

it, and thus have prevented an ignoramus like me from running into such unpardonable blunders! Was Dr. Adam Clarke and Dr. George Campbell, two of the most learned men of which the past and present century can boast, ignorant of the original language in which the New Testament was written, when they had the temerity to retain the same reading of our present version of the scriptures? Will Mr. Sleep say that they had any favourite doctrine to sustain when this great blunder (in his estimation) was passed by without a remark; not even so much as to mark it as a supplied word! Rather let me refer you to the original, and ask if "*tis*" is not an adjective pronoun, and inquire if you do not remember an old rule in grammar, which is a standing rule in *Greek* as well as *English*, viz. *Every adjective pronoun belongs to some noun or pronoun expressed or understood.* Will Mr. Sleep be so kind as to inform our readers to what noun "*tis*" belongs? It is true, as you assert, that *anthropos* (man) is not in the *fifth* verse, but it is in the *fourth*, and a *grown man* or person was the subject under consideration, and not as you say the whole "human species." "*Tis*," (any) therefore, belongs to "*anthropos*," (man,) and the translation is correct! Had the translators supplied a word not necessarily understood they would have given it in *italic* as in other portions of the word of God. One fact is sufficient to show that the Saviour was not speaking of the whole human species; and that is, *infants cannot be born again*; for this very good reason—all who are born, either into the kingdom of nature or grace, must first be begotten! Now, the first Christians were "*begotten* through the Gospel." "Of his own will *begat* he us by the word of truth," says an Apostle. No person, then, can be begotten by the "gospel," "the word of truth," until they believed it; and it is an exhibition of the grossest ignorance to talk about an individual being born again without being begotten by the Gospel. This being a fact which I know you cannot dispute, you see the Saviour had no necessity of alluding to infants—you must be sensible that the regeneration of infants finds no place in the Oracles of God. They will enjoy the benefits of Christ's death without any of the ordinances of the gospel—"of such is the Kingdom of Heaven." I hope, now, Sir, you are satisfied with my *confession*, if not I shall cheerfully make a longer one in my next.

16. Having given the principal burthen of your epistles a passing notice, we will turn our attention to some other allusions. You think that our Lord, in his conversation with the Jewish Rabbi, had "no reference whatever to the formation of the earth." I did not say that he had; but simply that the creation of the earth was analogous to the new birth, which I think you will not venture to dispute. For Moses calls the creation of all things the "generation of the heavens and the earth," and when the Lord Jesus speaks of the establishment of his church, he calls it the *regeneration*. The first creation of man was his generation, and the last is properly termed his recreation, regeneration, or, in the Saviour's language, his being born again. As then the deranged particles of matter came out of the water to exist in a new creation, to bring forth fruit for man and exhibit the creative energies of its Almighty Maker—so man, from a state of darkness, condemnation and death, arises from