

text, only *panoiki* an adverb. Here I must remark, that there is no English term in use which answers the Greek term; Mr. Edwards translates it domestically, and were this term in current use, it would answer exactly. The words of Luke would then run thus, He rejoiced domestically, believing in God. Compare this with what he has x. 2. *A devout man, and one which feared God* (syn panti to oiko auto) *with all his house*. The mere English reader has not an opportunity of observing the difference, but you, who pretend to know Greek, should have considered the matter. You ask, "Do you feel no guilt in thus disposing of the words of inspiration?" Pray, wherein does my guilt consist? I said, that *with all his house*, as we have it in English, is expressed in the original by *panoiki* an adverb; you, on the other hand, have thrown out this term, and substituted five other terms in place of it. The reader will determine on which side guilt lies. You add, "An ounce of common sense is worth a pound of learning." Common sense is very useful, but one who writes on controversy, should have as much learning, as to be able to distinguish the singular from the plural, especially when the argument rests on that circumstance. Now, Luke says, He rejoiced, you say, They rejoiced. One of you must be in a mistake.

You proceed, p. 108. to the argument from 1. Cor. vii. 14. and cite these words, "The children of married heathen were quite legitimate, but still unclean," and add, "pray, who told you that?" I reckon the ounce of common sense you mentioned quite sufficient. You proceed, "Your reference to Tit. i. 15. will help you nothing; for to apply it to the case in