us by Dr. inconsist-'Dip" and it into the erge" are cate condi-'erwhelm " he subject. e province k church. e standing the priest The "bapissionaries ie immerndeed all iae"), not gnized as e then is ort of the 633 ? the word radictions nd Fuller, g," while

f all the ld not be wanting." us under ometimes into the e water: on which hat in a hy one of exigency

115.

of the occasion. There must be a clear, well-defined. uniform sense. We, therefore, demand of Baptists that they hold to the sense of this word which they illustrate in their practice. In their practice all Baptists agree with Dr. Carson that baptizo is a word of specific mode, always meaning "dip and nothing but dip through all Greek literature." "The command to baptize," we are told, "is a command to dip." "Baptizing is dipping, and dipping is baptizing." "To dip" is to take up, put into and under the element, and then immediately withdraw. Thus I dip the point of my pen in the ink. This is the precise action of the Baptist when he baptizes. And this and nothing else, he claims, is baptism, so that all undipped persons are unbaptized and unworthy to come to the Lord's table.

Baptist theory and practice demand not merely "dip" as a meaning of baptizo, but as its only meaning. "Nothing but dipping is baptizing," they tell us, and they hesitate not to debar from the Lord's table all undipped persons as unbaptized, and consequently unworthy communicants. It is, therefore, not enough for Baptists to show that there are instances where, as they think, the word means "dip;" they must show that there are no . instances where it does not mean "dip." The careful philologist will perceive that such is the exclusive nature of the Baptist claim that it does not admit one solitary adverse instance. If, in these pages, we are able to point out one example in the whole range of Greek literature where the word cannot possibly mean "dip," then we have proved that dip is not the only mode of baptism, and the whole exclusive Baptist theory perishes. Let this point be carefully noted, a failure on our part to prove affusion in some of the instances will avail nothing for the Baptist theory, so long as there are other clear undoubted instances adverse to that theory-logically, one instance is sufficient. Our claim is, not that one instance merely, but all the instances, without one exception, are irreconcilably opposed to the dipping theory.