

We proceed now to another branch of our argument, and affirm that the entire New Testament does not furnish a single clear case of baptism by *dipping*. The proof of this statement, however, although it will serve to strengthen our argument, is not at all necessary to its conclusiveness. Its omission would not be leaving out the key-stone of the arch, but simply leaving the building a few inches lower. We may go even further, and affirm, that if it could be shown, beyond a doubt, that baptism in the times of our Lord and His apostles was *invariably* administered by dipping,—this would not at all invalidate that branch of our argument in which we have clearly proved that *baptism* and *dipping* are not synonymous, but would merely imply that dipping is a valid mode of administering the ordinance,—a point on which we are all quite agreed.

Did John, then, baptize by dipping? It is confidently affirmed that he did, because it is said that he “baptized *in* Jordan.” Now, were we even to admit that the subjects of John’s baptism went into the water, (which is far from certain,) how would it follow from this admission that they were *dipped*? If a man rides his horse *into* the water, does that imply that he plunges him over head and ears in it? *May* it not mean merely that he rides him in a few inches deep, for the convenience of letting him drink? The Jordan, as is well known, had a double bank, an inner and an outer. The stream was confined within the inner bank, except at the time of the annual overflow, caused by the melting of the snow on Mount Lebanon, when it reached to the outer. The expression “*in* Jordan,” then, ought not to have any great stress laid upon it; for it *may* mean no more than that John arranged

his co
of th
the v
sect
follow
Chris
tation
tice i
while
is lai
baptiz
that
“bap
sense
nonse

Bu
and v
water
on th
many
did n
remain
for th
—and
tion.
all, it
statio
Christ
custon
hood
from
But