

and I ground my opinion on a plain command, Matthew xxviii. 19. But I say that *Baptism* is never spoken of in the New Testament as being born of water *literally*. My opinion on the text, John iii. 5, agrees with Dr. Clarke's: "Our Lord asserts that a man must be born of water and of the spirit, i. e. of the Holy Ghost, which represented under the similitude of water, cleanses, refreshes, and purifies the soul." The remaining part of the note is worthy of being printed in letters of gold. The learned Bishop Hopkins has a note on this verse similar to the above. He says, "Born of water &c., except he be renewed by the Holy Ghost working as water, leaving the same effect upon the soul in cleansing and purifying it from sinful defilement as water doth upon the body in washing off contracted filth, &c. I suppose, Sir, you will allow that the above mentioned commentators who have written upon this subject were men of some note, and their piety and learning were not inferior to most commentators.

In conclusion I may observe, that if you have mentioned in your article all that your informant stated to you, he did not relate all that he heard, for I told the persons who heard me read the article that you had given a false statement of Our Lord's words, in saying that He did not say "any one" but "except a *man*" &c., for the word "*man*" is not in the original, and is only supplied by the translators to signify the human species, and therefore simply means "*any one*."

In your article under the head of "Baptism, No. 6," you say, relative to the administration of the ordinance, "Wesleyan Clergymen use the same Liturgy," &c. (You refer here to the Romish, Greek and Episcopal Churches.) In this I may take the liberty to inform you, you are not correct: I hope not intentionally so. The Liturgy of the Wesleyans is an abridgement of the "Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England," and not "the same;" and may I not suggest that before you publish in "The Christian!" (I will not say what you know is not correct, but,) what you do not know is correct, you had better call on some Wesleyan clergyman, and borrow a "Sunday service," and then you will know that *no one* has heard the language which you say "is used in the hearing of every one."

Mr. Wesley's Notes on Acts xxii. 16, is generally believed by Wesleyan Ministers, but it has nothing to do with the present controversy.

In reply to your inquiry, "where then shall we learn their sentiments on the design of Baptism, I reply in works approved by the English Conference. You will find in the 3d Volume Watson's Institutes a summary of this doctrine as held by us. If you have time you would derive much benefit from the careful perusal of Isaac's "Baptism discussed," and Thoms' "Modern Immersion not Scripture Baptism," which you can probably obtain from the Wesleyan Depository for books in St. John. I could mention other works, but those already noticed will furnish you all the information necessary.

I remain, dear Sir, yours, &c.

PETER SLEEP.

Aylesford, 27th July, 1840.

MR. EATON—Dear Sir,—On perusing the 1st No. of the 2d vol. of the "Christian," and noticing an article written on John iii. 5, I was