

his case more plausibly from the Greek Classics than from the New Testament? But, to let that pass for the present, we ask, What would be the real weight of the argument from the Classics, even if it entirely favoured immersion? Suppose its advocates could produce even hundreds of passages from heathen Greek writings, in which the words rendered *baptism* and *baptize* were used in the sense of dipping; and that their opponents were unable to adduce a single exception to this usage; would this settle the question, proving that we are wrong, and that they are right? If an affirmative answer be given, we ask,—Is, then, the meaning of a term in the Greek Classics to settle absolutely, and in all cases, its New Testament signification? Surely no one would affirm, that because a Greek word bore a certain meaning in the writings of Homer, this must therefore be its precise meaning in the Epistles of St. Paul! Unquestionably, the writers of the New Testament conveyed information which had not previously been communicated by the heathen Greeks. But how *could* they convey this new information, unless they either coined new words, or used existing words in a new or modified sense? Surely the Greek words which are rendered by the English terms *law*, *repentance*, *justification*, *sanctification*, *angel*, *spirit*, and many more, are not to be understood as bearing *precisely* the same meaning in the New Testament which they bear in the writings of the heathen poets and philosophers. Who would admit such a principle of interpretation? Then, if even the Greek words which are rendered *baptism* and *baptize* were invariably employed in the Classics to signify dipping, it would not follow, as a matter of course, that the New

Testa
in no
Dr
TIZO,
mean
the C
to dip
This
untru
New
only
It do
these
is ob
L
subj
cann
poun
him.
the
W
from
in *
Gree
tion
bein
exte
flow
bap
into
just
bap