

In the first place, then, much will depend upon the reputed orthodoxy and piety of those who execute it. The Society under whose patronage, and by whose instrumentality it is proposed, is properly called the "*Bible Union*." Not the Baptist Union.

Already it has been opposed and misrepresented as a *Baptist Union* for *Baptist* principles. A new measure to carry out *immersionist* views of the action of baptism, by translating *baptism*, *immersion*, and all its family, root and branches, by *immerse*, *immersing*, *immersed*, *immersion*! This is about all the logic and all the rhetoric that has appeared in one hundred and forty-four paragraphs, written, printed, and circulated against it, "from Dan even unto Beersheba," from Boston to San Francisco, from Mulberry street, New York, to Old Jewry, London.

Truly immersionists have been hardly pressed, although now the largest community in the Union, and annually gaining more than any denomination in the number of its membership; fully equalling in population, wealth, and resources, one-fifth of the political and moral force of this great nation.

But why have recourse to a new version, for the sake of translating this family of *baptizo*? Have not all, or nearly all, the learned Rabbis and Doctors of the Pedobaptist communities, affirmed not only that *baptism* means immersion, but also that it was so administered in the Apostles' days? Ask Brenner, of the Church of Rome, what was the ancient apostolic baptism? He responds, that "immersion was practised for *thirteen centuries* almost universally, and from the beginning till now," in the Greek Church. Ask the English Episcopal Church how long did the church practice immersion as the representative of baptism? And Dr. Wall responds, for 1600 years. Ask Luther what is his judgment on the premises? he answers, "I could wish that all such as are to be baptized, should be carefully immersed into water, according to the meaning of the word and the signification of the ordinance; as also, without doubt it was instituted by Christ." Ask the great American critic, the late Professor Stuart, what is the English of baptize, and he affirms, "that it means to dip, plunge or immerse in water, and that all lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this." And does not ancient history aver, that both Wycliffe and Tindal were in their views immersionists? With all these venerated names—a mere cluster culled from the orthodox Pedobaptist vine—what need have Baptists themselves to form a Baptist Bible Union, to inculcate their views of immersion!!

But it will be whispered that other views than these—heretical and false—are cherished by the Bible Union, and that the Bible will be colored by these. This has been insinuated; nay printed and published by Baptists themselves opposed to it. And what is the proof, or the basis of such suspicion? Have not the leading movers of this Bible translation, as now digested and exhibited by the Bible Union, been always regarded as sound and orthodox on every vital doctrine of christianity? Do not they believe in the fall of man; in the contamination and guilt of sin, which, as a leprosy, has