thus, a consistent association in scripture exists between water, the Holy Spirit, and cleansing.

Association of water with the Holy Spirit

- Jesus associated water with the Holy Spirit as a symbol.

...out of his heart will flow rivers of living water. But this He spoke concerning the Spirit...

John 7:38-39

- The baptism of John symbolized outpouring of Holy Spirit. Lk 3:16, Acts 1:5 cf. 11:15-16
- Jn.3:5 (Note: The grammatical form of the conjunction “and” links these two as synonyms. The meaning is, “water”, and I mean by that, “the Holy Spirit.”)
- Ez 36:26-28 prophetically links water with the Holy Spirit and cleansing.
- Regeneration is called a washing accomplished by the Holy Spirit. Ti 3:5-6

Association of water with the idea of cleansing

Old Testament purification rituals were done with water Heb 10:22 & 9:10 are references to these rituals examples of which are found in Le.8:6, 8:21, 14:8-9; Numbers 8:7, 19:17-20 and numerous other references.

Other Old Testament allusions to water as cleansing are Ez 16:4,9; Ez 36:25; Is 52:15; Pr 30:12

New Testament references are Eph 5:26; Ti 3:5-6; Heb 10:22.

Baptism originated in the Old Testament

Neither John the Baptist nor Jesus instituted baptism. This is shown by:

Water as a symbol of purification among the Jews

The writer of Hebrews called these *baptisms*. Heb 9:10 (the word *washing* in the original is *baptismois* = baptisms, and referred to Old Testament rituals.)

Ministry of John the Baptist

The Pharisees asked the question, “Why do you baptize if you are not the Christ, nor Elias, nor the prophet?” The Pharisees clearly recognized what baptism meant and understood the association of baptism with the Messianic kingdom. The texts on which this view was

traditionally based are, apparently, Is 52:15 and Ez 36:25. These texts in context were understood as prophetic of the Messianic kingdom, which would be involved with water purification. The Pharisees' assumption that John was claiming to be the Messiah, was understandable.

Jesus' baptism

This was in consequence of an Old Testament ritual. The priests were inaugurated at the age of 30 via a baptismal ritual. Jesus was baptized by John at the age of 30 to “*fulfill all righteousness,*” i.e. to fulfill the requirements of the Law of Moses regarding His priestly ministry.

The Mode

The correct modes are sprinkling or pouring

- John the Baptist's ministry was prophetic of the outpouring of the Spirit. It is inconceivable he would typify this by any other mode than pouring.
- Heb 9:10, identifies all Old Testament water-purification rituals as “*baptisms.*” Without exception, these were done by sprinkling or pouring, never by immersion. Compare these *sprinklings*, which are called “*baptisms*” in the following texts: Heb 9:13 = Nu 19:17-18
Heb 9:19 = Ex 24:6,8
Heb 9:21 = Lev 8:19; 16:14

Immersion is not the best mode of baptism

Baptism is not meant to symbolize identification with Christ in his burial and resurrection.

This would make water to represent the ground in which bodies are buried. In Scripture water never represents dirt. Texts showing water represents the Holy Spirit and the subsequent purification He brings are shown by such texts as Jn.3:5, Acts 1:5 cf. 11:5-6, Titus 3:5-6.

The text in Titus is particularly interesting. It portrays regeneration as a *washing*, which is caused by the Holy Spirit who is *poured out* on us. If then baptism represents our regeneration, why is immersion used rather than pouring?

- Immersion does not represent the burial Christ experienced because Christ was buried in a cave, not in the ground. This is more like putting a body into a room.
- Immersion involves applying the individual to the water. The Bible always portrays the water as applied to the individual. Immersion is reminiscent of a *works* theology which

sees people applying themselves to the Spirit by an act of their own will, rather than the Holy Spirit applied to people by a sovereign work of the Father.

- Immersion emphasizes the wrong member of the Trinity. Water does not represent Jesus Christ in the Bible. It represents the Holy Spirit.
- Romans 6 and Colossians 2 are used to support the immersionist view of identification with Christ are Romans 6 and Col 2. Correct exegesis shows these texts cannot support this view.

To understand these texts it is necessary to distinguish between REAL baptism and *ceremonial* baptism. The *ceremonial* baptism is baptism with water to symbolize the *real* baptism of the Holy Spirit. The *real* baptism refers to the work of the Holy Spirit in engrafting the believer into Christ and purifying him from sin. Other texts portraying *real* baptism, besides Romans 6 and Colossians 2, are 1Corinthians 6:11, 1Corinthians 12:13 and Titus 3:5-6, plus texts relative to the prophetic baptism of John. Only *real* baptism accomplishes regeneration, cleansing from sin, engrafting into the body of Christ, and all else our conversion entails. Only a Personal Being could do these things. An inanimate element like water can only symbolize this work, which is accomplished by the *outpouring* of the Holy Spirit.

If we forget this distinction between *real* and *ceremonial* baptism, we fall into the error of baptismal regeneration. This happens if we view Romans 6 and Colossians 2 as referring to *ceremonial* rather than *real* baptism.

[On Colossians 2:11-12 and Romans 6](#)

Note: The same basic arguments relative to this text also apply to Romans Chapter 6. There is no need therefore to analyze that chapter. A thorough exegesis of Colossians 2:11-12 is adequate for both.

In Him you were also circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ, buried with Him in baptism, in which you also were raised with Him through faith in the working of God, who has raised Him from the dead.

If this text means *ceremonial* baptism, then we are forced to the following erroneous conclusions: a) our spiritual circumcision was accomplished by baptismal waters, b) the sum of our sins was still on us until we were baptized, c) we were still dead in our trespasses and sins until baptism, (verse 13), d) condemnation under the law was still on us until we were immersed in water, e) we were not complete in Christ until we were baptized by immersion. (V. 10)

Such an interpretation is contrary to the doctrine of justification by faith alone.

Observe some interesting things in this passage:

- The agent performing the baptism mentioned in this text is God, not man. (*...through faith of the operation of God.*)
- In *ceremonial* baptism, man is the agent performing the act. In *spiritual* baptism, God alone performs it. This includes removing the *incircumcision* of our hearts, engrafting us into Christ, associating us with His death and resurrection, forgiving our trespasses, making us alive with Christ and wiping out the condemnation under the law. (V14)
- But can immersion represent all of this? It could, except for one factor: The Bible portrays these works of God as the result of the outpouring of the Spirit. Therefore, pouring or sprinkling best represents these aspects of conversion described in Colossians 2.

For those who may value Greek grammar as evidence, *baptizein eis kriston* cannot mean “baptized *by water* into Christ.” Though Greek grammar supports us here, it should be mentioned that the correct interpretation of Romans 6 and Colossians 2 does not depend on this. The same conclusions may be reached from other considerations.

The reason is the word *baptize* does not contain within it the idea of the particular element by which the baptism is performed. It is erroneous to imagine just because the word *baptize* is used, water must be meant. The element may be water, the Holy Spirit, the Body of Christ, blood, ashes mixed with water, oil, fire, etc.

Of equal grammatical importance is the word *EIS*, meaning “unto” or “toward.” It is a *direct* preposition, which, when linking “baptism” with a noun that follows, means the following noun is the baptismal element. Thus, Romans 6:3-4 can only mean, “do you not know that when you were merged with Christ, you were also merged into His death?” That is to say, whatever Christ experienced has been imputed to the believer, as Paul taught in Romans Chapter 4. Since all of Christ was has been imputed to the believer, we were also buried with Him through this merging into His death.

The element involved in both texts is not water, but the person of Christ. If we insist in assuming water by the word *baptized* in either Romans 6 or Colossians 2, then the Baptismal Regeneration doctrine is correct. Imputation of the righteousness of Christ would therefore be accomplished by water and not by faith alone.

As a summary, these texts do not support any *ceremonial* baptism view as identification with Christ in His death and resurrection for the following reasons:

- Baptismal waters cannot perform the works mentioned in these texts.

- The Agent performing all the actions is God, not man.
- The actions performed here are accomplished by the outpouring of the Spirit on the believer, and are portrayed as such in other portions of the Scripture, as mentioned in other sections above.

Though the term *baptize* has been shown to mean “immersion” in extra-biblical literature, it does not mean that in the Bible. In fact, it has already been shown it refers to pouring or sprinkling.

Cases in point: The *baptism* in the Holy Spirit is described as something that *fell* on Cornelius and was called *baptized*. Acts 11:15-16. In Mark 7:4 we read of the purification customs of the Jews. The term *washing* here is **BAPTIZO** in Greek, “to baptize.” It is hardly conceivable they “immersed” their beds and tables! All Old Testament baptismal rituals, including ordination for the priesthood, were done by sprinkling or pouring, never by immersion. In Lk 11:38, the Pharisees were astonished Jesus did not “wash” before dinner. What was the word used here? **BAPTIZO**, “baptize.” Are we to suppose the Pharisees expected Jesus to go out and immerse Himself?

From these examples, it is clear the term *baptism* cannot be limited to immersion. In fact, it is doubtful if it *ever* means that in the Bible.

[Examples of immersion absent from the New Testament](#)

The baptism of Jesus

Was Jesus' baptism by immersion? The answer depends on the reason why He was baptized. We know it was not a baptism of repentance. Nor was it merely as an example to others, since John had been baptizing quite some time before Jesus appeared.

Jesus' baptism was His ordination to the priesthood. This is shown by the Old Testament custom of inaugurating priests at the age of thirty. We see this in Numbers 4:3, 47. The candidates were presented to the priests and then sprinkled with water. (Numbers 8:6-7)

It is no coincidence Luke makes a point of mentioning Jesus was thirty years old when He was baptized. It also explains John's reluctance to baptize Jesus. John's baptism was a baptism symbolizing repentance. He knew Jesus needed no repentance. But then Jesus used a phrase idiomatic of fulfilling the requirements of the law, *fulfill all righteousness*. John then understood that Jesus had to fulfill the requirements of the Law in His ordination to ministry at the age of thirty.

Here's the point. If Jesus' baptism was His ordination to the priesthood, and if that ordination was performed by sprinkling, why should it be assumed Jesus was immersed?

However, immersionists have pointed out that Mark 1:10 says Jesus was *coming up out of* the water when the Holy Spirit descended. Jesus was therefore in the water, and must have been immersed.

The conclusion does not follow for two reasons. First, being *in the water* does not necessarily imply immersion. Early Christian pictographs show people standing in shallow water, and John pouring water over them. Since John's baptism was surely by pouring, it is likely people stood in shallow water while he was doing it.

Second, there is a translation problem with the words *coming up out of*. The preposition for *out of* is "EK" and can mean either "out of" or "away from." How do we know which one it means? By comparing Scripture with Scripture, we can find out. In the parallel text in Mat 3:16, another preposition for *out of* is used. It is **APO** and always means "away from." It does not mean *out of*. Thus, we see the meaning of **EK** in Mark 1:10 is "away from." Jesus went down the bank of the Jordan to the water, and then away from it.

Conclusion: It is not even certain Jesus entered the water at all, let alone be immersed in it.

The baptism of John in Aenon

Immersionism runs into an historical problem here. In the known geological history of Aenon, there has never been a body of water big enough to immerse a human body. The term *many waters* is a reference to numerous small springs and rivulets coming out of the ground. These waters contrast in purity and clearness to the muddy waters of the Jordan when it overflows at certain times of the year. The assumption he went to Aenon in order to immerse, is historically inaccurate as well as illogical. Why would he immerse people to portray the outpouring of the Spirit?

Baptism into Moses, 1Corinthians 10:1-3: Is this an allegory of baptism?

This text is used to suggest a prophetic reference to Christian baptism by immersion. But this interpretation runs into several difficulties. First, the intent of the text is not to give a portrayal of Christian baptism, but that *we might not lust after evil things*. (V.6)

Second, the Jews were not immersed in the sea. The only people to be immersed that day were the Egyptians. The Jews never got wet.

Third, they were *baptized unto Moses*, not baptized in the waters of the sea. This means their obedience to Moses in following him represented their *merging* unto him as their leader in obedience, as opposed to the rebellion of the Egyptians. It is hard to see how this incident was intended to portray Christian baptism. Leaning on this text as grounds for immersion shows the weakness of the position rather than its strength.

Baptism of the eunuch, Acts 8:37-38

The text says both Philip and the Eunuch went *down into* the water. Then they *came up out of* the water. If we take *into* and *out of* to mean “immersion,” then we must conclude Philip was immersed also, because the text says they *both* went into the water.

The same point applies here as in the baptism of Jesus. Going into the water does not necessarily imply immersion. It is entirely possible enter water without being immersed. The prepositions ***EIS*** and ***EK*** here can just as easily be translated “to” and “from.” Immersionism finds no support in the baptism of the Eunuch.

Though immersion is not the most advisable mode of baptism, it is nevertheless not wrong or sinful to practice it. After all, water is used anyway, and the candidate is still offering to God the answer of a good conscience. 1Peter 3:21

Summary

- Baptism is the external sign and seal of the covenant of grace. It corresponds to and replaces circumcision as the sign of the same covenant during the Old Testament administration. The water used symbolizes the Holy Spirit poured out in conversion and seals us into the covenant.
- The proper subjects for baptism are adult believers and their children.
- Unbaptized believers are not members of the visible church nor entitled to participation in the Lord's Supper.
- The correct modes of baptism are sprinkling or pouring.

Some who read this essay, also liked our book, [Unlocking Grace](#).

Smalling's articles and essays are available at www.smallings.com

¹ This verse, (37), is not a part of the original text of Scripture. It is an insertion dating no earlier than the sixth century and is correctly omitted in all modern translations.