

baptizing himself, we are told by Baptists, means "dip." And while it is not denied that it may sometimes be used in that sense, it is most positively denied that it is restricted to that narrow significance. It occurs fifteen times in the Old Testament, and according to some of the best lexicographers, such as Stokius, Schindler, Leigh, and Furstianus, the meaning of the word is exhausted, "if an object merely touches the liquid, *or is touched by it.*" The last named scholar defines the word to *moisten*, to *sprinkle* as well as to "dip." Robert Young, LL.D., in his "Greek and Hebrew Analytical Concordance to the Bible," defines *tabal* to *moisten*, to *besprinkle*, and under these definitions he ranges all the fifteen instances of its occurrence. *Tabal* cannot mean "dip" in Gen. 37:31. It would have been physically impossible to dip (in the Baptist sense) Joseph's coat in the blood of a kid. The coat was stained or smeared with the blood. The LXX. has it "*emolunan ton kitona to haimati.*" *Moluno* means "to soil, to stain, to smear." *To haimati* is the instrumental dative, and must be rendered "with the blood." Nor can *tabal* mean a Baptist dipping in Lev. 14:15, 16, where the priest is directed to dip the finger of his right hand in a few drops of oil held in the palm of the left hand.

The case of Naaman was that of partial leprosy. This is clear from v. 11. He expected that Elisha would "wave his hand (R. V.) over the place" like the modern animal-magnetizer. It was therefore enough to ceremonially wash or baptize the part affected.

Naaman's baptism was not for a physical or medical purpose. It was not intended to cure the leprosy. God alone could cure the leprosy, just as He alone can cure sin. It was a ceremonial cleansing, symbolic of the cleansing of the leprosy, and pointing forward to the "blood of sprinkling" which cleanseth from all sin.

But why wash in the Jordan, and nowhere else? Because the cleansing of the leper, according to the law