

*onian*, it has been thought that this word, like many others even of the common Version, should be retained in the translation; only giving it a Roman, or rather, as we may say, an English dress, *aionian*." Accordingly, he thus transfers this word, as Mr. Scarlett had done before, and so conceals its meaning in Matt. xxv. 46. "And these shall go away into *aionian* punishment; but the righteous into *aionian* life." As a word denoting limited duration would not only do violence to the *original* (*aionios*), but would also be manifestly incongruous—"These shall go away into *limited* punishment; but the righteous into *limited* life"—so likewise it would be in many texts, as for instance, Rom. vi. 3; 4, if the word *baptizo* were translated either to *sprinkle* or *pour*—"So many of us as were *sprinkled*, or *poured*, into Jesus Christ, were *sprinkled*, or *poured*, into His death. Therefore we are buried with him by *sprinkling*, or *pouring*, into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead," &c. (See also Mar. i. 5; John iii. 23; 1 Cor. xv. 29.) How, then, can our Pedobaptist brethren consistently censure the Universalists for doing the very thing which they themselves do, and for which they have set them the example, and at the same time, because we cannot in conscience do what they condemn in the Universalists in our translations for the poor ignorant heathen, refuse to co-operate with us in sending them the Scriptures?

8. One of the speakers, both in his Resolution and his Speech, deprecated "tampering with the word of God," evidently insinuating, at least, that the Baptists do so. What, I ask, is it to *tamper* with the word of God? Is it not unquestionably to conceal its meaning?—to attempt to make it seem to accord with the views and wishes of opposite parties? Have the Baptists done this? It was distinctly admitted by several of the