

by New Testament writers. Such instances, if used at all, can only be used in a subordinate sense as illustrating and confirming the meaning already established. The only proper scientific method of ascertaining the meaning of any ancient word at a particular date, is to collate as far as possible, all the examples of the word up to that date. Then arranging these in chronological order, the careful student can determine without difficulty the import of the word in each case. While making a free use of the labors of others, the present writer claims the privilege of thinking for himself, and he enters upon this inquiry untrammelled by anything said before by friend or foe.

One more word introductory. We do not claim that *baptizo* has the same specific meaning in the New Testament that it has in the Greek of profane authors. It would be contrary to all principles of philology to argue that a word must be understood in a particular sense in the writings of Matthew or Paul, simply because that had been proved to be its accredited meaning in the writings of Pindar, Plato or Aristotle. It would, however, be equally unwarranted and unreasonable to discard the *usus loquendi* of the word prior to the New Testament era. *Baptizo* occurs in the heathen classics, and in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament including the Apocrypha. And the most eminent writers on both sides of the controversy maintain that the word, when introduced into sacred literature, does not lose its essential meaning, though it acquires a new and sacred signification. The mode and radical import are retained throughout all Greek literature.

We open Dr. Cofant's "*Baptizein*," and knowing the purpose for which it was written, and the position and character of the writer, we may safely conclude that the best possible case for the dipping theory will be made out. - And yet, what do we find? Why, this great Baptist scholar, specially employed by the Baptist Revision Committee to defend their teaching and practice,