

the controversy, after stating that he desired not a formal discussion, having moderators appointed, and so many set speeches per day—it was finally arranged by mutual consent that he should preach two discourses immediately following each other treating upon the subjects of baptism, to be responded to by two discourses from us; and then two discourses from him on what he called the mode of baptism, followed likewise by two responses on our part. March was the month appointed for the “sermons” to be delivered, and Warsaw or vicinity the place for their delivery. The gentleman was to communicate definitely in respect to the day he would be prepared to begin. Desiring an assurance that the arrangement was not a mere feint, he affirmed to us in the presence of some two or three others, “You may depend upon it:” that is, we might depend upon him honoring and standing up to the arrangement.

The gentleman, for a stranger, was very generous with his knowledge of Greek at the commencement of the short interview to which we have now referred. He alleged that while discoursing that evening, in reading or repeating Matt. iv. 17, we had used Reform for Repent; and he gave us a specimen of his critical acquaintance with the language of the venerable Greeks. Whether indeed we employed the word as he asserted, we could not dogmatically affirm; but certainly the learned criticism he offered upon *metamelomai* would naturally have led to the suspicion that the gentleman had too small a capital from the Greek tongue to deal much in the article. We permitted him to deliver himself and exhibit his philological depth, simply putting in the plea, for the time being, that no doubt Doctor George Campbell, the translator and orthodox Presbyterian, was as fully versed in Greek as either of us, and that in the passage in question he had given us Reform instead of Repent. Mr. McAleese seemed just then not to have known the distinction between *metamelomai* and *metanoco*; neither did he appear to be aware that *metamelomai* is not in the Greek text in Matt. iv. 17 at all! *Apo tote erxeto ho Iesous kerussien, kai legin, Metanocite, engike gao he basileia ton ouranon.* So reads Matt. iv. 17 in the Greek text that we look into occasionally; does it read differently at Norwood in the KAINÉ DIATHEKÉ of Mr. McAleese?

But to the point. The month of March came, and no letter from Mr. McAleese. April passed, and no letter from Mr. McAleese. May and June gave us their complement of days, and no letter from Mr. McAleese. The most of July has come and gone at the date we write, and no letter from Mr. McAleese. Unwilling without evidence even