

mentions it. In all his explorations among classic and patristic baptisms, he seems never to have found one instance illustrating his own definition of a "new state," etc. It is always with him "mode, and nothing but mode."

But while *baptizo* is thus non-modal, the effect, state or condition expressed must have been produced in some mode or form of act. This mode can usually be determined from the context and the surrounding circumstances. And our position is that the mode, as thus determined, is always by the baptizing element being moved and brought upon the person or thing baptized. In no single instance is there a dip, that is, the person or thing baptized moved, put into the baptizing element, and then immediately withdrawn.

The material for our inquiry is at hand. It will be found scattered throughout the works of the two authors just referred to. Dr. Dale has, in four large volumes, gone over the whole baptismal controversy with a thoroughness never before even attempted, and has done more than any other man to bring this matter to a final settlement. Dr. Conant's researches on this subject were undertaken at the request of the American (Baptist) Bible Union, and were undertaken for the purpose of justifying and defending the Baptists in their work of revising the New Testament, and substituting the words "immerse," "immersion," etc., in place of the words "baptize," "baptism," etc. His Greek quotations are numerous, and very fully given; we shall make free use of them. Both these authors, however, exhibit a great lack of method. They give us instances of the use of the word centuries before Christ; and side by side with these, other instances from doggerel Greek centuries after Christ, and apparently attach the same importance to all in ascertaining the meaning of the word at the time of Christ. This is confusing and utterly unscientific. Books written after the New Testament era could have had no possible influence on the import of words used