

of Jordan," (20:8); "over Jordan," (Judges 10:9); "let us go to Jordan," (2 Kings 6:2); "were baptized of him in Jordan," (Mat. 3:6); "then comes Jesus from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized," (13:16). In the three first chapters of Matthew, we have the Greek preposition *en* answering to the English preposition *in* some fourteen times; and rendered *with* when it can be done; hence the King's revisers have said "*with* the Holy Ghost, *with* fire, *with* water I baptize you;" which rendering corresponds with the modern practice of putting the water on the person, and the emphasis is generally laid on *with*. But when these same petit jurors came to this same preposition *en* in connection with the Jordan, they render it *in* Jordan, in the wilderness, because to have said *with* Jordan would have conveyed the idea that John took up the Jordan and applied it to the people, instead of applying the people to the Jordan as he did. These same profoundly learned revisers said John baptized *in* the wilderness, instead of *with* the wilderness, as they did in the other cases. Was this ignorance, or wickedness, or both? Were they knaves, or fools, both? Do such men deserve the praise they have received? In order to see the indefiniteness and impropriety of this method of translation, let us see how the above would read in an American history, when speaking of our principal rivers. I crossed Ohio, would mean, I passed through the State of Ohio; he went beyond Tennessee, means he passed beyond the bounds of the State of Tennessee; he settled this side Kentucky, means this side of the State of Kentucky; they were baptized in Missouri, means in the State of Missouri; Washington came from Red to Mississippi to be baptized, means he came to the State of Mississippi. Would such a style as this be tolerated in any author? Yet this is the style of our common version made by Peto-baptists, or sprinklers. If such a style as this would not be tolerated by men, can it be pleasing to God to have the inspired writings so translated into English? Surely, no. Jesus came from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized, means to the country of Jordan; but when we say, Jesus came from Galilee to the river Jordan, or the Jordan, to be baptized or immersed, that is a very different matter—that makes it too plain, too easy to be understood by everybody. When I was young, it was no uncommon thing to hear the ignorant or designing priests say there was not water enough in the river Jordan to immerse a chicken. I hope our brethren will never debate this subject again, unless their opponents will agree first to prove infant baptism from tradition; that will be enough for all those whose religion stands on tradition: or, secondly, from circumcision: require them to prove that they sprinkle, pour or immerse the same part of the human body that Abraham circumcised—that will prove that sprinkling has come in the place of circumcision; or, thirdly, make them prove from the New Testament, that Christ and his Apostles sprinkled the same part that Abraham circumcised, or some other part, and show *when, where and who* changed it from Abraham's part to the face. Why, then, baptize females? Yours truly,

JACOB CREATH.

ON THE 21st ult., the Pope gave his benediction to the lambs which were to be afterwards shorn, in order to furnish wool for the pallium which Rome sends to each of the new bishops.

HUSKS.

Many readers of the charming parable of the prodigal son have been perplexed by the mention of husks on which he fed in his extreme destitution. The following extract from the invaluable volume of Dr. Hackett—*Illustrations of Scripture*—may relieve them:

"The word 'husks' is an unfortunate translation of the Greek term for which it is employed. The word so rendered signifies 'little horns,' with reference to the extended and slightly curved shape of the pods of the fruit of the Carob tree; that fruit being the article of food which the prodigal is represented to have eaten. The Carob tree is found not only in Egypt and Syria, but in Greece, and other parts of southern Europe. It is a large tree, with a thick foliage, and wide-spreading branches. I saw it growing on the Mount of Olives, and elsewhere around Jerusalem. The fruit is a leguminous product, resembling the pod of our locust tree, but much larger; it has a sweetish pulp when tender, but soon becomes dry and hard, with small seeds which rattle in the pod when shaken. It emits a slight odor, when first gathered, offensive to those whom use has not accustomed to it. The poorer class of people employ it as food in the countries where it is produced. I was told at Smyrna that it is in great request, in some of the Greek islands, as a nutritious article for fattening swine. It constituted a part of the provender (unless it was a very similar product,) with which our camels were fed in traveling through the desert. I saw great quantities of this fruit exposed for sale in the market at Smyrna. Some specimens which I brought away with me averaged six and eight inches in length, though they are said to be often eight or ten inches long. It is not meant in the parable that the prodigal resorted to food absolutely fit only for swine, but that he who had been brought up in wealth and luxury was reduced to such want as to be obliged to subsist on the meanest fare."

GOOD FOR EVIL.—An old man, of the name Guyot, lived and died in the town of Marseilles in France. He amassed a large fortune by the most laborious industry, and the severest habits of abstinence and privation. His neighbors considered him a miser, and thought that he was hoarding up his money from mean and avaricious motives. The population pursued him wherever he appeared with hootings and execrations; and the boys sometimes threw stones at him. In his will were found the following words:

"Having observed, from my infancy, that the poor of Marseilles are ill supplied with water, which can only be purchased at a great price, I have cheerfully labored, the whole of my life, to procure for them this great blessing; and I direct that the whole of my property shall be laid out in building an aqueduct for their use."