

solved to search the Old Testament baptisms again with this view. He was successful beyond his expectations. In Numb. xix. 18, 19, is a baptism which, when divested of the *diversity* of characters, which suit the Old Testament, and dispensed according to the simplicity of the New, leaves exactly that which is dispensed by the generality of Protestants. When Christ adapted it to the New dispensation he changed its signification also, to suit the New Testament state of the Church.

A GUIDE TO BAPTISM.

It pleased God to appoint in his Church an ordinance in which the sprinkling of its members with water represents purification from sin by the blood of Christ. In the English version of the Bible this rite is called "cleansing" or "purification" in the Old Testament, and baptism in the New; but it ought to be called by the same name in both, for in both the ordinance is substantially the same, and in both the original words signify the same thing. "Cleansing" or "purification" is a plainer translation than "baptism," for baptism is not, properly speaking, a translation at all, but a Greek word in an English dress, and still needs a translation. "Cleansing" is the plainest, being the only word of the three which is pure English, but "purification," though derived from the Latin, is used so commonly in the English language that it is understood perhaps as well as if it were a native word. It is far otherwise with "baptism." The English reader cannot easily find its meaning, for its use is so confined as to be almost, if not altogether, appropriated to express this rite. It seems to have been invented for this very purpose, though with some detriment to truth, and without any just cause, since it was not needed. Nevertheless, custom has established its use so long as now to forbid the substitution of any other word.

Had the whole Scripture been originally written in one language this rite would have been expressed in one word from the beginning to the end, because there could have been no occasion for a change; of course one word would have expressed it in the English version also, and probably in all others, for the same reason. Had the Hebrew of the Old Testament been continued through the New the words *Tahar* and others, commonly used in the Old Testament, would have been as commonly used in the New, and have had the same translation, viz., "cleansing" or "purification," in which case the word baptism would not have been seen in the English New Testament, nor perhaps in the English language, because "cleansing" or "purification" would have pre-occupied its place. On the other hand, had the Old Testament been written in Greek like the New, instead of the word "cleansing" or "purification" the English version would have the word "baptism" frequently in the Levitical law, and occasionally throughout the Old Testament, as well as the New, and with the same signification. In either of these cases one word, and of course one idea, would have been used throughout the Scripture, which would have facilitated unity of sentiment respecting the ordinance itself.

But the Scripture was originally written in two languages, the Old Testament in Hebrew and the New in Greek, on which account two words, one for each language, became necessary for expressing one and the same rite. But in translating these two words into any one language, as the English, propriety and consistency required that one word only should have been used; because whatever word would have been a just translation of the one would have been so of the other. Had this been done it would have rendered the connection of the Old and New Testament baptism more apparent,