

ring any system in his eye or any préconceived opinion to support, but to learn what the book required that he might do it.

*Query.*—If all read the Bible as the Indian did, would they not come to the same conclusion—viz. that if any believe baptism to mean any thing but immersion, they must learn it from some other book ?

The above was related to me by several persons who were present and heard the conversation between the preacher and the Indian.—Two of them were at that time members of the Paido-Baptist communion ; and if I am not mistaken, were led, from the remarks of the Indian, to read the Bible in the same old-fashioned way, and came to the same conclusion, and were afterwards immersed. One of them is now a preacher in the reformation, of more than ordinary talents."

No person who has attentively read the New Testament, without being prejudiced in favor or against any system, can doubt but that the conclusion of the untutored son of the forest would be that of every man who would take the word of God alone as his guide.

7. Our next argument to prove that *baptizo* means to immerse, and nothing but immerse, is, the uniform practice of the Eastern or Greek Church until this day. Persons, but partially acquainted with Church history, are aware that the Greek Church, embracing all the Russian Empire and the Christian Churches of Turkey in Europe and Asia, with all that call themselves Christians, east and north of the influence of Romanism, ordinarily immerse their infants and proselytes !

Although, perhaps, the present language spoken by the Greeks, differs as much from classic Greek as the Italian language does from the Latin of Virgil and Cicero, yet the difference is not greater than the present English and that written and spoken seven hundred years ago ; and it is well known that all the principal words in our language are the same in signification as then ; at all events the English ought to be the best interpreters of their own language !

This much, then, we claim for the Greeks. They say that *baptizo* means to *dip*, and they therefore practice this whether in Russia's cold and dreary forests, or the warm and delightful isles of Greece !

This argument is of more consequence to the illiterate inquirer for truth than volumes of criticisms on the roots and derivations of words.

How must the clergyman, professing to be a scholar and a christian, who asserts that *baptizo* does not in any case mean to immerse, blush in the presence of a native Greek, acquainted with his own language, who never attached any other signification to the word !

"If pity for the wretched be a generous passion, who can help indulging in it when he sees an illiterate believer in immersion hang his head, daunted and dismayed by the unfair criticism of a learned teacher who tells him the word baptize is Greek, and signifies pouring as well as dipping ? Great men love sometimes to trifle. The inference which these translators draw from their own version is not exactly logical ; for I prove, says the Doctor of Divinity, going to dedicate an infant to the Lord, that the word baptise signifies to pour as well as to dip. In virtue of this, what does he ? He takes the infant, and neither pours nor