

"or repentance." There was a difference as to their end, but no difference as to their mode.

What, then, was the mode of the baptism practised among the Jews before the time of John's preaching? *Immersion* is not enjoined in the law of Moses, neither among all the "divers baptisms imposed" was there any provision made for *immersion*—startling facts for immersionists, but true! But the mode of purification spoken of as baptism is revealed—Num. viii. 7, and 19th ch. 17th to 19—"Sprinkle water of purifying upon them." This latter passage is particularly in point when compared with Ecclesiasticus xxxiv. 25. In the latter passage, baptism for the dead is spoken of, while in Num. xix. that cleansing or baptism is enjoined to be by sprinkling. Josephus also thus describes the rite of baptism for the dead: When any persons were defiled by a dead body . . . they sprinkled with the water of separation, both on the third and on the seventh day, and after that they were clean." Such sprinkling being, then, baptism before John's time, it would still be baptism unless injunctions to the contrary be given. We do not find any. Again, from the passages referred to above, in Mark and Luke, it appears that washing and baptising are interchangeable terms; and that the laving of water on one hand by the other, accompanied by rubbing, is baptism. Besides, the baptism of these passages was a common ceremony, performed every day and often every day, in almost every Jewish dwelling. If this were by immersion, large baths in every house would have been absolutely necessary, and must have been in very constant use. There is no record of the existence of such baptisteries; still further, we are told in John ii. 6, that the water-pots used for purifying, i.e. for cleansing by baptism, contained two or three firkins apiece, about fifteen or twenty gallons only, and of course not possibly sufficient for "burial beneath the yielding wave." One other thing we notice in Mark vii. 3, couches or tables are among the things baptised. But what were these? Doubtless they included the *triclina*, on each of which three persons could recline at table, and which were fixtures. These might easily be defiled, and it certainly is more in accordance with Jewish usage that these were cleansed by sprinkling, baptism, than by being taken down and carried a great distance to some river or pool, in which they could be wholly put under the water.

To sum up this point in the language of the *Review*, "The Jews in their frequent baptisms did not immerse, but sprinkled

or poured the element on the person or object—the evidence is (a) That while these baptisms were imposed by the law of Moses, yet no where in that law is immersion enjoined. (b) While immersion is not enjoined, or even hinted at, another mode is definitely described; (c) this described mode, *sprinkling*, is denoted as baptising at least one or two centuries before the Christian era. (d.) Washing and baptising are interchangeable terms. In the former immersion was not practised, nor was it in the latter. (e.) No provision was made in their domestic arrangements for immersion, while there was provision for pouring or sprinkling. (f.) Some of the things baptised could not have been conveniently immersed, but might easily have been sprinkled. (g.) Such mention is made of sprinkling in connection with these divers baptisms, as to shew that they must have been administered after that mode. Heb. iv. 13." From these considerations we infer, that when John's baptism was instituted, baptism meant not immersion, but cleansing by sprinkling. In submitting, then, to baptism, the multitudes in the wilderness of Judea did nothing new or uncommon, did not take up a heavy cross for Christ's sake by going under the water, but underwent a rite symbolic of cleansing with an eye to the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.

2. Let us look at the instances of baptism recorded in the New Testament. Before doing so, however, we observe that the Old Testament prophecies, when referring to New Testament cleansing, speak of sprinkling, Isa. lii. 15; Ezek. xxxvi. 25. The Apostle also speaks of a baptism of the children of Israel in the Red Sea, when none but the Egyptians were immersed, 1 Cor. x. 2. And in Acts i. 5, the Baptism of the Holy Ghost is spoken of as, not immersion into God's spirit, but the pouring of the Spirit upon, Acts ii. 18; and the falling of the Spirit upon, Acts x. 44.

The Baptist argument is generally rested on three distinct propositions, besides Rom. vi. 4, and its parallel in Colossians. 1. Baptize means always and only immerse. 2. The Scripture speaks of "going down into," and "coming up out of" the water. 3. John went to Enon, because there was much water there. On the passage in Romans, as it is not an instance of baptism, we make no comment, further than to say that the passage does not speak of baptism as being the likeness of Christ's burial at all. It teaches us that the baptised Christian is in Christ; dead with him to sin, risen with him to newness of life, and all by faith—with him in the likeness of his death, i.e.

crucified to the world, and in the likeness of his resurrection, i.e. living to God. The first proposition we also pass by, as we think it has been already disproved in speaking of Jewish baptisms. The word does not always mean dip. "Nebuchadnezzar was baptised (*chaphe*) with the dew of heaven."

We come next to the prepositions *eis* and *ek*, as proving immersion. These prepositions do not mean necessarily *into* and *out of*. They would be as correctly used to denote *to* and *from*. In John xx. 4, the other apostle came first *to* the sepulchre, *eis*, but did not go in. John ix. 7, Jesus sent the blind man to wash his eyes in *two* pool of Siloam, *—eis*. He did not necessarily dip his body under it. And so it were easy to shew that *ek* means *from* as well as out of. "From the marriage" Unless, therefore, immersion can be proved in some other way, the eunuch's history in Acts viii. will not prove it.

The third proposition refers to the "much water" at Enon. But if John only wanted much water, why did he leave Bethabara? Surely Jordan had water enough for one man to immerse. The words, however, are "many waters," or streams. Enon, a small village near Salem, being well provided with water, was a suitable place for the crowds who attended on John's ministry, and therefore he went there with them.

Let us, however, now notice particularly the recorded instances of baptism. We may notice the multitudes baptised by John and the thousands on the day of Pentecost together, as presenting a like insuperable difficulty to the theory of immersion, unless, indeed, we allow a miracle. Let any one make a calculation for himself on the following basis, and he will be satisfied. If 1,000,000 were baptised by John, at what rate must he have immersed them? His ministry lasted about eighteen months; allowing, then, that he baptised every day for ten hours per day, during the whole time—he must have baptised at the rate of 185 per hour. Is it possible for a man to stand ten hours per day in the water, dipping men at the rate of three per minute, for eighteen months, without intermission? Truly this is aside from nature's course, it is a miracle. John, as a mere man, had neither time nor strength to do it. Again, in Acts ii., Peter began to preach at nine o'clock a.m., "With many words he testified," verse 40. Doubtless, therefore, the forenoon was well gone before the three thousand were ready for baptism. But the same day, that is, before sun-set, the whole had been baptised, verse 41. This gives us, say eight hours, to baptise 3000; or