the admission of the Gentiles into the  
Church,—I would answer that the Apostles  
*never had any doubt whatever* about  
*admitting* Gentiles,—only whether they  
should not be *circumcised* first. In this  
command, the prohibition of ch. x. 5 is for  
ever removed.

**baptising them]** Both  
these present participles are the conditions  
of the imperative preceding. The *making  
disciples* consists of two the *initiatory*,   
admissory *rite*, and the *subsequent  
teaching*. It is much to be that  
the inadequate rendering, ‘*teach*,’ has in  
our Bibles clouded the meaning of these  
important words. It will be observed that  
in our Lord’s words, as in the Church, the  
process of ordinary discipleship is *from  
baptism to instruction*—i. e. is, *admission  
in infancy to the covenant*, and *growing up  
into observing all things commanded by  
Christ*—the *exception* being, what circumstances  
rendered so frequent in the early  
church, *instruction before baptism* in the  
case of *adults*. On this we may also  
remark, that baptism, as known to the  
Jews, included, just as it does in the Acts  
(ch. xvi. 15, 88), *whole households—wives  
and children*.

As regards the command  
itself, no unprejudiced reader can  
doubt that it regards the *outward rite* of  
BAPTISM, so well known in this gospel as  
having been practised by John, and received  
by the Lord Himself. And thus it  
was immediately, and has been ever since,  
understood by the Church. As regards all  
attempts to explain away this sense, we  
may say—even setting aside the testimony  
furnished by the Acts of the Apostles,—  
that it is in the highest degree improbable  
that our Lord should have given, at a time  
when He was summing up the duties of  
His Church in such weighty words, a command  
couched in figurative or ambiguous language  
—one which He must have known  
would be interpreted by His disciples, now  
long accustomed to the rite and its name,  
otherwise than He intended it.

**into the name…]** Reference is apparently  
made to the Baptism of the Lord himself,  
where the whole Three Persons of the Godhead  
were in manifestation.

Not the *names*—but **the name**—setting forth the  
Unity of the Godhead.

**into]** It is  
unfortunate again here that our English  
Bibles do not give us the force of this word.  
“*In*” should have been **into**, (as in Gal. iii.  
27 al.,) both here and in 1 Cor. x. 2, and  
wherever the expression is used. It imports,  
not only a *subjective recognition*hereafter by the child of the truth implied  
in the Name, &c., but an *objective admission*  
into the covenant of Redemption—a  
*putting on of Christ*. Baptism is the  
*contract of espousal* (Eph. v. 26) between  
Christ and His Church. Our word ‘*in*’  
being retained both here and in our  
formula of Baptism, it should always be  
remembered that t*he Sacramental declaration  
is contained in this word*; that  
it answers (as Stier has well observed, vii.  
268) to the “*This is my Body*,” in the  
other Sacrament. On the difference between   
the *baptism of John* and *Christian  
baptism*, see notes on ch. iii. 11: Acts  
xviii. 25; xix. 1—5.

**20.]** Even in  
the case of the adult, this teaching must,  
*in greater part*, follow his baptism;  
though as we have seen (on ver. 19), in  
*his* exceptional case, *some of it* must *go  
before*. For this teaching is nothing less  
than the building up of the whole man  
into the obedience of Christ. In these  
words, inasmuch as the then living disciples   
*could not teach all nations*, does  
the Lord *found the office of Preachers* in  
His Church, with all that belongs to it,—  
the duties of the *minister*, the *school-  
teacher*, the *scripture reader*. This ‘*teaching*’   
is not merely the *preaching* of the  
gospel—not mere proclamation of the good  
news—but the whole catechetical office of  
the Church upon and in the baptized.

**and, lo,...]** These words imply  
and set forth the *Ascension*, the manner  
of which is not related by our Evangelist.

**I**, in the fullest sense: not the  
*Divine presence, as distinguished from the  
Humanity* of Christ. His Humanity is  
with us likewise. The vine lives in the  
branches. Stier remarks the contrast be-  
tween this ‘*I am with you*,’ and the view  
of Nicodemus (John iii. 2) ‘no man can do  
these miracles—except *God be with him*.’

**with you]** mainly, *by the promise  
of the Father* (Luke xxiv. 49) *which He  
has poured out on his Church*. But the  
presence of the Spirit is the effect of the  
presence of Christ—and the presence of  
Christ is part of the *gift of all power*above—the effect of the well-pleasing of