

that this is the fact! Now, the wise man says, that he "who trusts to his own heart is a fool," and the scriptures plainly declare that "the heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked." Hence those evidences *last* to be looked for, are the beginning, middle, and end. This, then, is the criterion of discipleship. No wonder, then, that such persons' happiness should be as vascillating as their feelings! How different the primitive Christian! He heard of Jesus—he believed the testimony—convinced of his sins he forsook them—he was forthwith baptized, and went on his way rejoicing; not only did his heart testify, but Father, Son, and Holy Spirit testified that he was born again—of water and the spirit.

23. You object to translating "*en*" by *in*, and say it should be *with*. You should know, sir, if you do not already, that the Latin and English preposition *in* is derived from the Greek *en*, and you must also certainly know that *in* exactly corresponds with *en*, and should *never* be translated by any other English preposition than *in*, when the connexion will possibly make sense. This subject is too plain to require many words. If the authors of the Bible, or the inspiring spirit, had meant *with* water, *with* fire, &c., the Greek language was not so barren that they were under the necessity of using one word in so many different significations, especially when a positive institution of heaven was to be spoken of. They had *meta* and *pros*, the first of which primarily means *with*, and is so translated as invariably as *en* is by *in*. When the Apostles say—Grace, peace, &c. be *with* you—it is in all the places which I have just glanced at *meta*, and never *en*. But if *en* is not *always* to be translated *in*, when the connexion will possibly admit of it, then, sir, I challenge you, or any other person, to prove, that the three Hebrew children were *in* the fiery furnace—that Jonah was *in* the great fish—that the Savior was *in* the heart of the earth—that the swine were drowned *in* the sea—that the *Logos* was *in* the beginning with God, or that any person ever was, or ever will be, in Heaven, Hades, or Hell. By more numerous arguments, sir, will I prove that the ancient disciples of John and Jesus were baptized *in* water; that the Apostles on the day of Pentecost, and Cornelius and his household, were baptized *in* the Holy Spirit, and that the wicked Jews who would not obey the Lord Jesus were baptized *in* fire at the destruction of Jerusalem, than you can bring to prove that Jesus was *in* Joseph's tomb, or that any person will ever be in heaven or hell; the last I as firmly believe, however, as the former, but on similar testimony, and by the same construction of language.

24. I am obliged to you for the books to which you have cited my attention. "Watson's Institutes" I have partially examined, the others; I shall read when I can find leisure. But how can you recommend Thorn's* work when he says, "Modern Immersion is not scripture baptism," when your "Sunday Service" says, the Minister "shall dip him in the water, or pour water upon him, or shall sprinkle him therewith." Will you perform a ceremony which you do not believe is "scriptural?" For one at least of your leading Ministers in Nova-Scotia has been known to immerse an individual whom he knew

* This name was printed, by mistake, *Thoms'* in Mr. Sleep's letter of the 2d December, inserted in this number. The reader will please make the correction.