

Over against the Baptist claim,

*"Dip, and nothing but dip, through all Greek literature,"*

I place this proposition:

*In the whole range of Greek literature prior to the time of Christ, baptizo never, so far as the record tells us, had such a meaning as "dip" or "immerse" in the sense of "dip."*

In every one of these ancient baptisms, secular and sacred, we find the baptizing element or instrumentality moved and brought upon the person or thing baptized; never once do we find the person or thing baptized moved, and put into and under water or any other element, and then immediately withdrawn, after the manner of the Baptists. The actual meaning of *baptizo* can be determined only from the usage. Lexicons are not a final authority; their definitions are worthless unless sustained by the instances. Too frequently, as Robert Young, LL.D., tersely observes, "Lexicographers follow each other like a flock of sheep," and Dr. Carson himself declares that "the meaning of a word must ultimately be determined by an actual inspection of the passages in which it occurs."

There are twenty-seven undoubted instances of the use of *baptizo* before the time of Christ. These we shall place, one by one, in chronological order, and in the original language, before the reader. Each instance we shall fairly translate, and examine with this crucial test, What was moved in this baptism: the baptizing element or the subject baptized? In every instance the answer is adverse to the dipping theory. The baptizing element is always moved, the subject never.

A word lest we may be misunderstood. We do not claim any specific mode for *baptizo*. It is not a modal word. It does not mean "to sprinkle" or "to pour" any more than it means "to dip" or "to immerse." The word itself determines nothing as to mode, but it expresses effect, state or condition, no matter how produced. Simi-