

which I would make some remarks, You say p. 50. "Luther in his translation of Mat. iii. 1. says In those days came John the dipper. Why was John termed the baptist or dipper? Because he baptized or dipped his disciples. This accounts in a satisfactory way for our being called baptists."

Now, Sir, I must remark here, that Luther did not use the term dipper; for he did not translate the Bible into English, but into German. The term dipper therefore, is but the translation of a translation. Why then should we leave the original and go to a translation, which we must again translate: or must the mere English scholar renounce the present version, learn German in order to understand the meaning of the term baptist, as applied to John, and all this to be led into a mistake; for baptist is not derived from the word which means to dip, but from the one which means to baptize. Were there any necessity for changing the term, according to the language in which the New Testament was originally written, it would be baptizer. *Baptistes* is formed from *baptizo* in the way in which *basanistes* is formed from *basanizo*; and according to the language of the Old Testament scriptures, it might be rendered purifier.

John the Baptist was an eminent servant of God, but there are two very great improprieties in your conduct respecting him: all the true disciples of the Baptist became the disciples of Christ, is it not then a backward motion, for the disciples of Christ, to call themselves the disciples of the Baptist?

Again you make the baptism of John the origin of your baptism, and are at some pains (p. 46.) to shew that "John's baptism was christian

"bap  
did t  
end?  
viz.  
bowe  
vail  
John  
tion  
2. ix  
A  
Chri  
like  
Bap  
tain  
them  
an  
Joh  
of t  
Ghe  
prin  
poin  
end  
"of  
"an  
wer  
reje  
Lon  
iv.  
for  
all  
tion  
dy  
sub  
ty.  
jee