

what is there to prevent the Methodist church from augmenting their works to tenfold the number of the church already alluded to, and then we must wade through the whole of them before we dare to say what you do or do not believe!!

14. Ah! these human decrees often lead many astray. Will Mr. Sleep be so kind as to inform our readers how long it has been since the "Sunday Service" took the place of the book of "Common Prayer?" Are there not Wesleyan Clergymen in this city now, who have repeated the language which I have attributed to them? Will you say to our readers that these clergymen have not within a short time stood before the congregation, and said, "Dearly beloved, seeing this child is born of water," &c.? Do not again accuse me of publishing *incorrect* intelligence until you answer the above questions. You admit that the "Wesleyan Liturgy is an abridgment of the book of Common Prayer;" will you please to show us, then, in what it differs from it? When you say* "We yield thee hearty thanks, most merciful Father, that it hath pleased thee to receive *this infant* for thy child by adoption, and to admit *him* into thy holy church." And again: "Grant that *this child* now baptized, may receive the fulness of thy grace," &c. And—"Seeing, dearly beloved, that *this child* is admitted into the body of Christ's church, let us give thanks, &c." Do you believe that this child is "adopted" into the family of God—that he receives the fulness of God's "grace," and that then he is "admitted into the body of Christ's church?" If you do believe this, then can you show me the difference between these sentiments and those attributed to you in the article to which reference is made?† You certainly cannot! According, then, to your own exposition of being "born of water and spirit," and the Wesleyan "Sunday Service," you admit that unconscious babes are born of water and spirit, which is all that I intended to express. So much, then, for my "*ignorance*" of the changes going on in Methodism!

15. But a graver charge than this is preferred, for asserting that the Saviour did not say "*any one*," but "*except a man*." Your allusion to this in both articles naturally leads us to suppose that you were sensible of a signal triumph: "Here Eaton is pinned to the wall!!" Well, I hope that it is not too late to amend our ways! Nothing better calculated to humble the aspiring than to be compelled to confess their faults! Hence the Lord requires his children to confess their faults one to another; and promises pardon to the erring and disobedient, only on condition that they confess their sins. But have I a confession to make? What is it? I will tell you, sir. I confess that when I wrote the article which called your's forth I had no Greek Testament before me; No! nothing but King James' translation; and believing that it was a faithful version of the original of that passage, I wrote and commented as you have seen!! This, sir, is my confession! You may now attribute it to "*ignorance*," or a design to "prove a favourite sentiment." It does not offend me to be accused of "*ignorance*;" of this I am sensible! But tell me, sir, was Mr. Wesley ignorant of the Greek when he gave the same version of the passage under consideration? If he thought that "*tis*" in the passage meant "*any one*" why did he not so translate

* Sunday Service pp. 163-163.

† Christian, vol. 2, p. 135.