

stronger confidence in his own opinions than the "giant of Tubbermore." Dr. Conant, on page 4, falsely translates *baptizo* of this passage by "immerse," but on page 88 he correctly renders it "overflow." It avails nothing for the Baptist to say that the "sea-coast" was "covered" with the tide. The question in dispute is not the quantity of water used, but the mode of the baptism. Whether every part of the land was overflowed by the water we cannot know. The probability is that, like all other similar districts of country, the lower parts were overflowed while the higher parts were not. Yet the whole is baptized. For pungent and destructive criticism on the Baptist system, founded on this passage, the reader is referred to Dr. Dale's *Classic Baptism*, pp. 236-244.

These are all the occurrences of *baptizo* in the pure classics, beginning with Pindar (B.C. 500), and ending with Aristotle (B.C. 360), covering a period of one hundred and forty years. During all these years it always expresses state or condition as its import, while the context clearly shews affusion as the mode, the baptizing element always coming upon the subject, never the application or dipping of the subject into the baptizing element.

We now proceed to consider the four instances of *baptizo* in the Septuagint. These come next in chronological order. The Septuagint is a Greek version of the canonical books of the Old Testament, together with the Apocryphal writings of that period. It was made by seventy learned Jews in Egypt, by order of the king, about 280 B.C. Our Lord and His apostles usually quoted from it, rather than from the original Hebrew. It is therefore to be regarded as of the highest authority on all questions of New Testament language, and it throws a flood of light on the subject of our present investigation. In the Septuagint we shall find that while now, for the first time, *baptizo* is used in a religious sense, it still, as in the classics, expresses condition—