

serviceable. Paul was certainly a sincere friend, and not an enemy, to Peter ; though in one particular, wherein "he was to be blamed," he "withstood him to the face." Gal. ii. 11.]

3. It was asked, whether the Baptists, if they had the helm, would allow aid to be given to Pædobaptist Versions, rendering the word *baptizo* by words signifying *to sprinkle*? I answered, Yes ; and I repeat it. Though we should consider such Versions incorrect in that particular, yet if the translators declared themselves conscientious in such a course, we would not infringe on their liberty of conscience, nor withhold from them a fair proportion of the common fund, to which they were contributing as well as we. This is not barely my view of the subject. The Committee of the Baptist Union in England, in a Memorial presented to the Committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society, Jan. 6, 1840, say, (p. 15,) "The Baptist body, standing as they do on this plea of liberty, would be the last to deny it to their fellow-servants. If a Pædobaptist translator conscientiously believes that sprinkling or pouring is the meaning of *baptizo*, let him so render it. As an honest man he is bound to do so; and if, upon the authority of competent scholarship, his Version be certified to be faithful, let the Bible Society support it."

And now, having answered this question, it is my turn to ask one. I ask my Pædobaptist brethren, therefore, If they were in the minority, and the Baptists would not allow one shilling to be given in aid of any translation in which the word *baptizo* was not rendered in accordance with their wishes, would they continue to furnish funds from which versions prepared by Baptist translators alone would be supported? If not, how can they expect us to contribute for the support of versions made by Pædobaptists