

lating it, is used sometimes in the classics, perhaps once or twice in the New Testament, where a word meaning poured or washed might have been used instead. When we have admitted this we have practically allowed all that any can claim, and yet not weakened our own case in the least degree. An examination of any authoritative Greek lexicon, such as Grimm's, Liddell & Scott's, etc., will give us as the primary meaning of "*baptizo*," to immerse. All authorities agree on this point. In cases where the word may be used in any other sense, it is simply because the idea it represents is intimately associated with that of immersion, such as the practical consequences of "pouring" or "washing." But when the word is used alone, without qualifying circumstances that would render its primary meaning impossible or improbable, it is only fair that it should be translated "immerse." Let us suppose that the proper mode of baptism was by "sprinkling" or "pouring"; is it not a proper question to ask why, if such is the case, did not our Lord and His apostles in speaking of the rite use either of the Greek words that unmistakably signify these things? Yet in not one case is the ordinance described by any other word than "*baptizo*." It is not the method of the Holy Spirit to use language without special significance. Every scriptural word is employed because of its absolute fitness for the idea it is intended to express. Why, then, did the Holy Spirit use the word "*baptizo*" if He really meant "*rantizo*" or "*cheo*"? The discussion of this point need scarcely be carried farther. The open mind will readily see that