

If he *could* have made it plain, and *would not*, there would have been a lack of *benevolence*; but if he *would*, but *could not*, there would have been an insufficiency of *wisdom*: neither of which charges dare we prefer against the author of the living oracles.

That every thing connected with our happiness under the christian dispensation is perfectly plain, would appear obvious from the fact that under the Patriarchal and Jewish dispensations many "bodily acts" were required, on an exact attention to which was suspended the life and happiness of their votaries. Then there was no difficulty in understanding the Lord. During those days the people were taught that when the Messiah should have visited the earth, our duties would be still more simple and plain! And has it come to this, that the first act of obedience to the Lord is involved in such utter obscurity, that it requires a classical education, and the painful researches of a lifetime to know what the Lord means when he says, "Be baptised every one of you!" This would indeed be making the present dispensation ten times more abstruse than any former one. But it is not so. As the gospel dispensation came nearer to men, the light grew stronger until the recipients of the truth were surrounded with a flood of celestial light and truth. Yes, the glory of the new covenant was that they should not be under the necessity of teaching every man his neighbour and brother, saying, know ye the Lord for all should know him from the least to the greatest.

With these preliminaries, too extended already, we hasten to enquire into the meaning of the words *bapto*, *baptizo*, *baptisma*, and their derivatives.

To what source shall we direct our longing eyes for the meaning of these words? They were in use in the days of our Lord and his apostles: they were then familiar words. We have not a hint from the New Testament that they were words of doubtful import. Shall we ask Homer, Pindar, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Heraclides, Ponticus, Herodotus, Aratus, Xenophon, Plutarch, Lucian, Diodorus Siculus, Plato, Epictetus, Hypocrates, Strabo, Polybius or Josephus, what the Lord meant by them? Professor Stuart, of Andover, (Mass.) an instructor in one of the first Paido-Baptist theological schools in America, tells us that he has examined all the above authors; he thinks that no occurrence of the words escaped his observation, and in every instance the words meant "*to dip, plunge, or immerse into any thing liquid.*" All Lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this. Mr. Alexander Carson, A. M., Minister of the Gospel, Edinburgh, gives the same testimony, after quoting largely from the above works. Our readers may say we have not these works, and it is only second-hand testimony after all! How do we know that the Savior or the Apostles (except Paul) ever saw one of these books? What books then had they?—*Answer.*—They had the Septuagint Greek of the old Testament. This work, according to Josephus, was the production of seventy-two learned Jews, who visited Egypt in the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus for this express purpose. With their Hebrew copies of the Old Testament before them (than whom no men living understood them better)