

Cole, defines baptizo, "to baptize, to wash, to sprinkle."

Passor, defines it, to "immerse, wash, sprinkle."

Suidas, defines it, "immerse, moisten, sprinkle, wash; purge, cleanse; (mergo, mædëfacio, lavo, purgo, mundo.)"

Conlon, defines it, by "immersion, washing, sprinkling, or wetting; (mersione, ablutione, et aspersione.)"

Here we have a definition of a few of the most eminent lexicographers; and not wishing to intrude on your limits, I shall let these names suffice at this time—and give others when called for; not considering, Mr. Editor, that I am giving you information, but for the benefit of your readers.

You ask, "was there ever a man living who translated *bapto* or *baptizo*, by pour or sprinkle?" I do not wish, Sir, to evade this question by asking, was there ever a man before Campbell, who ventured to translate *baptizo*, by immerse, for christian baptism? Have our translators in any one instance in the New Testament, rendered baptizo, to immerse or dip, though the word is used about eighty times? Whenever they have translated it, (as they have done in some instances,) they have translated it *wash*, or some word that does not necessarily signify a total immersion. Generally they have only transcribed the word, giving it the English form *baptizo*. They have never translated it *immerse*. And why was this? Did they not *know* the meaning of baptizo? Then, they were not fit for their great undertaking. Did they know the meaning and not choose to give it? Then they weakly and wickedly shrunk from the duty they undertook. But the translators of the Bible were neither ignorant nor wicked men. They *knew* and *did* their duty. Why then did they not translate baptizo into English? Because there is no word in English that fully and precisely, and in all cases, answered it in signification. They did not translate it *sprinkle*, because they knew it did not always signify sprinkle; for the same reason they did not translate it, *pour*, *immerse*, *wash*, &c. They knew it signified the application of water or other liquid, either by *sprinkling*, *pouring*, or *immersing*; and as no English word expresses this signification, they judged it best generally, to give an English form, and leave it untranslated.

As to the word *bapto*, as you have very justly shown in your 9th number, it is a word generally used in the New Testament to express dipping. But I would ask, in how many cases is it used to express christian baptism? In cases of dipping, we find the Apostles have used the word *bapto*, and not *baptizo*; and if the only meaning of *baptizo*, is, to *dip*, why do the Apostles always use another word when they wish to convey the idea of total *plunging*? The fact that when they speak of *dipping*, they use another word, furnishes conclusive proof that they do not consider the only meaning of baptizo to be immersion.

If Christ and his Apostles had intended to confine us to one and the same mode of baptism, they might, and doubtless would have had words of the most definite signification. If they had intended to desig-