

the very place where the children of Israel passed over Jordan when led by Joshua. At first, according to the name, it might only be a house at the ford or ferry, but in time it appears to have grown to a village.

Matthew Henry says, "Bethabara signifies the house of passage; some think it was the very place where Israel passed over Jordan into the land of promise, under Joshua." So say Dr. Gill, Dr. A. Clarke, Bloomfield, Cruden, and Barnes.

I have heard of a baptism that fully explains the matter. I was told by some that Mr. O—— was baptized at Montreal, and by others, that he was baptized in the River St. Lawrence. I believe both accounts are true. As for the word *beyond* Jordan, any village on the eastern banks would be so to a person residing in Jerusalem, or any where to the west. How little are men aware of the power of system when the Scriptures are so plain and expressive on this point—"And were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." Mark i. 5.

The same preacher urges with equal confidence, against the idea of immersion, the use of the word baptism in the original, although not in the translation, of that memorable passage, Mark vii. 4. But for my part I take this passage to be a strong proof for the other side of the question, as the following extract will shew:—"Of the practices of the Pharisees in these particulars we are best informed by their own writers 'If the Pharisees touched but the garments of the common people, they were defiled and needed *immersion*.' MAIMONID. Now in the markets contact was unavoidable; and care was necessary to avoid it in the streets; accordingly they walked on the sides of the way that they might contract no defilement. This accounts for the obvious progress of

thought in these views, viz., they always wash their hands (immersing them as we do) before they eat; but coming from market, where contact with one another is inevitable, they *bathe* or *immerse* the whole body. So of the other things mentioned, even to tables and couches and beds, *immersion* was imperiously required." Thus runs their canon:—"A bed that is wholly defiled, if he *dips* it part by part, it is pure again. A bolster or pillow of skin must be lifted out of the water by the fringe, lest being holden by the hand the water should not gain access to every spot. In like manner a table was cleansed in a pond; but if there was a spot when after defilement it was *immersed* untouched by the water, as by means of pitch sticking to it, it was still unclean.' The same Jewish writer from whom all these cases are selected, viz., Maimonides, says further—"Whosoever in the law washing of the flesh or of clothes, is mentioned, it means nothing else than the *dipping* of the whole body in water; for, says he, if any man wash himself all over except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness." This memorable Rabbi must have known the traditions and customs of his own nation, better, far better, than any of us.

The use of the word in Heb. ix. 10, is often advanced for the same purpose; but there, there must be a reference to the various *immersions* enjoined upon priest and people under the law. Read Lev. xv. xvi, 4—24. xvii. 15. Num. xix. However, it is quite possible that other modes may be included, and for the sake of brevity only one word used; although, in point of language, as it regards *part of the service* not used in its natural signification, nor within its common latitude. We know examples of this can be found in the use of many plain and distinct words by the most learned and best of our