

"Enon" mainly for the convenience of having water to baptize with, it would not follow that he baptized by *dipping*. If a minister in the present day were as popular as John the Baptist, and were to baptize, by sprinkling or pouring, vast multitudes, say the entire population of one of our large counties, would he not find it necessary to select a spot where water was abundant? In Palestine water was very scarce: the Jordan was the only stream that deserved the name of a river, the rest were mere mountain-torrents. Then if John had merely sprinkled or poured a little water on each of his numerous converts, he would have found it a great convenience to have plenty of water at hand, even if it had been required for no other purpose than that of baptism. As to "Enon," and its "much water, on which so much stress has been laid, it is quite certain, from the face of the country, as described by travellers, that it never did furnish such a quantity of water as John would have required for *dipping*. Biblical critics are agreed that the phrase rendered in our version, "much water," properly means "*many waters*," that is to say, many springs. Now, if John baptized by pouring a little water from a vessel on the head of each convert, according to the representation in ancient bas-reliefs, then the "many springs of Enon would have furnished him with all the water that he needed; but they would have been altogether inadequate to supply him with the quantity of water that he would have required to *dip* so large a number.

That John baptized his converts by dipping is utterly *incredible*. How any man who has reflected on the circumstances of the case can believe that he did, is astonishing. Did John dip his converts in a state of *nudity*,

or in
forme
Then
of the
tion
only
popul
until
Bathi
tion.
that t
dresse
banks
could
habit
Th
have
step
possib
course
mates
Jerus
Jorda
John
too h
sand
that
taken
John
our I
at the
that i