

sal. In fact, this is the only characteristic of the version, the only change from the common version which is carried persistently through. The aim seems to be to expunge from the New Testament the very idea of baptism, and substitute immersion—foreclosing all discussion.

4. "According to the declarations of immersionists, ten thousand times repeated, has not this word (baptize) always had a definite meaning, which they have expressed by 'baptize,' and of which they have claimed a sort of denominational ownership, boasting of their title of 'Baptists,' and excluding all other branches of the Christian church from the Lord's table, on the ground that they were unbaptized? If 'baptize' has always been the exact equivalent of 'baptize,' when did it lose its signification? When, how, by what process of defection, did it forfeit its ancient and honorable distinction, and come to mean something so different, so unlike its former signification, as to need to be impeached and removed from office, and forever disqualified from presiding over the interests of a large and growing portion of the church of Christ? 'Baptism' is Greek anglicized. 'Immersion' is Latin anglicized. The former is the language of the New Testament; the latter is the Roman form. The former is the language of inspiration; the latter is man's device. The former is the thing itself; the latter is what is affirmed to be its exact equivalent; then why exchange the one for the other? And if it is not an exact equivalent, then who are they who thus dare to pervert the word of God by foisting into it the carnal teachings of man?"