

130 broad, and 75 deep;" "the sides of which are built up with masonry of small stones, whose surface is covered with a hard smooth cement." On which he thus reasons [p. 18]

"Here certainly has remained since Christ's day an expanse of water furnishing 900 baptisteries, each 6 feet by 10;"

in which the 3,000, he says, could have had "facilities for Christian baptism." He should have said 780, but 180 more is not material. What troubles us is the dividing and utilizing a pool of its depth, 75 feet, into baptisteries, 6 feet by 10, all over its surface! They would need a number of boats and we don't read of any in Jerusalem or nearer than Joppa or Galilee. Even if they had them enough, it would hardly be "easy and without any hurry to immerse the 3000 in less than an hour," as Cramp assures his readers, or "within twenty minutes" as Mr. C. assured his. Mr. Cameron said, however,

"Greater than all was the royal cistern under the temple—a veritable lake—where hundreds could be simultaneously immersed."

Observe, the Pharisees, priests, scribes, and the mass of the people were hostile to Christ, whom they had just crucified, and to his disciples and their baptism. That day of Pentecost was a great festival attended, besides those of Jerusalem and Judea, by Jews from "every nation under heaven" [Acts 2: 5], full of bitter anti-christian zeal. The pools and cisterns contained their water for food and religious uses. Would they allow them to be polluted by the immersion in them of thirty hundred of the hated sect of the hated Nazarene? We read of no disturbance on that account, which of itself implies there was no immersion. Mr. C. suggests they may have been immersed in a large "cistern [1] under the temple;" that is, from which the water was taken for the sacrifices, and while the priests, pharisees and people crowded the temple above, worshipping! Such is the struggle to make out immersion.

Let me conclude on this with another Baptist account from a different point of view. To make out that John's mode was immersion, Pengilly reasons thus, (p. 14):

"We should notice the place where John administered this ordinance. It was 'the river Jordan.' If in reference to the people of Jerusalem, a situation where water might be easily obtained for *sprinkling* or *pouring*, was what John required, we read of our Lord at this place, directing the man that was born blind to go and 'wash in the pool of Siloam;' so we read of the 'pool called Bethesda,' and 'the brook Cedron,' all *in* or *near* Jerusalem, (and we read of others in the Old Testament); and without doubt, at some of them the penitent Jews of that city and neighbourhood might have received the ordinance, if *such* were the mode by which John administered it; and it cannot *reasonably* be imagined he would have *required* those persons to go the distance of several miles for the convenience of the river Jordan: more reasonable to suppose he would have baptized in every town and village where his ministry had its intended effect; and *especially* at or near the *metropolis*. This strongly favors the opinion that immersion was his mode."

Pengilly here proceeds on the unwarranted assumption that John could have no other reason for abiding and preaching in "the wilderness," but the quantity of water for immersion. But let us suppose his facts and reasoning correct. His contention is that because, "at or near Jerusalem," *there were no conveniences for immersion*, though plenty for sprinkling, therefore John "required the penitent Jews of that city and neighbourhood to go the distance of several miles for the convenience of the river Jordan." Well, if John could not find sufficient water for immersion there, neither could the apostles. Oh, but—! That argument is sound enough in favor of immersion; but as against immersion it must not be mentioned. Yet the Baptist Church Publication Society