

Testament writers had employed them in this sense, and in no other.

Dr. Carson affirms that the Greek word βαπτίζω, "BAPTIZO," wherever it occurs, denotes *to dip*, from which meaning it never, in the slightest degree, departs. "In the Classics it denotes *to dip*, in the Scriptures it denotes *to dip*, and in the Fathers it denotes nothing but *to dip*." This is a bold statement, unquestionably; but it is simply untrue, as we shall see presently. We shall come to the New Testament by-and-by; but for the present we have only to do with the statement as it affects the Classics. It does not require extensive quotation in order to refute these strong words: a *single* example of a contrary usage is obviously enough to destroy the entire theory.

Let it be remembered that *to dip* means to move the subject, and plunge him into the baptizing element. There cannot be a case of dipping when the baptizing element is poured on the subject, even though it should overwhelm him. In dipping, the *subject* is moved to the *element*, not the element to the subject; he is baptized *in* it, not *with* it.

With this explanation, we proceed to furnish two cases from the Classics (it would be easy to furnish many more) in which there was *baptism* but *no dipping*. An ancient Greek author (Diodorus Siculus) says, "The greater portion of the land-animals overtaken by the river perish, being baptized." In this passage he is speaking of the extensive destruction of cattle caused by the sudden overflowing of the river Nile. Here, then, is a clear case of baptism without dipping; for the animals were not *put into* the water, but the water *rushed upon* them. Take just another. Aristotle speaks of the sea-shore as being baptized by the advancing tide. Now how was this done?