

—THE—
Harding - Nichols
DEBATE.

FOUR PROPOSITIONS DISCUSSED.

I.

“A sinner is justified from past sins by faith only.”

II.

“Christian Baptism is in order to the remission of sins.”

III.

“Infant Baptism is authorized by the word of God.”

IV.

“Christian Baptism is immersion; in it there must be a burial in water.”

Held in Lynnville, Tenn., beginning Tuesday, January 24,
and ending Friday, January 27.

HARDING AND NICHOLS DEBATE.

FIRST PROPOSITION.

A SINNER IS JUSTIFIED FROM PAST SINS BY FAITH ONLY.

MR. NICHOL AFFIRMS.

TUESDAY, JAN. 24, 1888.

Brethren and Sisters:

To be justified from past sins, and become a child of God, is quite a different thing from living a Christian life after having been justified from past sins. To be justified and born of the Spirit into the family of God, is quite different from living an obedient child of God, after having been thus born. Faith is mentioned in the Bible 242 times, and belief is mentioned 279 times, total 521. I shall use faith and belief as synonymous terms. There are degrees in faith, and not every degree of faith is justifying faith. Let me give you some of the degrees in faith. (1) Jesus said to the multitude, "O ye of little faith." Matt vi: 30. (2) Of a centurion, "I have not found so great faith." Matt viii: 10. (3) Him that is weak in faith receive ye." Rom. xiv: 1. (4) "But was strong in faith, giving glory to God." Rom. iv: 20. (7) "Faith which worketh by love." Gal. v: 6. (6) "Faith without works is dead." Jas. ii: 20. (7) "Believe to the saving of the soul." Heb. x: 39. So

we have at least seven degrees of faith, and not all of these are justifying faith. In II Tim. i: 12, Paul tells us what kind of faith saved him. "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him." Now I understand that that degree of faith which assents to all the truths taught in the word of God, and goes no further, does not justify the sinner from past sins; but it is that degree which commits the soul to God, puts the entire inward man under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, giving up all sin and trusting in God for pardon. I understand that this unreserved committal of all to God through Christ is the faith by which a sinner is justified from past sins. Here let me make a plain statement of what I mean when I say that a sinner is justified from past sins by faith only: I mean that degree of faith which commits all to God—which does not trust in any kind or amount of good works for pardon, but comes to God trusting alone in the merit of Christ for justification—that faith is the only immediate instrumental cause of justification. All that comes before this faith comes too soon for justification; and all that comes after that faith, comes too late. So now you understand what I mean. But here I am met with a difficulty—I am reminded that it is said in Acts xiii: 39, that we are "Justified by Christ;" Rom. iii: 24, "Justified by grace;" and in Rom. v: 9, "Justified by his blood." You say, "how can that be, if we are justified by faith only?" Now read John iii: 16, "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten son"—here we have a clear statement of what God did for the world of sinner?. Now in giving his son he gave the *name*, the *life*, the *blood*, the *death*, the *grace*, and all that was necessary to make it possible for a sinner to be saved. So you see "saved by grace," "by his blood," and "by his life,"

an simply statements which refer to what God has done to give the world a chance for eternal life. Now if any one in this large audience believes that these expressions are in opposition to the doctrine of justification by faith only—that the sinner must be nailed to a cross, shed the blood of Christ out of his own veins, and furnish the grace by which he is to be justified, let such an one stand up. (No one stood.) Then you all agree that these expressions only show what God did for the sinner. Now take the last part of that same verse, John iii: 16, and you will see what the sinner is required to do for himself in order to be justified. It reads thus, "That whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." Now look at this verse and you will see that it tells exactly what God did for the sinner, and exactly what the sinner is to do for himself. No sinner is left out if he will believe with that degree of faith which "commits the keeping of the soul to God." I Pet iv: 19. "That whosoever believeth"—that includes *all*, if they will believe. But there are some things the sinner must do before he can exercise justifying faith. He must repent. No man can believe to the saving of the soul who has not repented of his sins. Just here our Campbellite brethren get things into a tangle—they say "believe and repent," whereas the Bible always puts it "repent and believe." Why is this? Will Bro. Harding be kind enough to tell us why his brethren always say, "believe and repent," when Christ and all his apostles always say, "repent and believe?" I think I know their trouble, and it is this, they seem to fail to see the difference between believing that Jesus Christ is the son of God, and believing *on*, or *in* Christ. Let me say that assenting to a truth, and committing yourself to that truth, are very different things. All agree that a sinner must believe that God is, and that he is

a rewarder of them that diligently seek him, before he will repent, but this is by no means justifying faith—he is then in a condition to repent, and when he repents he is in condition to exercise saving faith. Take a few texts: Mark i: 15, "Repent ye and believe the gospel;" Acts xx:21, "Testifying both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Now does any one here believe that Jesus and Paul were only asking the multitudes to believe that Jesus was the son of God? If Bro. Harding believes it, I will ask him to tell us why Jesus and Paul put repentance before faith, and how any one can repent who does not believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God. Now take Matt. xxi: 32, Jesus said to the chief priests and elders concerning the publicans and harlots believing John's preaching, "And ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward that ye might believe." So we see that saving faith is impossible without repentance. Now I challenge Bro. H. to give us one text which says, "believe and repent." And if a sinner who believes that Jesus Christ is the son of God, does not have to repent before he can believe to the saving of his soul, I still ask Bro. H. to tell us how one can repent who does not believe that Jesus is the son of God. Please tell us, too, why you Campbellites find it necessary to transpose the language of Jesus and the apostles to make it fit your theory. Now let me call your attention to a few direct texts on the subject of justification by faith. Paul went into the synagogue at Antioch in Pisidia, in Asia Minor, and preached to Jews and Gentiles. After telling them that through Jesus was preached to them the forgiveness of sins, he said, (Acts xiii: 39) "And by him all that believe are justified from all things." Now if you begin at the 16th verse of this chapter, and read to the 41st verse, you will read the sermon which Paul preached, and

he gave no intimation that anything was required of a sinner in order to his justification from all things, except in the 39th verse. Hear his language again: "By him all that believe are justified from all things." "Who will stand up and say that Paul did not tell the truth? Who will try and connect this sermon, and this occasion, with other circumstances recorded in the Bible, in order to get something else in as a condition of justification, when Paul gives nothing but faith only. This case is separate from all other cases in the Bible—so far as Paul's sermon was concerned at the time he delivered it, it had to do with the salvation of the people of Antioch alone. Now did Paul tell them the truth? "By him *all that believe are justified from all things.*" If the people of Antioch believed, were they justified from all things? Who will stick some other condition of justification in, and by what authority? I am on Paul's side. I think he told the truth. Take Rom. iv: 5, "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Here the apostle cuts off all works as a condition of justification from past sins. How can anybody urge upon a sinner to *work* for justification from past sins, when Paul plainly says, "*to him that WORKETH NOT, but believeth?*" If works have anything to do in the justification of a sinner, it does seem that his works should be counted for righteousness as much as his faith, but Paul says his *faith is counted for righteousness*. Paul says, "to him that worketh not." Now I want Bro. H. to show us how he can get a sinner justified by the Campbellite theory without works—and if you will have a sinner to work for his justification from past sins, please tell us what Paul meant in this verse, don't forget it, will you? Just think of a sinner in his dirt and filth, covered from head to foot with moral rottenness, beginning a

round of ordinances and works, in order to pay God to forgive him I "Either make the tree good, and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt. Matt. xii: 83; For "A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit" Matt. vii: 18. "An evil man, out of the evil treasure of his heart, bringeth forth that which is evil." Luke vi: 45. Now is not a sinner an evil man until he is justified? If so, he can do nothing in the way of works but that which is evil in the Sight of God. Now can evil works be a condition of pardon? Would it not be best to let it be just as God has fixed it? Just let the sinner's heart be "purified by faith," and then let him go to work. I now call your attention to Gal. ii: 16, "Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ" Says one, "That means that we are not justified by the law of Moses." Certainly it does; but do you mean to say there is some other law of ordinances, or works, by which a sinner *is* justified? If so, give us chapter and verse. Here again it is stated that we are justified *by* the faith of Christ, and I say there is no law of works by which a sinner can be justified. "Wherefore the law was our school-master to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith." Gal. iii: 24. So you see the law of Moses was never intended to justify any body—it pointed the Jews to Christ, that they might be justified by faith. Now it appears that God has never had any other way of justifying a sinner, except by faith. There were certain croaking Pharisees going round telling the people, "except ye be circumcised, and keep the law of Moses, ye cannot be saved." They were like some who go round now, making water baptism essential, or a condition of justifica-

tion, but Paul corrected their false teaching in the text I have just given you, Pity that some of our modern teachers will not take a hint from the apostle's teaching. You say, "I thought the condition of pardon under the law was different from what it has been since Pentecost." Let me say that the condition of pardon from Abraham to this day has been by faith only. Hear it, and let my Bro. H. disprove it if he can. The Jew looked forward through his sacrifices to the Lamb of God on Calvary, and was justified by faith. We look back through the gospel to the same cross, the same Savior, and are justified by faith. It is as easy for me to understand how a Jew could look forward 1800 years, and be justified by faith in a Savior to come, as it is for me to understand how a Gentile can look back 1800 years to a Savior crucified, and be justified by faith in him. In all ages men could look to Jesus and obtain righteousness, "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe: for there is no difference." Rom. iii: 22. "For the scripture saith, whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek." Rom. x: 11, 12. "And the scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before, the gospel unto Abraham." Gal. iii: 8. What! the gospel preached to Abraham! I was visiting a family once, and a little girl was asked by her mother, "Who preached the first gospel sermon!" She promptly answered, "Peter." I knew at once some Campbellite had tutored her. I was sorry that she had been so wrongly taught. Paul says the gospel is the "Power of God unto Salvation to every one that believeth; to the *Jew first*, and also to the Greek." Rom. i: 16. Now notice, (1) The gospel is the power of God. (2) It is unto salvation. (3) To *every one that*

believeth. (4) To the Jew first, and also to the Greek. Just think of the church of God, from Abel to Peter at Pentecost, having no gospel in it! If any one, Jew or Greek, was ever saved, justified from past sins, except through the gospel, by faith, I will ask Bro. H. to tell us how it was done. Now take a few illustrations from the miracles of Christ: "A certain woman which had an issue of blood twelve years, when she had heard of Jesus, came in the press behind, and touched his garment, and straightway the fountain of her blood was dried up; and she felt in her body that she was healed of that plague." Mark v: 25-29. Now if I ask Bro. H. what was the only immediate cause of her healing, perhaps he would say, (1) She *heard*, (2) She *came*. (3) She *touched*. And he would make all these immediate instrumental causes of her healing. But I will ask Jesus what saved this poor woman. Hear his answer, "And he said unto her, Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole; go in peace, and be whole of thy plague." v. 34. Now if the *hearings coming*, and *touching*, were causes of her healing, why did not Christ say so? He said *faith made her whole*—then there was nothing left to be done by any thing else. But we have another case in the same chapter, "a ruler of the synagogue, Jairus by name." He came to Jesus "and besought him greatly" for his little daughter, who was at the point of death. As they were in the way one came from the ruler's house and said, "Thy daughter is dead; why troublest thou the Master any further?" As soon as Jesus heard the word that was spoken, he saith unto the ruler of the synagogue, "be not afraid, *only believe*" Mark v: 35, 36. Luke says, "fear not; *believe only*, and she shall be made whole." Luke viii: 50. Now you see that Jesus proposed to make the ruler's daughter whole *by FAITH ONLY*. Will Bro. H. tell us that the *coming*, and *beseech-*

ing were immediate instrumental causes of her restoration to life? Then I will stand by the blessed Master, and leave Bro. H. to stand by his Campbellism. Now let us read Matt. xx: 1, 2. "For the kingdom of heaven is like unto a man that is an husbandman, which went out early in the morning to hire laborers into his vineyard, and when he had agreed with the laborers for a penny a day, he sent them into his vineyard." Now you will notice (1) This is an illustration of how we get into God's vineyard, or church; (2) The agreement was made *before the laborers were sent into the vineyard*; (3) If the agreement had not been made, they would have had *no right*, but would have been *intruders* if they had gone into the vineyard; (4) The agreement was made *'without works* of any kind, simply on the *belief* of the laborers, that the husbandman would pay the wages promised; (5) All the work was done after the agreement was made. Now a question—can God and a sinner come to an agreement before the sinner is justified? I hope Bro. H. will tell us in his speech.

I now call your attention to Rom. iii chapter: (1) Paul proves that both Jews and Gentiles "are all under sin" (v. 9) (2) He shows that none can be justified from sin by the law. (v. 20.) (3) He shows that *all*, both Jews and Gentiles, must reach the righteousness of God *by faith*, "Even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ *unto all and upon all them that believe*: for there is no difference." (v. 22.) (4) He is not speaking of Christians living a justified life by faith and works, but he is talking about sinners being justified from sins that are past. "Through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past." (v. 25.) (5) Paul then concludes that justification from past sins is by *faith only*. "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by

faith without the deeds of the law." (v. 28.) (6) He then tells us that whether a man is circumcised or uncircumcised, he is justified by faith, if he is justified at all. "Seeing it is one God, which shall justify the circumcision *by faith*, and the *uncircumcision through faith*" (v. 30.) Please notice Paul's conclusion, "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." When Bro. H. gets up, look out for a different conclusion. But I must be allowed to stand up in Paul's defence to-day, for he was "called of God," and felt that "woe is me if I preach not the gospel," and when a man who says he is not called of God, rises up to contradict Paul, you will always find me on Paul's side—yes, you will. Now I read Eph. ii: 8,9, "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast." Salvation and grace are gifts of God, but faith is the gift of God and the act of the creature. Grace is God's favor to us, but we reach salvation "*through faith*, NOT OF WORKS." "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." Rom. iv: 4. Now if Bro. H. can get any sort of works in as a condition, or immediate instrumental cause of justification, and then show that it is of grace, and *not of debt*, I am sure you will be glad to hear him do so, and if he does it, he will tangle Paul's theology terribly. "Not of works, lest any man should boast." Do you notice a spirit of boasting in those who teach that a sinner must *work* in order to his justification? Do they not exalt themselves to the highest seat, and cry aloud to the world, "We are the only true church—all others are sects, and on their way to ruin?" If a poor sinner looks up to God with a penitent heart, and believes on the Lord Jesus Christ, and is "freely justified from all things," there is no room for boasting; but if he must do a

round of works in order to his justification, that is, pay his way, he can walk into the kingdom of God with a proud and boastful spirit, saying, "Pay me that thou owest, it is not of grace, but of debt, I have *done religion*, and you owe it to me." The proud Pharisee had a Campbellite idea in his head. He said, "God, I thank thee that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this publican. I fast twice in the week, I give tithes of all that I possess." Luke xviii: 11, 12. Now if justification could be had by works, here was a good case, *but he failed*. The poor publican said, "God be merciful to me a sinner." (v. 13.) His faith took hold on God, and he went *down justified by faith* without any sort of works. I call your attention to Matt. ix: 27-30. Two blind men came to Jesus to have their eyes opened. Jesus did not ask them what they had done, or what they would do, but said "Believe ye that I am able to do this? They said unto him, Yea, Lord. Then touched he their eyes, saying, according to your faith be it unto you. And their eyes were opened." No works here. But you say, "They followed him, and cried." So they did, but did Jesus open their eyes for their following and crying, or on *their faith only*? Jesus said nothing about the following and crying, but made faith the only condition of their cure. "Yes, they cried, thou son of David, have mercy on us." Bro. H. I advise you to have but little to say about this crying—that is a sort of Methodist way, and does not suit Campbellism much—too much excitement for you. Take another case which is recorded in i Cor. xiv: 23-25, "The whole church," (that is all the members of one society) "come together to worship," and a sinner comes in—an unbeliever—"He is convinced of all," convicted, "so falling down on his face he will worship God, and report that God is in" the church "of a

truth," that is, he repents of his sins, and is thus brought to where he can exercise saving faith, and through faith he is justified from his past sins. Jesus has been formed in him the hope of glory, and he reports that God is in the church of a truth, because he now has an experimental knowledge of

that fact. Is there any body in this audience who ever saw a case of this kind in a Campbellite church? If so, stand up. (No one stood.)

Now Bro. H. if you ever saw an unbeliever fall down on his face in one of your churches, and worship God till he could report that God was in the church of a truth, please give us the case, and we will say that is something new under the sun. Brethren, if Bro. H. is a "true blue" Campbellite, and an unbeliever should fall on his face in one of his meetings, just as Paul states in this case, don't you think Bro. H. would say, "Look here my friend, you have been hearing these miserable Methodists preach, and you've got a mourner's bench idea in your head—get up and come with me to some stream or pond, and obey the gospel, and stop that foolishness." Then as soon as he came out of the water, he would stick a Testament under his arm and say, "now if any body wants to dispute, I am ready." (Laughter.) I don't say these things to make you laugh, I want to stick them in your heads, and I want you to keep them there till you die—I do. If I had preached 22 years, and had never seen a sinner fall down on his face and worship God, I should certainly conclude that I was not preaching the Pauline doctrine; but thank God, I have seen many hundreds fall, and rise again, and report that God was in the church of a truth. Now take Rom. v: 1, "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." The "therefore" in this verse reaches back to the sublime argument Paul had made in the 3d and 4th chap-

tors on justification by faith, and here he states the full benefit which those receive who are justified by faith. Not only do they have peace with God, "but the love of God is shed abroad in their hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto them." (v. 5.) How sick I do get when I hear a man who pretends to preach the gospel of Christ, ridiculing justification by faith, and Holy Ghost religion. I am always sorry for his audience, and more sorry for him. Now hear Paul in Gal. iii: 26, 27, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus, for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Not dipped into water, oh no! The idea is, when a penitent sinner believes with all his heart, on Jesus Christ, commits all to Him, he is baptized into Christ by the Holy Ghost, and this makes him a child of God. Don't get scared Bro. H., justification by faith is the apostles subject in most of this chapter, and water is not once mentioned in the chapter, but the Spirit is mentioned four times. Take the 14th verse, "That we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." Now I say it will take one of the longest stretches of Campbellite supposition to get any thing but Holy Ghost baptism out of the 27th verse of this chapter, but we will hear from Bro. H. on this text soon, *if he don't forget it*. Once more. Some came to Jesus and said, "What shall we do that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." That is it; a *heart work*, "*believe on him whom he hath sent.*" Jno. vi: 28,29. "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation." Rom. x: 10. O, mighty faith! Thou can'st reach from the very lowest degradation in sin, to the very throne of the world's redeemer, and bring a flood-tide of the Holy Ghost that will

wash every stain from the sin-polluted soul. Thou can't look up through penitential tears to Him that saith, "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth," (Isa. xlv: 22) and bring everlasting life to a soul, "dead in trespasses and sins, for a broken and a contrite heart he will not despise." Thank God for terms of salvation that will suit every case—all who will may look and live. O, sinner, look now.

[*Time expired.*]

FIRST PROPOSITION.

MR. HARDING'S FIRST REPLY.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

It affords rue pleasure to come before you again to defend that which I assuredly believe to be the truth of Jesus Christ.* I enjoyed *my* stay in your midst before, and I am glad to be here again. That no time may be lost I proceed at once to the consideration of Mr. Nichols' speech.

He informs us that there are "at least seven degrees of faith." "Little faith," he claims, is one degree, and "weak faith" another; "strong faith" is one degree, and "great faith" another; "faith which -worketh by love" is one degree, and "faith to the saving of the soul" is another; and dead faith, or "faith without works" is still another. It seems never to have occurred to the gentleman that "little faith" and "weak faith" may be but two names for the same degree, (little things are often weak), that the same may be true of "strong faith" and "great faith," and of the faith that works and the faith that saves. Such, indeed, is the truth in the case.

I am glad, however, that my opponent begins by admitting that faith has degrees; he has saved me the trouble of proving it. There are two clearly defined, sharply dis-

*Mr. Harding had held a debate at this same place about four months before this one, with a Cumberland Presbyterian minister, Mr. W. A. Bridges.

tinguished grades of faith mentioned in the Bible. The one is weak, the other strong; the one little, the other great; the one works by love, but the other does not—it is dead; the one saves, but the other sinks him who dies with it into deeper depths in torment. He who understands what these two grades of faith are, has no trouble whatever on the subject of justification by faith; he thoroughly understands it. Each of the two may be subdivided into degrees, but the great chasm between them remains. It shall be my chief object in this address to bring out clearly these two grades, so that all may see them, and understand well the differences between them. Paul teaches that we are "justified by faith." Rom. v: 1. Jesus says: "He that believeth on him, is not condemned: but he that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten son of God." John iii: 18. John says: "He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life: and he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life: but the wrath of God abideth on him." John iii: 36. And Jesus expresses the same idea in still stronger words thus: "He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation: but is passed from death unto life." John v: 24. The faith mentioned in these passages is one grade, namely, the faith that saves; it even brings the greatest of blessings, eternal life.

The other faith is mentioned in the following passages: "Nevertheless, among the chief rulers also, many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue. For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God." John xii: 42, 43. "The devils also believe, and tremble." James ii: 19. "But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith without works is dead?" These rulers believed, but

their faith was altogether an internal affair; it did not express itself in action. The devils believed, but their faith, like that for which Mr. Nichols is contending, was "faith only." [Laughter.] In both these cases the faith was dead. It bore no fruit, reached no blessing, accomplished no good. It did no work, and James says, "As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." James ii: 26.

My opponent has the misfortune, in his proposition, to plainly and flatly contradict the word of God. He affirms that, "A sinner is justified from past sins *by faith only*." Whereas the apostle James says that "by works a man is justified and *not by faith only*." James 11: 24. The one says, "by faith only;" the other, "not by faith only." Take your choice, my friends, as to which one you will believe. I shall stand by the word of God. I trust that Mr. Nichols will try in his next speech to harmonize these two statements. Unless he can do it, his proposition stands as incorrect—as being exactly the reverse of the truth: for he speaks of justification as being "by faith only," while God, speaking of the very same thing, says it is "not by faith only."

"But," some one may say, "Paul says we are justified *by faith*; and is not faith the same as faith only?" By no means. Faith only is dead faith, (see James ii: 17,20, 24, 26), and dead faith is as different from faith, as a dead man is from a man, or a dead horse from a horse. Just as a dead man is only a part of a man, a dead horse only a part of a horse, so dead faith is only a part of faith. And I would just as soon try to ride home on a dead horse, as to reach justification by a dead faith. [Laughter.]

Death is separation. That is the root-idea of the word. The first death occurred in the garden of Eden. In the

day that Adam ate of the forbidden fruit he died—that is, he was separated from God, from peace, from the tree of life and from all the joys of that delightful place. "The second death is mentioned" right at the close of the Bible. John, in his apocalyptic vision, saw the wicked cast into the lake of fire—separated from God, from heaven, from the tree of life, and from all the joys of the blessed city, and he wrote, "this is the second death." When the body is separated from the spirit it is said to be dead; when the sinner ceases to love and practice sin, and turns to the Lord, he is represented as being dead to sin, but alive to God (see Rom. vi: 11); and it is equally true that when one turns from God, and loves and practices sin, he is dead to God, but alive to sin. I repeat, the root-idea of death is expressed by the word separation. Wherever you find the word "death," whether it be used literally or figuratively, you find a separation. Hence, when James says, "faith without works is dead," he simply means that it is separated from all efficacy—it reaches no blessing, accomplishes no good.

Just here is a good place to examine some of the Biblical illustrations presented by Mr. Nichols. Every one of them, when carefully looked at in its connection, is clearly against him. If I cannot show that to be so I will quit debating. (1) He refers to the woman with the bloody issue, who pressed through the crowd that thronged about Jesus, to touch the hem of his garment, that she might be healed Mark v: 25-34. Jesus said to her, "Daughter, thy faith had made thee whole, go in peace, and be whole of thy plague." Clearly she was saved by faith, but by what degree or grade of faith? Faith only? Nay, verily; but by faith that worked—that expressed itself in action. She arose, pressed through the great crowd, was dashed hither and thither, no doubt, by the surging throng, but diseased

even to death's door though she was, the frail woman struggled on till she touched the hem of his garment; then she found healing. Saved by faith that acted—that arose and came to Jesus. Had she possessed nothing but faith only (dead faith), she would never have found relief. So in the raising of Jairus' daughter: The father so believed in Jesus that he came to him and besought him to come to his house, saying, "Come and lay thy hands on her, that she may be healed, and she shall live. And so the little maiden was raised from the dead by her father's faith. Was it simply an internal faith that reached the blessing? No, indeed; it was faith perfected—that is, an internal faith that expressed itself in bodily action, that reached the blessing. Why was not the child saved the very moment the father exercised this faith in his heart? Simply because God never bestows his blessings that way. Faith is absolutely of no account, except as it moves to action. This is true of faith every where, in the Bible and out of it. Nor do I "stand by Campbellism" when I so teach, but by the word of God. (By the way, just a few words about the terms "Campbellite" and Campbellism," that Mr. Nichols is so fond of using. These words are nicknames that have been given by ignorant and prejudiced people to a respectable religious body, and to the doctrine which they advocate. I am one of this body. I am not a Campbellite. I do not accept one word that Alexander Campbell taught *because he taught it*. If I cannot find his doctrine in the Word of God, I reject it, as I would the doctrine of any other man. I teach nothing that I cannot read from the Bible. I affirm nothing that flatly contradicts God's blessed word, as Mr. Nichols is now doing. I call no man by a nickname that he repudiates and dislikes, because I don't think it a gentlemanly thing to do. It is not often I meet a man in debate, or out of it, who uses the

term Campbellite in referring to me or my brethren. By common consent, among gentlemen, it is now regarded as an improper thing to do. Mr. Nichols seems to be somewhat behind the times. However, if, after this protest, he continues the use of these offensive terms, I can stand it if he can.)

But let us return to Mr. Nichols' illustrations. He thinks he finds his doctrine taught in the parable of the "Laborers in the vineyard." (see Matt. xx: 1-16). But if he had searched diligently to find a passage that is clearly against him, he could not have done much better. Did those laborers get into the vineyard without doing any thing? Did they receive any blessing before they labored? Did the Lord of the vineyard bear them in his arms from the market place into the vineyard? Nay, verily; the scriptures say, "he sent them into his vineyard." In order for them to obtain the blessing it was necessary for them to do something—to arise and go into the vineyard and work. True enough, as Mr. Nichols says, the agreement was made before they went into the vineyard; but it is equally true that they received no blessing till they *obeyed*. And so of the sinner: he must come to Christ—must enter into Christ' before he is pardoned; for in him "we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." (See Eph. i: 7). "For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us." II Cor. i: 20. "Therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away; behold, all things are become new." II Cor. v: 17. And be it remembered, that it is said time and again in the scriptures that we are "baptized into Christ." (See Gal. iii: 27, Rom. vi: 34). The justified man is cleansed by the blood of Jesus; he has a pure soul; and Peter says to certain justified people (i Pet. i: 22),

"Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren." And he exhorts them to "love one another with a *pure heart* fervently." We see how these people obtained a "pure heart." They *obeyed the truth*. It is true this same apostle Peter, speaking of this same class of people said, God "put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith (see Acts xv: 9), and both statements are true. Their hearts were made pure by faith, but not by faith only; they reached the blessing by faith perfected—that is, by a faith that obeyed. Obedience is always included in saving faith. In the case of Rahab we have a perfectly clear illustration of this. Paul says, "By faith the harlot Rahab perished not with them that believed not, when she had received the spies with peace." Heb. xi: 31. Whereas, James says, "Likewise also was not Rahab the Harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way?" James ii: 25. Paul teaches that she was saved by faith: to this James agrees, but shows that it was not by "faith only," but by faith made perfect by works. And with this Paul very heartily agrees, for he says, (Gal. v: 6) "In Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love." Ah, yes, my friends, that is the thing that reaches the blessing, *faith which worketh by love*. Let my opponent find a single case in which any one ever received a blessing from God by this internal faith, faith alone, faith that had not expressed itself in action, and he will show what I have never found, though I have read the Bible through many times, and have been in numbers of debates on this very question. He will never show it, simply because that is not God's way.

"But," said a gentleman once to me, "is not your faith

stronger than it used to be?" "Do you not hope that it will grow stronger and stronger even to the hour of death?" "Yes, most certainly I do," was the reply." "Well, then," said he, "according to your theory a man cannot be pardoned till he is ready to die; for you say he must have a perfect faith before he can obtain pardon." The gentleman evidently did not understand the word "perfect" as James uses it. A thing that has all of its parts is perfect; a thing that is wanting in any of its parts is imperfect. The mother that has lost her finger is an imperfect person: the little infant lying in her lap is a perfect person because it has all of its parts—all of its limbs and members. A very large house may be a very imperfect one, while a very small one may be very perfect. The bud is often more perfect in its symmetry and beauty, than it afterwards is when it becomes a full blown flower. Just so of faith: in the beginning it is an internal assurance; when this assurance expresses itself in living obedience, you have faith made perfect. All of its parts are there. It should grow stronger and clearer continually, but no other limb or member will ever be added to it; it is complete in its parts. Internal assurance and the external expression thereof constitute faith. The assurance without the expression, is like the body without the spirit; it is dead, just as the body is without the spirit; it is useless, it bears no fruit, reaches no blessing.

But, argues Mr. Nichols, Paul says: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Rom. iii: 28. Do I believe that? Certainly, and so do all of my brethren; and what is more, we understand it, which is more than can be said of our Methodist friends. They don't distinguish between the "deeds of the law," and the "obedience to the faith." In the very chapter in which Paul says that a "man is justified by faith without

the deeds of the law," he begins by inquiring, "What advantage then hath the Jew?" And he explains that their chief advantage consisted in this, that "unto them were committed the oracles of God." In the ninth chapter, he explains the law was given to the Israelites. The whole argument of the apostle along here is to convince the Judaizer that it is not necessary to require the Gentiles to be circumcised and to keep the Mosaic law. These sticklers for the law insisted that "it was needful to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the law of Moses. (See Acts xv: 5.) Hence when Paul says that a man is justified "without the deeds of the law," he is talking about the Mosaic law. We are justified by faith—by faith made perfect by works, and not by the law of Moses.

But just here I am reminded that Mr. Nichols quotes: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works lest any man should boast." Eph. ii: 8, 9. Yes, salvation is by grace, through faith, and it is not of works. But what is meant when it is said that it is not of works? Simply that it is not in reward for our work; we do not pay for it by our works; there is no merit in what we do on account of which we can demand salvation as our right. So I understand it, and so, it appears, Mr. Nichols does; for he claims that I cannot get in any sort of works without making salvation a matter of debt and not of grace.

Well, let us see about that. If a man were to fall into a well, and Mr. Nichols were to let down to him, by a rope and windless, a large basket, if the man were to get into the basket, and Mr. N. were to draw him out, would the fact of his getting into the basket make Mr. Nichols a debtor to him? Could the man say that he was saved as a matter of debt? that he had brought his saviour under obligations to

him by his getting into the basket? No, indeed; his getting into the basket did not pay Mr. Nichols anything; he saved him purely as a matter of grace, but, nevertheless, *the man had something to do.*

And so of these Ephesians to whom Paul was writing: they were saved by grace, but they also had something to do. Turn to the nineteenth chapter of Acts, and there you will see how the first of them came into the church, whom Paul received. Paul preached to them, they heard the preaching, believed the preaching, were baptized, and then the Holy Ghost came on them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied. See Acts xix: 1-7 They certainly did two works, they believed and were baptized. Jesus says: "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent." Jesus calls faith a work and even Mr. Nichols will admit that baptism is a work; but neither of them are works of merit; neither of them bring Jesus in debt to us; in neither of them do we pay him anything; and the baptized Ephesians could say that they were saved by grace, not of works, just the same as if Jesus had seen fit to save them without either faith or baptism. Our works don't save us, but the "obedience to the faith" puts us into the place where Jesus saves us; just as in the supposed case, the man's getting into the basket did not save him; it simply put him into the place where Mr. Nichols saved him.

By the way, in the very connection in which Paul speaks to the Romans of being "justified by faith without the deeds of the law," he says to them, "ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." Rom. vi: 17, 18. So it was after that they *obeyed* that they were made free from sin. Where are we freed- from sin? We have already learned that it is

in Christ that we have "redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," and in the beginning of this same sixth chapter of Romans Paul says: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death?" So in the very connection in which the apostle teaches that we are justified "by faith without the deeds of the law," he shows that we are made free from sin when we have obeyed the "form of doctrine," that we are baptized into Christ, baptized into his death, that we are buried with him by baptism, that like as he was raised, so we should walk in newness of life. Verily, my opponent's passages fail him in his hour of need. For even he who runs may read clearly enough to see that being "justified by the deeds of the law" (the Mosaic law), and being justified by faith—the faith that "worketh by love," the faith that obeys the "form of doctrine," are very different things. Why Noah built the ark by faith "without the deeds of the law," but it was a faith that obeyed God for all that. (See Hebrew xi: 7.) By faith Abraham went out from his native land when God called him, but not by faith only; it is expressly said, by faith he "*obeyed*" (See Heb. xi: 8.) He offered Isaac by faith (see Heb. xi: 17); and in so doing "faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect." See James ii: 21, 22.

We will proceed now to notice some other of Mr. Nichols' Biblical illustrations; it is my purpose to consider every case that he presents. He refers to Paul's preaching at Antioch in Pisidia, and reminds us that Paul, speaking of Jesus, said: "By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Acts xiii: 39. Well, I most heartily believe this statement; these people also were "justified by faith without the deeds of the law;" but was it "by faith only?"

Let us see about that: The people of Antioch of Pisidia were converted of course just like they were at that more noted Antioch, Antioch of Syria; upon turning to their case, we read that of them it is said "*a great number believed and turned to the Lord?*" (See Acts xi: 19-21.) So you see, they not only believed, they also *turned unto the Lord*. Were they pardoned before they turned unto the Lord? Of course not; for in him "we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." Eph. i: 7. So this case furnishes me another weapon with which to crush my opponent's doctrine. Now if you want to know how these believers "turned unto the Lord," open your Bibles at the eighteenth chapter of Acts, and read the record of Paul's great meeting at Corinth, (for of course he taught the same doctrine, and received his converts in the same way every where.) The record is summed up thus: "Many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized. (Verse 8.) No "faith only" about that; they believed, they obeyed the "form of doctrine" which was delivered to them, they were buried with the Lord in baptism and raised to walk in newness of life; and thus they were made free from sin.

Mr. Nichols refers to the case mentioned in Matt. ix: 27-30, to the opening of the eyes of the two blind men who followed Jesus; and (strange to say!) he seems to think that that notable cure helps his cause. But, does it? Observe the following facts: (1) they believed on him; (2) they publicly confessed their faith; (3) they followed him; and not till they had done these things did he cure them, saying, "According to your faith be it unto you," Does this illustration help his doctrine? Most assuredly not; but it is precisely what I teach, namely, that if a man will believe in Jesus, publicly confess that faith, and then follow

the Lord, he thus perfects his faith, and the Lord will promptly forgive him. They perfected their faith by following Christ, not by groaning at the mourner's bench, nor rolling in the straw.

Just here I am reminded that Mr. Nichols seems to be highly elated at finding a place in the Bible where a man, falling down on his face, worships God (i Cor. 14: 23-25); but this does not meet his wants, for the man did not fall down to "pray for faith," nor to "get religion;" no, the man did not fall down till after he was convinced of all, till after he was ready to "worship God." Moreover, the brethren did not exhort him to "pray on, brother," "if you will continue to seek, you will surely find," "stay where you are till the Lord shall speak peace to your soul;" no, I suppose they said to him as Ananias said to Saul, "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts xxii: 16. And now if Mr. Nichols ever heard a Methodist preacher tell a sinner who had been convinced by his teaching, and who had fallen down on his face to worship God, to arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord; or, if he ever heard a Methodist preacher say to a lot of convicted sinners who were crying out, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" "Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost," he will please tell us all about it, and we will have another new thing under the sun. Peter gave that answer on Pentecost (Acts ii: 38), but I have yet to find a Methodist preacher who is willing to do as he did. They prefer to ridicule "doing religion," and to exhort their mourners to "get religion." They seem to forget that the only time the word "religion" is used in the Bible it is represented as something

to be done. James says (chap, i: 27), "Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep himself unspotted from the world."

Mr. Nichols seems to have a great horror of buying his salvation. He seems to think that one cannot do anything at all in order to justification without thereby paying for it. He seems to think that if one must, in addition to exercising internally a loving, trusting faith, also express that faith by some external action, he thereby pays for his justification, and can say, "Pay me that thou owest; it is not of grace, but of debt; I have done religion and you owe it to me." A strange idea, indeed! I suppose if one of the gentleman's brethren were to say to him, "Come up to my house tomorrow, and bring a bridle with you; I have a horse that I intend to give you," he would think that in carrying the bridle he would pay for the horse! According to his theory he ought, in such a case, to go up to his brother's, fall upon his face, and beg for a bridle, lest in bringing the bridle he should pay for the horse. Then he ought not to catch the horse, lest he should pay for him in that way. Indeed he could not consistently go up after him, as the mere act of going would be a kind of work. The trouble with him and with his brethren is, they do not distinguish between works of law or merit, and "obedience to the faith." If a man did carry a bridle, he would not thereby secure the horse by purchase instead of by grace; and just so of the man who is baptized for pardon; he thereby pays for the justification neither in whole nor in part; it is purely of grace. Faith, repentance, confession and baptism are conditions upon which the Master has seen fit to bestow the blessing. When we do them we pay him nothing. When the apostle says, "To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace,

but of debt," he is evidently talking of such works as furnish full value for what we receive; for if what we receive *is given*, either in whole or in part, *grace* is still present. Had a man kept the Mosaic law faultlessly from the day of his birth to the day of his death, had he done right always, every where, perfectly, then indeed of him it could be said, "To him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt" and of such a man only could it be said.

One other point, I believe, remains to be noticed. Mr. Nichols seems anxious that I should state my position with regard to faith and repentance. Well, in brief it is this: His sort of faith (faith only) precedes repentance; but the faith that saves (faith perfected by works) includes repentance. When I find a man that believes as he does, I am ready enough to tell him to "repent and believe the Gospel." For I would fain see all purify their souls "in obeying the truth," and thus rejoice in faith by works made "perfect."

[*Time expired.*]

AFTERNOON SESSION.

J. H. NICHOLS' FIRST SPEECH.

Brethren and Sisters:

I said in my first speech that repentance was necessary to bring a sinner to where he could be justified by faith. Bro. Harding attempted to show that all that was required to bring a sinner to where he could be justified by *faith only*, was as immediately instrumental in justification as faith is. Let me give you an illustration: Two men are in a difficulty. One plunges a shop-made butcher knife to the heart of the other and takes his life in a moment. Now what was the *immediate instrumental cause of death in this case?* I answer the butcher-knife *only*. But Bro. H. will ask, "Would the knife have killed the man if it had not been used by the angry man?" I answer no; neither would faith justify if it was not exercised by a penitent sinner. Now you see the knife was the only thing that touched the seat of life, and caused the life-blood to flow out, so I say the knife was the *only immediate instrument of death*. But Bro. H. says, "Did not the murderer use his feet and legs in going to his victim? Did he not use angry words? Did he not use his *hand* and *arm?*" I answer yes, but neither one, nor all of these things parted the flesh, and caused the heart's blood to flow out—the *knife only* did that. But Bro. H. says, "The steps taken by the murderer, the use of the hand and arm,

and whatever else was done to get the murderer in position to do the deed, were just as *immediate* instrumental causes of the man's death as the knife was, because the knife could not have reached the heart without these other steps." Now let us try that just a moment. His argument runs about thus: "The knife could not have killed the man if it had not been handled by the murderer, and the murderer could not have been in existence if he had not had parents, and his parents could not have existed if they had not had parents, therefore the murderer and all of his ancestry were *immediate instrumental causes of murder*. Again, the knife could not have existed if the smith had not made it, and the smith could not have made it if some one had not made the steel out of which the knife was made, and the steel could not have been made if the ore from which it was made had not been taken from the ore bank by some one, therefore the smith, those who made the steel, those who dug the ore from the bank, and all the tools used by them, were *immediately instrumental in the murder*." Just such foolishness, and yet that is the argument my brother makes to prove that faith is not the *only immediate instrumental cause of justification*. Now Bro. H. there is a shade of difference between the word *only*, and the word *alone*. If you will notice that, it may keep you out of trouble. Faith cannot exist *alone*, yet it is the *only* thing which reaches the great heart of Jesus Christ, and brings justification from past sins to a poor sinner who has "a broken and a contrite heart." It is known and read of Campbellism that it claims the Acts of the Apostles to be the only book in the Bible which teaches just what a sinner must do to be saved, but Bro. H., like all of his brethren whom I have met in debate, will not stand square and flat-

footed on the platform of his church when he is pressed on the question of justification from past sins. If he had been preaching you a sermon on "Rightly dividing the word of truth," he would have said about this: "If you want to know what to do to become a Christian, go to the Acts to learn that; but if you want to know how to live a Christian life, go to the epistles to learn that," but he is in a debate now, so he must step off of his platform over into the epistle of James to learn that a sinner is not justified from past sins by faith only, and in this debate he does not seem to see any difference whatever, between *becoming a Christian and living a Christian life*, so when he finds a passage of scripture which is pointing out the duties of a Christian he applies such passages to sinners who are seeking justification from past sins. Now let me call your attention to the passages he quoted from James, 2d chapter: He first called attention to verse 21, "Was not Abraham our father justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son upon the altar?" I answer *yes*; but I will ask Bro. H. to state to you in his next speech, does he wish this audience to understand that he teaches that the offering of Isaac was a condition of justification from Abrahams past sins? Was the offering of Isaac the act of a penitent sinner seeking justification from past sins, or was it the act of a faithful servant of God? Was Abraham a guilty, condemned sinner before God until he offered Isaac on the altar? Will Bro. H. not forget to answer these questions? I now read Gen. xv: 6, "And he (Abraham) believed in the Lord, and he counted it to him for righteousness." I here challenge Bro. H. to show any passage of scripture that teaches that Abraham ever had that degree of faith which God counted to him for righteousness before the one I have just read. It is true that Abraham had left his country at God's com-

mand. (Gen. xii:1.) It is true that God had promised to make of him a great nation, (v. 2.) It is true that God had promised him and his seed after him the land of Canaan, and that his seed should be as the dust of the earth. (Gen. xiii: 14-16.) It is true that Abraham had built altars, and prayed to God, and yet he did not have justifying faith until God told him that his seed should be as the "stars of heaven," (v. 5,) then he recognized that it was a spiritual seed, for God "saith not, and to seeds, as of many; but as of one, and to thy seed, which is Christ." Gal. iii: 16. So then, all that should be justified through faith in Christ, in all ages, should be "*Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise*" (v. 29.) When Abraham grasped the idea of salvation through Christ, "he believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Rom. iv: 3. "And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had yet being uncircumcised; that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also: And the father of circumcision to them who are not of the circumcision only, but who also *walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham, which he had, being yet 7ncircumcised.*" Rom. iv: 11, 12. "For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God." (v. 2.) Now my friends, you see that Abraham was justified by faith, *before he was circumcised, and without works*, and up to the time of his justification by faith, he was an ungodly man, for the 5th verse reads, "But to him that *worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the UNGODLY, his faith is counted for righteousness.*" Here we see what class is justified *by faith only*—it is the *ungodly*. Now if Abraham did *any sort of works*, or

submitted to *any kind of an ordinance*, as a condition of justification, I do beg of Bro. Harding to tell *unjust what work he did*, and *Just what ordinance he received*, as a condition of justification, and don't forget to give us *chapter and verse*. Now turn to Gen. xxii: 8-13, and you can read the account of Abraham offering Isaac, in which act, James says he was "justified by works." This was about 40 years after he had been justified by faith, *without works*, and yet Bro. H. quotes what James says as positive proof that a sinner is not justified from past sins by faith only. But James is not talking about the justification of a sinner from past sins. Let me read the language with which James introduces the justification about which Bro. H. has had so much to say, and seems to understand so little. "What doth it profit, *my brethren*, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? Can faith save him? If a brother or sister be naked, and destitute of daily food, and *one of you say unto them*," etc. James ii: 14-16. *One of who say unto him?* An unjustified sinner, or one of the brethren? All see that it is the *brethren* here spoken to, and it is *works of charity* referred to, and these works are to be done by *the brethren*, and now I am more than ever astonished at Bro. H. for bringing in this 2nd chapter of James as testimony on the subject of justification from past sins, since there is not a spoonful of water in the chapter, and you know he cannot get a sinner in on the Campbellite platform without "*much water*" Now Bro. H. had a good deal to say about me contradicting James, from all of which you see that he does not understand James, and he makes Paul and James fight each other on the subject of justification, for Paul says "to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." Rom. iv: 4,5. *Here Paul*

excludes all works, but James says, "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Jas. ii: 24. Now if Paul and James were talking about the same class of men, and the same kind of justification, they contradict each other flatly, and I defy Bro. H. to reconcile their statements. He next brings up Rahab the harlot. "*Likewise also* was not Rahab the harlot justified by works, when she had received the messengers, and had sent them out another way." Jas. ii: 25. "*Likewise*" that is, as Abraham was justified by an act of obedience to God's command, being a true servant of God at the time the obedience was rendered, so also was Rahab justified. Now let me read from the 2nd chapter of Joshua, 9-15: "And she said unto the men, *I know that the Lord hath given you the land . . .* For we have heard how the Lord dried up the water of the Red sea for you, when you came out of Egypt; and what ye did unto the two kings of the Amorites, that were on the other side of Jordan, Sihon and Og, whom ye utterly destroyed. *And as soon as we had heard these things, our hearts did melt*, neither did their remain any more courage in any man, because of you; *for the Lord your God, he is God in heaven above, and in earth beneath.*" Then she prayed them for protection for her father's house, and for all that they had, and her petition was granted on condition that she did not tell their business. "Then she let them down by a cord through a window; for her house was upon the town wall, and she dwelt upon the wall." Now you see she had *heard* of God's dealings with his people—she *knew* the Lord had given Canaan to his people, and that He was "God of heaven and earth." So she was justified by faith "when she had RECEIVED THE SPIES WITH PEACE," (Heb. xi: 31) and she was justified by Works "when she had *received the messengers*, AND HAD

SENT THEM OUT ANOTHER WAY." Jas. ii 25. I hope Bro. H. understands this case now, and will not suffer the desperate pressure that is upon him just now, to drive him entirely off of the platform on which he and his brethren always stand when they preach about "Rightly dividing the Word." But you say "Rahab was a harlot." Certainly she had been a harlot, but she "received the spies WITH PEACE" and was justified by faith *when she thus received them*. But Bro. H. seems to be dull of comprehension, so I will make this plain by reading 11 Cor. vi: 14, 15: "What fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness? and what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?" Now I suppose Bro. H. will admit that the spies were men of God, and if Rahab had been a bad woman when she received them, there could have been no *peace, concord* or *communion* between them. Once more: Rahab received them WITH PEACE, and "*There is no peace saith my God, to the wicked*" Isa. lvii: 21. Therefore Rahab could not have been a wicked woman when she received the servants of the Lord *with peace*. Now Bro. H. you have said much about Abraham and Rahab being justified by works, and you go to James to prove it. Did James write his epistle to sinners or to Christians? (Bro. H.—to Christians.) Glad you admit that. Can you take the book of James, and by it, show a sinner how to be saved according to the Campbellite theory? Well, if you won't answer now, please don't forget it in your next speech. I think Bro. H. has taken the wrong cases to sustain the Campbellite doctrine, for Abraham was justified by faith, *before he was circumcised*, or had received any church ordinance of any kind, and Rahab was justified by faith when she received the spies with peace, and with-

out any church ordinance, and you know that if either of them were here now, and should tell Bro. II. that they had

fied Christian life, or did he write them as instructions to sinners, telling them how to become "justified from sins that are past?" If he was instructing Christians how to live a Christian life when he wrote, "To him that *worketh not*, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness," (iv: 5). Did he mean that Christians should not work? "When James wrote the 2nd chapter of his epistle, and wrote about justification by works, was he instructing sinners how to become justified from "sins that are passed," or was he telling Christians how to live a justified life? When he wrote, "Ye see then how

that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only," (v. 24) did he refer to the *same class of men and same kind of justification* that Paul referred to when he wrote, "To him that *worketh not* but *believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness.*" Will you please charge your memory *especially* with these questions, and give us some light? But you say Paul's whole argument here "was to prove to the Jews that it was not necessary to circumcise a Gentile! *Shades of logic!* If you had given us *chapter and verse* for that, it would have given us some relief, but this is another of your *suppositions.*

Now I come to the poor fellow who "fell in the well." Just suppose it had been my Bro. H. who fell in that well, and I had let a rope down to him; he would have looked up and said, "Look here, you can't play your Methodist tricks on me—you have let down a *rope only.* I can't be saved that way, *pour in water here until I am submerged from head to foot, or I am gone forever.*" Now there was nothing that the poor fellow could touch that connected him with the power which delivered him from the well *but the rope*—yea the *rope only* was the *immediate instrumental cause* of his deliverance. This is a fine illustration of justification by *faith only.* Now let me try his horse illustration. The man came to me and said, "I will give you a horse if you will come and get him." I *believed* what he said—love for the man, and joy that I had a horse, spring up in my heart at once. I am now *justified* in any steps I may take to make the horse serviceable to me, because a *positive agreement* has been made. If such agreement had not been made, I would not have been justified in taking the horse, but would have been a *thief* had I taken him, because I took him without a *positive understanding* be-

tween me and his owner. Now suppose the horse had always belonged to me, and I had wanted to use him that day, I would have had to make the very same steps to get to the horse, that I made after he was given to me. The gift was *made, and accepted*, before I took *one step* towards the horse; so here is another fine illustration of justification by *faith only*. But let us suppose the horse had been given to Bro. H. He would have gone to the saddle house and gotten the man's bridle and saddle, then drawn the buggy out of the buggy-house, harness and all, then the wagon, plow, harrow, and all things on the place that are ever drawn by horses. The gentleman says, "What do you mean by all this? I gave you the *horse only*." Bro. H. replies, "Ah, my good fellow, I've got you; you did not say *horse only*, you said you would give me a horse, and all these things are mine, because they are connected with horses, and by these things the gift is made perfect." Yea sir, that is the way you reason about justification from past sins. In your illustrations you remind me of the man who jumped into a pit to save himself from a buffalo, but lo, there were two lions in the pit. Now let me notice the Campbellite theory of justification. (1) Faith. (2) Repentance. (3) Confession. (4) Baptism. I now state that if Bro. H. will turn to any New Testament account of conversion, and take that account just as it is recorded, and not patch about to get something else to tack on to it, and will get the four points out of it just as Campbellism states them, without any alteration, I will be one of any number you may name to put a humming bird feather in his cap. But he refers to I Cor. xiv: 23-25. Still he does not tell us that he ever saw an unbeliever go into a Campbellite congregation, and fall on his face and worship God, and report that God was in the church of a truth—O

no, but he asks me a question. O, yes, I have often said, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, CALLING ON THE NAME OF THE LORD, and men and women have stood up and received baptism, *then and there, in the house*, standing on their feet as Paul received it in the house of Judas. (Acts ix: 18-22, & xvi.) O yes, I often tell sinners to "Repent and be baptized . . . *in the name of Jesus Christ* for the remission of sins," (Acts ii: 38) but I never teach them that water baptism has anything to do with washing away sins, it is only a picture of Holy Ghost baptism, which docs wash away sins, but as to-morrow will be the day for "no salvation without water," I will drop baptism here—should not have said anything about it if Bro. H. had not lugged it in, but we will excuse him, for you know how hard it is for a Campbellite to talk without "much water."

To the afflicted woman (Matt. ix: 22) Jesus said, "*Thy faith hath made thee whole.*" What was left for works to do if she was "*made whole.*" by faith? Bro. H. does not seem to have seen any difference between *being made whole*, and remaining whole after having been made whole. Now let me introduce a few witnesses.

(1) Jesus says, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have eternal life." Jno. iii: 14, 15. When we read Num. xxi: 8, 9, we see that the only condition of salvation to a bitten Israelite was to "look on the serpent." But if Moses had been a Campbellite he would have told them that to "*look only*" would not save them. Now notice how my brother will manufacture suppositions to invent something else as a condition of cure besides "*look.*" He will *suppose* there were 180,000 in the camps of Israel, and

he will *suppose* that some of the bitten ones were where they could not see the serpent without being moved, and all this he does to get in a condition of salvation that God did not put in, and yet he goes by the Bible (?) so he says. "*As Moses lifted up the serpent, even so must the Son of man be lifted up.*" As the bitten man "*looked and lived*" even so the sinner "*looks to Jesus by faith, and lives*" but my brother will stick "*much water*" a dip, and one to do the dipping, between the sinner and Jesus, and all this is done by *supposition*. The salvation offered to the bitten Israelites *through looking on the serpent*, Christ takes to illustrate the *salvation he offers to the sinner who believes on him*, but it by no means illustrates the salvation offered to the sinner by Campbellism—Moses would have had to *dip* all the bitten fellows, or their looking would have been a failure, according to Bro. H's. teaching. But Bro. H. tells us that all are saved alike, then *suppose* that some of the bitten men were where they could look on the serpent *without being moved*, and others *had to be moved so as to look*, and this *supposed* moving he makes a *condition of their salvation*, so you see he has some saved by *one condition*, while others were saved by, it may be, a *thousand conditions*, for if his *supposed* moves are correct, and it took four men to carry one, there are *four conditions*; but they could not carry him *without walking*, and of course they could not walk *without stepping*, and of course *every step* was a *condition of salvation* to the poor fellow, and there is no knowing how many conditions it did take to save some of those poor fellows, according to Bro. H's. *supposition*. Truly my brother is in a broad field when he steps out of the Bible into *supposition*.

(2) I call Paul and Silas to the witness stand. Acts xvi:

30, 31. "Sirs what must I do to be saved? And they said, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." Here is a plain, pointed question, and a straightforward, full answer. Nothing mentioned here as a condition of salvation but "*believe on the Lord Jesus Christ*" A heathen jailer asked the question—an inspired apostle answered it. It was at midnight, in a jail, and this case was separated from all other cases of conversion in the Bible by these circumstances. Now has any body here ever heard a Campbellite preacher answer a sinner in this language when he asked the same question, let him stand up. (No one stood up.) Bro. H. did you ever answer one just that way? Now will Bro. H. take this case as it stands, or will he "patch round" to get something to tack on to it to make it fit Campbellism? "But he was baptized the same hour of the night," you say. O yes, I have seen many sinners saved by believing on the Lord Jesus Christ, and have baptized them the same hour of the night. That is the way we Methodists do, but Paul did not put in baptism here as a condition of justification. The only thing here expressed as a condition of salvation is *faith*, baptism was an after consideration according to the record. If Bro. H. gets baptism in here as a condition of pardon, he will do it by his rule of supposition. I next call Peter and all the prophets to the witness stand. Peter preaching at the house of Cornelius said, "To him (Jesus Christ) give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins. Whilst Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word." Acts x: 43, 44. The six brethren who went with Peter were astonished, "For they heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God." Now all this was done before Peter mentioned water in any way

so far as the record shows, but Bro. H's. rule of supposition will assist him in getting the water in, for there is no way to get it in but by patch work and supposition, and the water must come in as a condition of pardon, or this case will not fit Campbellism. Peter states *no condition of pardon whatever, but faith in Jesus Christ*, and he states that *all the prophets* testify to the same, and while he "yet spake these words," those who heard *believed*, and the Holy Ghost fell on them. All of this before water baptism was administered *or even mentioned*, so far as the record shows. Will Bro. H. remember that here is a case that is separate from all other cases of conversion in the Bible, and that it was necessary for Peter to tell them just exactly what the condition of pardon was, and faith is the only condition he gives. But Bro. H. says, "Three men were sent for Peter—Peter and six other men came back with them—Peter preached, and all these things were conditions of Cornelius' pardon." Let me try that a little. It was about 35 miles from Caesarea to Joppa, or 61,600 yards. If each of the three men sent stepped one yard at a step, we have 184,000 conditions before they got to where Peter was. Peter and six others went back with them—in all ten men. They made 1,348,000 steps, or conditions of pardon," before they reached the house of Cornelius. Add to this the steps made by the three as they went to Joppa, and we have a grand total of 1,932,800 "conditions" before Cornelius could be saved, according to Bro. H's. plan. Don't try to dodge this, my brother, you know that your argument leads to this conclusion. Now I state that there is not an account of conversion given in the Bible that fits Campbellism without adding something to it that is not recorded in that account.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. HARDING'S SECOND REPLY

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The point of difference between us is becoming more clearly denned, and that is good, for the more distinctly it stands out, the easier it is to decide upon the merits of the arguments and illustrations that are brought to bear upon the proposition under discussion. In his entire address Mr. Nichols did not say one word about my argument from the statement of James that "Faith without works is dead." The apostle shows that faith without works is incomplete, that it is not faith any more than the body without the spirit is a man. We call the body without the spirit a "dead man," and a dead man is only a part of a man; it has no power in it to bless, or to help in any way. James explains that faith is "made perfect" by works, just as the body became a perfect man when God breathed into it the breath of life, and "man became a living soul, (Gen. ii: 7.) Why did not Mr. Nichols endeavor to meet this argument? Is it possible that he knew that the more he talked about it the worse it would be for his cause? Let him not flatter himself that he can escape in that way, for I intend to show that every passage of Scripture which he quotes, and every illustration that he uses, condemns the faith for which he contends as being dead, and as being as useless for justifying as a dead horse is for plowing.

Consider his butcher-knife illustration: A man takes a huge butcher-knife and plunges it into the heart of his

enemy, and kills him. Now, argues Mr. Nichols that man was killed by the knife only; and just so the sinner is justified by faith only. He freely admits that the knife would not have killed had it not been used by the angry man; "neither," says he, "would faith justify were it not exercised by a penitent sinner." Very good, my friends, I like that; now if I can just get these Methodists to see how a penitent sinner is directed to exercise his faith, and if they will do it, we will get the last one of them out of the Methodic church without further trouble.

See that knife lying upon the table; it is dead, that is, it is separated from all efficacy; by itself it can neither do good, nor can it do harm. That knife Mr. Nichols tells you represents "faith only." See that furious man rush in and grasp it in his hand; watch him spring upon his foe and drive it into his heart; see the warm blood gush out, and watch the wounded man fall upon the ground and die; was he killed by the knife only? No, indeed the knife (faith) would have done nothing without the bodily action. So it was the knife (which represents faith) in connection with the action of the body that did the deed. And just so it is in every case of faith recorded in the Bible; as long as it is alone, as that knife was on the table, as long as it is purely internal, it does absolutely no good. Certain rulers of the Jews, John tells us, believed on Jesus Christ, but they did nothing; they did not even confess their faith; they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God, If we do not confess him, he will never confess us before his Father and the angels. Confession is a bodily work The devils believe, but they do nothing in obedience to the Lord; their faith is dead. Why were those rulers not saved? Why were they not justified? Simply because their faith was like that knife lying on the table, it was

"dead, being alone." Notice how much alike these two statements are: Ye see then how that by works that man was killed and not by the knife only; and, "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified and not by faith only." James ii: 24. I thank the gentleman for the butcher-knife illustration; it suits me very well. Nor can he imagine an illustration that will not suit me. "Faith only" is worthless, and it is impossible to find an illustration either in the word of God, or in the book of nature that does not so stamp it. Take another of his favorite cases: That of the Israelites who were bitten by the fiery serpents. (Num. xxi: 5-9.) The Israelites did wrong (not simply thought wrong or believed wrong) and God sent fiery serpents among them, and they bit them, and many of them died; then the people confessed their sins, saying unto Moses: "We have sinned against the Lord, and against thee; pray unto the Lord, that he take away the serpents from us." And Moses prayed for the people. And the Lord said unto Moses: "Make thee a fiery serpent, and set it upon a pole; and it shall come to pass, that every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it shall live." "And Moses made a serpent of brass, and put it upon a pole, and it came to pass, that if a serpent had bitten any man, when he beheld the serpent of brass he lived."

Now, my friends, you have the case before you. Does it suit for Mr. Nichols' doctrine of faith only? By no means; true enough, the people believed, but they were not then immediately cured: they were sorry for their sin, they believed that God was able to save them, they confessed their sin, they asked Moses to pray for them, he did pray for them, God directed him to make a serpent and put it upon a pole, and to tell the people to look and

that they should live; Moses made the serpent and the people obeyed the Lord, they looked and then they were cured. In this case we have faith, sorrow, repentance, confession and obedience before they received the blessing. Suppose there had been a Methodistic Israelite there, and he had said in his heart, "'faith only' is the thing that reaches the blessing, and as I am dreadfully sick, I will not leave my bed, nor go out of my tent; I will just make an internal surrender to the Lord, and that will do just as well;" is there a man here who thinks he would have been cured? (If I were to adopt Mr. Nichols' tactics I would say, if there is such a man here, let him stand up. No one stood.) [Laughter.]

"But," some one may say, "it does not take much effort to look." Sometimes it takes a good deal, but whether it takes much or little it is *bodily action*; the people had something to believe, and an action of the body by which to express their faith; and thus they perfected their faith and reached the blessing. As Mr. Nichols' intimates, there were a great many people in that camp. We are told there were six hundred thousand warriors, and it is perfectly safe to assume that there were as many women as men, and as many people under twenty years of age as there were women, which would make one million eight hundred thousand people in the camp. That is, that camp was more than twenty times as large as the city of Nashville; it was nine times as large as Louisville, and five or six times as large as Cincinnati. And even in Cincinnati if all the people were required to look upon a pole erected at Fountain Square, some of them would have to work a good deal to do it, The camp of Israel must have been at least ten miles square. Judged by our cities, it would cover even

a great deal more ground than that. So another of his illustrations fails the gentleman, and comes over to my side. These people had to "exercise their faith" by *doing something in obedience to the Lord* before they were saved. But, says Mr. Nichols, "Moses would have had to dip all the bitten fellows, or their looking would have been a failure, according to Bro. Harding's teaching." Of course he did not expect you to believe that when he said it; he was just talking to fill up time; he knows as well as you do that I do not teach baptism is necessary to cure the bite of a serpent; nor was it necessary to save a man from his sins till it became so by appointment in the New Testament. Now it stands to the sinner just as looking at the brazen serpent did to the bitten Israelites; as the one had to *believe and tool*, the other has to *believe and be baptized*. And as the looking did not pay for the cure (it was by grace), so the baptizing does not pay for the pardon (it is also by grace). And it seems to me that any one who can understand how the Israelites were saved by grace not of works (although they had something to do to be cured), could, if he would, understand how the sinner is saved from his sins by grace not of works (although he, too, has something to do to obtain the pardon).

Mr. Nichols was careful to say nothing about the difference between the works of merit (that is, works by which we pay for a thing), and what Paul calls "the obedience of faith," see Rom. xvi: 26. Yet in the understanding of this difference lies the solution of this whole matter. When I say that a man must do something to be saved, he seems horror stricken, and the contortions of his countenance remind me of a boy with a false-face on. [Laughter.] But he need not be so stirred up; we don't *pay* anything for our salvation any more than did the bitten Israelites

Were a man to say to one of his farm hands: "That horse is worth one hundred dollars; your work is worth twenty-five dollars per month; if you will work for me four months you may have the horse;" and if that laborer were to work for the four months and thus secure the horse, he would obtain him by works, not of grace. And it could be said of him in the words of Paul (Rom. iv: 4), "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." But if the farmer were to say to his hand: "I love you, and I want to give you that horse; if you will catch him and ride him, you may have him;" and if the man were to catch him, and ride him, he could truly say, "I did not pay for this horse at all; my employer gave him to me; I obtained him by grace, not by works; my master loved me and gave him to me, on the conditions that I would catch him and ride him; I believed him, and did what he told me to do, and so I got the horse." *In both cases, however, the man had something to do.* Under the first supposition the works were those of merit; under the second we have the obedience of faith. In the one case it was by pure purchase; in the other by pure grace.

When Paul argues in Romans against justification by works, and teaches that it is by grace and not of works, he does not exclude "the obedience of faith;" for in the very connection, as I showed in my former speech, he says, "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin, but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." Rom. vi: 17-18. So, in this very letter, upon which Mr. Nichols puts his chief dependence to prove his doctrine of justification by faith only, Paul tells the Roman Christians plainly that they were formerly servants of sin, but that they were made

free from sin when they had obeyed from the heart the form of doctrine which was delivered unto them. They were saved not by the works of merit, but by the obedience of faith. And Peter teaches the same thing when he writes to the Christians scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia and Bithynia, saying: "Ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth." (See 1 Pet. i: 22.) He calls these people "strangers," and he could not have known that they purified their souls "in obeying the truth," if he had not known that that is the only way in which any body ever purifies the soul.

But, to return to the horse illustration, Mr. Nichols says were a horse promised to him upon the conditions that he should come and catch him, when he *believed* it, *love* and *joy* would spring up in his heart, and he would be *justified* in any steps he might take to make the horse serviceable to himself, because a positive agreement had been made. Here is a nice little play upon the word "justified" that might catch the unwary. Just such tricks as that mislead many a man. True enough he would be justified in taking steps to get the horse, but he would not own him till he had taken the steps—till he had fulfilled the agreement. Just so of the sinner; when he believes in Jesus and loves him, he is justified in taking steps to obtain pardon, but he is by no means justified from his sins. He must obey the "form of doctrine" before he is made free from sin. That kind of a trick is even worse than calling respectable people by offensive nicknames, inasmuch as it is calculated to mislead the thoughtless in the matter of their eternal salvation. I would hate to catch myself doing either the one or the other.

When James says (Jas. ii: 24), "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only," he is

talking about the justification of the Christian, says Mr. Nichols; but Paul (Rom. iv: 3), when he says, "Abraham believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness," is talking about the justification of the sinner. Let us examine this position: Was James talking about the justification of the servant of God only? No, indeed; no man can study the passage fairly and candidly, and so believe. When the sinner would become the child of God he must be justified; and when the Christian who has done wrong would return to God's favor, or when one would occupy a higher place in his favor, he too must be justified. I claim that James is talking about both these classes—that he lays down a great, universal law which covers the whole ground of justification, when he says, "Ye see then how that by works a man (any man, every man), is justified, and not by faith only." As illustrations under this great universal rule, he gives Abraham offering Isaac, and Rahab receiving and sending away the messengers of God in peace. At the time Abraham offered Isaac he had been for many years a diligent servant of the Lord; so his case shows that God's people are justified by works, and not by faith only; to this Mr. Nichols and his people agree. But not so when we come to the other illustration under the rule. Let us now study that: Rahab was not one of God's people, she was not a Jewess, she dwelt in a doomed city of the Canaanites, being one of that accursed people, *and she was a harlot*. Mr. Nichols says, "She had been a harlot, but she 'received the spies with peace,' and was justified by faith when she thus received them." This justification he claims was by faith only. Then, he argues, she ceased to be a harlot, and when she "sent them out another way," being a servant of God, she was justified by works, and not by faith only. So he has Rahab the harlot

justified by faith only, and Rahab the servant of God justified by works, and not by faith only.

This interpretation might do were it not that it flatly contradicts two facts that lie right before us. First, It was just as truly^c work" to receive the spies as it was to send them out; so had she been justified immediately upon receiving them, her justification would not have been by faith only. Second, James plainly teaches that Rahab *the harlot* was justified "by works, and not by faith only," and as long as his words are true we cannot believe Mr. Nichols' doctrine of Rahab's two justifications. So it is evident that James in giving this rule of justification includes both of the great classes, the one represented by Abraham the servant of the Lord, and the other by Rahab the harlot; hence he talks about the justification of "a man," not of "a sinner," nor of "a Christian;" he uses a term that includes all who would come to God, or who would attain to greater heights in his favor.

By reading the second chapter of Joshua the following facts appear: (1). Two of Joshua's spies came into the city of Jericho, and they went into the house of a harlot, named Rahab, and lodged there, (2). When the king of Jericho sent to take them, the harlot hid them, saying that they truly had come, but that they had gone away again. (3). She hid the two spies upon the roof, covering them with stalks of flax; but before they were laid down she said unto them: "I know that the Lord hath given you the land, and that your terror is fallen upon us, and that all the inhabitants of the land faint because of you. For we have heard how the Lord dried up the water of the Red sea for you, when ye came out of Egypt; and what ye did unto the two kings of the Amorites, that were on the other side of Jordan, Sihon and Og, whom ye utterly destroyed.

And as soon as we heard these things, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more courage in any man, because of you; for the Lord your God, he is God in heaven above, and in earth beneath. Now therefore, I pray you, swear unto me by the Lord, since I have showed you kindness, that ye will also show kindness unto my father's house, and give me a true token: and that ye will save alive my father, and my mother, and my brothers, and my sisters, and all that they have, and deliver our lives from death." (4). The spies promised to grant her request provided she would not betray them. (5). So she let them down by a cord through the window, for her house was on the town wall. (6). According to their instructions, she put a scarlet thread in the window, so that they would know the house when they returned to take the city. (7). From Joshua vi: 25, we learn that "Joshua saved Rahab the harlot alive, and her father's household, and all that she had; and she dwelleth in Israel even unto this day; *because she hid the messengers, which Joshua sent to spy out Jericho.*"

I have taken pains to give this whole account, my friends, so that you might have the whole case clearly before you. Rahab had faith when the spies came, and that is why she received them with such great kindness; but her faith was purely "historical," and that, you know¹, our Methodist friends say will not save any body. She and her people had "heard" what God had done for Israel, and their hearts had melted within them, so that the whole city was given up to fear. Rahab was persuaded that the Lord, the God of Israel, was "God in heaven above, and in earth beneath." And so she turned to the Lord, showing kindness to his messengers, and for this reason the Lord saved her by the hand of Joshua. She heard, believed and

turned to the Lord and thus was justified "by works and not by faith only."

But Mr. Nichols argues because Rahab "received the spies with peace," she must have been a child of God, already justified! Did any body ever hear the like before? Why most of us have heard of a woman who was "a sinner," who crept to Jesus' feet and kissed them, who washed them with her tears, and wiped them with the hair of her head. And not till she had *done* these things did she obtain pardon. I wonder if Mr. Nichols ever heard of that case? Rahab received the spies with peace, that is, she treated them as friends and not as enemies. Cannot a sinner treat a man of God in a friendly way? Is a sinner bound to be justified before he can treat a Christian peaceably? The gentleman was surely hard pressed when he made that argument. And when he quoted Isaiah lvii: 21, "There is no peace saith my God to the wicked," and applied it to this case, he was sadly perverting the word of God. To receive a man with peace is to receive him in a kindly, peaceable way; whereas to have peace yourself is to be quiet, contented and happy within. The former Rahab did; but the latter she had not, for she was terribly scared; she was full of "terror," and her heart "did melt." So much for the case of Rahab. This harlot, who did not even belong to the Jews, God's people, who was saved "because she hid the messengers," James says was justified by works, "and not by faith only." Hence it is clear that James was talking about the justification of sinners as well as of God's people.

Now we will turn our attention, if you please, to Paul's teaching on the subject of justification in the fourth chapter of Romans. Mr. Nichols says Paul is here talking about primary justification, the justification of a sinner.

Here again he is mistaken. Paul also illustrates by the case of Abraham. He says (v. 3,) "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." This saying is a quotation from Genesis xv: 6. Now at the time that it is said of Abraham, that the Lord counted his faith to him for righteousness, he had been a faithful, diligent servant of the Lord for about eight years. Friends, when you go home, take your Bible and read the twelfth, thirteenth and fourteenth chapters and down to the sixth verse of the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, and you will learn the following facts: (1). At the commandment of the Lord, Abraham gathered together all his possessions, and left his father's house and his native land and went forth into the land of Canaan. (2). At the time of making this call, God blessed Abram with the promise of Christ. (3). God promised to give all the land of Canaan to his seed. (4). There was a famine in the land, and he went down into Egypt. (5). Abram left Egypt "very rich in cattle, in silver, and in gold." (6). Lot also was with him and was rich, so that the land was not able to bear them both; so they separated, Lot going east into the plain of Jordan, and Abram dwelling in the land of Canaan. (7). Then came the war of the four kings against the five, in which Chedorlaomer and his associates ravaged Sodom and Gomorrah and captured Lot. (8). Abraham, with the assistance of Aner, Eshcol, and Mamre, pursued Chedorlaomer, recaptured everything, and saved Lot. (9). Upon his return Abram was blessed by Melchisedec, priest of the most high God; and he gave to him a tithe of all. (10). After this God said to Abraham in a vision, "Fear not, Abram: I am thy shield, and thy exceeding great reward." (11). *And it was after all this that the Scripture said of Abraham, "He believed in the Lord; and he counted it to him for*

righteousness." Nevertheless, Mr. Nichols says, referring to this very passage, "I here challenge brother H. to show any passage of Scripture that teaches that Abraham ever had that degree of faith which God counted to him for righteousness before the one I have here read." Judge for yourselves, my friends. Abraham had been a servant of God for eight years; Christ had been promised to him; he had been blessed by Melchizedek, that most wonderful priest, after whose order Jesus was; God himself had spoken to him, and had told him that he was his shield, and his exceeding great reward. *It is a clear ease that his faith was not counted unto him for righteousness without obedience.*

So in Romans, fourth chapter, Paul is not talking about primary justification exclusively; true enough the faith of which he speaks excludes works of merit, which would make the justification a matter of debt, instead of a gift of grace, but it does not exclude "the obedience of faith;" for in that very connection (in the 12th v.) he talks about Abraham being the father of all who "walk in the steps of that faith" which he had. Abraham's faith *stepped*; so must ours, if we would be blessed. How did Abraham's faith step? Let Paul answer: Heb. xi: 8, "By faith Abraham, when he was called to go out into a place which he should after receive for an inheritance, OBEYED; and he went out not knowing whither he went." So you see, my friends, from the very day he left his native land he walked by faith—by faith he obeyed—and remember this was eight years before it was said of him that "his faith was counted to him for righteousness."

One more point with regard to Abraham's faith being counted for righteousness: When God was afterwards telling Isaac about it, he explained that it was, "Because

Abraham *obeyed my voice*, and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes and my laws." Compare Gen. xv: 5, 6 with Gen. xxvi: 4, 5. Now, my friends, if Mr. Nichols' challenge is not met and answered, I confess I cannot understand plain English.

"There is not a spoonful of water in the second chapter of James," says Mr. Nichols. Be not too certain about that; obedience to Christ is there, and baptism is a part of that obedience. But it is certain there is not a "mourner's bench" in the whole book of Romans. Baptism is there however. And, by the "way, I have seen some sinners who *worked pretty hard*, and sweated like quarter horses at the mourner's bench trying to get justification.

Mr. N. says there is a difference between "faith alone" and "faith only." Well, neither one of them is of any account, for James says, "Faith, if it hath not works, is dead *being alone*" (ii: 17); and, "By works a man is justified and not by *faith only*." (ii: 24.)

He says of the man in the well, the rope was the *only* thing he could *touch*. True enough; but it does not follow that he was *saved* by the rope only; for had there not been some one at the other end of the rope, he would never have gotten out of that well; and had he not caught hold and held on, he would not have been lifted out. He did something more than simply to believe in his friend above.

He says my brethren teach that Acts of Apostles is the only book in the Bible which teaches just what a sinner must do to be saved. That statement is wholly incorrect. The commission, as recorded by Matthew and Mark and Luke, teaches a sinner what to do to be saved. And though the epistles are written to Christians, the writers of them talk to those Christians about their conversions, and hence even from the epistles a sinner could learn the way

of salvation. My friends, when you hear Mr. Nichols make a statement as to what my brethren believe, you should receive it with great caution for generally, in such statements, he is incorrect.

He claims that Paul was baptized standing up, because he was told to "arise and be baptized." I wonder if his wife were to tell him to "arise and milk the cow," if he would do it standing up? Most folks would squat down. Would it be necessary for her to be so particular as to say, "Arise, go to the cow, squat down beside her, and milk her?" Hardly, I guess.

Paul and Silas told the Philippian jailer, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (Acts xvi: 31.) Mr. Nichols wants to know if I would give such an answer to a sinner. Certainly I would. Every man who believes on Jesus Christ, in the sense that Paul here used the word, will follow him; and Christ will save all who follow him. The jailer followed him (and he had to go out of the house at midnight to do it), he was baptized, and he was saved; for Jesus says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," The jailer's faith was made complete in this obedience, for it is *after his baptism* that it is said, he "rejoiced, believing in God with all his house." He was not saved by faith only.

Mr. Nichols wants to know if I can find faith, repentance, confession and baptism in any New Testament account of conversion. Suppose we try it in this case of the jailer. The Bible teaches (1) by precept, (2) by example, and (3) by necessary inference. To this all agree. The jailer believed; this the Bible states. The faith that saves includes repentance, all of us agree; hence he repented. Paul would not have baptized him unless he had understood that he was a believer; for the apostle says (Rom.

x: 10) "With the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation;" so that the jailer confessed, we learn, by necessary implication. And the Bible says that he was baptized. Here then is your faith, repentance, confession and baptism. The next time the gentleman asks a question, let him ask something hard.

Mr. Nichols makes his last effort on the case of Cornelius. He quotes Peter's words to him and to his friends, as follows: "To him [Jesus Christ] give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Acts x: 43.) This does not say that whosoever *believeth only* shall be saved, but whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins "THROUGH HIS NAME." And Peter immediately commanded them to be baptized "*in the name of the Lord*" (v. 48.) (1) They believed; (2) as saving faith includes repentance, they repented; (3) Peter and the six Jews "heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God" (v. 46), hence they confessed; (4) and they were baptized (v. 48.)

Again, Peter spake words unto them—that is, he preached the gospel to them and told them to be baptized; they were saved by the words that he spake (see Acts xi: 14); and we are saved by words, by hearing them and doing them. (See Jas. i: 21, 22.) So, we see, Cornelius also was saved under Christ's great commission, which says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." No "faith only" here. Faith is not the "immediate instrumental cause" of justification, as Mr. Nichols is so fond of saying, nor is it a "cause" at all. But faith, repentance, confession and baptism are *conditions*; and upon our complying with them, justification comes to us as a free and gracious gift, without money and without price.

[*Time expired.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION.

"CHRISTIAN BAPTISM IS IN ORDER TO THE REMISSION OF
SINS."

MR. HARDING'S FIRST ADDRESS.

SECOND DAY, Wednesday Jan. 25, 1888.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The subject which we are to consider to-day is one of very great importance, and one which is much misunderstood. I am glad, therefore, to see so many of you here to-day to listen to the discussion of it. It behooves us, as far as in us lies, to lay aside all prejudice, and to seek diligently for the truth, that we may receive it just as God has delivered it in his holy Word. A man is foolish indeed who will allow anything to so bias him as to cause him to reject any part of the truth of God. "If ye continue in my word," says Jesus, "then are ye my disciples indeed; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." John viii: 31, 32. We want to be free men in Christ Jesus; therefore let us in all honesty, and with all diligence, seek for the truth as the pearl of great price.

In order that we may go the more intelligently about our work, I will spend a little time in the beginning of this address in defining the terms of the proposition. By "Christian Baptism" is meant the baptism of the commission, the

baptism by which Christ commanded his apostles to baptize people. "Go ye therefore," said he, "and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." Matt. xxviii: 19, 20. The baptism mentioned in this document, the Great Commission, is what I mean by the words "Christian Baptism."

In affirming that it is "in order to the remission of sins," I would not be understood as teaching that no one will be found in the city of God at last who has not submitted to it; it was not given as a law to those who lived under the patriarchal and Mosaic dispensations, but it is peculiar to the gospel age, and is binding only upon those who live under the glorious light and blessed privileges of the New Covenant. Again, this baptism is not for infants and idiots, seeing that they are incapable of violating law, and hence have no sins to be remitted. (Sin is the transgression of the law." I John iii: 4.) It is only for those who are capable of being taught, and who have been taught, for Jesus puts the teaching before the baptizing; "teach all nations, baptizing them," he says.

As to the heathen who have lived and died without ever hearing the gospel story, this law never came to them, and we say of them, in the words of the Apostle Paul, "As many as have sinned without law shall also perish without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." Rom. ii: 12.

These people have never had the light that we have, and hence their responsibilities are not as great as ours are. They pass their lives in great darkness, and go to the other side of the veil into the hands of the just and merciful Creator

"We can afford to leave them with him, and turn our thoughts to our own responsibilities.

The New Covenant has been unfolded to us: Christ has come, and we have heard the wondrous story of his love; the gospel in its fullness has been preached to us, and the words of the Commission are as familiar in our ears as the lullaby-songs that we have known from our babyhood. And I do not hesitate to affirm that no man to whom the light of the New Testament has come, can have any divine assurance of pardon until he has been baptized.

Another error needs to be guarded against before we begin to study the proof bearing directly upon the proposition: There is no magical efficacy in the water, nor is there any in the act of baptism to cleanse the soul. My brethren have been represented as teaching that there is such an efficacy, that baptism washes away sin from the soul as water washes away the dirt-stain from a soiled handkerchief. There never was a greater perversion of the truth; we hold to no such doctrine, nor did we ever. As we understand it, baptism is an act of faith, by which we express our trust in Jesus Christ, and in which we reach the blessing. Jesus found a blind man (see John ix: 1-7), and he opened his eyes thus: "He spat on the ground, and made clay of the spittle, and he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay, and said unto him, Go, wash in the pool of Siloam, (which is by interpretation, *sent*). He went his way therefore, and washed, and came seeing." No one in this audience is so silly, I presume, as to think that there was virtue in the water of Siloam to cure blindness. No, indeed; JESUS *cured the man*. The virtue was in our great Lord; but it did not go out of him and restore the sight to those blind eyes, till the man had done what he told him to do. The man expressed his faith by going to the pool, and

washing away the clay and the spittle from his eyes; then his faith was made perfect by works, and in that moment virtue went forth from the Lord and cured him. Could not Jesus have cured him without sending him to the pool? Certainly he could; but he chose to tell the man to "Go, wash in the pool of Siloam," and had the poor creature said in his heart, "There is no efficacy in water to wash away blindness; the water of our cistern is just as good as the water of Siloam; I will go home and wash," he would have rejected Jesus Christ by rejecting his words, and he would have died in his blindness. The Master himself has said, "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day." John xii: 48.

Notice these facts also: The blind man did not pay Jesus for curing him, nor did he obtain the blessing by his own works. He was saved by grace through faith; and that not of himself; it was the gift of God; not of works, lest he should boast; *but, for all that he had something to do* His works paid Jesus nothing; nor was there in them any virtue whatever to cure blindness; they were but the expression of his faith and trust, by which faith was made perfect; and then Jesus of his own free grace, gave him the blessing. The reward was not reckoned to him of works, but of grace.

Had that blind man been as Mr. Nichols here seems to be, he would have said something like this: "Oh, no, Lord; don't tell me to do any thing, for then the reward will be of debt, and not of grace; and, when I have done it, I can catch you by the throat and say, 'Pay me that thou owest'; oh Lord, don't tell me to do any thing; I don't want to work my way to the blessing, I want to be cured by grace." But the blind man was not such a simpleton as that; he knew

well that if ever he obtained his sight, it would be a free gift from God, no matter where he might go, or in what he might wash.

And the same is true of Naaman the Syrian. He was a leper, dreadfully afflicted. The prophet of the Lord, Elisha, said unto him, "Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean." I Kings v: 10. "Then he went down, and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God; and his flesh came again like unto the flesh of a little child, and he was clean, (verse 14.) And Naaman's exclamation after his curing was this: "Now I know that there is no God in all the earth but in Israel," (verse 15.) He did not give glory to the water, nor think that he had paid for his cure, nor imagine that he had cleansed himself by his own "work: no, he gave the glory to God, knowing that what he had received was a gracious gift from him who rules over all the earth. The seven dippings were not works of merit; they belong to that other class, *viz.*, to "the obedience of faith." They paid nothing, nor was there any virtue in them; they were acts by which faith was expressed and perfected; and immediately upon the performance of them God gave the blessing. Yes, 'tis God who cures all of these diseases, (blindness, leprosy, sin,) and he does it without money and without price; but he does it after the afflicted ones have done what he has told them to do.

Just here I will ask Mr. Nichols a question or so. 1. Were Naaman and this blind man saved from their afflictions by grace, or by works? 2. Could it truly have been said unto them: "By grace are we saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast? (Eph. ii: 8, 9.)

If the gentleman admits that they are saved by grace,

then he must acknowledge that even in salvation by grace there were, in these cases, things to be done by those desiring the salvation, without the doing of which they would not have obtained the blessing; *nevertheless the doing of these things did not make grace void*. And just so it is with regard to baptism: we do not claim that there is any virtue in the water to wash away sin, any more than that there was virtue in Siloam to wash away blindness, or in Jordan to wash away leprosy. Baptism is an act of faith, upon the performance of which the Lord bestows the blessing, just as were the blind man's washing and Naaman's dippings. Had these acts been "works," in the sense in which Paul uses that word in Romans, fourth chapter, there would have been no grace in the transaction at all. "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt." These men did nothing by which 10 bring Jesus in debt to them; nor does the sinner, in being baptized. I trust that Mr. Nichols will not fail to answer my questions. In answering them I prophesy that he will "slaughter" himself.

I have, my friends, been at some pains to remove the misconceptions of our teaching that sometimes befog the minds of the people, and prevent them from receiving the truth. And now I am sure that all who are fair, who desire to know the truth, can easily understand the position that we occupy, and are therefore in a proper condition to consider the proofs from Holy Writ that I am now ready to offer.

Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews, came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born? Jesus answered, Verily, verily I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of flesh is flesh and that which is born of Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." (John iii: 1-7.)

This man Nicodemus is brought before us three times in the Sacred Writings: in the passage just quoted, in John vii: 50, and in John xix: 39. In the first case he comes to Jesus by night, acknowledges him to be a teacher come from God, and seems anxious to learn from him. In the second case, he is in the midst of the chief priests and Pharisees standing up for Jesus. When they were disposed to condemn him without a hearing, he significantly asked, "Doth our law judge any man, before it hear him, and know what he doeth?" And it seems that his opposition to them immediately broke up the meeting. "Every man went unto his own house." In the third case, we find that it was he that brought the myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight, for embalming the body of Jesus. He, with Joseph of Arimathea, took the body of our Lord, wrapped it in linen cloth with the spices, and laid it in the tomb. He was bold enough, time and again, to stand up for Jesus, when almost everybody else was afraid to do it. Some have thought that he came to Jesus *by night*, because he was a coward. But I would rather follow the Christian rule, and impute no evil, especially as we can easily conceive of a nobler reason for his coming at that hour: in the day time Jesus was thronged by the surging crowds, but at night, doubtless, Nicodemus expected to find a quieter time in which to talk to the great Teacher, No one can fairly

conclude, from his record, that he was a coward. He seems to have been an ardent admirer of Jesus, believed him to be a teacher come from God, seemed anxious to learn of him, was bold enough to take his part in the Sanhedrim when it took a very brave man to do it, and was true to him even after death, lovingly caring for his dead body. He was one of the chief leaders in the Jewish church, as our Lord himself called him a "Master of Israel."

But notwithstanding Nicodemus was such an excellent man, such a bright light under the Jewish polity, such a "master of Israel" under the old covenant, he was not in the kingdom of God, which is the church of the living God. Jesus said unto him, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." "Ye must be born again." (By the way, we have incidentally given to us here perfectly conclusive proof that the Jewish institution, under the Old Covenant, was a very different thing from the kingdom of God, in which Christians now live: Nicodemus was a ruler and teacher in the one, being one of its purest and noblest members, but he had to be born again to get into the other.) By comparing Mark i: 14, 15, Matt. iv: 12, 17, and Matt. xvi: 18, 19, it will be seen that kingdom of God, kingdom of heaven, and church of Christ are synonymous expressions. Mark says that when Jesus came into Galilee he preached, saying, "The kingdom of God is at hand." Matthew says that when he came into Galilee he began to preach, and say, "Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand;" and Jesus, in talking about the building of the church, said, "Upon this rock I will build my church;" and then, in the next sentence, he calls it the kingdom of heaven, saying to Peter, "And I will

give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." When therefore Christ told Nicodemus that a man must be born of water and of the Spirit in order to enter into the kingdom of God, he taught that a birth of water and the Spirit was necessary in order to become a member of his church; and when he told him that *he* must be born again, he very clearly implied that he was not yet a member of it.

What, then, is it to be born of water and of the Spirit? This is a very important question, seeing that there is no way revealed by which a sinner can finally attain to a home in the eternal city, except by becoming and remaining a faithful member of the church of God. Mark you, this new birth is *one*: true, it consists of two parts, a begetting and a bringing forth, but it is *one birth* into *one kingdom*. There are not two kingdoms here, a visible and an invisible, and two births to get into them, one of water and the other of Spirit; no, the birth is one, "born again," not "born again twice;" and the kingdom is one "the kingdom of God," not "the kingdoms of God."

In studying the question, we will ask first what is it to be born (begotten) of the Spirit? God begets us by his Spirit all agree: hence, to be born (begotten) of the Spirit, and to be born (begotten) of God are the same—two expressions conveying the same idea. Let us turn now to 1 John v: 1, and we will learn what it is to be born (begotten) of God. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of him." From this verse we not only learn what it is to be born of God, but we also learn that to be born of him—to be born of the Father—is to be begotten of him. When one is begotten by the Fa-

ther, and brought forth by the mother, the birth is then complete, he is born of father and mother

We have now learned that -when one has faith in his heart, loving, trusting faith, he is begotten of God. "Who-soever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." But bear in mind that when one is thus born (begotten) of the Father, he is not yet a son of God. He has *power to become* a son, but the birth must be completed before he is a son, as the following verses clearly show: "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." John i: 11-13. Here, now, were people who were born (begotten) of God; they believed Jesus to be the Christ; but they were not yet sons: it is plainly stated that to such people Jesus gave "power to become the sons of God."

It is sometimes held that the very moment a man believes in his heart, lovingly receiving Jesus as his Lord and Master, he is born again, justified, a child of God. Indeed Mr. Nichols took that position in discussing the former proposition, and I suppose he will strive to defend it under this one: but his position can never be sustained as long as these verses stand: most of the Jews rejected Jesus, but some of them, like Nicodemus, "received him," believing on his name: these were born (begotten) of God, and to them he gave power to *become* sons of God. This birth was not of blood (Nicodemus no doubt prided himself in his "blood," in his Jewish lineage), nor of the will of the flesh (not the strong in the flesh, the rich, the great, the influential, are begotten of God), nor of the will of man (this begetting is according to God's will, not according to man's,

and man has nothing to do but to submit to God's way), but it was of God. Whether Jew or Gentile, whether great or small, whether rich or poor, bond or free, white or black, learned or unlearned, whoever believes that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, with his heart, is begotten of God; and to such Jesus gives power to become sons of God.

The next question that naturally arises in this investigation is this: How does God beget us? and the Apostle James gives us a very clear and definite answer. In writing to Christians, who, of course, had been born again, he said: "Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first fruits of his creatures." (James i: 18.) All life, in both the animal and vegetable kingdoms, as those who are informed in such matters well know, springs from the implanting of seed; and the "seed" that God plants in the heart in begetting us is "the word of God." (See also Luke viii: 11.) Just here a statement from Paul fits in nicely and links together the teaching of John and of James. He says: "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." (Rom. x: 17.) John teaches that the believer is begotten of God; James affirms that God begets us with the word of truth, and Paul explains that the faith, of which John speaks, comes by hearing the preaching of the word of truth, of which James speaks. And Peter chimes in most beautifully by saying of God's people that they are "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth forever." (1. Pet. i: 23.)

Then the question arises: If God begets us by the preaching of the word of truth, in what sense can we be said to be begotten by the Spirit? And the answer to this question at once suggests itself, when we remember that

God sent the Spirit down from heaven to preach the truth. All that we know of God, of Jesus and of the Spirit, of heaven and of hell, of our own spirits and of the life beyond death, has been preached unto us by the Holy Spirit. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Spirit." (2 Pet. i: 21.) Peter teaches that the gospel was preached "with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven." (1 Pet. i: 12.) Jesus, in talking to the twelve, as he was about to send them forth, said, "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." (Matt. x: 20.) Paul claimed that he and the other apostles spoke "not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth." (1 Cor. ii: 13.) And so all testify. Our Lord, while he was upon the earth, never allowed any one to preach him as "the Christ, the Son of the living God." On the contrary, he repeatedly charged his disciples "that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ." (Matt. xvi: 20.) That grand truth was to be preached by the Holy Spirit, and hence after Jesus came up from the grave, and just before he ascended to heaven, being assembled together with the disciples, he commanded them "that they should not depart from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of the Father, -which, saith he, ye have heard of me." He told them that that they should be "baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence;" and that they should receive power after that the Holy Ghost had come upon them, and that they should be witnesses unto him in Jerusalem, in all Judea, in Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth. Having thus spoken, he was taken up to heaven. (See Acts i: 1-11.) About ten days afterwards the Holy Spirit descended upon the apostles. He came to bring to their remembrance all that Jesus had taught them, and to

guide them into all truth. When these inspired men spoke, it was God speaking; when they wrote, it was God writing; when they convinced any one, it was God convincing; and thus men are begotten by the spirit, thus they are drawn to Christ. As the Lord said, "No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him: and I will raise him up at the last day. *It is written in the prophets, And they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me*" (John vi: 44, 45.) So we see exactly how it is: The Holy Spirit preaches through apostles and prophets, men hear, by hearing faith comes, and whoever believes that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God, and then has power to become a son of God.

Let us now give a little attention to this famous verse (John iii: 8), which is generally considered so mysterious. The Savior found fault with Nicodemus for not understanding it, and I am sure we have far better opportunities than he had. In the light of what has just been said, I think its meaning is quite patent. The verse reads thus: "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit." The word to be emphasized is the word *hear*, We HEAR the the wind; we know not whence it comes, nor whither it goes, but we HEAR it: and so of the Spirit; we know not whence he comes, nor whither he goes, but we HEAR him, and thus we are born of him. "Faith comes by hearing and hearing by the word of God."

It may be objected that we do know whence the Spirit comes, and whither he goes. He comes from God and will return to God again. But I reply, we know not where God is, nor where heaven is. If I meet a man, and ask

him whence he comes, and he replies, "I come from father's," if I know not where his father's home is, I am as ignorant of the place from which he comes as I was before. We can tell the direction from which the wind blows, but we know not the place of its rising, nor where it goes to rest. Let no one ever forget that we are born (begotten) of the Spirit by *hearing*; not by *feeling* (as our Methodist friends seem to think), nor by tasting, nor by smelling, but by HEARING. Hence, in the words of Jesus, I would say, "Take heed, therefore, how ye hear." (Luke viii: 18.) "We have now one other question to answer before we are done with this new birth, namely, what is it to be born of water? In reply I call attention to the words of Jesus: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Mark xvi: 16.) Let us study this statement carefully: it begins with the word "he," representing the man who has not yet believed, and who is therefore in a lost state; it ends with the word "saved," the man is now in Christ, in a saved state. He has been transferred out of the kingdom of Satan into the kingdom of God's dear Son. In order to pass out of the one kingdom into the other, we have already learned that one must be born of water and the Spirit. ("Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.") So it is clear that between the "he" (the man who has not yet believed) and the "saved" (the man in the kingdom of God) the new birth comes. Now, as a matter of fact, faith and baptism come between these two words. Does it not follow that faith and baptism constitute the new birth? So it seems to me. We have already learned beyond a doubt that the believer is born (begotten) of the Spirit; then comes the baptism, and he is born of water and the Spirit. Faith and baptism stand between the lost man and the saved

man: the new birth stands between the lost man and the saved man; hence it follows with absolute certainty that faith and baptism constitute the new birth.

Hence we find in all the conversions recorded in the Bible, the apostles and apostolic men strove first to produce in their hearers loving, trusting faith, a faith that would obey Jesus at any cost and in spite of all opposition; and then they immediately baptized the believer. The jailer believed on the Lord, and he was baptized the same hour of the night. (See Acts xvi: 31-34.) "And many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts xviii: 8.) Paul preached to Lydia and to the women that were with her, and she and her household were baptized at once, apparently before going to the house. (See Acts xvi; 12-15.) She, too hearing believed and was baptized. Of the Samaritans it is said, "When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." (Acts viii: 12.) The eunuch heard a sermon, believed it with all his heart, and just then coming to a certain water (for he was riding with the preacher along the highway), he was at once baptized. (See Acts viii: 26-39.) Thus people in Apostolic times were born again: when they believed, they were begotten of the Spirit; when they were baptized they were brought forth from the water; and thus they passed out of the world into Christ, "in whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins." (Eph. i: 7.) "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. iii: 26, 27.)

[*Time expired.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION.

MR. J. H. NICHOLS' FIRST REPLY.

Brethren and Sisters:

Yesterday Bro. Harding whined considerably because I called him a Campbellite. I do it because he wants me to call him and his brethren Christians to the exclusion of all others, and that I cannot do. But if Bro. H. will admit that Methodists are Christians, I will call him a Christian—what do you say? (Bro. H. "Doubtless there are immersed Methodists who are entitled to the name Christian.") But what about the thousands of Methodists who have not been immersed? (Bro. H. "No matter how excellent and amiable a man may be, he is not entitled to the name Christian until he has been properly initiated into the church of Christ. Unimmersed people have not been so initiated.") Unimmersed Methodists will be damned then, will they? If not entitled to the name Christian, they are not entitled to heaven, are they? Then you are a Campbellite, and I will so call you.

I will pass over Bro. H.'s preamble and resolutions in regard to infants, idiots and the heathen, and come to those to whom the light of the gospel has come, of whom, he says, they can have no divine assurance of pardon until they have been *immersed in water*, and then he whines, when I say if that be so, a man can as easily get divine assurance of pardon without Christ, as he can without water. Is it

not so? If there is *no divine assurance of pardon without immersion in water*, would it not be as impossible to save a man without water, as it would to save him without Christ? Hope Bro. H. will tell us about this.

Next he complains that he and his brethren have been accused of teaching that water washes sin from the soul, and claims that they are misrepresented. Well, they certainly do teach that sins cannot be washed away without water, and what does it matter whether the water washes away sins, or whether they are washed away by something else? It is eternal damnation without water, if Campbellism be true, and Bro. H. cannot deny this if he will stick to the Campbellite platform. But he cites the case of the blind man (John ix: 1-7) as proof that sinners cannot be justified from past sins without immersion. I cannot see why he cites this case unless it is about the only case of healing found in the New Testament where water was used. But this case does not suit his purpose, for only the man's eyes were washed and not his whole body immersed, and I will ask Bro. H. to please tell us if the man's eyes were washed by *immersion*, or by sprinkling; and did the man wash his own eyes, or did some one wash them for him? It seems to me that these are pertinent questions, as Bro. H. will take nothing for baptism but immersion, and the sinner must not immerse himself, according to Campbellism. But suppose this blind man had been of the faith of Bro. H., he would have said: "No, Lord, it will never do to just put a little water on my eyes; that is too much like the Methodists do, they pour a little water on the head; but I must be *immersed*, or I can never see."

Then he takes up the case of Naaman. (II Kings v: 10.) But this case does not suit his purpose, for Naaman *dipped himself*; and he went under *seven times*, while Bro. H.

teaches that a sinner *must not dip himself*, but must *be dipped*; not *seven times*, but *once only*. Bro. H. is in the same sort of trouble the Frenchman was in with the mule, when he came to a hill the mule refused to go. After beating him for some time the mule started with all speed, and dashed up the hill with great fury for a short distance, and stopped again. Some one came along and found the Frenchman beating the mule, and asked the cause. The Frenchman replied. "I ish no like 'tish mule; he is too much or he is too nun." Just so—Naaman's case is too much for Campbellism, and the blind man's case is too none.

But let us look at Naaman's case again. If his case is an illustration of how people get into the kingdom—he dipped himself *seven times*—Campbellism dips her subjects *only once*; therefore, as one is to seven, so is Campbellism to getting to heaven. Is that good logic? But Bro. H. asks me two *very profound* questions. O, yes; the blind man and Naaman were cured by faith. You acknowledge that *water, immersion*, nor works of any kind, have any virtue in them, so faith is the only immediate instrumental cause of justification in all cases.

Now let us take a few more illustrations from the New Testament, and get Bro. H. to explain them from a Campbellite standpoint. John iv: 46-53. Jesus cured a nobleman's son; *no water in the case, but faith only*. Mark i: 23-26. Jesus cured a demoniac—*not one drop of water in this case*. Mark i: 30-31. Jesus cured Peter's wife's mother of a fever—*no water here*. Mark i: 40-45. Jesus healed a leper *without water*. Matt. viii: 5-13. Jesus healed the Centurion's servant, *by faith only*, (v. 10-13), *not a drop of water here*. Luke vii: 11-15. Jesus raised the widow's son from death *without water*. Matt. viii: 28-

34. Jesus cured two demoniacs *without water*—sent the devils out of them into the swine—the swine tried immersion and lost their lives, (v. 32.) Matt. ix: 1-8 Jesus cured a man of the palsy. "Jesus seeing their faith, said unto the sick of the palsy: Son be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee." (v. 1.) Matt. ix: 23-26. Jesus restored to life the daughter of Jairus, and *no water here*. Luke viii: 43-48. Jesus cured a woman diseased with a flux of blood, *without water*, but by *faith only*. (v. 48,) "Thy faith hath made thee whole." Matt. ix: 27-31. Jesus restored to sight two blind men *without water*, but by *faith only*, (v. 28-29.) John v: 1-9. Jesus cured a man who "had an infirmity thirty and eight years" *without water*, and yet there was water right at hand, and the man wanted to go *down into the water*, but Jesus cured him dry. This is the only case in the Bible where we have an account of one who wanted to be a Campbellite, but Jesus knocked the last Campbellite idea out of him in a moment. Heart felt, Holy Ghost religion, generally cures Campbellism. Now if Bro. H. will make these cases harmonize with Campbellism, his church will owe him a lasting debt of gratitude, but this he will never do, nor can he find one case in the Bible that will illustrate the Campbellite doctrine of no immersion no salvation. But I have about eight more cases that I will give in my next speech as rebutting testimony, if he will clear up the cases I have given him.

He takes up Nicodemus next. Before I enter into this case I will ask Bro. H. to tell us, as he violates the rules of this debate by departing from King James' translation, saying *born* of God is to be *begotten* of God. Then we must agree that to be *born of water* is to be *begotten of water*. But to be born (begotten) of God constitutes us

sons of God; and to be born (begotten) of water constitutes us sons of water. Is that it, Bro. H.? Or is God our Father, and *water our mother*? Please tell us how this is. But you say we are born of the Spirit by *hearing*, not by *feeling*, this you base on John iii: 8. But do not men *feel* the wind as well as hear it? Tell me, did you *ever feel* the wind? But if we are born of the Spirit by *hearing* the Spirit, are we not born of water by *hearing* the water? If a man sits on the bank of a stream and *hears* the murmuring of its water, is that man *born of water*? Will you please tell us how a man can be born of the Spirit without feeling the Spirit, and yet he must *feel* the water from *head to foot* before he is born of water, according to Campbellism? Can a child be born of its mother without *feeling its mother*? "Having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart, who, being *past feeling*, have given themselves over unto lasciviousness, to work all uncleanness with greediness." (Eph. iv: 18-19.) You will be damned if you don't *feel water*, and you will be damned if you do *feel the Spirit*! Is that it?

Now to his argument based on John iii: 5. "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." This *birth* of water he thinks means "immersion in water," but when we get to the mode of baptism, he will tell us that a "*burial*" means immersion in water. I hope he will be kind enough to show us the points of similarity between a *birth* and a *burial*. But let me ask Bro. H. to tell us, are there two distinct births referred to in this passage, one of *material water*, and the other of the Spirit?

Please tell us how it is that the kingdom was not "set

up till Pentecost," and yet here is a passage which was spoken to a "ruler of the Jews" before Pentecost, and this passage, if it had been obeyed by Nicodemus, would have saved him before the "kingdom was set up," and the same passage teaches what a sinner must do to be saved since the kingdom was set up. Do you mean to say that the Jews had the same condition of pardon *before* the kingdom was set up, that Jews and Gentiles have *since* the setting up of the kingdom? Don't forget that your theory is, that the kingdom was not set up till Pentecost, and that a new order of things began on that day.

Now let us see if there is any material water in John iii: 5. In the seventh chapter and 38-39, Jesus calls the Holy Spirit *water*; and if the divine writer had not told us in so many words that "this spake he of the Spirit," Bro. H. would have a time of it explaining "out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water."

In Acts ii: 3, we read: "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them."

Mal. iii: 2-3: "He (Christ) is like a *refiner's fire*, and like fuller's soap; and he shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver."

Now we see that the Spirit of God has a *two-fold* action on the soul of man, (1) That of water on articles washed. (2) That of fire on gold and silver in purifying them.

A gold digger told me that when gold dust was dug from the earth, (1) The dirt is washed from it with water. (2) The gold is then purified by smelting.

Now Christ purifies men *as a refiner purifies gold*. That is, the first action of the Spirit *convicts* the sinner, and causes him to leave off all of his mean acts—outside wick-

ed works—answering to the outside washing of the dirt from gold dust. But when the dirt is washed from the gold, the *inside* of the gold is still unchanged, so when a convicted sinner "forsakes his ways," he is still unregenerated—outwardly he may appear beautiful as washed gold, but *inwardly he is full of iniquity*—he must then "return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, *for he will abundantly pardon.*" (Isa. lv: 7.) Here is the second action of the Spirit, answering to the second process, or smelting of gold to purify it. Now take the fuller's soap. The first process is to wash the clothes in soap and water, the second process is to *boil them*.

Now try the prophet's illustration by Bro. H.'s order of purifying a sinner—the last process in purifying gold is to *smelt it thoroughly*—Bro. H.'s last process with a sinner is to *wet him thoroughly*. To make the prophet's illustration fit Bro. H.'s plan, the gold must be put into the crucible, and the whole thing *plunged into the water*, and the work is done. But he says the Spirit does its work by *talking*. Well, just think of a refiner of gold walking round a pile of gold and dirt and dross all mixed, and talking beautifully about *pure gold, fine gold, gold tried in the fire*, and some one says what are you doing? He says, the process by which gold is purified is like the process by which Jesus purifies a sinner—the Spirit of God purifies a sinner *by talking*, and I am trying my hand at purifying gold in the same way. Or think of a washer woman with a tub full of dirty clothes, walking round the tub, talking beautifully about snow white garments, and some one says, what are you doing? She says, I am talking these clothes clean—I am a *talking woman*, and I do my work by *talking*.

Now let me say there is only *one birth* mentioned in John iii: 5, for Jesus explained it to Nicodemus thus: "The

wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth; *so is every one that is born of the Spirit.*" Only one birth, you see, but in that birth the Spirit has its two-fold action. But Bro. H. says this water birth here means immersion in water—also that "buried with Christ" means immersion in water. Now a man's *birth* and his *burial* are the two widest periods of his earthly existence apart, and one is coming into life—the other is going out of life, and means decay and rottenness. Birth and burial are as unlike as snow and charcoal—yet either one will do to represent immersion when a man is in a great strait. But let me call your attention to Titus iii: 5, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the *washing* of regeneration, and *renewing* of the Holy Ghost." Here we see the two-fold action of the Spirit—*washing* and *renewing*. But Bro. H. may claim that this washing of regeneration is water baptism. If so, it must have been by pouring, for the next verse says: "Which he *shed on us abundantly* through Jesus Christ our Savior."

Speaking of a very wicked class of people, Paul said to the Corinthians: "And such were some of you; but ye are *washed*, but ye are *sanctified*, but ye are *justified* in the name of the Lord Jesus, and *by the Spirit of our God.*"

(I Cor. vi: 11): "*For by one Spirit are we all Baptized into one body.*"

(I Cor. xii: 13): Here we see the *washing*, *justifying*, *sanctifying*, and *baptizing into one body*, (that is, into Christ,) is all done "*by the Spirit of our God.*"

Now notice Bro. H. when he comes to these passages, how he will *wriggle*, *turn* and *twist* to get water in, and to show that the "Spirit of our God" cannot do these things

without water. He reminds me of a sign a man put over the door of his lathe shop which read thus: "All kinds of turning and twisting done here." Just quote plain texts of Scripture which teach that the "Spirit of our God" washes, sanctifies, justifies and baptizes a sinner into Christ, then comes "all kinds of turning and twisting," done by Bro. H. to get water in, or rather to get the sinner into water, before he can be saved.

You remember he told us on yesterday that he had met ten Methodist preachers in debate, and all of them had gone down under the mighty weight of his wonderful arguments, and that friend Nichols would go down the same way. The fact is, he blowed so much that I thought of the fellow who said, "my Bible says, 'he that bloweth not his own horn the same shall not be blowed unto him.'" "I (Elder Harding,) have met ten Methodist preachers in debate, and I downed them all"—toot! toot!! toot!!! "I (Elder Harding,) have gotten hold of Mr. Nichols now, and he will go down just like all the rest went, for I am going to slaughter him"—toot! toot!! toot!!! Brethren, I feel like I was almost in the jaws of the lion of the tribe of Campbell—don't I look scared? Now Bro. H., if you would take another look into my eye, and if you knew the stock to which I belong, you would leave off your brow-beating, bull-doing, blowing, and get down to your work, for I don't brow-beat worth a cent.

Bro. H., how is it that you can get a man born of the Spirit without his *feeling* the Spirit, while he cannot be born of water without *feeling the water from head to foot*? "Friend Nichols is going down," you say, down where? You are called by some a regular Methodist eater—just gulp them down like an oyster eater does oysters, but I hope you will spare me as I would hate to be swallowed just now.

I now call your attention to the point he tried to make on Mark xvi: 16: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Here he thinks he finds immersion in water for the remission of sins. No water here, not one drop; "he that believeth *and is* (in the act of believing) *baptized* (with the Holy Ghost) shall be saved." Why do I say this? Because the very next verse says: "And these signs shall follow them that believe," and then names the very signs that generally followed Holy Ghost baptism. Notice again that Jesus does not tell his apostles here to baptize anybody, nor does he tell them the *name*, or give them any formula, in which the baptism here mentioned, is to be administered. Why not? Because the apostles could not baptize with the Holy Ghost—Christ did that, and he knew when a man's faith was strong enough to entitle him to Holy Ghost baptism, so he told the apostles, "preach the gospel to every creature," that is all he commanded them to do here, and Bro. H. cannot make any more of it unless he goes to Matt. xxviii: 19, where Jesus did command the apostles to baptize, and gave them the formula in which water baptism was to be administered. So you see the account in Mark xvi: 16, will not suit the Campbellite theory until Bro. H. *patches* it with Matt. xxviii: 19, Now take the commission just as it stands in Matt. xxviii: 19, where the apostles were commissioned to teach and baptize all nations with water, and you have a clear case, and no patching needed; for there is the formula plainly laid down—"baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Then take Mark xvi: 16, where Jesus tells his apostles what will be the *spiritual* benefit of their preaching to *all who believe*, and what the condemnation will be to those who will not believe, and

you have another case already made out, and no patch work needed. But if you see water baptism in this verse, you will have to *patch it* to get a formula.

Bro. H. got very much concerned because I used some expressions which are not found in the Bible, but he seemed to forget that the proposition which he is trying to sustain to-day contains the expression, "Christian baptism," and that is not a Bible expression—yet he can find the word "Christian," and the word "baptism," both in the Bible, but nowhere connected together; but that is very good Campbellism, for it is a system of *patch work*. Now I have no objection to the term "Christian baptism," I only mention this because he made such an ado because I used some terms which were not Bible terms. Of course Bro. H. knew there was no argument in all he said about "terms that are not in the Bible"—he seemed to be put to it to fill up his time, and he put that in as a "time killer."

I believe Bro. H. and his brethren do not believe in a divine call to the ministry—they go out on their own hook. Well, if a man proposes to transact business with me in the name of another, and tells me that he was not sent by the other, I have no dealings with him, so I am not going to transact religious business with these fellows who are going round claiming to be the only true ministers of the gospel, and yet say they are not "called of God as was Aaron." He puts great stress on the expressions, "baptized for the remission of sins," "baptism for the remission of sins."

I now call your attention to the passages in which these expressions occur. Mark i: 4, "John did baptize in the wilderness, (water baptism), and *preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.*" Luke iii: 3, "And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the *bap-*

tism of repentance for the remission of sins." We see that John preached the *baptism of repentance* for the remission of sins; but Bro. H. preaches the *baptism of water* for the remission of sins—quite a difference between the two. John knew that water baptism could not remit sins, or save any body, so he took great pains to say, "*baptism of repentance* for the remission of sins."

Let me say that the language of Campbellism, and the language of the Bible do not accord — Campbellism says: "Without immersion there is no remission." The Bible says "Without shedding of blood is no remission." (Heb. ix: 22.) Immersion means to overwhelm, and if a man's little finger fails to go under the water when he is dipped, he is not immersed, and must be damned; or if *one hair* of his head should fail to go under, *he is gone*, according to Campbellism, What makes you tell the people that they will be damned if they are not immersed, when the Bible says no such thing? Why do you say there is no promise to those who are not immersed, when Jesus says, "God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that *whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life?*" (John iii: 16.) How can you, in the face of so many such promises as this, say there is no promise to the unimmersed—that these precious promises mean nothing to the unimmersed?

I call your attention to the thief on the cross — immersion was out of the question in this case—he said, Lord remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom. And Jesus said unto him, Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." (Luke xxiii: 42-43.) But some say paradise here means the grave—what do you say, Bro H.? (Bro. H. He was saved.) Very well; then in your next speech please tell us how he was saved without

baptism. You have told us that John preached baptism for the remission of sins—*water baptism*—now tell us about this thief's case, please. Be kind enough too, to tell us just what kind of works that thief did in order to his justification, as you say a sinner is justified from past sins by works, and not by faith only.

I now read Romans i: 16: "I am not ashamed of the gospel of Christ: for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (1) The gospel of Christ is the "*power of God.*" (2) "*Unto salvation.*" (3) "*To every one that believeth.*"

Is immersion the power of God? Now we see that the gospel saves *all who believe*. But is water baptism a part of the gospel that saves?

I read I. Cor. i: 14-17: "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say that I baptized in mine own name. And I baptized also the household of Stephanus: besides, I know not whether I baptized any other. For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel." Now, if Paul was sent to preach the gospel, and baptism was a part of the gospel, he certainly was sent to baptize; but he says in so many words, "Christ sent me *not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.*" The disjunctive *but* would show almost anybody but a Campbellite, that the gospel is one thing, and water baptism is another thing. But if baptism is the "fourth condition of pardon," and Paul left so many of the Corinthians *unbaptized*, and thanked God that he did not baptize them, he simply left them unpardoned, and thanked God that he left them on the way to hell. But you may look out for Bro. H.'s rule of *supposition* when he comes to this point; by that rule he can soon find some one to do Paul's baptizing for him. Paul did not baptize the Corinthians,

yet he said to them, "In Christ Jesus I have begotten you *through the gospel*" (ch. iv: 15.) Yes, *through the gospel*, not through *water*. Did any of you ever hear a Campbellite Elder thank God that he had not baptized those who were begotten through the gospel preached by him; if you did, stand up. (No one stood.) There seems to be a very marked difference between the apostle Paul and Bro. H. Paul says, "*Christ sent me* to preach the gospel." But I think Bro. H. does not claim to be sent by Christ, but went of his own accord. I don't know what he will say about his call to the ministry, *as he is in a debate now*; but I do know that it is the custom of Campbellite preachers generally to ridicule any one who claims to be called of God to preach the gospel—the Pharisees and scribes ridiculed Paul, and beat him too, and some poor Methodist preacher might get a beating if he was not protected by the civil law—he gets plenty of ridicule I know.

Another difference between the apostle to the Gentiles and the apostle of Campbellism is, Paul says, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ. (Gal. vi: 14.) And Bro. H. seems to glory more in water baptism, and that by immersion, than he does in the cross. Have you never noticed that Campbellite preachers generally say more in the pulpit about the *mode* and *design* of water baptism, than they do about Christ and the cross both?

Sometimes Campbellite preachers say, "I preached at a certain place, and a man who had been going to a Methodist mourner's bench for twenty years, came forward and obeyed the gospel." Well, let me give you a case from the Bible of a man who had been trying to get healed by the Campbellite plan for thirty-eight years. You may read the account in John v: 5-9: He had an "infirmity thirty

and eight years," and was lying beside a pool waiting for some one to put him "*down into the pool*," but Jesus came along and cured him on dry land; and that knocked the last Campbellite idea out of his head, and I have not read another case in the Bible of one who tried to be a Campbellite, and this one failed as you all plainly see; but I suppose Bro. H. can fix this case up like he fixed out his Bible case of "faith, repentance, confession, and baptism" yesterday—he knew he could not find a case in the Bible where that Campbellite order was laid down in so many words, so he fixed it out by "*necessary inference*." Certainly, that is just what I have been telling you; *if one case of conversion in the Bible* is made to suit the Campbellite theory it must be done by "supposition," or Bro. H.'s "*necessary inference*"—yes, "*supposition*" and "*inference*" are *very necessary* to Campbellism.

But wasn't that milking illustration funny? You know he used it to show how Paul was *immersed*. Well, we milk at our house by *pouring*. Bro. H., do you milk by *immersion*? If so, which do you immerse, *yourself* or your *cow*?

Now, if you will allow me to manufacture a word, I will say that Bro. H. is so pressed that his rule of "supposition," and "necessary inference," are about to fail him, and his only chance is to introduce the rule of *twistification*—the fact is, he has already manufactured the rule, and I have given it a name. I would have been glad if you had told us yesterday, by some of your rules, *just how many conditions* are immediately instrumental in the justification of a sinner from past sins, by the Campbellite theory "For there is one God, and mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." (I Tim. ii: 5.) But Campbellism has three mediator—Christ, water, and some one

to do the immersing. If one of these cannot be had, the result is the same as if all were out of reach. The constant cry of Campbellism is:

"The only way to make men flee,
The wrath to come and set them free,
From sin and sorrow, death and slaughter,
Is to plunge them into the water."

Now I hope Bro. H., in his next speech, will notice Acts ii: 38, xxii: 16, and I Pet. iii: 21, and all other texts generally used by Campbellites to prove that Christ cannot be reached, only through water. O, it stirs my soul when I hear men magnifying external ordinances *into Gods*—as though Christ was on an island, and all who would be saved must *dive to him!* No, sinner; your salvation is not hid away in the bottom of a pool or stream. "Ask and ye shall receive, seek and ye shall find, knock and it shall be opened unto you; For *every one* that asketh receiveth." (Matt. vii: 7-8.) Yes, *every one*; dear sinner, that embraces you—"every one that asketh receiveth." *Ask, seek, knock, now*, for "behold now is the day of salvation."

[*Time expired.*]

SECOND PROPOSITION.

MR. HARDING'S SECOND ADDRESS.

Ladies and Gentlemen :

It rarely ever falls to the lot of mortals to listen to a speech that is fuller of misrepresentation, caricature and perversion than is the one which you have just heard. My positions have been misrepresented, my brethren maligned, and the word of God most terribly perverted. I am glad indeed that I am here to expose these sophisms, and to vindicate the truth. I would not be astonished if there are not Methodists here who believe that Mr. Nichols' speech fairly represents us, and the Scripture, and who would never know any better, if this were not a debate. But by the grace of God they shall know better, if they will listen patiently to this review.

I will call attention in the first place to his answer to my questions. He says, O, yes; the blind man and Naaman were cured by faith." In so saying he gives up the whole doctrine of justification by faith only; for although these men were saved by faith, the "obedience of faith" was not excluded: they had something *to do* before they were cured, without the doing of which they would never have been cured. And just so in the salvation of the sinner from his sins: he is saved by faith, but not by a faith that excludes the "obedience of faith." Works of merit

are excluded, but not works of obedience. To my mind this settles the whole question. All that Mr. Nichols has brought against my position that has even the appearance of argument consists in such quotations from the scriptures as these: "Whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have eternal life;" "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved;" and "Being justified by faith we have peace with God." These passages teach the doctrine of salvation by faith—but it is by faith perfected by works, not by faith only. Naaman believed, and obeyed, and was then saved by faith. The blind man believed and obeyed, and was then saved by faith. We believe and obey, and are thus saved by faith. And so by the simple force of these two plain cases, Mr. Nichols has been driven to the true ground that when a curing is predicated of faith, it does not follow that the parties to be cured did not have something to do in order to reach the blessing. The man who believes *with his heart*, will follow Jesus, and all who follow him he will save: and, as Jesus was baptized, and commands us to be, no man can follow him without being baptized.

The gentleman claims that I want him to call us Christians to the exclusion of all others. I do not. We do not claim to be the only Christians on earth. I do not care what he calls us, so he does not call us by a name that conveys a false idea. We are Alexander Campbell's *brethren*, we are not his followers. I will not call unimmersed people Christians, for I do not think they have been properly initiated into the church. But I will not call them by offensive nicknames that convey a false idea. Nor would any gentleman do so.

If "Campbellism" be true, Mr. Nichols claims that "a man can as easily get divine assurance of pardon without Christ, as he can without water." Well, my friends, a man

who will not obey Christ *is* without Christ; and a man who desires to obey him, can find the water. "Being made perfect, he became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him," says the apostle (Heb. v: 9); and when the Lord comes again, he will take vengeance on them that know not God, and that *obey not the gospel*" II Thess. i: 7, 8. A strange doctrine indeed, which seems to hold that *believing* in Christ is of more importance than following him; that crying Lord, Lord, (at the mourner's bench) is more efficacious than obeying his commandments! To all such deluded people the Master sternly says, "Why call ye me Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" And he compares them to a foolish man who builds his house on the sand. Faith only is a poor foundation upon which to build one's hopes, but the faith that obeys Jesus will stand the storm forever.

Well, says Mr. Nichols, "It is eternal damnation without water, if Campbellism be true, and Bro. H. cannot deny this if he will stick to the Campbellite platform." It certainly is eternal damnation without obedience to the gospel, if the Bible be true, and baptism is one of the first commands of the gospel; and "brother Harding" will stick to that platform though the heavens fall. Let the gentlemen rest assured of that.

But the blind man did not immerse himself, he merely washed his eyes, argues Mr. Nichols. Of course, for the blind man was not seeking pardon under the New Covenant; but his sight, under the personal ministry of Jesus; and he did what Jesus told him to do; and then he saw. Naaman dipped himself seven times, and hence his case won't suit us, Mr. Nichols thinks, as with us the sinner is dipped but once. Did not Naaman do what the Lord told him to do? Yes, undoubtedly. Well that suits us exactly;

we propose to do what the Lord tells us to do. Naaman was told to wash seven times; we are told to be baptized: Naaman obeyed, and was cured of leprosy; we obey from the heart, and are then made free from sin. "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin: but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine, which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." (Rom. vi: 17,18.) If Naaman had said, "Lord, I believe, but I do not think it essential to do any thing; a man is saved by faith only," he would have died a leper, if he had not repented. And our Methodist friends, who depend on faith only, and who refuse to be baptized, will certainly die in their sins, except they repent, and obey the gospel. We must not do what Naaman and the blind man did: our great Physician does not give the same directions for all diseases: but as they followed his directions to them, so must we follow his directions to us: and as they were saved by faith when they obeyed (as Mr. Nichols himself agrees), so are we saved by faith when we obey. It seems to me that any man, even if he is a Methodist preacher, ought to be able to see that.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Nichols says that when the swine were possessed with the devils, and rushed into the sea, there was an immersion, and they lost their lives. Yes, and in that case the devil was the administrator; he lost his bacon, and he has been practicing sprinkling ever since. [Laughter.] Immersion in water is not a part of the divine prescription for curing demoniacs, nor the palsy, nor for raising the dead, and when Mr. Nichols showed that Jesus wrought many miracles without water, he was simply wasting his time by proving what nobody denies. Nor is it likely that he deceived any body, for I suppose there is not a man here who is so

silly as to suppose that that talk had any bearing on our proposition.

Mr. Nichols claims to have found one Campbellite in the Bible, and he says Jesus knocked all the Campbellism out of him. The case to which he refers is very interesting; suppose we look into it a little: There was, at Jerusalem, a pool having five porches, called Bethesda. It appears that an angel from God went down from time to time and troubled the waters; and "whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in, was made whole of whatsoever disease he had." (See John v: 1-9.) In the porches around the pool lay a great multitude of impotent folk, of blind, halt, withered, waiting for the moving of the water. When Jesus came to the pool he found there a man who had an infirmity for thirty-eight years. When the water was troubled some body always stepped down into it before him. Jesus saith unto him, Rise, take up thy bed, and walk. And immediately the man was made whole, and took up his bed, and walked. Upon which I remark as follows: (1) God was accustomed to meet those people in the water, and the first one that stepped down was cured. Here then is a clear case of salvation in the water. (2) It was not the water that cured, but the power of God that met them in the water. (3) The impotent man was not cured during all those years of his disease, because he did not get down into the water. (4) He was not like our Methodist friends who are able to go and wont, he was unable to go down into the water, and so Jesus, when he came in person, saved him independently of the water, and in an unusual way. And so we, whom Mr. Nichols persists in calling Campbellites, conclude that those who can obey and will, will be saved, those who can obey and wont will be damned,

and those who would obey and can't (if there be any such on earth) with cheerful hearts we leave to the "uncovenanted mercies" of God, being glad to know that he is just and good, loving and merciful, and that in every case he will do right:—*unless we can help them to obey; in that case we do it at once*. That impotent man was doing all he could to get into the water; and Jesus, seeing that, had compassion upon him and cured him.

"He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," says Jesus Christ; and these directions are just as clear and simple as are those to Naaman, or to the blind man; and the man who follows them will just as certainly be saved from all the sins that he has committed, as they were from their bodily afflictions. But Mr. Nichols says that the baptism here mentioned by Jesus is Holy Ghost baptism. What makes him say so? He has no reason on earth for so interpreting the passage, except that it ruins his position, if the ordinary interpretation is correct: if baptism in water is meant, then Jesus has made baptism in water a condition precedent to salvation, just as were Naaman's dippings, and the blind man's washing, conditions precedent to their receiving the blessings they sought. Did Jesus mean water baptism in this place? Yes, so the whole world agrees, except in an occasional rare case; when some poor fellow, being like my opponent, hard pressed for an argument, tries to save his cause by calling it Holy Ghost baptism.

But doubtless, my friends, you think there ought to be some rule by which we can certainly tell whether the baptism here mentioned by Jesus is baptism in water or in the Holy Spirit, and in so supposing you are correct; there is such a rule based upon the most simple, common sense principles; it is this: Words are to be taken in their common and most usual meaning, except when so modified as to make it evi-

dent that another meaning is intended. For example, all during this debate I have been accustomed to call my opponent "Mr. Nichols." John H. Nichols is the "Mr. Nichols" of this debate. Here, by my side on this platform, sits his brother, Jasper Nichols. If I have occasion to refer to him, it will not do for me to call him "Mr. Nichols," unless I add some word of explanation; John H. is the "Mr. Nichols" of this occasion, and to call any one else by that appellation, without proper explanation, would be to deceive. Just so with regard to baptism in the New Testament. The word baptize in all of its forms (noun, verb and participle) occurs one hundred and fourteen times in the book. In about ninety-five or one hundred of these times it unquestionably means water baptism: this establishes the rule; in all other cases it must be understood to refer to water baptism except where modifying words, or circumstances, are given to show that it has a different meaning.

Again, Matthew closes his gospel with Christ's instructions to his apostles to Go, and teach all nations, etc.; while Mark closes his with the Savior's instructions to his apostles to Go, and preach the gospel to every creature, etc.; and that both of them are giving an account of the same conversation is certain. The Lord did not give them two different commissions for the same journey. But the baptism in Matthew is water baptism, according to Mr. Nichols himself; so then it is in Mark. In Mark's account, Jesus is represented as saying: "And these signs shall follow them that believe, in my name shall they cast out devils, they shall speak with new tongues, they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them, they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." (Mark xvi: 17.) But this promise of miracle working power cuts no figure in our discussion. These signs were common in the apostolic

age, but they are unknown now. Men work miracles no longer. The Holy Spirit is received still, but he enables no man to work miracles now. If the Savior meant "Holy Ghost baptism," as Mr. Nichols claims, and if these signs are proof of it, why do not our Methodist friends work these miracles now? Mr. Nichols claims to have been baptized with the Holy Ghost, why does he not work them?

Mr. Nichols calls attention to John's baptism. Very good: it suits me well to consider it; let us do it. "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." (Mark i: 4-5.) The baptism was water baptism, it took place in the river of Jordan. It was a baptism of penitents; but their sins were not yet forgiven, for it is said they were baptized "confessing their sins." The baptism of these penitents was "for the remission of sins;" and, in this place, we learn beyond a doubt that "for the remission of sins" means to obtain pardon. "He that covereth his sins shall not prosper: but whoso confesseth and forsaketh them shall have mercy." (Prov. xxviii: 13.) These people confessed their sins, and forsook them by obeying John. "If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness." (1 John i: 9.) Thus we learn that confession comes before forgiveness. When sins are forgiven there is no need ever to confess them again. Under John's ministry, people were baptized "confessing their sins," "for the remission of sins." But did not John preach "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins? Yes; and so do my brethren: we will not baptize a man unless he is a penitent believer. But not so with the Methodists: they

sprinkle little babies that have neither believed nor repented. They believe mightily in "water; with them a precious little of it goes a long way; whereas we believe in Christ, and in going according to his word. Unless baptism is "the baptism of repentance"—an act of obedience springing out of a penitent heart—it is worthless.

The thief on the cross!!! Yes, indeed; my opponent cannot get along without his case. 'Tis a favorite theme with a Methodist debater. They talk as though it were a model case of conversion under the New Covenant. The thief was never baptized, Mr. Nichols claims. How does he know that? It is said that John baptized the people of "Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan," (Matt. iii: 5); and the Pharisees heard that "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John," (John iv: 1); then I would like to know how any man can affirm that the thief was not baptized? It is certain that that thief had a clearer conception of the power of Jesus and of the nature of his coming kingdom, as he hung on that cross, than any other man on earth. Even his apostles seemed to think that Christ's death ended all their hopes; but that thief looked for something beyond death, and, having a strong faith, he prayed to that One whom all others thought unable to save Himself, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom," (Luke xxiii: 42.) Evidently he had heard preaching, it may have been from John, or from the disciples, or from Jesus himself; and while hanging there between the heavens and the earth, his mind being stirred unto an unusual activity by the terrible realities of that awful hour, he understood as he never had before the teachings about the death and the resurrection of Jesus; and hence his prayer. Who can say that he had never been baptized? But, even if he had never been, it would

in no wise affect my cause, as he was dying under the personal ministry of Jesus, and in his immediate presence; whereas we are living under the last will and testament of our Lord; which, of course, did not go into effect till after his death. "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of the testator. For a testament is of force after men are dead: otherwise it is of no strength at all whilst the testator liveth." (Heb. ix: 16, 17.) The New Testament did not come into force till after Jesus died. While men live they dispose of their property as they please: after they die, it must be disposed of according to the will. While Jesus lived on earth he spake to men as he chose to do; now he speaks to us through his written word. He says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," and my brethren propose to go according to that rule.

We have seen that under John's labors people were baptized confessing their sins, "for the remission of sins;" and the question naturally arises, Were people baptized for the same purpose after the death and resurrection of Jesus? Yes; the commission that I have just quoted was given after the resurrection of our Lord, and just before he ascended up on high; and now I proceed to call attention to the labors of the apostles under that commission. On the Pentecost after the resurrection there was gathered at Jerusalem a vast multitude of people from "every nation under heaven." Peter, standing up with the eleven in the midst of the great multitude, and speaking as he was moved by the Holy Ghost, preached Jesus with wonderful power. He told them that with wicked hands they had crucified and slain Jesus, but that God had raised him up. The proof that he adduced to sustain this statement was so full and conclusive that it left no room for doubt, and his hearers realized the awful fact that they were the murderers of the

Son of God. Peter concluded his address by saying, "Therefore let all the house of Israel know assuredly, that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ." Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter, and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost" (Acts ii: 37, 38.) Here were great sinners, for *they* were the murderers of the Son of God; they were not penitents either when they asked what to do, for in reply Peter told them to repent; but they were "pricked in their hearts" when they heard his sermon — convicted of sin — and they wanted to know what to do. He told them to repent, and to be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and then came the promise, "Ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Here were sinners coming to Peter just as sinners came to John; Peter told them to repent, just as John did; Peter baptized for the remission of sins, as did John; and as in John's case, so in Peter's the baptism was water baptism, for *the gift of the Holy Spirit came afterwards*.

Before leaving this case I want you to notice particularly, my friends, that the people were to be baptized *in the name of Jesus Christ* for the remission of sins; that is, trusting in the name of Jesus for the remission, not trusting in the water. When Naaman was dipping in Jordan he was not trusting in the water, but in God, for his cleansing; when I was baptized all my trust for pardon was in God, none in the water; and so of all of my brethren; we know that when we obey God, he will cleanse us, just as he cleansed Naaman when he obeyed him; we never baptize a candidate

unless he gives us assurance that he trusts with his whole heart in the Lord Jesus Christ. But not so with our Methodist friends, for many of their subjects for baptism have no faith, no love, no repentance, no trust, nothing, nothing but a little water. And then this man has the effrontery, to charge my brethren with believing in water salvation! He reminds me of the thief who ran down the street with the stolen money in his pocket, shouting, "Stop thief, stop thief." He wanted to divert attention from himself.

Mr. Nichols says: "Bro. H. seems to glory more in water baptism, and that by immersion, than he does in the cross." And then he inquires, "Have you never noticed that Campbellite preachers generally say more in the pulpit about the mode and design of water baptism, than they do about Christ and the cross both?" A grosser misrepresentation was never uttered since this world was made! It is not only not true, it is exactly the reverse of the truth. Every one who has heard my brethren preach on baptism knows well that all the importance that we attach to it grows out of the fact that Christ commanded it. We invariably teach that as Christ died, and was buried, and rose again, so the sinner -should die to sin by a loving, trusting faith in Christ, and that he should be buried and raised again in baptism. I never take a penitent sinner down into the water of baptism without carefully instructing him to go down "calling on the name of the Lord," trusting in Christ, and looking to him for every blessing. And if we insist on immersion, it is because we know well (as I will show you when we come to that question) that Christ was immersed, and that he commanded immersion. The Lord himself says, "If a man love me, he will keep my words," (John xiv: 23); and we love him, and by his grace we intend to keep his words; we do not intend to call them "non-essentials," and

say a man can be saved just as well without them as with them. Jesus says, "He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me," (John xiv: 21); and no man that loves him, will be careless about doing his will, or about striving to get others to do it. So I have taught all through this debate and so I teach always; yet, in the face of such teaching, Mr. Nichols accuses me of seeming to glory more in immersion than I do in Christ and his cross. I am glad he did it; for I want the paedobaptist people present, especially those who do not often hear my brethren, to know just how reliable his statements are when he talks about us and our teaching. If he were to make a speech during this debate without misrepresenting us, or our doctrine, I would be as much astonished as I would by a clap of thunder from a clear sky; and I believe the one thing to be fully as improbable as the other.

And he misrepresents the Bible just as freely and viciously as he misrepresents us. As a fair sample of his manner of dealing with the word of God, consider the following: "He claims that Paul left many of the Corinthians, to whom he afterwards wrote his epistles, unbaptized, and thanked God that he did not baptize them; and he argues that, if baptism is a condition of pardon, he left them on the way to hell, and thanked God for it. Now one of two things is certain: Either Mr. Nichols knew at the very time he was making that speech that Paul did not leave any of the Corinthians that believed unbaptized, or else he is even a much greater ignoramus than I had taken him to be. Read the eighteenth chapter of Acts, and you will find an account of Paul's planting the church at Corinth, and, at verse 8, you will read these words: "And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord, with all his house: and many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were

baptized." Yet Mr. Nichols says that Paul left many of them unbaptized! When he so treats God's word, we need not expect him to be very careful in handling the words of the Lord's disciples.

It is true that Paul thanked God that *he* baptized none of the Corinthians, except Crispus and Gaius and the household of Stephanas; but he gives the reason why he was glad that he did not baptize the others: "Lest," he says, "any should say that I had baptized in mine own name," (1 Cor. i: 15.) The church at Corinth was troubled with divisions; instead of being content with following Christ, and of glorying in him, many of them were disposed to rally around men. One would say, "I am of Paul;" another, "I of Apollos;" another, "I of Cephas;" and another, "I of Christ." (And that spirit is not out of the world yet; some men call themselves Calvinists, while others are Armenians, and others Wesleyans, naming themselves after Calvin, Arminius and Wesley.) Paul reprov'd the Corinthians sharply for this, and reminded them that Paul was not crucified for them, nor were they baptized in the name of Paul. And in this connection he expresses his gladness that he did not baptize any of them but Crispus, Gaius and the household of Stephanas, "lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name." It appears that Paul baptized the first converts, and then appointed some of them to baptize the others. The household of Stephanas were the "first fruits of Achaia," (see 1 Cor. xvi: 15), and Crispus is the first convert mentioned as having been made at Corinth. It is also a fact that Silas and Timothy joined Paul shortly after he began his work in Corinth, (see Acts xviii: 5); and it may be that they did the baptizing after they came. In any event it was done, for the Bible expressly says, "Many of the Corinthians, hearing, believed, and were baptized."

"Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel," says Paul, (1 Cor. i: 17.) And the statement is very true, and easily understood. The apostolic work consisted in revealing the gospel: any Christian could baptize. The one work (until the Bible was completed) required inspiration; the other did not Paul did not have to be specially "sent" in order to be authorized to baptize; every Christian, by virtue of being a Christian, is a priest unto God, (see Rev. i: 6), and has the right, when it is necessary, to baptize. And Paul used the right, too, as we have just seen, when it was necessary to do so.

"In Christ Jesus I have begotten you through the gospel," says Paul, (1 Cor. iv: 15.) "Yes, through the gospel, not through water," adds Mr. Nichols; and he seems to think there is something in that in his favor. Well, let us see: Paul, being full of the Spirit, preached Christ unto the Corinthians; it was not he that spake, but the Spirit of God that spake in him, (see Matt. x: 20, and 1 Cor. ii: 13); the people heard him, and many of them believed with the heart that Jesus is the Christ; and thus Paul begot them through the gospel: and then they were baptized; and thus they were born of water and of the Spirit.

Since we have gotten back to the new Birth, let me refresh your memories concerning some things that we now know certainly to be true. (1) The gospel was preached to the Corinthians by the Holy Spirit. (2) Many of them, from the preaching, believed that Jesus is the Christ. (3) Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born (begot, ten) of God, (see 1 John v: 1.) (4) Thus Paul begot these people. (5) The believer is not yet a son, but has power to become a son, (see John i: 12.) (6) When they believed, they were baptized, (see Acts xviii: 8.) (7) They were then in the kingdom of God. (8) And they

were born of water and of the Spirit, for "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (9) And so we have demonstrated that baptism is a part of the New Birth, and hence is a condition of pardon, for out of the kingdom of God there is no pardon, (see Eph. i: 7).

Mr. Nichols wants to know if to be born of God is to be begotten of him, is not to be born of water to be begotten of it? I will answer by asking, If to be born of one's father is to be begotten of him, is therefore to be born of one's mother to be begotten of her?

He inquires again, "Will you please tell us how a man can be born of the Spirit without feeling the Spirit, and yet he must feel the water from head to foot before he is born of water, according to Campbellism?" I will answer again by asking, Does the child feel the father in its birth? but does it not feel the mother from head to foot?

He wants to know how immersion can represent both a burial and a birth. Well, when one goes under the water we have a burial in water; and when he comes up out of it, we have a birth of water. When Christ was put in the tomb, was he not buried? And since he came out of it, is he not "the first born from the dead? (See Col. i: 18).

"But," he says, "let me ask Bro. Harding to tell us, is there two distinct births referred to in this passage, one of *material water*, and the other of the Spirit?" In reply I inquire, Are there two distinct births when a man is born of his father and mother?

"But" some one may inquire, "does not this theory of the New Birth marry God to the water? And does not that degrade God?" God and Mary were the parents of Jesus; did that marry God to Mary? Mary, as to her body, was dirt; does it degrade God more to be united with

water than with earth? Jesus was God in the flesh, and every man is made of spirit and matter; is it then at all astonishing that in being born again we should be born of water and the Spirit?

Mr. Nichols holds that in John iii: 5, the word water means Spirit. Then Jesus said, Except a man be born of Spirit and of Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. Does Mr. Nichols think we are born of the Spirit twice? Did any of you ever hear of a child being born of one parent only?

"Do not men *feel* the wind as well as *hear* it?" Yes: but in John iii: 8 the point of comparison between the wind and the Spirit is in the *hearing*. Jesus teaches that we hear the wind, and then he adds, "so is every one that is born of the Spirit." That is, we hear the Spirit, and so we are born of him.

A gold digger told Mr. Nichols "that when gold dust was dug from the earth, (1) The dirt is washed from it with water; (2) The gold is then purified by smelting." Well, that illustration suits me very well: The Spirit came to earth and (through the apostles) preached the gospel (this was digging the gold out of the earth); the believer was baptized (this was washing the gold), and thus it was separated from the earth (he is then in Christ): then, seeing he is a child of God, the Spirit enters his heart (see Gal. iv: 6), and helps the Christian to free himself from all alloy, that he may be a fit inhabitant for the city of God.

He does not want me to swallow him. He need not be uneasy; I am somewhat of a Jew; I don't eat swine flesh. [Laughter.] He is safe, for "I have never eaten anything that is common or unclean." [Laughter.] If I were to eat him, I would be fuller of filthiness than I ever have been, or ever expect to be.

"Ask, and it shall be given you: seek, and ye shall find: knock and it shall be opened unto you. For every one that asketh, receiveth," (Matt. vii: 7, 8), quotes Mr. Nichols. Yes, that was true when any one, seeking salvation, came to Christ, or his apostles; and it is true now when one comes to my brethren; but not so when the seekers go to the Methodist mourner's bench, for there they often fail to find. When the blind lead the blind it is not strange if both parties lose the way.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. NICHOLS' SECOND REPLY.

Brethren and Sisters:

As Bro. Harding sticks to it, and still says that a birth, or a burial either, represents baptism by immersion, I want to ask a few questions which will lead your minds to a proper understanding of the ridiculous position of Campbellism on this point. How is immersion performed? You all know it is performed by dipping the subject under the water and raising him out of the water the same moment. Do you see any similarity between immersion and any natural birth of which you have any knowledge? Do you know any natural birth that takes place by the thing which is born being dipped into its mother's womb, and taken out *the same moment, by the same power that dipped it, and in the same shape, and of the same size it was when it was dipped?* Do you, can you see one particle of similarity between a natural birth and the Campbellite mode of baptism? Did any of you ever see a dead man dipped under the dirt and jerked out *the same moment, for burial?* Is that the way we bury folks in this country? When your dead are buried do you not let them remain under the sod until God shall raise them at the last day? Where is the similarity between our manner of burying the dead, and the Campbellite mode of baptism? But enough on this point till we come to the mode of baptism.

The Campbellite order, "Faith, repentance, confession, and baptism, places Campbellism in another absurd position, viz: Faith purifies the heart, this the Bible teaches, (Acts

xv: 9), and Campbellism admits. Of those whose hearts are pure, Jesus says, "Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God." (Matt. v: 8.) But when a man's heart is purified by faith, Campbellism says he must *repent, confess* and *be baptized* before he can be saved. Now we have one whose heart has been purified by faith, and Jesus says he is *blessed* and *shall see God*; but Campbellism says he is going to hell *for the want of immersion*, and yet I am called a terrible man because I say this makes a man's salvation as dependent on water as it is on Christ. If there is no salvation without immersion in water, there can be no such immersion without water, therefore no water, no salvation. Is that good logic? Am I misrepresenting Campbellism when I say if her doctrine is true, a man to whom the light of the gospel has come can as easily get to heaven without Christ as he can without water? Just think of a man with a pure heart—ready to see God—*repenting*! What for? Is it because he is prepared to see God? Is that why he should repent? But worse still—think of a man—whose heart has been purified by faith, and whom Jesus calls blessed, suffering in hell because he has not been immersed. A pure heart in hell!! What a monstrosity!!! He makes a terrible ado because I said Naaman and the blind man were healed by faith, and then says, "Although these men were saved by faith, the obedience of faith was not excluded." Here he admits that they were saved by faith, and if I charge him with holding to water salvation, he foams and rants about that, and says that he is grossly misrepresented—he will not say they were saved by water—he does say they were saved by faith, now what is the matter? If they were saved by faith, were they saved by any thing else? He says not by faith only, and I ask, was it by water then, and he says no, you are misrepresenting

us. "Well he seems to be in a terrible predicament on this point. Admits that they "were *saved by faith*, then brings in *works*, and says they could not be saved without works; then baptism. Could not be saved without immersion, and what not. I would like to know how many times a man is saved by the Campbellite theory.

His argument reminds me of the decision of a jury of inquest concerning a man who was found dead in the river, the decision ran about thus: "His life was choked out of him, and he was beaten to death with a canoe paddle, and he was thrown into the river and drowned."

Well, he is improving some, says he does not claim that he and his brethren are the only Christians, but he is so holy that he cannot call unimmersed persons Christians, because he *does not think* they have been *properly* initiated into the church. I wonder if he means that they got in by improper means; or does he mean that they are not in at all? I like Bro. H. because he comes right out with bald-faced Campbellism. But it is funny to see him turn red in the face, clench his fist, and rage about how badly I have misrepresented his brethren, and then in the next breath acknowledge that they do teach, no water, no salvation.

He speaks of Methodists who refuse to be baptized—I wish he would give us the name of one such Methodist—but of course he would not misrepresent any body, he is a gentleman, he tells us. They are baptized, but not saved by water baptism. O no! they are saved, justified, by faith only; then they live a justified life by faith and works.

Next he says, "Our good physician does not give the same directions for all diseases." So Bro. H. just takes such cases as he thinks suits his case, and by them he makes out *just the same directions for all cases*, so far as the water is

concerned, that is, no one can be saved without water. Of the man at the pool, Bro. H. says Jesus "saved him independently of the water, and in an *unusual way*." O, how it does astonish, and bewilder a Campbellite when he finds a case of salvation into which he cannot possibly *press, suppose, or necessarily infer* water. Naaman's case was away back in the days of the kings, and the man who was born blind, was before Pentecost, but they both were connected with water; therefore they suit my brother's theory of water salvation; but when I brought about one dozen cases before you where Jesus had healed people without water, Bro. H. disposed of them without any sort of trouble by saying they were all under another dispensation, and have no bearing on the question. Truly that is a convenient way to dispose of an array of Scripture testimony which belonged to the very same dispensation to which his two cases belonged. But I promised to give you a few more cases. Matt xii: 10-13. Jesus cured a man with a withered hand *without water*, (Matt. xii: 22, 23.) Jesus healed one "with a devil, blind, and dumb." This was a bad case, yet he was healed *without water*. (Matt. xv: 22-28.) Jesus healed a poor girl who was "grievously vexed with a devil," (v. 22.) *without water*, but by the "great faith" of her mother, (v. 28.) Luke xiii: 11-13. Jesus healed a woman who "had a spirit of infirmity eighteen years, and was bowed together, and could in no wise lift up herself," (v. 11.) all this without water. Luke xvii: 11-19. Jesus cured ten lepers *by faith only*, (v. 19.) and not a drop of water. Matt. xx: 30-34. Jesus restored to sight two blind men *without water*. Thank God, there is no stream, pool, or pond between the sinner and Christ.

The multitude rebuked these blind men because they cried to Jesus for mercy, just as Campbellites rebuke poor

mourner's who cry for mercy now-a-days. Cry on sinners, never mind the rebukes and jeers of Campbellism, cry on till you get to the point where you can "believe to the saving of the soul," and Jesus will say to you, "according to thy faith be it unto thee." "*Every one that asketh receiveth,*" but you mu4 "ask in faith, nothing doubting," for "he that doubteth is damned."

In regard to Mark xvi: 16, Bro. H. works out water baptism by his rule of "necessary inference." Yes, I knew there was no other way left to him, and I was not surprised

in the least. His illustration is funny. He says: "John H. is the Nichols of this occasion," by which I suppose he means that water baptism is the baptism of Campbellism; and in referring to my brother, I suppose he intends to represent Holy Ghost baptism, and he need not tell us that

Holy Ghost baptism must be *specially mentioned*, or a Campbellite would not admit that it was Holy Ghost baptism, for all who are much acquainted with Campbellites know that already. But as he makes me represent water baptism, and my brother Holy Ghost baptism, I will accept that; for my brother is older, larger, and better looking than I am, therefore he came into this world before I did—hence Holy Ghost baptism may come before water baptism — is of vastly more importance, and one looks much better who is filled with the Holy Ghost, than one does who is coming out of a muddy stream from immersion. Yes, I accept the illustration. But to show how beautifully consistent he is, he says, since the days of the apostles, "men work miracles no longer;" and then asks, if this is Holy Ghost baptism, why don't Methodists work miracles? It never seemed to enter his mind that any one could think of asking a Campbellite to work a miracle to prove that it was water baptism — everybody must just admit that it is water baptism with-

out demanding any proof of him or his people, but if it is Holy Ghost baptism, some Methodist must work a miracle to prove it. It is a pity that he did not give us a case where the signs mentioned in Mark xvi: 17, 18 followed water baptism—it would have helped us to appreciate his—I like to have said argument—assertions.

But he refers to John's baptism. Let me read Acts xix: 2-7. (1) Here were twelve men who had been baptized by John. (v. 3.) (2) They had not received the Holy Ghost. (v. 2.) John obligated those whom he baptized to believe on Christ Jesus who should come after him. (v. 4.) (3) When they heard this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, (v. 5.) (4) Paul laid his hands upon them, and the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied, (v. 6.) Now they had been baptized with the baptism on which Bro. H. puts so much stress, but still they had not the Spirit of Christ, and "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his." (Rom. viii: 9.) This will show all earnest seekers after truth that John's baptism did not take away men's sins.

Next he speaks of the thief on the cross. He has three or four ways of disposing of his case. (1) He *supposes* that the thief was baptized by John. (2) He *supposes* that this thief "had a clearer conception of the power of Jesus and of the nature of his coming kingdom, *than any other man on earth,*" that is truly wonderful. (3) He *supposes* this thief had certainly heard preaching, but he does not seem to be very clear as to whether the thief heard John, Jesus, or some of the apostles preach. 'Tis a pity that he could not *suppose* just who it was the thief did hear preach. But fearing lest this audience would not be entirely satisfied as to his supposition in regard to the thief's baptism; (4) He *supposes* that if the thief had not been baptized, it

didn't make much difference, as Christ was there, and could save him, baptism or no baptism. But (5) the thief was saved under a different dispensation from the one we are under. Well truly, he has supposed many ways of escape for Campbellism in this case.

Now let us notice how he digs up his own theory with his suppositions. (1) If the thief had been baptized, he was still a thief, and that proves that water baptism does not save. So all that Bro. H. has said about "John's baptism saving, or being for the remission of sins, goes for naught, by his own *supposition*. (2) If this thief knew more about Christ's power and kingdom than *any man on earth*, he was the meanest man on earth; "for where much is given, much is required," if he knew more than any man on earth, he was responsible for more than any, and yet he *was a thief*. So, according to Bro. H's. supposition, this was a *desperate case*. (3) But if he had so much knowledge, and had heard so much preaching, and still remained a *thief*, he was in a *doubly desperate* condition. (4) But if in this *awful* condition, not having been baptized did not materially affect the case, according to the 4th *supposition*, it might do to trust in Christ by faith only, for salvation, at least in *extreme eases*. (5) But if the thief, according to the 5th *supposition*, having been saved under a different dispensation from the one we are under, leaves it without a bearing on the way men are saved now, then all cases of salvation under the same dispensation are without a bearing on that subject, and so down goes Bro. H's. whole speech, and his Campbellite theory with it; for he gets his illustrations from the dispensation under which the thief was saved. O, brethren, is it not wonderful how a Campbellite can go back into the Jewish dispensation, and take *just two* cases and prove by them to a (Campbellite) demonstration, that

a sinner cannot be saved without water; and when *more than twenty* cases are presented from the very same dispensation, they can be tamely disposed of by just one simple remark: "They belonged to another dispensation, and have no bearing on the question."

"Christ was here then,," we are told. Are we to be taught by Bro. H. that Christ is not here now? Are we to be told that he had more power on earth more than eighteen hundred years ago than he has now? "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii: 20.) This is his last precious promise to his disciples, and I believe every word of it is true. O, Yes, dear friends, Christ is here yet, and will be to the end of the world. He makes his abode with all who love him, and hears and answers all who call upon him in faith.

Well Bro. Harding admits that the devil did immerse the hogs, and says he lost his bacon by it. Very well. Now let me call your attention to two other cases of immersion where God was the administrator. In Genesis vii: 21-23, we have an account of the immersion of men, women, children, cattle, beasts, fowls, "and every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth," *and they were all lost*. God administered this immersion. In Exodus xiv: 26-31, we have an account of the immersion of Pharaoh and his mighty army, chariots and horses, *and they were all lost*. This immersion was administered by God. Now, as Bro. H. admits that the devil lost his bacon by immersion, and as we see all the Antediluvians, and all the Egyptians were lost, soul and body, by immersion, is it not strange, *strange indeed*, that Bro. H. will stand up before an intelligent audience and proclaim immersion as the *only way to Christ, the only way to heaven*!

Now I have given you the only clear cases of immersion

recorded in the Bible, and in every case, whether it was administered by God or the devil, whether it was administered to men, women, children, cattle, or hogs, *it was death!* Who, then, in this audience, is willing to trust in immersion in any sense for salvation? But he calls our attention to Acts ii: 38: "Be baptized * * * in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Water baptism, he says. Let me read Psalms li: 2: "Wash me thoroughly from mine iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin." "The *soul* that sinneth, it shall die." (Ezk. xviii: 20.) Now does God wash souls *with water*, or by his Spirit? Let us see, after speaking of a very wicked class of people, Paul says, "And such were some of you; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified, *in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ*, and by the *Spirit* of our God." (1 Cor. vi: 11.) Here we see, sins were remitted *In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and by the Spirit of our God*—no water here. Let me read Titus iii: 5, 6: "He *saves us* by the *washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost*, which he *shed on us abundantly*." No water here, and I infer that Bro. H. admits it, as I used this text in my first speech, and he made no reference to it. I read again, 1 Cor. xii: 13: "For *by one Spirit* are we all *baptized into one body*." The last words of the twelfth verse read: "So also is Christ." "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body," (into Christ.) No water here. Now does God have two ways of getting folks into Christ—one by water, and the other by the Spirit?

Now let Peter explain Acts ii: 38. In speaking of the day of Pentecost and of the conversion of Cornelius and his friends, he says: "And God, which knoweth the hearts, beareth them (Gentiles) witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, *even as he did unto us; (Jews at Pentecost.)* And

put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." (Acts xv: 8, 9.) (1) We see that God gave the Gentiles at the house of Cornelius the Holy Ghost, *even as he did to the Jews at Pentecost* (2) God *put no difference between them*. It was an unusual thing for a Jew to go among the Gentiles to teach, so it is natural that Peter should give a very particular account of the exact order in which every thing was done at the house of Cornelius.

Now let me read Acts x: 34-48. (1) He preached to the Gentiles "peace by Jesus Christ," (v. 37.) That Jesus was anointed with the Holy Ghost, and healed all that were oppressed of the devil, (v. 38.) (3) That Peter and the six Jews who went with him, were witnesses of these things, and that Jesus was slain, (v. 39.) (4) That God raised him from the dead the third day. (v. 40.) (5) That Peter was not a *self called, self sent* preacher, but God had *commanded* him to preach, (v. 42.) (6) That Jesus was to be Judge of quick and dead. (v. 42.) (7) That all the prophets testify "that *through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins*. (v. 43.) (8) That just as soon as Peter announced that remission of sins is obtained through faith in the name of Jesus Christ, they accepted the terms, and the "Holy Ghost fell on them which heard the word." (v. 44.) (9) That they spake with tongues and magnified God, and all this before water was *even mentioned to them*. (v. 46.) (10.) That *after*, (and not before,) they had been baptized with the Holy Ghost, Peter said "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" (Jews at Pentecost.) Now here is the case fully made out, and the whole case would have to be exactly reversed to make it suit Campbellism. Now remember *there was no difference* between this occurrence and the day of Pentecost.

Now read Acts ii: 41: "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized." Now at the house of Cornelius we see that the *"name of Jesus Christ—through faith in his name, remission of sins is obtained, and Holy Ghost baptism is given, all before water is mentioned.* Now they that *gladly received the word* at Pentecost were baptized with water after they had been baptized with the Holy Ghost. This makes no difference between Jews and Gentiles, as Peter says. Peter was the speaker at Pentecost and also at the house of Cornelius, and he gives us the exact order in which every thing occurred at the house of Cornelius, and then tells us there was no difference between the two occasions, and I am willing to admit that he told the truth.

But Bro. H. is wonderfully stirred up because I said Campbellite preachers generally have more to say about baptism than they do about Christ and the cross both. When did any of you ever hear a Campbellite preach a sermon without winding it up with water? I will leave that matter with the audience—you have heard them preach, and you know how much truth there is in what I said. But you must excuse Bro. H. for his great love for water, for he shows very clearly in his argument on "born of water and of the Spirit," that Campbellism teaches that God is the Christian's father, and *water is his mother!* and you know we have a contempt for a man who does not love his mother. The fact is, men generally love their mother more than they do their father—and I beg you to be patient with Bro. H. if he does show a little preference for his mother, for it is according to nature for a man to partake largely of the nature of his mother, and so it is just natural for Bro. H. to love water. Don't cry out, "misrepresentation," Bro. H. I can come to no other conclusion from your argument and illustrations, than that you

teach, "water is the mother of Christians." Well, if that is so, it is just as impossible for a sinner to be saved without water, as it is for a child to be born into this world without a mother.

Now you talk about a child being *born of its father!* Who ever heard such nonsense? All this nonsense you talk to get rid of *feeling the Spirit*, in the Spiritual birth. What makes you Campbellites so much afraid of feeling the Spirit? A man is to be damned if he does not feel the water *all over*, and he is a *fanatic* if he feels the Spirit of God. Ah! you saw that your theory would necessarily marry God to water, and you tried to dodge. You are like a child that has been spanked so much he dodges every time any one comes near him. Water *the wife of God!! The mother of all Christians!!* Just think of a Christian *drinking the wife of God—his own mother*, every time he takes a drink of water. Think of a Christian woman washing her clothes *in the wife of God—in her own mother*—Cooking her dinner in the *wife of God—in her own mother!!* Such sacrilege is enough to sicken the coldest-hearted nominal church member—almost enough to sicken even a Campbellite preacher.

I used to hunt coons, and I noticed that when a small clog got hold of a coon on dry land, he could soon kill him; but if the coon got into the water, it took the very best dog to manage him. Coons seem to know that they can make a better fight in water than they can any where else, so they take the nearest route to water when they can not get to a tree. How forcibly have I been reminded of my coon-hunting days during this debate—almost any body can manage a Campbellite if he can just keep him on dry ground, but look out if he gets to water. He seems to know that his strong hold is in water, hence, when you

tackle him he strikes a bee-line for water, and when he gets there, he cries:

"Every mother, son and daughter,
Here's the gospel in the water;
O, ye blinded generation,
"Won't you have this cheap salvation?"

But Bro. H. agrees not to swallow me. I am glad for my sake and for his also—for my sake, because I think it would be very unpleasant to me to live in a "whited sepulcher"—for his sake because he would be so very much out of proportion, having so much more brains in his stomach than he has in his head. In my first speech on this subject, at the close of my remarks, I asked Bro. H. to please bring forward several texts to which I referred, and which are generally used by his brethren, but he did not notice them. This is a way he has of saving his theory as well as he can, from a thorough digging up. I would like to notice those passages, but if I undertake it, he will cry, *order! order!* So I will have to let them pass.

My next objection to his theory of water salvation is: It lowers the standard of Spiritual Christianity. In laying so much stress on an "outward sign," men lose, or fail to obtain the "inward grace." They thus become religious bigots, self-righteous, judges of others, and declare themselves to be the only true followers of Christ. All others are *sects*, and will be lost. But stop! Bro. H. did become charitable enough to turn us unimmersed Methodists over to the "uncovenanted mercy of God,"—the kind of mercy by which the thief on the cross was saved, you know. Well, brother, I am much obliged to you for giving us even that much chance, for you remember when you came to the thief's case, you seemed for a time to be in a dilemma; but you put your rule of supposition to work, and

soon had about *five horns supposed* to that dilemma, and no matter which horn you took the thief could be drawn *out of his sins, into paradise*, by that horn. Now it may be that we poor, unfortunate, unimmersed Methodists may chance to get hold on one of those "supposed" horns, and get into glory at last; so cheer up, my brethren, there is *some* hope for you yet. Is there a sinner here who believes that God has made his justification in any way dependent on water? If immersion is essential to your pardon, then some one to immerse you is essential too, so you have three mediators between you and God, instead of one, as the Bible teaches. I told you this in my first speech, and Bro. H. forgot (?) to explain about these three mediators.

Think of a Campbellite preacher going to a wounded man on a battle field. The man is in a dying condition, and he is a sinner, but not a worse one than the thief on the cross was. The dying soldier says, "Brother, I am dying without hope. What must I do to be saved?" Minister.—"You must *believe, repent, confess, and be immersed.*" S.—"There is no water here, and my life is so far gone that it is impossible for me to be carried to water before I die. Can't I be saved without water?" M.—"There is no promise for you without water." S.—"My good mother gave me a Testament -when I joined the army, and I remember reading from the Savior's own lips these words, 'Ask and it shall be given you; * * * every one that asketh receiveth,' and I am willing to ask with all my soul, and in the name of Jesus, for pardon. Can't I get it?" M.—"No! Without water you must be lost." S.—"I read in John iii: 16, 'For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life.' I am willing to believe in him with *all my heart*. May I not

have life?" M.—"No! no! *There is no salvation without water.*" S.—"The jailer asked Paul the same question I asked you, 'What must I do to be saved?' and Paul said, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.' May I not be saved the same way?" M.—" No! Water! Or you are lost forever." S.—"Peter said, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins.' O may I not have remission of sins on the same terms that *Christ, Peter, Paul, all the apostles, and all the prophets—offered it to the whole world?*" M. — "Water! Water!! Water!!! Eternal damnation without water." O brethren, I am sick of hearing so much *water, water, water*. Water is the way to pardon, *and the only way*. Water is the way to Jesus, *and the only way*. Water is the way to glory, *and the only way*.

Now, Bro. H., don't accuse me of misrepresenting your doctrine, for your speech bears me out in all the conclusions I have made, and it is a poor, pitiful way of begging the question to cry out "misrepresentation" when the horrible conclusions of your doctrine are brought out.

I now repeat what I have said before, and what Bro. H. has failed to disprove by producing a single case from the Bible, that is, I said, "There is not one case of conversion in the Bible that meets the demands of Campbellism."

I close now with a clear case of Spiritual regeneration. The account of it is recorded in 1st Samuel, x: 6-10. Samuel said to Saul, "The Spirit of the Lord will come upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, *and shalt be turned into another man.*" (v. 6.) "And it was so, that when he had turned his back to go from Samuel, *God gave him another heart.*" Does any man here believe that God took Saul's heart of flesh out of his body, and gave him another in its

stead? Does any body believe that God turned Saul's physical man into another man? Are not all bound to admit that this wonderful change was wrought on Saul's inner man—or in plain words, is not this a very plain case of Spiritual regeneration? If Saul did not *feel* the Spirit, how did he know when to prophesy? Is not Campbellite testimony of conversion based on an external ordinance, and outward works? Do they *feel* the Spirit "bearing testimony with their spirits that they are children of God," or do they say, I have *obeyed the gospel*, and know I am saved because I have obeyed?

Brethren, my evidence of pardon does not rest on any thing I have clone, but on what God has wrought in me. "He that believeth on the Son of God *hath the witness in himself.*" (i John v: 10.) "Hereby *know we* that we *dwell in him, and he in us, because he hath given us of his Spirit.*" (i John iv: 13.) "Hereby we know that he abideth in us, by the Spirit which he hath given us." (i John iii: 24.) O, that you will seek this witnessing Spirit.

[*Time Expired.*]

THIRD PROPOSITION.

PROPOSITION: "INFANT BAPTISM IS AUTHORIZED BY THE
WORD OF GOD."

J. H. NICHOLS AFFIRMS.

THURSDAY, JAN. 26, 9:25, A. M.

Brethren and Sisters;

You remember that I was stopped in my last speech yesterday, by Bro. Harding, as I was introducing a text from the sixth chapter of Romans. That text came into this debate the first day, and was not new matter, yet the ruling moderator sustained Bro. H. You will remember too that Bro. H. was allowed to introduce *seven texts* in his final negative the first day of this debate that had not been referred to before, and I did not object. Now I am not here to gain the mastery over Bro. H. in this discussion, but I am after the truth; so I say now, and I want you to hear it; Bro. H. has my permission to introduce *any text*, and as many as he chooses, whether they have been referred to before or not, and I will not call him to order so long as he stays in the Bible. You remember also that Bro. H. wanted to go into the debate without moderators. I objected. He asked my reason. I told him that I had understood that he was in the habit of jumping up and interrupting his opponent when he was clinching the nail too tight, and he said he would not interrupt me, yet you saw what

he did yesterday.

He has been trying very hard to prove that some one has lied. Well, I will not say that any one has lied, but I will relate a circumstance. Last summer I was in a shop where two negro men worked—Morgan and John. A man came to get a mule shod. John said, "Dis mule kick?" The man said "no." John picked up the mule's foot, and the mule kicked him about ten feet, flat on his back. John came in the shop and said, "Morg, did you see dat?" Morgan said, "What?" John said, "I don 'no what to call it, 'dats what I want you to tell me." "What was it?" said Morgan. John said, "I went out dar ter shu dat mule; I axed de man if de mule would kick; he say no; I lif up de mule's hine foot, and he kicked me down; now dar I wus dun kicked down; dar stood de mule dat had dun kicked me down; and dar stood de man dat had dun say de mule wouldn't kick; now what you call dat?"

Infants have a right to a place in the visible kingdom of God, or church. The Spiritual kingdom is defined by Paul in Romans xiv: 17. "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." We may see the fruits of the component parts of the kingdom here mentioned, but "righteousness, peace, and joy" are invisible. People are brought into this Spiritual kingdom by baptism of the Holy Spirit, but they are brought into the visible kingdom by water baptism. Of the Spiritual kingdom, Jesus said in Luke xvii: 20, 21: "The kingdom of God cometh not with observation * * * for behold the kingdom of God *is within* you." Notice the language, "*not with observation*," then it is not dependent on visible ordinances. "*Is within you*" not will be in you after Pentecost. This kingdom was in Abel, for "he obtained witness that he was righteous." (Heb. xi: 4.) I

now state that both the visible and the invisible church of God is the same to-day that it was in the days of Abraham and Moses, and children were put into the church by the command of God in Abraham's day, and if God has ever commanded any body to leave them out, I will thank Bro. H. to give us chapter and verse. Now if I prove that the present church is a continuation of the Jewish church, in so doing I prove that children, infants, have a right in the church, unless some one will show us where God commanded that they should be left out.

Now as I give chapter and verse, I hope Bro. H. will take them down, and notice them in his reply, and not skip so many as he has done ever since this debate began. I give you Num. xii: 7. "My servant Moses * * * is faithful in all mine house." Now let Paul explain this passage, Heb. iii: 5, 6. "And Moses verily was faithful in all his house, as a servant. * * * But Christ as a Son over his own house; whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." Here we see (1) Moses was faithful *in* the house of God as a *servant*, (2) Christ was a *Son over the same house in which Moses was faithful as a servant*. (3) We are that house if we are faithful. Now we will let Paul tell us what that house is. i Tim. iii: 15. "That thou mightest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the church of the living God." Does not this make one point? Look at it a moment. (1) Moses faithful in the house of God. (2) Christ Lord over the same house, and (3) That house is *the church of the living God*. Well, children were in the house in Moses' day—who has put them out? Did God do it? If he did, I demand chapter and verse.

Now take Psalms xxii: 22: "In the midst of the congregation will I praise thee." We will let Paul tell us what this congregation was, Heb. ii: 12: "In the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee." So Paul tells us that the congregation spoken of by David was the church. What, the church of God back yonder in the days of Abraham, Moses, and David! Not according to Campbellism, but nevertheless it is true. Hear Luke in Acts vii: 38: "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness." So you see the church existed away back with Israel as they passed through the wilderness, and it was full of infants, for there were "about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, besides children." (Ex. xii: 37.) It seems to me this would have been a good time for Luke to have told us that the church in the wilderness was all done away, and a new one established at Pentecost by Peter, if such had been the case, but Luke had not made that discovery, that was left for Mr. A. Campbell and his disciples to discover. Now we see that the church of God existed in the days of Abraham, Moses, David, and was in the wilderness.

Let us now see how it was in the days of Christ on earth. I read Matt. xxi: 43 "The kingdom of God shall be taken from you (Jews) and given to a nation (Gentiles) bringing forth the fruits thereof." Now notice that the same kingdom taken from the Jews, was the kingdom which was given to the Gentiles. "No," says Campbellism, a new kingdom was set up at Pentecost." Well, Jesus says nothing about the *new kingdom, not one word*. So I reckon some body must be mistaken about it, I do really think so.

(Taking up a book.) Here, I take this book from one man, and give it to another, and Bro. Harding says "That is a brand new book, it never existed until it was given to

that man." That is just about as sensible as he will talk about the "new church."

In Romans xi: 13, Paul declared himself to be the apostle to the Gentiles. From verse 17 to 24 he tells the Gentiles (1) That the Jews were the natural branches of the good olive tree (Jewish church.) (2) That the Gentiles were of a wild olive tree. (3) That some of the Jews were cut off from the good olive tree because of unbelief. (4) That the Gentiles were grafted into the same olive tree (Church) from which the Jews were cut off. (5) That if the Jews "abide not still in unbelief they shall be grafted in; for God is able to graff them in *again*." Now remember that Paul wrote all this about twenty-seven years after the day of Pentecost, and if there had been a *new church* established at Pentecost, he could not have found a better place to tell us about it than right in this eleventh chapter of Romans, but it seems that he had not discovered that fact. (?) Now look at Bro. Harding. I can almost hear him thinking that if he had written Romans 11th, he would have told us all about the "*new church*." Yes, but Paul wrote it, and if Campbellism is true, the world will be left to wonder why he did not tell us about it.

But Bro. H. says, "I'll slaughter you when I get up." You know he has told us of having slaughtered so many preachers in debate. But here comes his proof. Dan. ii: 44: "In the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed." Matt. xvi: 18: "Upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." "Ah," says my Bro. H., "I've got you now." "Will build," shows that a new church was to be set up—one that had no existence before.

I want to tell you something now. When we were ar-

ranging for this debate, I wrote to my Bro. Fry, who sits before me there, that I would have no books in this debate except King James' translation of the Bible. He wrote me that the debate could be nothing but a quibble if other books than the Bible were excluded from the debate. Now you don't know how funny that did sound to me, coming from one who belongs to a church which has always loudly boasted that she is the only church that takes the Bible alone. I had to write several letters before they would agree to use the Bible alone, in this debate. But at last they agreed to it, so I will now let the divine writers help Bro. H. out of his trouble about Dan. ii: 44, and Matt. xvi: 18.

I read Amos ix: 11: "In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen, and close the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it *as in the days of old*" Notice (1) No new church is to be built, but the *tabernacle of David*, (2) Not in a new style, but "*as it was in the days of old.*" The church was in a back-slidden state, but God here promises to "raise it up," and bring it back to the true doctrine and practice of godliness as it was in the days of old. Now let us see when this was done. Some years after Pentecost, when the apostles and church generally were somewhat stirred on the subject of the "coming in of the Gentiles," and about circumcision, they had a meeting in Jerusalem to consider of these matters. James made a speech about the Gentiles coming in. I read it in Acts xv: 14-16: "Simon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name; and to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written. After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again the ruins thereof, and I will

set it up. How is that? Build a new church, you say? No sir! "Build again the tabernacle of David." Now if there had been a new church established at Pentecost, isn't it strange that the apostles did not know it? How stupid they must have been. If Bro. Harding had been there to enlighten them on this subject, wouldn't it have saved a great deal of debating, and vexation on this question? Here you see the apostles and prophets all agree that the tabernacle of David was rebuilt "*as of old*" but none of them say anything about a new church. Now I hope Bro. H. will notice this difficulty, and get the writers of the Old and New Testaments out of it if he can, and get them on the side of the "*new church*."

I am not leaving these objections for Bro. H. to bring up, for I have learned in this discussion that he does not bring up near all the passages generally used by his church, and if I try to introduce them on a final negative that I may refute them, he chokes me down on a "*point of order*." I wish my Campbellite brethren would stir their champion up a little. I am getting tired leading all the time, both in the affirmative and in the negative. He has utterly failed to furnish enough matter in any speech to occupy more than half of my time in answering all his points (?) and this throws me in the lead, even on the negative.

I will refer to the kingdom of David after a while.

I now call your attention to God's covenant with Abraham. Here I will state (1) All of the Bible was written by Jews. (2) All of God's covenants were made with the Jews. (3) All of the twelve apostles were Jews. Will Bro. H. deny this? We shall see. Let me read Romans ix: 4: "Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the *covenants*, and the giving of the law, and the service of God and the promises." So you see

the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the service of God, and the promises," all pertained to the Jews, and the only way for a Gentile to get the benefit of all these blessings was for him to be taken out of the "wild olive tree," and be "grafted in among them, (Jews) and with them partake of the root and fatness of the olive tree" (Jewish church) Romans xi: 17. Now if God ever made a separate covenant with Gentiles, I challenge Bro. H. or any of his brethren, for chapter and verse, and you can give it now if you will, and I will read it and take back what I have said.

I read Genesis ix: 16: "And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the *everlasting covenant* between God and every living creature of all flesh that is upon the earth." This verse is speaking of God's rain-bow covenant with all flesh. Now are we living under that rain-bow covenant? All will answer "yes, for the promise is that it should be an *everlasting covenant*." Very well. I read again from Genesis xvii: 7: "And I will establish my covenant between me and thee and thy seed after thee in their generations for an *everlasting covenant*, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee." Now a question; are we living under the covenant God here made with Abraham? My Bro. H. will answer "No." Then tell me why not. The word used here to express the duration of this covenant, is the very same word used to express the duration of the rain-bow covenant, and you say we are living under the rain-bow covenant. Ah, my brother, the trouble is, if you admit that we are living under the Abrahamic covenant, that lets infants into the church, and destroys your beloved Campbellism; for the 10th and 11th verses of this chapter show that infants were taken into the Abrahamic covenant I say to this audience, that if the rain-bow covenant inter-

ferred with the teachings of Campbellism as much as the Abrahamic covenant does, Bro. H. could just as easily prove that the rain-bow covenant ended at Pentecost, as he can that the Abrahamic covenant ended then. It is well that the rain-bow covenant does not interfere with Campbellism, for if it did, Bro. H. would "*slaughter*" the man who should dare to say that the rain-bow covenant exists today. Now here is a covenant which God made with Abraham, which was to be "*everlasting*" and children were taken into that covenant at eight days old; now if we are living under the same covenant, who dares to say that children must be left out of it? Why, Bro. Harding, of course. Well, God put them in, now who has a right to leave them out without a special command from God to leave them out? Why, our Campbellite brethren, of course; at any rate, they do leave them out, and almost curse those who bring them in. I read Psalms cv: 8-11: "He hath remembered his covenant forever, the word which he commanded to a *thousand generations*, which covenant he made with Abraham, and his oath unto Isaac; and confirmed the same unto Jacob for a law, and to Israel for an everlasting covenant; saying, unto thee will I give the land of Canaan." Notice (1) This is the covenant God made with Abraham. (2) "He commanded it to a *thousand generations*." (3) He gave his *oath* unto Isaac that thus it should last. (4) He confirmed the same to Jacob for a law. (5) He confirmed it to Israel for an everlasting covenant. (6) In confirmation he promised to give them the land of Canaan. Now if this covenant ceased at Pentecost, God's oath to Isaac *was untrue*, and that which he commanded to a *thousand generations*, failed before fifty generations passed away. I read Matt. i: 17: "So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations; and from

David to the carrying away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations." Now here are three times fourteen generations which make forty-two generations, and, to be liberal we will allow that one generation passed away from Christ unto Pentecost, and that makes forty-three generations. Now take 43 from 1,000, and you have 957, that is, the covenant that God commanded to a thousand generations, and swore to Isaac that it should stand that long, according to Campbellism, failed at the end of forty-three generations; or, in plain words, God just missed the truth 957! Bro. Harding, that is a heavy indictment you Campbellites bring against God.

I read Gal. iii: 17: "And this I say, that the covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was 430 years after, cannot disannul, that it should make the promise of none effect." (v. 19.) "Wherefore then serveth the law? It was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the promise was made." (v. 29.) "And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." We notice (1) The covenant that was made with Abraham was "*confirmed of God in Christ.*" (2) That the law which was given, four hundred and thirty years after this covenant was made, cannot disannul it. (3) (v. 19.) That the law of ordinances was added till the seed should come, (that is, till Christ should come, and then that law was at an end). (4) (v. 29.) That all who are Christ's are Abraham's seed. Now can my Bro. H. give us a better covenant than the one which was confirmed of God in Christ? The law of ordinances was added, and the sacrifices were offered, in order to keep the coming Savior before the minds of the Jews, to bring them to him, that they "might be justified by faith," (v.

24.) but when Christ came there was no further use for that law, so he "took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross," (Col. ii: 14,) He did not nail the Jewish church to his cross, Bro. H., as you Campbellites sometimes have it, but it was the "law contained in ordinances," so says Col. ii: 14. But the 29th verse of the 3rd chapter of Gal. says: "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed?" Does that mean that we are Abraham's seed according to the flesh? Surely Bro. H. will not say that. Does it mean that we are Abraham's seed according to the Spirit? I think so. Well, is not all of a man's seed, members of his family? You meet a little boy and ask him, "Whose son are you?" He answers, "I am Mr. Davis' seed." Would you not understand that he was a member of Mr. Davis' family? Then if all Christians are the seed of Abraham, are they not members of the same church to which Abraham belonged? I hope Bro. H. will not forget to tell us about that. You have noticed that he seems to be a little forgetful on some points. But Bro. H. says: "I'll slaughter you when I get up; the death rattles are in your throat now. I'll show you a *new covenant* in Heb. viii: 8, 9." Very well. I will read it: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah. Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand to lead them out of the land of Egypt." Yes, here is a new covenant, but it was made with the *same "house of Israel"* and "*house of Judah"* that God led out of Egypt. Ah, brother, that is just what I am trying to show you. A covenant is not a *church* that all of you know, very well. Now if God made a "*new church*" Paul should have said here that God would make a new *house of Israel, and a new house of Judah*" but he did

not say that, he says just the opposite, he says this new covenant was made with the same old house, (or church), that he led out of Egypt. Bro. Harding, please tell us about this when you get up, will you?

I now challenge Bro. H. to show any covenant that God ever made with his church that did not include children. But my time is flying, and I must pass on.

You Campbellites talk like God experimented with his people, about 4,000 years, before he found just what he wanted, and then, on the day of Pentecost, God acted like a little boy who had worked at an example in his Arithmetic for a long time, and saw his failure and spit on his slate and wiped the whole thing out. I do wish you would stop talking such nonsense; just as if God saw on the day of Pentecost, that all of his efforts to establish a church on earth had failed, and he just wiped out and began a new. Such folly is almost enough to make one sick.

Now I go back to the tabernacle of David, or the kingdom, or throne of David. You know that Campbellism says, "Jesus was not a king till Pentecost, that if he was he had no kingdom, no throne, because his kingdom was not established on earth till Pentecost." That is Campbellism: now we well consult some *wise* men, and see what they say about it. Matt. ii: 1, 2: "There came *wise inert* from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is *born king of the Jews?*" Yes, these wise men say he was *born a king*, but Campbellism says he was not. Which will you believe, my friends? I must confess, that somehow I have a decided bearing to the wise *men*. I read John xviii: 37: "Pilate therefore said unto him, art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth." Here Jesus says he was born

a king, but Campbellism says, "not so." When Jesus was hanging on the cross, Pilate wrote this title and put it on the cross: "*This is the king of the Jews.*" Luke xxiii: (38.) If Jesus was not a king at that time, he died with a written lie hanging to his cross, and he did not correct it. O, my brother, do not be so cruel to my Savior, just to save your Campbellite theory. Remember when he rode into Jerusalem, the people cried, "Blessed is the *Icing* of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord," (John xii: 13.) and he did not correct them. Now my brethren, if Jesus was not a king till Pentecost, should he have allowed this vast multitude to have called him a king without correcting them? I now read John xii: 15: "Fear not, daughter of Sion: behold, thy king cometh, sitting on an ass' colt." But Campbellism says that Jesus was made a king in heaven on the day of Pentecost, and was never a king before. I wonder if anybody in this audience believes that Jesus rode on an ass' colt into heaven! But you ask if Jesus was king while on earth, what throne did he occupy? That is not for me to say, but I will call up some witnesses, and let you hear from them. We will take Isa. ix: 7. Speaking of the coming Savior he says, "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even forever." Here the throne and kingdom of David are promised to Christ. Luke is my next witness, i: 32, 33: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest, and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." This witness states that He should have the throne of David, and reign over the *house of Jacob forever*. Next I call Peter to the stand. Acts ii: 30. Speak-

ing of David, he said, "Therefore being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne." This witness was speaking on the day of Pentecost—the *very time and place* when and where our Campbellite friends say the new church was set up, and he says Jesus was to sit on the throne of David. Now Bro. H. please don't forget to tell us if David ever sat on the throne of the "*new church*?" why did not Peter say, "This is the day that the new church is to be set up, and Christ is crowned in heaven to-day, and sent the Holy Ghost here to tell me to organize the new church?" Why did he not say so, if it was so? Echo answers, why! Take Jer. xxxiii: 20, 21: "Thus saith the Lord. If ye can break my covenant of the day, and my covenant of the night, and that there should not be day and night in their season; then may also my covenant be broken with David, my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne." Do we still have day and night? Has God's covenant with day and night failed? My brethren, when you look upon the beautiful day, and the starry night, don't forget that God's covenant is still standing with David. Bro. Harding may do his utmost to set it aside and establish the "new church" upon its ruins, but he must first break God's covenant with day and night, and cause that there be "no day and night in their season" before he can build his "new church," if God told the truth, and I think you will all agree with me when I say, God told the truth, Bro. H. to the contrary, notwithstanding. I now read Ps. lxxxix: 3, 4: "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David, my servant, Thy seed will I establish forever, and build up thy throne to all generations." Here we have God's oath to David that his

throne should be "built up *to all generations.*" Do generations still exist? Then let Bro. H. tell us what became of God's oath if the "new church" theory is true. (v. 2.) "His seed also will I make to endure forever, and his throne as the *days of heaven.*" Does heaven still exist? Then let my brother tell us what about the throne of David. (v. 34-37.) "My covenant will I not break, nor alter the thing that is gone out of my lips. Once have I sworn by my holiness that I will not lie unto David. His seed shall endure forever, and his throne as the sun before me. It shall be established forever as the moon." Do the sun and moon still exist? Then if David's throne has been cast down and a Campbellite church built upon its ruins, I will ask Bro. H. to please tell us what becomes of God's oath to David.

Now we have found the Abrahamic covenant confirmed to Jacob for an *everlasting* covenant, and to Israel "to a *thousand generations.*" We have found the throne of David established *forever as the days of heaven, as the sun and moon,* and Jesus Christ on this throne.

On the day of Pentecost we find that "Three thousand souls were added unto them." (Acts ii: 41.) Added unto what? Something that never existed before? Why didn't Peter say they organized the "new church" then and there? That's what Campbellism says, but I reckon Bro. H. will tell us all about it when he gets up.

[*Time expired.*]

THIRD PROPOSITION.

MR. HARDING'S FIRST REPLY.

Ladies and Gentleman:

Mr. Nichols is disposed to complain somewhat because I stopped him when he was about to introduce new matter into his final negative. The law forbidding this is based upon the common-sense idea that in a debate both sides of every question should be presented. If new matter is introduced into a final negative, of course only one view of it can be given to the audience. And the fact that a text had been used in the discussion of a former question, does not prevent its being "new matter" when another subject is under investigation. When the presiding moderator ruled him out of order, he should have submitted gracefully, and have said no more about it.

When the question of moderators came up, at the time that we were making our preliminary arrangements, I suggested that we should do without them; that two brethren should be appointed to "call time," and that each man should be permitted to use his time as he pleased. Mr. Nichols objected, saying that he wanted moderators to keep order: I very cheerfully agreed to this, as I am willing to anything that is fair. Had we gone into the discussion without moderators, I would not have interrupted him under any circumstances; but as he would have the moderators, I determined to submit to them myself, and to see to it that he did, too.

So, when the moderators decided against him, it was a "mule" of his own choosing that kicked him over, and I am in no wise to blame for it.

The rule against the introduction of new matter into a final negative does not necessarily forbid the use of a new text, for a new text may be required in replying to that which has been introduced; but it does forbid the introduction of a new argument, or a new line of thought. I introduced no new matter into my last speech on the first proposition, though I may have introduced a new text. Since Mr. Nichols would have the moderators, we will be governed by the ordinary regulations to which debaters submit. It is a little amusing, seeing that he insisted so on having moderators to keep *me* in order, that he should be the first one to be straightened out by them.

But now to the question before us: Mr. Nichols' speech is, in one respect, exactly like the Bible; that is, it is perfectly silent on the subject of infant baptism; not once did he mention it from the beginning to the end of his address. Could anyone have told from his speech what he was trying to prove? Would you, my friends, have known, if the proposition had not been read in your hearing before he began? I think not.

Instead of endeavoring to show that the practice of baptizing infants is scriptural, he has been doing his best to prove that the church of God has been in existence from the days of Abel till now, and that it has infant members in it. I might grant all of this, were I disposed to do so, and still deny that infants should be baptized. They were not baptized in the days of Abel, nor in the days of Abraham, nor in the days of David, nor in the days of Jesus. Indeed, in so far as the Bible testifies, infant baptism was unheard of while inspired men lived on earth. If they were not baptiz-

ed in the days of Abraham (and Mr. Nichols will not say that they were) why does he baptize them now, seeing that he claims the church is the same? Ah, there has been a change, he will say, we baptize now, they did not then. Very good; let him turn to the place where the change was made, and show that in making that change God required the baptism of infants. This he will never do, simply because it is not a fact. Infant baptism is a tradition of men, which, to the extent that it is practiced, makes void a commandment of God.

Just here I want to call your attention to a startling fact, a fact that ought to make every paedo-baptist in this house stop and think: It is not only true that the Bible is silent on the subject of infant baptism, but is also a fact that wherever cases of baptism are mentioned, there are attendant circumstances which show that infants are not included in the number baptized. (1) John baptized, but he baptized with "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins," and the people were baptized "confessing their sins." (Mark i: 4, 5.) Of course there were no infants here. They have no sins to be remitted, and they could not confess them if they had them.

2. Jesus baptized, but it is said that he "made and baptized" disciples, (see John iv: 1); he made the people disciples first (that is, he taught them, made them learners) and then he baptized them. Infants eight days old cannot be made disciples, or learners, they cannot be taught, and hence there were none among the converts under the personal ministry of Jesus.

3. In commanding his holy apostles to baptize, our Lord told them to "teach all nations, baptizing them," (see Matt. xxviii: 19). Ashe did, he wanted them to do—to teach first and baptize afterward, Where Matthew says "teach,"

Mark, in recording the same instructions, says "preach the gospel;" and he puts faith in that gospel before the baptism, (see Mark xvi: 15-16). No infants here of course.

4. On the day of Pentecost Peter preached, and about three thousand souls were added to the disciples. Any infants among them? No, for it is said, "they that gladly received his word were baptized." Acts ii: 41. Infants cannot "gladly receive" preaching.

5. In the conversion of the people of Samaria, Philip preached and great multitudes turned to the Lord, but it is expressly said that those baptized were "men and women," (See Acts viii: 12). How did it happen that when a great city turned to the Lord not a single infant was baptized?

6. In every case of household baptism there are circumstances mentioned in connection therewith which show unmistakably that there was not an infant in the household. The jailer's household "rejoiced, believing in God," (Acts xvi: 34); the household of Stephanas had "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints," and were rulers in the church of God, in five or six years after they came into the church, (i. Cor. xvi: 15); the most precocious of babies do not become rulers within six years: Lydia's household consisted of "women" (Acts xvi: 13-15), who were old enough to be "comforted," (see verse 40); Crispus "believed on the Lord with all his house," (Acts xviii: 8); Cornelius "feared God with all his house" (Acts x: 2), and when Peter preached to them "the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word;" the Jews with Peter "heard them speak with tongues, and magnify God;" and Peter commanded those who had thus heard, received the Spirit, and magnified God to be baptized, (see Acts x: 44-48); of course there were no infants there: this closes up the five

household baptism of the Bible, and, although they have been so much relied upon by paedo-baptists, it is certain there was not an infant in one of them.

7. In addition to the cases of baptism which we have considered, there are in the New Testament three others: (1) that of Saul (Acts ix: 18); of the eunuch (Acts viii: 38); and of the twelve men at Ephesus (Acts xix: 1-7). Of course there were no infants in these cases.

Thus we have considered every case of baptism mentioned in the New Testament, and by proof perfectly clear and conclusive have shown that there was not an infant in one of them, but that in every case the people were old enough to hear and understand and obey. No wonder Mr. Nichols did not mention infant baptism in his hour speech. Neither will he mention it in his next one, if he is true to his contract to stand by King James' version. He must go out of the New Testament to find infant baptism.

Mr. Nichols claims that people are brought into the "invisible" Kingdom of God by baptism of the Holy Ghost, and into the "visible" Kingdom by water baptism, and that the latter baptism is a sign of the former—"an outward sign of an inward grace," as I have heard it called. That is all nonsense, and there is not a particle of scriptural warrant for such an idea, but if it were true it would ruin the gentlemen's position; *for in every case of the reception of the Spirit since Christ left the earth, it was a believer who received it.* And if water baptism is a sign of baptism of the Spirit, or is in any wise connected with the giving of the Spirit, it can be for none but believers. Christ foretold that "*they that believe on him* should receive" the Spirit (John vii: 37-39). Paul tells the Ephesians that they were sealed with the Spirit *after they believed*; his words are, "after that ye believed ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise" (Eph. i: 13):

he tells the Galatians that we "receive the promise of the Spirit *through faith*" (Gal. iii: 14): and he significantly asks the disciples that he found at Ephesus, "Have you received the Holy Ghost *since ye believed?*" (Acts xix: 2). And so it is in every case. I will give up the debate, if the gentleman will find a case, since the Great Commission was given by our Lord just before he ascended up on high, where any one in any way received the Spirit who was not a believer. Now let him find the case, or quit talking about water baptism being a sign of Spirit baptism, or give up his infant baptism; for one of these three things Scripture, logic and common sense demand that he must do.

All of this talk about the "visible" and the "invisible" kingdoms of God is pure foolishness, without a particle of scriptural authority for it. A man is either a child of God, or he is not a child of God; if a child, then he is in the kingdom; if not a child, he is out of the kingdom: but whether in or out he is quite "visible." If he is in the kingdom he does not need baptism, for that act is apart of the process of initiation: if he is out of the kingdom he must be "born again," "born of God," "born of water and of the Spirit," in order to get in; but to be "born of God" one must believe that "Jesus is the Christ" (see i. John v: 1). Hence faith as well as baptism is a part of the new birth, and of course it follows that infants cannot be born again. Indeed, they do not need to be; they are born *safe*, and hence do not need to be *saved*: they are born *innocent*, and do not need to be pardoned: they are born *clean* and do not need to be *washed*. But when the child is old enough to sin, and does sin, he thus goes from his Father's house as Adam did in the beginning; he is now a prodigal son, and to find peace must come back; now he must be born of water and the Spirit in order to enter the kingdom of God.

I would like to know why Mr. Nichols baptizes babies any how. He does not do it because Christ and his apostles did, for there is not the slightest evidence in the world that any infant was ever baptized in the apostolic age. Indeed, as I have shown you, we know that not an infant was baptized in any of the cases of baptism recorded in the New Testament. There is not a command to baptize infants to be found in the New Testament. On the contrary, whenever a command on the subject is given, it is always to baptize believers. In addition to all this, we have in a case that is generally quoted in favor of infant baptism, the most conclusive incidental proof against the practice. It is this: "Then were there brought unto him little children, that he should put his hands on them, and pray: and the disciples rebuked them. But Jesus said, Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven. And he laid his hands on them, and departed thence. Matt. xix: 13-15. See also Mark x: 13-16. These people wanted their children blessed, and realizing that the great teacher had power above all others on earth to bless, they brought them to him. But the disciples thought it altogether improper to disturb the divine Master by bringing such little ones to him, and so they rebuked those that brought them. Evidently those disciples were not Methodist preachers; for, if so, they would have said to the mothers, "That is right, bring on the infants that the Bishop may baptize them." Whoever heard of paedo-baptist preachers forbidding mothers from bringing their children to them! Their trouble frequently is that they cannot get them to bring them. But Jesus was displeased, and said, "Suffer little children, and forbid them not, to come unto me; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." What a glorious opportunity to institute infant baptism! But the Lord did not do it. He took the

little children in his arms, put his hands upon them and prayed, and then gave them back to those that brought them. I believe in following Christ, in striving to do as he did; hence I pray God to bless the little children. But our paedo-baptist neighbors seem to think that they can improve upon the Lord's procedure, for they do that which he did not do, and which he did not tell them to do: he prayed for the little ones; they sprinkle water upon them. We do as Christ did; they do differently: which is correct? And to make the matter worse, they claim to baptize infants *in the name of Jesus Christ*, that is, *by his authority*, when to save their lives they cannot show that he ever did such a thing himself, or ever commanded anybody else to do it. And to do a thing in his name that he has authorized no man to do, is horrible. I would not like to sign the name of the governor of this State to a document without his consent; nor would I like to sign the name of my brother here to a check, and draw money on it, without his authority; but such crimes to my mind seem insignificant, in comparison with doing *in the name of JESUS CHRIST* that which he has never authorized any one to do. Doubtless if there had been any blessing in baptism for infants, he would have baptized them himself, and would have taught others to do so. As he did neither the one nor the other, we may be sure it is a foolish, sinful practice.

Mr. Nichols is continually telling you what I believe, and he is continually getting it wrong. He does not know what I and my brethren teach, or else he has a most unfortunate way of telling what he knows. Whenever he begins to tell you what I believe, or what my brethren teach, look out for a misrepresentation; for, as a rule, one will come. I don't say that he intends it; I simply state the fact. As an illustration, he says that when God calls the rainbow covenant *an*

everlasting covenant, I agree that it means everlasting; but when he calls the covenant of circumcision (Gen. xvii) an everlasting covenant, I say "No." And then the gentleman makes quite a speech to show that the one is just as "everlasting" as the other. He consumed ten or fifteen minutes on this one point; and all to no purpose, too, for I believe that one of those covenants is just as everlasting as the other—that both shall last till time shall be no more. All of his talk in counting the generations, and in claiming that our theory makes God miss the truth just 957 generations, is a whistling against the wind, and a misrepresentation of the people he calls Campbellites.

Yes, God gave the covenant of circumcision to Abraham for all time; and his children should observe it forever; that is, his descendants according to the flesh; for it was made with him, and with those born in his house, and bought with his money. (See Gen. xvii: 12-13). God said to Abraham, "This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me, and you, and thy seed after thee: Every man child among you shall be circumcised." Gen. xvii: 10. "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant. And the uncircumcised man-child, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant." Gen. xvii: 13-14. Now in the letter to the Galatians (chap, iii: ver. 15) Paul teaches that even a man's covenant can not be added to or disannulled after it has been confirmed. But this covenant of circumcision was made and confirmed, and Abraham and his people began to live under it when he was ninety-nine years old. Of course after that it could not be changed, altered, disannulled or added to. And this fact "slaughters" the

doctrine of Mr. Nichols; for baptism cannot be put into the covenant, seeing no man can add to it; nor can circumcision be taken out of it; nor can the time of circumcising be changed from the eighth day; nor can females be circumcised, or baptized, under this covenant; nor can any other change be made in it. It was for the children of Abraham and hence Paul said to the Gentiles, "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." Gal. v: 2.

Hence, you see, this talk that you sometimes hear about baptism coming in the room of circumcision is the silliest kind of foolishness. That could not be without changing a covenant which God himself made and confirmed, and declared should be "everlasting." Hence Jesus was circumcised and afterwards baptized; the apostles were circumcised and then baptized; the three thousand on the day of Pentecost (or the males among them) were baptized though they had formerly been circumcised; Paul was circumcised and afterwards baptized; but Timothy was baptized and afterwards circumcised (see Acts xvi: 1-3. Twenty years after the ascension of Christ, there were judaizing teachers who wanted the Gentiles in the church to be circumcised, (see Acts xv: 1-2); but the apostles and elders decided that they should not be (see Acts xv: 23-29); they knew it would not do to tamper with an "everlasting covenant" that had been "made and confirmed." Seven years later, however, Paul and James and the elders at Jerusalem show plainly that it would be disorderly to teach the Jews not to circumcise their children, (see Acts xxi: 17-25); Paul had been charged with teaching Jews "that they ought not to circumcise their children," but, as this passage shows, he took prompt steps to show that the charge was false. But though James and Paul and the Jerusalem elders were so united about the propriety of Jews circumcising their chil-

dren, they said, "As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written, and concluded that they observe no such things," See Acts xxi: 25. It was after Paul and the others had directed the Gentiles not to circumcise, that he circumcised Timothy. This was allowable as Timothy's mother was a Jewess. Acts xvi: 1-3.

So we see that both baptism and circumcision were practiced right along side by side during the days of Christ and the apostles. Sometimes, (as in the case of Timothy) when circumcision had been neglected at the proper time, it was attended to after baptism. How weak the cause that depends upon the one coming in the room of the other, and how silly the argument!

Mr. Nichols challenges me and my brethren to show that God ever made a separate covenant with the Gentiles, *when he knew well that we claim no such thing*. He might just as well call on me to prove anything else that I do not believe, infant baptism for instance. But one thing I have proved beyond the possibility of a reasonable doubt, namely, that God did make a separate covenant with Abraham and his seed, the covenant of circumcision, and that Gentiles have no part nor lot in it. Hence these Gentile Methodists need not be referring to it to establish their infant baptism.

Mr. Nichols claims that the Jewish institution "the church in the wilderness," and the church of Christ are one, that infants were in the one, and therefore they ought to be in the other; that they were not baptized in the one, but that they ought to be in the other. I must confess that even if we grant his premises I don't see how he can draw his conclusion. If the two institutions are not two, but one, if they are built upon the same everlasting covenant, then the fact that infants were not baptized then, would seem to me to be proof positive that they should not be now; but there

is no accounting for a paedo-baptist's way of reasoning. But is the church of Christ merely a continuation of the Mosaic economy? Let us see. In proof of his position Mr. Nichols quotes: "And Moses verily was faithful in all his house as a servant, for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken after. But Christ as a son over his own house, whose house are we, if we hold fast the confidence, and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end." (Heb. iii: 5, 6.) The gentleman claims that Moses and Christ were in the same house, and that this quotation proves it. Does it? Here is a man, (we will suppose), who before the war had a servant faithful in all his house; but now his son is over his house; does it follow that he is living in the same house that he occupied before the war? I call on my friend here and stop in his house; suppose I should visit him twenty years from now and stop in his house, would it follow that I would stop in the same house? As Mr. Nichols truly says the "house of God" over which Jesus rules as a son is the "church of God," God's people. And the Scriptures say, "I will call them my people, which were not my people: and her beloved, which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there shall they be called the children of the living God." (Rom. ix: 25, 26.) God's people are changed, you see, since the days of Moses. But his people are Christ's church. When was Christ's church built? in the days of Moses? Listen! Jesus says, speaking of the confession that Peter had just made, "Upon this rock I will build my church," (see Matt xvi: 18). So it seems that Christ is a son in a new house, which he built himself. "The church in the wilderness" was, so to speak, the *ante-bellum* log cabin that was burned down during the war; the church of Christ is the palatial mansion that has been built

upon its ruins; Moses was a faithful servant in the one; Christ, the Son, is Lord over the other.

But Mr. Nichols claims that when Jesus said he would build his church upon that rock, he simply meant that he would rebuild the old institution that had fallen down. Well, suppose we grant that, for the sake of argument, and see how much good it will do him. Suppose a man's house were to fall down: he clears away the rubbish, and lays a new foundation, partly at least of new material; he builds upon it, using material new and old, but rejecting most of the old because it is not good; he employs a different set of builders in putting up the house; he makes it almost infinitely larger than it was before; would that new house be simply the old house rebuilt? Would it be the same house? Could you conclude that what was proper to go into the old house was fit to be built into the new? Would it do to say that every thing that was part of the old house must be built back into the new? Would it certainly follow that you would go through the same doors in going into the new that you did in going into the old? To ask these questions is to answer them.

No, no, my friends; the church of Christ and the Jewish institution are very different affairs; they were built upon different foundations, out of different material, by different builders, at different times. Infants came into the one by the natural birth, but no one could enter the other unless he were born again. When one of the purest, noblest and best members of the Jewish community, Nicodemus, a man whom Jesus himself called "a master of Israel," came to our Lord, it was said unto him, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." And the Master added, "Ye must be born again." (See John iii: 5-7.) Here was a

mighty leader in the Jewish church who could not get into the church of Christ without another birth, and yet Mr. Nichols would have us believe that the two institutions are one. He reminds me of the man who lost the blade of his knife and replaced it with a new one; then he lost the handle and had to get a new one; finally the rivets were worn out and replaced by others; but the man insisted that the knife was just the same that he had bought in the first place—the same old knife.

Not only was Nicodemus yet out of the kingdom, but so also were the disciples during the life-time of Jesus on earth, for he said unto them, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. xviii: 3.) To these same disciples on another occasion he said, "But rather seek ye the kingdom of God; and all these things shall be added unto you. Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." (Luke xii: 31, 32.) Joseph of Arimathea the Scriptures say was "a good man and just," he is also called "a disciple of Jesus" (John xix: 38), and it was he who buried Jesus. Nevertheless at the very time of his burying Jesus he still waited for the kingdom of God." Luke xxiii: 50, 51. If the kingdom was established on earth he did not know it. If the best and mightiest of the Jewish rulers were not in the kingdom, and if the disciples of our Lord were not, it is certain it had not yet come. Indeed he taught them to pray, "Thy kingdom come," Matt. vi: 10; and when he sent them out to preach, he told them to say, "The kingdom of heaven is at hand," Matt. x: 7; "The kingdom of God is come nigh unto you," Luke x: 9; and so on. Oh, it had been on earth ever since the days of Abraham, says Mr. Nichols: Well, that shows how much he knows about it.

"The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it" Luke xvi: 16. Which shows that the kingdom was not preached till John's time, and that men did not begin to press into it till then; hence the kingdom of heaven is a different thing from the Jewish church.

The temple of Solomon was a type of the spiritual temple, the church of God. In building the temple of Solomon, one hundred and fifty thousand workman were engaged, and they were seven years in the work. Every stone was prepared at the quarry; so that when they began to put up the building, the sound of a hammer was not heard. During all these years of course they talked about the temple, about going to see it, about the stones being fitted into it and so on. And thus men were pressing into the kingdom of God during the time of John and of Jesus: they were being prepared for it. Did ever a young married couple build them a house that they did not talk about "our house" from the time they began it till it was finished?

Mr. Nichols dwells at length on the allegory of the olive tree, (Rom. xi: 16-24). Christ is the root of the tree, (see Isa. xi: 10; Rom. xv: 12); the Jews, Christ's brethren according to the flesh are the natural branches; the Gentiles, the wild tree; the Jews were broken off "because of unbelief;" the Gentiles stand in the tree "by faith;" the Jews will be grafted back if they continue not "in unbelief." So you see, my friends, it is all a matter of faith. No babies here. Paul says to the Galatians, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." This shows how people are grafted into Christ, it is by faith—by faith perfected, and not faith only.

How did it happen that there was not a baby in all the

churches of Galatia? Paul says they were *all* children of God *by faith*.

Abraham had two seeds: one by natural birth through Isaac, Jacob, and so on; the other through his great Son Jesus Christ by the new birth. The new birth involves faith, and hence is not for infants. All Christians are children of Abraham in this spiritual family. Was not Jesus born a king? asks Mr. Nichols. Yes, and so was Solomon. But neither of them ruled in the kingdom, or were crowned upon the throne, for many years after their birth. True enough Jesus was to sit upon David's throne, but it is also true that David never sat upon a throne in heaven, nor did Jesus ever sit upon one on earth. But what has all this to do with infant baptism? Infants were not baptized in the days of Abraham, nor in the days of David, nor in the days of Jesus, nor in the days of the Apostles. Why don't the gentleman talk about infant baptism?

[*Time expired.*]

THIRD PROPOSITION.

INFANT BAPTISM.

J. H. NICHOLS' SECOND SPEECH.

Brethren and Sisters:

Bro. Harding's speech was like the snake that made the track, you couldn't tell whether he was going North or coming back; so I will take up the subject where I left off in my first speech, and attend to what little he did say after I get through with my speech. I do this because I have made it a rule of my life when I had important matters en hand, to attend to them before giving attention to *small matters*; so I will now take up the Church under the name of the Twelve Tribes. On his death-bed Jacob called his sons around him and blessed them, and it is said, "All these are the twelve tribes of Israel." (Gen. xlix: 28.) According to the best chronology we have, that was 1689 years before Christ. One hundred and ninety-eight years later, when Moses had set before the people "all the judgments," with the moral law of ten commandments, and the people answered with one voice, "All the words which the Lord hath said will we do;" then Moses "builded an altar under the hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of Israel." (Ex. xxiv: 3,4.) This altar denoted God's presence as a party in this covenant; and the twelve pillars, the twelve tribes of Israel, as the other party. Later still, when the breast plate of judgment, which was to be worn by the high

priest, was made, there were twelve stones set in it, and the names of the twelve tribes were engraven in those stones. (Ex. xxviii: 17-21.) Still later, when Israel crossed the Jordan, God commanded them to bring up twelve stones out of Jordan, each stone representing a tribe, and Joshua pitched them "in Gilgal." (Joshua iv: 20.) Now it is significant that when Jesus came into the world, he chose twelve apostles and appointed them to "Sit upon twelve throne, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Matt. xix: 28.) I will ask Bro. Harding to please tell us who he appointed to sit upon the throne of that new church he talks about, and judge it? Again we notice that Jesus appointed unto his apostles the kingdom of the twelve tribes, and put his table—the Lord's supper—in that kingdom; "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, (the twelve tribes) as my Father hath appointed unto me; that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." (Luke xxii: 29-30.) Now if Jesus ever authorized any one to eat at his table (take the Lord's supper) any where else than in the twelve tribes, I hope Bro. H. will not forget to tell us about it, and be sure to give us chapter and verse. Please tell us where your new church got its table, as you disclaim any connection with the twelve tribes. About twenty-nine years after the day of Pentecost, Paul says, speaking of the promise of God which was "made of God unto our father's: Unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come. For which hope's sake King Agrippa, I am accused of the Jews." (Acts xxvi: 6, 7.) Here we see the twelve tribes still hoping to come to the promise of eternal life through Jesus, and Paul claimed no other hope than that of the twelve tribes—he did not seem to have heard of the new church. Bro. H. please tell us why Paul did not have the

hope of the new church—why he identified himself with the twelve tribes, and not with that new church—don't forget it. James wrote his Epistle about twenty-seven years after, Pentecost, and how easily he could have settled this question if he had just addressed it to the *new church*, but instead of that he wrote, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to *the twelve tribes* which are scattered abroad, greeting." (Jas. i: 1.) What a pity James did not recognize the *new church* in his Epistle. It would have saved so much discussion, and hard feelings, for these new church folks generally do not have any very great love for a man who gets straight after their new church fallacy. Will Bro. H. tell us who ever addressed an Epistle to the *new church*? We found the names of the twelve tribes written on the twelve stones in the "breast plate of judgment;" now let us read about the "great city, the Holy Jerusalem"—it "had twelve gates, and at the gates twelve angels, and names written thereon, which are the names of the *twelve tribes of the children of Israel*" (Rev. xxi: 12.) In the twelve foundations of the holy city are written "the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb," (v. 14). They are the rulers of the twelve tribes. But where is the name of the new church written? Bro. H. please tell us, when we enter the city we behold the tree of life which "bears twelve manner of fruits," one for each tribe, but where is anything for the new church? But in his desperate strait just here, our brother turns, for a little consolation, to Rev. vii: 9, where it is said, "A great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, * * * stood before the throne," and he tries to find the new church in the great multitude. Well, if we read the third verse we will see that all that is said in the ninth, and succeeding verses, took place *on earth*, where the winds were to be controlled for a time by four angels,

who stood on the "*four corners of the earth*" that the winds should "*not hurt the earth, the sea, nor the trees*" (v. 1.) "*till the servants of God were sealed*" Was all this to take place in heaven? Are not the servants of God sealed till they get to heaven? Is there an earth in heaven? Will there be fearful storms in heaven, to hurt those who are not sealed with God's seal? Will there be persons in heaven who are not "sealed in their foreheads?" Think of those who have the seal of the living God, and those who have it not, being mixed together in heaven, and the angels making arrangements to punish the unsealed with destructive storms by sea and land! "Now he which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath *anointed* us, is God; who hath also *sealed us*, and given the *earnest of the Spirit in our hearts*" (2 Cor. i: 21, 22.) So we see this sealing is done on earth, and not in heaven. Now almost anybody but a Campbellite, would understand this great multitude that came from all quarters of the earth, to be the Gentile nations that are converted to Christianity, an "*grafted into the good olive tree*," (Jewish church Rom. xi: 17-24.) If that good olive tree was ever *cut down*, and a new olive tree planted in its stead, I would thank Bro. H. to tell us *who cut it down*, and *who planted the new one*, and be sure to give us chapter and verse. Again, if olive tree in the eleventh chapter of Romans does not stand for, or represent the visible church of God, and if the natural branches do not represent the Jews, and the wild olive tree, all Gentile nations, we will get Bro. H. to please tell us what these things do represent, and don't forget chapter and verse. Now we have established the fact. (1) That God has no covenant with the *new church*. (2.) No king on its throne. (3.) No apostles to rule it. (4.) No Lord's table in it. (5.) No Epistle written to it. (6.) Its name

written nowhere about the gates of heaven. (7.) No fruit for it in heaven.

Our Geographies inform us that the Mississippi river has its source in lake Itasca in Minnesota, As it flows towards the great ocean, other waters are added, and it continues to grow larger and larger, until the great Missouri river pours its mighty waters into it a few miles above St. Louis. This more than doubles the waters of the Mississippi. So the church of God has its source away back in Abel for he obtained witness of God "that he was righteous." (Heb. xi: 4.) As the ages rolled on towards the great ocean of eternity, one prophet after another arose and poured one ray of light after another into the church of the living God, until the great day of Pentecost, when a mighty stream of light was poured into the church, doubling its capacity for saving the world. Now I would as soon undertake to prove by Geography that when the Missouri river empties its waters into the Mississippi, the Mississippi is *then and there made a new river*, that it *never existed before the Missouri poured its waters into it*. I say, I would as soon undertake to prove this by Geography, as to undertake to prove by the Bible that the church was *set up, organized*, on the day of Pentecost, and that it never existed before. One of these propositions can be as easily sustained as the other, and if the truth of the Campbellite theory depended on proving that the Mississippi never existed until the Missouri flowed into it, as certainly as it depends on proving that the church of Christ never existed till the day of Pentecost, I should expect to see Bro. H. set about getting up the proof that the Mississippi river *never existed* till it formed a junction with the Missouri, and he would succeed just as well as he will in proving that a new church was established on the day of Pentecost. Now I will notice so much of Bro. H.'s

speech as has a bearing on the subject, but a little poetry first,

"Timothy Hill built him a mill,
On Pinchback sandy plain;
There was no water in a mile and a quarter
'Cept when there came a big rain."

As to what he says about the moderators bringing me to order, you all know that two of them are of his way of thinking on the mode of baptism, and infant baptism, and the audience has noticed how freely they sneeze when Bro. H. snuffs (Order.) Of course, *order*; well I say again Bro. H. has my permission to bring *any Scripture, at any time*, into his speeches, and I will not call him to order—I am not here to establish a doctrine that will not stand a Bible test. I don't wonder that Bro. H. cries, "order, order," when I am quoting Scripture—he seems to know that his theory can't stand the Scripture test. Now to answer all he says about no Bible authority for baptizing infants, I read Matt. xxviii: 19. "Go ye therefore, and teach *all nations*, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Now this is the only commission given by Christ to baptize anybody, and there is just as much said here about baptizing infants as there is about baptizing men and women. Nations are composed of men, women and children; and it suits Bro. H.'s theory to leave out one of the component parts, and so he just leaves the babes out. But he says there are "*attendant circumstances*" in connection with all cases of baptism, that exclude children; so you see he gets children out by "*circumstances*." But I will notice his "circumstances." Jesus says, "Teaching them to observe all things" etc. (Matt. xxviii: 20.) And that leaves babes out. Well, you say to your servant, "Go ye, put my flock in the fold, feeding them." You mean your

sheep, and Jesus takes a flock of sheep in the tenth chapter of John to represent his church. The servant puts the old sheep in the fold, and leaves the lambs out. You ask the reason. He says, you connected "*circumstances*" with your command that excluded the lambs—you said, "feeding them," and the lambs can't eat, and therefore I left them out" Now all can see plainly that the servant disobeyed your command—better have left the old sheep out than the lambs—yes, Jesus says *baptize nations*, Campbellism says, "No! No!! that's Methodism! you must leave out all the babes, or you commit sin." As the apostles had known nothing but infant membership in the Jewish church all of their lives, it is a great wonder that Jesus did not say "leave the babies out." "But John baptized with the baptism of repentance, and for the remission of sins, and infants have no sin, and cannot repent," you say. Well, that disqualifies Christ for baptism just the same that it does babes, and yet you put great stress on His baptism. (2.) "Jesus made disciples, or *learners* of those whom he baptized," and this leaves children out. Well, if children are not *learners*, what are they? *The very greatest learners on earth.* (3.) But Jesus commanded his apostles to "teach all nations, baptizing them," and that leaves infants out, you say. The very same thing would leave Jesus out again, for John could not teach him. (4) "Any infants there on the day of Pentecost?" you ask. Why did you not quote the very next verse after the one in which baptism is mentioned at Pentecost? Let me read it. "For the promise is unto you, and to *your children*, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." (Acts ii: 39.) But Bro. H. says, "no children at Pentecost." I reckon he will show us, by some of his rules, that the promise is to our children after they grow to be big boys

and girls. He may say, "yes, as many as the Lord shall *call*—and he has not called babies." What? "Suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." (Mark x: 14.) Luke says they were "infants." (Luke xviii: 15.) Is this not a *call* for children? Why say, immediately after mentioning baptism at Pentecost, *For* the promise is unto you *and to your children*" if children were not included in the ordinance and benefits of the covenant? But he refers to Mark xvi: 16-17. No water here, and if there¹ was his argument would cut Christ off from baptism again, and damn all infants, for Christ had no faith, and infants have none, (so he says) and "He that believeth *not shall be damned*" So if this text has any reference to water baptism, and infants are not proper subjects for baptism because they cannot believe, they must be damned also because they cannot believe. Next, he says concerning the household baptism, "there was not an infant in the household," this he proves to his satisfaction by *circumstances*. Well, I reckon Bro. H. is the only man on earth who *knows* that neither one of the five households that were baptized had an infant in it. He makes this *broad assertion*, and I just own up; that is an argument I cannot answer. Next he makes a great ado about a *visible* kingdom and an *invisible* kingdom, and just before he closed his speech he said, "All Christians are children of Abraham in the *spiritual family*." I wonder if the *spiritual part* is visible or *invisible*? "The kingdom of God *cometh not with observation* * * * * for, behold, *the kingdom of God is within you*." (Luke xvii: 20, 21.) Does that seem to be a *visible kingdom*? "*Is within you*." Does that sound like something that had not yet come? Does Bro. H. pray "thy kingdom come," or does he change the Lord's prayer to suit his theory, and say, "Thy kingdom

having come," as some of his brethren do? All sinners are out of God's kingdom—to them it has not come—it is not *within them*. "Though our *outward* man perish, yet the *inward* man is renewed day by day." (2 Cor. iv: 16.) Water baptism is administered to the *outward* man, is *visible*, and takes a man into a *visible* kingdom—all of which Bro. H. admits, but does the Spirit of God do anything for the *inward man*? Is there any connection of the *inward man* to Christ *by the spirit*? If so, is it *visible*? He then says children do not need baptism *because they have never sinned*. Here he disqualifies Christ again. Notice. (1.) No one is entitled to baptism who has not sinned. (2.) No one can obey God in baptism before they sin, hence sin is *necessary* to the obedience of God's command. (3.) No one can be saved who does not obey God in baptism, hence sin is essential to salvation. How do you like that for Campbellism? He tells us the apostles were not Methodist preachers when they objected to the little children being brought to Jesus; then he tells us before he closed, that they were not in the kingdom of God while Christ was on earth—not even converted. Well, let us admit that, for the arguments sake, and I do not wonder that they were not Methodist preachers, and objected to infant baptism "Out of the kingdom," and "unconverted," they were good Campbellite preachers then, if Bro. H. has showed them up right; but when they got converted they cried out like Holy Ghost Methodist preachers, "For the promise is unto you and to your children," and we have no more objection from them in regard to infant baptism. While the apostles were Campbellites, and opposing those who brought their children to Jesus, He was "*much displeased*" (Mark x: 14.) with their conduct, and I have no doubt that Jesus is highly displeased with the rantings of Campbellite preachers against those who bring their babes to Jesus now.

Next he admits that the Abrahamic covenant still exists, but says it is only binding on Abraham's "descendants according to the flesh," that they should be circumcised yet. Well, well; will Bro. H. tell us how he knows, or how anybody knows, just who are the descendants of Abraham according to the flesh? Can he tell us, (and be very certain about it) that he is not one of Abraham's children after the flesh? Are you *sure* that you will be safe without circumcision? God has *two laws* in full force now. *Circumcision* and *baptism*, two ways of saving folks, and it depends on *who a man's father is* as to which will save him, *circumcision* or *baptism*. Who told you that all of the 3,000 who were baptized at Pentecost had been circumcised? You found that out by one of your strange rules, I reckon. But you admit that God made no separate covenant with the Gentiles, then you cut them off from the Abrahamic covenant. *Poor Gentiles!* Bro. H. leaves you out entirely. What "confusion confounded" you do get into when you try so hard to leave little babies out of covenant relation with God. All of the testimony we have in God's word on this point is, "There is no difference between the Jew and the Greek." (Rom. x: 12.) But Bro. H. has found great difference—the Jew under the law of circumcision—the Greek under baptism. But let me try the logic by which he proves that there were no infants in the five household baptisms mentioned in Acts, and see what strange things can be proven by *his hind* of logic.

(1.) Large amounts of bacon, beans and cabbage are eaten in American households. (2.) Very young infants cannot eat bacon, beans and cabbage. (3.) Therefore there can be no very young infants in American households! Again. (1.) Large sums of money are made by hard manual labor in American households. (2.) Infants cannot do

hard manual labor. (3.) Therefore there are *certainly* no infants in American households. That is logic with a vim, is it not? But let me prove, by *his kind of logic*, that every Jew who circumcised his child committed sin. (1.) "Every man that is circumcised * * is a debtor to do the whole law." (Gal. v: 3.) (2.) An infant of eight days knows nothing about law. (3.) Therefore infants of eight days are not proper subjects for circumcision—hence those who circumcised them sinned—but God commanded it to be done—hence it is sinful to obey the command of God, according to Bro. H.'s logic. Truly he is a "*smashing*" logician. He can smash common sense and the word of God alike with *his kind of logic*. His knife illustration comes next. I did not know before that God was in the habit of losing things. The book says, that God would "raise up the tabernacle of David *that is fallen*, and close up the breaches thereof; and I will raise up his ruins, and I will build it *as in the days of old*." (Amos ix: 11.) Now if a man builds his house *that had fallen down*, and builds it *as in the days of old*, like it was before it fell, and then says he has *a new house*, he simply tells a "*whack*," as the girls say. But Bro. H. admits that the "Jews * * * are the natural branches" of the good olive tree mentioned in Rom. xi chapter. That the Gentiles were "the wild tree." But he does not tell us who cut that good olive tree down (Jewish church,) or how breaking off some of the *natural branches* (Jews,) and *grafting in the Gentiles, made the whole tree new, root and all!* What a pity he did not tell us all about this. His argument reminds me of the description a negro gave of an eloquent sermon preached by another negro. He said, "I tell ye sir, he jes pile himself on himself." Surely Bro. H. has "piled himself on himself" all through his speech. He makes "sad havoc" of Scripture logic, and common sense,

all to get up a strong indictment against Methodists, because they believe that God loves their babes just as well as he loves the babes of the Jews, and because God put babes into the covenant made with Abraham, (and Bro. H. admits that no separate covenant was ever made with Gentiles and he has failed to find where God commanded anyone to leave them out,) and we put them into covenant relation with God now, as the Jews did. But why did not Bro. H. show us where God made a covenant in which children were not included? He admits they were included in the Abrahamic covenant. If he claims a new covenant at Pentecost, it is said there, "The promise is unto you *and to your children*" (Acts ii: 39.) If he refers to the "new covenant" mentioned in Heb. viii: 8, it was made "*with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah*" the same house which he "*led out of Egypt.*" (Heb. viii: 8, 9.) Were there no children in that house? Any intimation here that God "*burned down* the old log hut" about which Bro. H. had so much to say, and built a palace? "All kinds of turning and twisting done here" by Bro. H. to get the babes out. Now let him show *one single covenant* God ever made with his people in which children were not included. In regard to Jesus sitting on the throne of David, he says, "David never sat upon a throne in heaven, nor did Jesus ever sit upon one on earth." So we see, all that God says about Jesus sitting on the throne of David is *simply false*, according to Bro. H.'s statement. Well, that is rather bold, even for a Campbellite preacher. In Eph. iii: 15, Paul speaks of the church as "the whole family in heaven and earth." For thousands of years before Pentecost this family had little babes in it, put there by God's command. In heaven Bro. H. will admit that the family has babes in it. Who has the right to leave them out between Pentecost and the day

of judgment, and by what authority? No one but immersionists, and by the authority of * * *necessary inference*." "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old, he will not depart from it." I would have mine go in the church of God, so I obey God's word, *put them in*, and *train them up in the church*. Take the olive tree which Paul uses to illustrate God's church in Rom. xi, and it has very young tender branches as well as old branches on it. By this illustration, children should be in the church. Take the *sheep* and *fold* used by Jesus to represent his church in John x: 10-17, and by this illustration babes should be in the church—for the lambs are always put into the fold with the old sheep. Take all the covenants made by God, and children are included *in every one*, so there is but one way left for Campbellites to get babes out, and Bro. H. understands the rule—"Necessary inference I" Take the departure of Israel from Egypt, which all admit is a type of the church of God—and by it children must come in. Pharaoh tried to make a compromise with Israel about the children—he said to Moses, "Who are they that shall go? And Moses said, we will go *with our young* and with our old, with our sons *and with our daughters*." (Ex. x: 8, 9.) Pharaoh said, "Look to it; for evil is before you. Not so; go now ye that are men, and serve the Lord." (Ex. x: 10, 11.) Strange that our Campbellite friends have taken Pharaoh's side of this question. They say, "look to it, there is evil before you if you take the babes with you into the church of God." The devil was represented in the case of Israel in Egypt by Pharaoh, and though Pharaoh failed to get a compromise with Israel, and keep the babes in Egypt, the devil was not wholly defeated; so he worked diligently. and has struck a compromise with Bro. H. and his brethren in which compromise Campbellism agrees to leave their babes

in the devil's kingdom, and cry out against all who will take their babes into covenant relation with God. I want you to understand that I am on Moses' side of this question, and will take all my babes with me into God's kingdom. Just think of an Israelitish mother raying to her darling babes: "Farewell, my little darling, I would like to carry you with me, but our departure from Egypt is a type of God's church and you do not know anything about church, or *faith*, or *repentance*, or *confession*, or *baptism*, and of course you are not a fit subject to go—farewell my sweet little babe, mamma hopes when you get large enough to understand these things you will come to Canaan—farewell"—so printing her last kiss on the sweet little lips, she lays it down on the cold soil of Egypt, and turns away with tearful eyes 'and a heavy heart, to serve God! O. my sisters, could you ever forgive such a mother⁹ Would you not have an utter contempt for even her memory? Then will you come into the church of God and leave your sweet babes out? O, no! I trust you will not. Israel did not leave *one babe in Egypt*—there were "about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, *beside children*" (Ex. xii: 37.) And "all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." This is the first infant baptism of which we have any account. Here are three *all's*—" *All under the cloud.*" Does this all include the babes? Were they under the cloud? All answer yes. (2.) "*All passed through the sea.*" Does this *all* include the babes? Most people say yes, but Bro. H. says the babes did not pass through the sea in any proper sense of the word *pass*. Well, that is too foolish to talk about, but I must obey that passage which says, "Answer a fool according to his folly." I hold a stone in my hand, I throw it, and it goes out on the street, and a light is miss-

ing out of that window. Some one says, "Bro. Fry, how came that light broken out of the window?" Bro. F. says, "Bro. Nichols threw a stone and it passed through the window and broke the light." The reply came—"you goose; a stone knows nothing about the word pass, and it could not pass through a window in any proper sense." How foolish! The second all then includes the babes. (3.) "And were *all baptized.*" Does this third *all* include the babes? "No! no!! no!!!" answers Bro. II. Are not the babes that crossed the Red sea as much our father's as the men are who crossed? "O, yes; but if the babes were baptized that would prove sheep, goat and cattle baptism, because they parsed across the sea as well as the infants." Well, it may prove sheep, goat and cattle baptism to you, but it does not to me; for Paul says, "*All our FATHER'S were baptized*" and as I claim to have descended from the *human beings* and not from the sheep, goats, and cattle that crowed that sea, it proves to me that all the *human beings* that passed over were baptized. "*All our fathers.*" Now if sheep, goats, and cattle are *your fathers*, it is not surprising that it proves sheep, goat and cattle baptism to you. Only one thing forces me to believe that you Campbellites are sincere when you speak of brute baptism, and that is, you are about as likely to take your pigs, and calves into God's covenant by baptism, as you are your babes. Thank God, I have fenced all of my children in, and hedged them about with God's ordinance, and covenants—thank God, it is our privilege to go to heaven, and take our children with us. How pleasant to have all our children in the church of God with us. May they be in glory with us by-and-by.

[Time expired.]

THIRD PROPOSITION.

MR. HARDING'S SECOND REPLY.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

My opponent is very much out of humor this afternoon; and no wonder, for it is calculated to make a man feel uncomfortable to have to defend a practice about which the New Testament is as silent as the grave. Pie snarls at the presiding moderator, and in his usual courteous (?) and gentlemanly (?) style intimates that he is unfair and dishonorable. He calls me "brother" repeatedly, and then calls me a "fool," apparently forgetful of the fact that Jesus has said, whosoever shall say to his brother, "Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell-fire," (Matt. v: 22.) He reminds you of the fact that the presiding moderator being a Baptist, agrees with me on two of the propositions: but he fails to tell you that when the point of order was made against him, we were discussing the design of baptism; and on that, you know, the Methodists and Baptists agree. Some time ago a large, good-humored, pleasant-faced Newfoundland dog was passing leisurely down the street, when suddenly a vicious, miserable looking little cur ran out of an alley and began to bark most furiously at him; the large dog turned his face serenely towards the ugly little brute, but without showing the slightest symptoms of anger or fear, and without in the least changing his gait, moved gently on his way. Every action of the Newfoundland seemed to say, "Such a

beast as you are, cannot stir me." Well, gentleman, there are some men who cannot insult me; and Mr. Nichols is one of them.

He has repeatedly referred to the fact that in arranging for this debate he insisted that we should confine ourselves to King James' version; while Bro. Fry was anxious that we should have liberty to use other books. A word of explanation about that: Mr. Nichols wrote a pamphlet some time ago consisting of a dialogue, which he claims that he heard, between a Methodist and a "Campbellite;" he claimed to give the dialogue *just as it was spoken*; in this dialogue the "Campbellite" is represented as giving up his positions, and as deciding in favor of infant baptism; he avows his purpose to have his infants baptized. Of course our brethren did not believe that any such conversation had ever occurred; but when they asked Mr. Nichols about it, he declared that it was so, that just such a conversation had occurred. And upon being asked for the name of him whom he represented as the "Campbellite" of the conversation, he said J. M. Kidwill was the man. Bro. Kidwill is one of the most logical and powerful of our preachers in Tennessee, and all who knew him, knew well that no such conversation had ever taken place. He was written to about the matter and he came at once. He denied in the most positive way that he had ever had any such conversation with Mr. Nichols, or any other man, and he branded the whole thing as slanderous. Why, my friends, anybody ought to know that a man could not report from memory a conversation, that would make a book of thirty-two pages, *just as it occurred!* Bro. Fry insisted that we should have the right to introduce any book into this debate, because he wanted this, and other writings of Mr. Nichols', properly exposed. And we believe that Mr. Nichols dreaded the exposure of this

book, and therefore insisted so tenaciously that we should use the common version alone. Doubtless he had other reasons, as he cut off the revised version and the Bible in the Hebrew and Greek, but no doubt this was a principal one. When Bro. Fry wrote to me, I told him to agree at once to limit us to the common version. I need no better club than that furnish me to smash Methodism.

Now to the gentleman's argument: He thinks it would be terrible to leave the little lambs out in the cold, while the old sheep are taken into the fold. Well that would be bad; but suppose the little lambs are already in the fold, have been born in it, and have never yet gone out; and suppose the old sheep have strayed away, and are lost; wandering about on the cold, bleak mountains; would it not be proper for the Good Shepherd to hunt for the lost sheep and bring them back to the fold, where the little lambs are so warm and snug? Little infants are not out in the cold, they are not lost; and one" might as soon argue for the baptism of angels as of infants; the one class is just as innocent as the other. The prodigal son was born in his father's house; but when he grew up he wandered away from it; then he had to come back to enjoy its warmth and comfort and safety. So of every man that is born in this world; he is born safe; when he sins against God he wanders away, he is lost; then he "must be born again" to get back into a saved state; and baptism is a part of this new birth. Jesus says: "I am not come to call the righteous but sinners to repentance." (Matt. ix: 13.) Paedo-baptists do not give the Lord's supper to infants. Why not? Jesus says, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." (John vi: 53-56.) If, as Mr. Nichols argues, the Jewish institution is simply continued, and circumcision has been changed into baptism, and the pass-over into the Lord's supper; if he baptizes the children because the Jews circumcised them, why not give them the Lord's supper? Jewish children ate of the passover. If he argues that no one should partake of the supper till he can understand the nature of it, will not the same doctrine hold good with regard to baptism? Let the gentleman answer if he can.

Nearly one-fourth of his speech was taken up in the effort to show that the twelve tribes constitute the church. He talked about the twelve tribes, twelve pillars, twelve stones, twelve thrones, twelve apostles, and so on. But he did not tell you anything about the thirteenth apostle, though he surely knows that Paul was the thirteenth. He tells you just what it suits him to tell. However he stumbled upon a passage that upsets every point he tried to make in the twelve tribe argument. In giving an account of the sealing of God's people, (Rev. vii: 1-17,) John saw one hundred and forty and four thousand sealed out of twelve tribes, twelve thousand out of each tribe; and then he says, "After this I beheld, and lo, a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands; and cried with a loud voice saying, Salvation to our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb." (Rev. vii: 9, 10.) When John was asked who these were, by the elder from before the throne of God, he replied, "Sir, thou knowest." Then the elder said, "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood

of the Lamb." So the redeemed consisted of one hundred and forty-four thousand from the twelve tribes, and a vast innumerable multitude from all other nations, kindreds, people, and tongues. Hence the twelve tribes do not constitute the church, and Mr. Nichols' argument falls to the ground. A few out of those tribes, and countless millions from other nations, make it up. In talking about Jews and Gentiles, Paul says, "He (Christ) is our peace, who hath made both one, and hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us having abolished in his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; for to make in himself of twain, one new man, so making peace." (Eph. ii: 14,15.) Here the apostle uses a figure common to him, in which the church is compared to a body, a man; of this body Christ is the head, and every Christian is a member. A few Jews and many Gentiles constitute the body, and Paul calls it "one new man;" of the twain, Jew and Gentile, Christ makes "one new man." That "new man" is the new church that Mr. Nichols wants me to give chapter and verse for. It is the same church that Christ was talking about when he said, "On this rock I will build my church." (Matt. xvi: 18.) When Paul wrote to the Ephesians it had been built. But Mr. Nichols insists that this sealing of these vast multitudes took place on earth. Well, what of it? Are not God's people on earth, before they enter the city of God? Is not his church on earth? Does not baptism take place on earth? Were not those from the twelve tribes also sealed on earth? But the capital point is this: This vast multitude comprised the great body of God's people. The one hundred and forty-four thousand Hebrews was an insignificant number compared to the innumerable hosts of whom the elder said,

"These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." I suppose it is hardly necessary to remind you that the blood washed through constitute the church of Christ. As I have shown you, the Jews (as Nicodemus, the disciples, and all others), and the Gentiles alike had to be born again to enter into this church. "Ye must be born again" was spoken of all who have sinned, both Jew and Gentile. And we know that all men sin when they arrive at the age of accountability. The prodigal must come back to God, "must be born again." Those who have never wandered away, who have never sinned, do not need to be *saved*, they are *safe*; they are as the angels, and hence do not need to be redeemed. The word "redeem" means to ransom, to recover, to save. Are infants sinners? Do you baptize them to save them? If they die before they are "born again" will they go to perdition? Suppose one of them dies in the moment of birth, will he be lost? or, is a child "born again" before he is born the first time, the second birth before the first? What nonsense this miserable tradition of men leads its advocates into! When you remember that God has said, "Behold, all souls are mine; as the soul of the father, so also the soul of the son is mine: the soul that sinneth it shall die," (Ezek. xviii: 4), the matter becomes plain. All souls are alive unto God, are safe, till they sin. Then they need the church with its ordinances and appointments: they must be born again.

Before I forget it, there is one fact that I want to call your attention to. Mr. Nichols has repeatedly intimated that the covenant which was made with Abraham and confirmed in Christ was the covenant of circumcision. This is a mistake that no Bible reader is excusable for making, A single glance at the chronology of our common version will

set him straight on that matter. Paul says the covenant confirmed in Christ was made four hundred and thirty (430) years before the giving of the law. The law was given B. C. 1491; four hundred and thirty years before that will take you back to Genesis 12th chapter, and to the covenant there made with Abraham, when he was seventy-five years old; that is, to B. C. 1921. The covenant of circumcision was made with him about twenty-four years later, when he was ninety-nine years old (see Gen. xvii), that is, about four hundred and seven or eight years before the giving of the law. Never forget that Abraham is the father of two seeds: a spiritual family, through Jesus Christ, by the new birth; as well as a family by the natural birth. Of this spiritual family it is said, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. *And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.* (Gal. iii: 26-29.) Into this spiritual family, you see, my friends, we come by faith—by faith perfected. It is all a matter of faith, and hence infants do not belong to it. Abraham is the father of the faithful. Hence, in verse 7, it is said: "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." Are infants "of faith?" Can they wash their robes in the blood of the Lamb? Have they "come up out of great tribulation?" To ask these questions is to answer them. No wonder that neither Christ nor any of the apostles ever baptized an infant?

Mr. Nichols goes back to the olive tree, (Rom. xi: 16-24), which he calls the "Jewish church." Let us follow him and study the case a little. In the allegory of this olive tree

its root and branches are spoken of. The root is called "holy," and is represented as "bearing" the branches. Some branches were broken off because of "unbelief;" and others are represented as standing "by faith." Of those broken off it is said (verse 23), "And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be graffed in: for God is able to graff them in again." Here again we find it all a matter of faith. Of this tree, Christ is the root; for Isaiah says (chap, xi: 10,) "And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people: to it shall the Gentiles seek: and his rest shall be glorious." Paul quotes this and applies it to Christ thus: "And again, Esaias saith, There shall be a root of Jesse, and he shall rise to reign over the Gentiles: in him shall the Gentiles trust. (Rom. xv: 12.) If the olive tree were the Jewish church, Abraham would be the root. But long after Abraham was dead, long after the Jewish church began, Isaiah, a notable prophet of that church, prophesied, "In that day there *shall be* a root of Jesse:" Christ had not yet come to the earth to be the "root" of the olive tree; or, to change the figure, the "rock" on which his church should be built. The Jews who had for nearly two thousand years been cultivated by God, and of whom Christ came, were the natural branches; the Gentiles who had not thus been cultivated, and who were not thus related to Christ, were the wild olive tree. Were these Jews children of God, in his church, growing out of the root when Christ came? Mr. Nichols claims they were; and if they were not his whole argument falls to the ground. Now I shall show yon they were not. I read (John i: 11-13.) "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood,

nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Here the fact it, set forth that Jesus came to his own kindred (not his own church), and as a rule they received him not: but there were exceptions to the rule; a few were true and humble; they did receive him; they believed on his name. Did these constitute his church? Were they children of God? No; for it is said, "To them *gave he power to become the sons of God.*" Now as the Jews that rejected Christ did not constitute his church, and as the Jews that received him were still out of it, and not yet children of God, where was his church? It was not yet built. It was long afterwards that he said, "On this rock I will build my church." We agree that the olive tree represents the church of Christ. And it is a fact that both Jew and Gentile get into it in the same way. Never forget the fact that *the Jews that received Christ, the truest, purest and best of them all, were not yet sons of God. He gave them power to become sons.* Now what becomes of Mr. Nichols' argument on continuation of the church from the days of Abraham? It is not worth the paper upon which our stenographer has taken it down. Yet upon it he has staked his cause: he has scarcely made an effort in any other direction. But what else could the poor man do? No wonder he "pitches into" the moderator, and calls me hard names!

But, like the widow Bedott, he occasionally "glides into poetry." That is he calls it "poetry;" he should have called it doggerel verse. Well, I am following him, and I suppose I must get down that low myself, though I don't altogether like to; and I apologize beforehand by saying when a man hunts low game, he must shoot low. Did you ever attend a Methodist camp meeting? Did you ever see the mourner's bench system in operation, and the people rolling in the straw? I guess you have, as such foolishness

is pretty common in this country. How would this do for Mr. Nichols to shout at a camp meeting:

Ho, every mother, son and wench,
Come, get religion at the mourner's bench.

[Laughter.]

Yea, white man, Indian, negro, squaw,
Come find pardon by rolling in the straw.

[Laughter.]

There now; that will do, I might give you more of that sort of stuff, but I suppose that is enough for one time.

Now let us notice Mr. Nichols' logic. It is like his "poetry" of the doggerel kind. He tries to ridicule my statement of facts showing that there are no infants in any of the households that were baptized in apostolic times thus: he says, "(1.) Large amounts of bacon, beans and cabbage are eaten in American households. (2.) Very young infants cannot eat bacon, beans and cabbage. (3.) Therefore there can be no very young infants in American households." So says Mr. Nichols; but that is not the way to put it. How will this do: (1.) Every member of Tom Jones' family eats bacon, beans and cabbage. (2.) A very young infant cannot eat bacon, beans and cabbage. (3.) Therefore there is not a very young infant in Tom Jones' family. That shows a case similar to the one I made out about the households. I took up separately each one of them mentioned in the New Testament, and showed that something was said about every member of it that could not be true of infants. Every member of the jailer's household "believed;" an infant cannot believe, therefore there was no infant there. Every member of Crisp us' household "believed." Lydia's household consisted of "women," who were also old enough to be "comforted." All the members of Cornelius' household "heard the word," and spake with

tongues and magnified God. And so on in every case, Mr. Nichols gives us another syllogism, which, upon being changed somewhat, reads thus: (1.) Large sums of money are made by every member of Tom Jones' family, by hard manual labor. (2.) Infants cannot do hard manual labor. (3.) Therefore there are no infants in Tom Jones' family. His logic suits me very well, *when it is changed a little bit*; and it does not fit the case till it is so changed.

The gentleman's Mississippi river illustration does not suit any better than does his logic. He illustrates the Jewish church by the Mississippi, and the Gentiles coming into it are the Missouri. That might do very well if the Jews were God's people now; but they are not, nor have they ever been since Christ came. A few of them, possibly one in a thousand, received Christ and entered his church. The great mass of them continue Jews to this day. In order to make the river illustration fit the case it should be about thus: Suppose president Cleveland should stand on the Mississippi at Memphis, and say, "I will make a new river." Suppose he were to dig a trench and draw from the great "Father of waters" about the one-thousandth part of its volume; then from the Tennessee he draws into his new river a large proportion of its waters; then into this new river he brings other tributary streams from the Tombigby, the Alabama, Chattahoochee, the Flint, the Altamaha, the Savannah, and from many other creeks and rivers; no one river enters into his new stream, but parts of many; this new river he calls "Cleveland;" and he so digs the bed for it as to empty it into the Atlantic. Would that new river be a continuation of the Mississippi?

Well that fairly sets forth what Christ did: he chose a few Jews, and then an innumerable multitude from the many Gentile nations, (all who received him in loving obe-

dience,) and of them built a new kingdom; to this new kingdom he gave a new law, called the New Testament, the like of which had never been known on earth before. At first this kingdom supplanted no nation, either Jewish or Gentile; it grew up in the midst of them all; but in the end it was designed to take the place of them all. Daniel the prophet, who was a member of the Jewish kingdom and who wrote about 600 years before Christ and about 1200 years after Abraham, looking forward to the time of the Roman Kings, and to the establishment of Christ's Kingdom, said: "And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." (Dan. ii: 44.) Mr. Nichols and I and all other protestants, so far as I know, agree that Daniel was here prophesying about Christ's church. This church was established in the days of the Roman Kings; and now, if you please, we will come down to that time, and examine the ceremony of initiation into it.

"Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world. Amen." (Matt. xxviii; 19, 20.) So spake Jesus, and so did his apostles. They taught the people about Jesus, that he was the Son of God. Those that received this teaching with loving hearts they baptized. And then they taught the converts to observe all that Jesus had commanded. The word "teach" occurs twice in this commission; there is a teaching that comes before baptism and a teaching that comes after; the first teaching is to convince people that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, the

Savior of sinners; the second is instruction in the Christian's life, that his people may do his will.

Notice how the apostles carried out this commission; there is no better way to discover its meaning: Ten days after Jesus gave it, the apostles did the first preaching under it; vast multitudes heard and believed indeed that Jesus was the Christ, the Saviour of sinners; Peter was as the chief speaker, and it is said, "*They that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.*" (Acts ii: 41.) Then it is said, "*they continued steadfastly in the apostles doctrine*" (teaching). So there was in this case teaching before baptism and teaching after it; and they only were baptized who gladly received the word. The next conversion under this commission is recorded in the next two chapters; it is summed up in these words: "*Howbeit many of them which heard the word believed; and the number of the men was about five thousand.*" (Acts iv: 4.) In the next chapter (Acts v: 14) it is said, "*And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.*" In the next chapter (Acts vi: 7) it is said, "*And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith.*" The seventh chapter is taken up with a speech; but in the eighth chapter, verse 12, we read, "*But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women.*" Here the great city of Samaria turned to the Lord; but only the men and women were baptized; why were not the infants baptized? Was there ever a better opportunity to start that ceremony? Here the inspired Philip was the preacher, the whole city was converted, and the men and women were baptized, but not

a single baby. Why not? When I asked Mr. Bridges that question, he said, "Because there were no infants there." Who ever heard of a great city without an infant in it! No, my friends, there is a better reason than that: Philip was preaching under a commission that required him to teach the people before baptizing them. Why, if I believed, as Mr. Nichols claims to do, that the commission requires us to baptize the nations, and then teach them, and if I thought that sprinkling is baptism, I would get a squirt-gun and sprinkle every soul that I meet. But in every case of baptism mentioned in the New Testament the parties baptized were first taught. Let any man name a case, and put me to the test. So far my opponent has failed to do it, as have all of his brethren that I have ever met in debate; and I have met not a few of them.

In (Acts ii: 39,) in speaking of the gift of the spirit, Peter says, "The promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call." And Mr. Nichols teaches that Jesus called infants when he said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me." He did not; that was no call to the infants; it was an order to the apostles to get out of the way. The infants "were brought" to Jesus; they were not able to walk. Nor did he baptize them, he prayed for them, and let them go. But in the second chapter of Acts the children that were called were able to come, for it is plainly said, "They that gladly received his word were baptized." Children might be "brought" for a blessing; but, when it came to the matter of baptism, they had to be old enough to come themselves.

My time has nearly expired, and there are still two or three other points that I want to notice. I must be brief. Were not the "fathers" all "baptized unto Moses in the

cloud and in the sea?" Did they not carry their children with them? Yes, but (1) that was not Christian baptism; that was about 1500 years before Christ gave the Great Commission, in which he intended his disciples to first teach and then baptize. Then (2) all that passed through the Sea were not baptized "unto Moses;" for to be baptized unto (or into) one implies the intelligent acceptance of him as a leader. As Mr. Nichols intimated, cats and dogs, horses and cows passed through the sea; but they were not baptized "unto Moses;" they could not intelligently receive him as their leader. For the same reason infants were not baptized unto him. If the fact that they carried their infants with them through the Sea is proof that infants should now be baptized, the same reason holds good for the dogs and cats, the pots and kettles. You can immerse or sprinkle an infant or a dog, but you can baptize neither; baptism requires intelligence; it is an act of faith.

The baptism of Jesus now demands a few words. I baptize people in order to the remission of sins; Mr. Nichols baptizes them as a sign of their having been cleansed; Jesus was baptized for neither reason: he had never been cleansed, and hence needed no sign of it; he had never sinned, and hence needed no remission. He was baptized to fulfill all righteousness (Matt. iii: 15,) and that he might be made manifest to Israel as the Son of God. (John i: 29-34.) When children are old enough to fulfill righteousness (that is, to do right, to obey God) they should follow Jesus by being baptized. If it is asked why Jesus did not submit to baptism before he was about thirty years of age, I reply, God did not send John to baptize till about that time. John did not know Jesus as the Son of God, but he did know him as his cousin, and as being a much better man than himself; therefore, at first, he declined to baptize him.

Why? Had he understood baptism to be the outward sign of an inward purification, he would have considered Jesus a capital subject; but as baptism is for remission, he thought that it would be better for Jesus to baptize him.

[Time expired.]

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

"CHRISTIAN BAPTISM IS IMMERSION; IN IT THERE MUST
BE A BURIAL IN WATER."

MR. HARDING'S FIRST ADDRESS.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

In discussing this question in your presence with Mr. Bridges several months ago, I was at liberty to appeal to the lexicons and to all other authorities in determining the meaning of the Greek word translated "baptize" in our common version. But at this time we are limited to King James' version. And I am glad that this is so, as I want you to see how strong and clear the argument is from our common English Bible. Those who make dictionaries go to the books of the language, read them, and then determine upon the meaning of each word by the way in which it is used by the best writers and speakers. And the dictionaries, after they are made, are revised and corrected by a further study of the books. It is *use*, therefore, that determines the meaning of a word.

Now we want to know the meaning of the word "baptize," and of its cognates, in the New Testament; we will therefore go to the book and notice carefully how it is used in the various passages in which it occurs. Let us try to put ourselves in the place of one who has no prejudice in the matter whatever, who has never studied the question, but who, knowing that some practice sprinkling for baptism, some

pouring, and others immersion, has come to the Bible to satisfy himself as to what is correct. He begins at the beginning of the New Testament and reads to the third chapter of Matthew before he finds the word. There he reads thus; "In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the wilderness of Judea. and saying, Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. * * * And the same John had his raiment of camel's hair, and a leathern girdle about his loins, and his meat was locusts and wild honey. Then went out to him Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." (Matt. iii: 1-6.) Let your mind rest upon that picture, my friends. John in his hair raiment (hair will not hold water,) girded with a leathern girdle (the girdle is a support, which those who do heavy work, as blacksmiths, workers in iron foundries, etc., wear) is baptizing the people in the Jordan. What does that look like? Does it suggest sprinkling or pouring? or, does it not rather suggest immersion? People of sound mind don't go to a river, and then into the river to have water sprinkled or poured upon them. When we see a crowd of people going away to a stream of water, and some one tells us that a man is to be baptized, we at once conclude that the people are Baptists or disciples, and that an immersion is to take place; Methodists and Presbyterians don't go away to streams of water, except when some of their converts will persist in being immersed. If we see the minister and the candidate go down into the water, we are then sure that an immersion will follow. John went to the river Jordan, the people came to him, and he baptized them in the river. I have heard a man say that John went to the Jordan to *teach*, and that he selected that place because there would be water in abundance for the stock, for cooking, etc.; but that won't

do, simply because the fact remains that John baptized the people *in the river*; he used it *by baptizing in it*

A little further down in the chapter, beginning at the thirteenth verse, we read, "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan, unto John, to be baptized, of him: but John forbade him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? and Jesus answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him. And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him. And lo, a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased."

All will admit that we ought to follow Jesus. Surely there is not a believer in the world, who, when he comes to baptism, would not submit to any inconvenience to be baptized as Jesus was. When we walk in his footsteps we know we are right. Well, he went down into the water, was baptized, and then came up straightway out of the water. Jesus was full of wisdom, and of course did not do unpleasant and troublesome things for nothing. If standing upon the dry ground, and having a few drops of water sprinkled upon him would have done just as well, of course he would not have gone down into the water. Our Methodist friends claim that pouring is "the most scriptural way of baptizing;" if that were so, of course Jesus would have submitted to it, and, as there would have been no necessity for his going down into the water, of course he would not have done it. I would like to ask Mr. Nichols one plain question; and I hope he will not fail to give us a plain and direct answer. It is this: Why did Jesus go down into the water? I have never yet heard any sprinkler give even the shadow

of a reason for his doing it. In Jesus, wisdom and intelligence were perfect; and such a being would not do such an inconvenient thing without a reason for it.

I desire now to present to you an argument that to my mind is perfectly conclusive on this subject. It is based upon this idea: IN THE DOING OF THAT WHICH MUST BE DONE, MEN NEVER TURN FROM A WAY THAT IS EASY, PLEASANT AND CERTAINLY RIGHT, TO A WAY THAT IS DIFFICULT, UNPLEASANT AND DOUBTFUL. Let us apply this principle to the question before us. Baptism is a requirement of the gospel, and, if we would do our duty, it must be attended to: Now grant (for the sake of the argument) that in apostolic times it consisted in the sprinkling or pouring of a few drops, of water; grant that Christ was so baptized, that the apostles were, and that all were who came into the church under the ministry of the apostles and their co-temporaries; then the question arises, How did the practice of immersion ever originate? It is here in the world, and of course it began at some time. Of course the first man who was immersed understood that in so far as he knew no man had ever submitted to immersion for baptism before. He was the first one; it was a new thing under the sun. What consideration now, I ask, could have induced him to turn away from the example of Christ and the apostles and the martyrs, from the way that was easy and pleasant and certainly right, to submit to a rite that was hard, unpleasant and perhaps displeasing to God? Such a change would not be made to please God, for all would know that it would be more acceptable to him to do as his great Son and holy apostles did; it would not be made to please the preacher, for it is never pleasant and often very disagreeable to immerse; it would not be made to please the candidate, since the immersion is even more unpleasant to him

than to the preacher. If such a change could never have been made to please God nor man, how could it ever have occurred? Let the gentleman answer.

But, on the other hand, we can easily account for the change from immersion to pouring and sprinkling; it is natural that men should pass from the hard to the easy, from the unpleasant to the pleasant, even when in so doing they turn from that which is certainly right to that which is of doubtful propriety; they will often risk the easy, pleasant way even though it be a doubtful one. Grant that immersion was practiced in the apostolic age; that Christ was immersed, that his apostles were, and that all the Christians of the first century were; we can easily believe that at some later period, pouring might begin, in order to meet the supposed wants of some sick man, weary and worn, and lying at the point of death. Believing him too feeble to be immersed, they pour the water all over him as he lies upon his couch. Then, when infant baptism came in, how natural for mothers to object to the immersion of the tender little ones! And then, as the centuries roll on, how natural for administrators to use less and less water, until at last the practice (which now prevails in many places) of laying moistened fingers on the head, is substituted for the ancient way! And this is precisely the truth in the case, my friends; immersion was practiced by Christ and his apostles, and was submitted to by every soul that came into the church during the first centuries of the Christian era, but after awhile, to meet the wants of the sick and dying, it was deemed expedient to practice pouring and sprinkling.

We have seen that John baptized "in the river Jordan," and that Christ, after his baptism, came up "straightway

out of the water;" it is said also that "John was baptizing in Enon near to Salem, because there was much water there; and they came, and were baptized." (John iii: 23.) In order to go "down into" it, and come "up out of" it, and be baptized "in" it, we need "much water." And as John's candidates (Jesus being among them) went down into the water before their baptism, were baptized in the water, and afterwards came up out of it, we can easily see the propriety of his baptizing in Enon near to Salem, *became there was much water there*. He needed much water for baptizing; and so do I; but Mr. Nichols does not. And the reason for the difference is easily understood: John immersed; and so do I; but Mr. Nichols does not.

It has been sometimes said that John was at this place of much water because the vast multitudes that thronged about him would need much water for their camels and horses, and for drinking and cooking purposes; but the Bible says *he was baptizing there*, because there was much water there, and that settles it with me.

Again it has been said that the word "Enon" means "springs or rivulets," and that there were there only little streams of water trickling through the sand, in no place deep enough to immerse a baby, much less, multitudes of grown men and women. Well, I have never yet seen a place where there was water enough for vast multitudes of people, and for their horses and mules and camels, and for cooking and drinking purposes, that did not also furnish water enough for immersion. Verily, as saith the wise man, "the legs of the lame are not equal."

It is not only true that John immersed, and that Jesus was immersed, but it is also true that the disciples of our Lord continued the practice after his ascension to heaven. In proof of which consider the following: "Then Philip

opened his mouth, and began at the same Scripture, and preached unto him Jesus. And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water; and the eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized? * * * And he commanded the chariot to stand still: and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch: and he baptized him. And when they were come up out of the water, the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more: and he went on his way rejoicing. (Acts viii: 35-39.) This case is very clear; it scarcely needs a comment to make it plainer. It took place about a year after the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, and it clearly shows that his disciples continued to walk in his footsteps, to do as he did. In this case, as in the baptism of the Lord, there was (1) a coming to the water; (2) a going down into it; (3) the baptism took place; and lastly (4) there was a coming up out of the water. It seems to me that anybody of good sense ought to be able to see that these things were not done simply to sprinkle a few drops of water on that eunuch's head. People don't stop in the midst of a journey and get themselves all wet and smeared up for nothing. If sprinkling had been the thing to be done, doubtless a servant would have handed up a cup of water, if there had not been water already in the chariot; the latter is the more probable supposition, as it is common in that eastern land for caravans, and people traveling in chariots to carry a supply of water with them. But the fact that this wealthy treasurer of queen Candace and Philip descended from the chariot, and then went down into the water, both of them, shows clearly that something more than merely the sprinkling of a few drops of water was to be done. John baptized the people *in water*, "in the river Jordan," and so in this case there was to be a baptism *in*

water, hence the necessity for going down into it. In the baptism of the jailer's household, which, you remember, took place after midnight and before day, we have another strong circumstantial argument in favor of immersion. The record of his conversion is given in Acts xvi: 23-34. Paul and Silas were given to the jailer; he put them into the inner prison, and made their feet fast in the stocks; at midnight, God by a mighty earthquake shook the prison, every door was hurled open, and every one's bands were loosed. The jailer, being suddenly aroused, and thinking the prisoners were fled, was about to kill himself; but Paul restrained him, crying with a loud voice, "Do thyself no harm: for we are all here." Then the jailer sprang into the inner prison, and brought them out into his house. They preached unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house. Then he took them somewhere, certainly out of the house, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway; after the baptism he took Paul and Silas back into his house, and gave them something to eat. That he brought them into his house when he took them out of the inner prison is evident from the fact that the preaching took place in his house. It is said (v. 32), "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." That he took them out of his house and was baptized is evident from the fact that immediately after the baptism he brought them into the house, and gave them something to eat (see verses 33, 34.) As one cannot come into a house twice without going out once, it is clear that the washing of the stripes of Paul and Silas, and the baptism of the jailer and his household took place somewhere out of his house. We don't take wounded men out of doors at midnight to wash their wounds; that is not neces-

sary; the water for such a purpose can easily be brought in; hence these people must have gone out to attend to the baptism. That required in this case, as in those already considered, much water, a going down into the water, and a coming up out of the water; hence it was necessary to go out of the house. Had Paul and Silas been Methodist preachers, a quart of water and a wet rag would have been sufficient for washing their backs, and a thimble full apiece would have been a great abundance for baptizing (ran-tizing) his household. But as they, according to the commandment and example of Christ, immersed, it was necessary for them to go out of the house.

We will consider next an extract from the sixth chapter of Romans. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life. For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection." (Rom. vi: 3-5.) Now at the time that Paul wrote this to the Romans he had never been in their city; how, then, did he know that they were "buried in baptism?" Not only to the Romans does he apply this language, but he says it is true of himself, and of all who are baptized into Christ—"so many of us as were baptized into Christ," etc. To the Colossians he writes in a similar way, saying, "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." (Col. ii: 12.) Paul could never have made these statements of people whom he had never seen had they not been general truths. He knew well that all baptized people are buried with Christ, and

raised to walk in newness of life, and hence he could make these statements of all, whether he had ever seen them or not. In his time people not only went to the water and down into it, but they were also buried in it and raised up, and then came up out of it. People had not yet forsaken the example of the Savior in this matter. They believed in Christ, and followed him; they believed his way was the best way, and they were content to walk therein, without hunting for a better one; and so I think yet; what say you, my friends?

But I believe Mr. Nichols has already taken occasion to say more than once that in this sixth chapter of Romans there is not a drop of water. In so doing he has the misfortune to differ from every scholar of world-wide fame that lives, or that ever did live, with perhaps two or three exceptions. However, grant that the gentleman is right, and that at this place the apostle refers to the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and his cause is not in the least helped; for the fact remains that in the baptism there is a burial and a resurrection; and if there is a burial in spirit baptism (and there certainly is), every paedo-baptist must admit that there is one in water baptism, as they universally claim that the one represents the other. No paedo-baptist can consistently hold that we are buried in the baptism of the Spirit and not buried in the baptism of water.

Since the matter has come up, suppose we devote a little time to the study of the baptism of the Holy Ghost. John the Baptist, speaking to the mixed multitude before him, that he calls a "generation of vipers," but among whom there were some good, says:

"And now also the ax is laid unto the root of the trees; therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire."

"I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire:"

"Whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." (Matt. iii: 10-12.)

Each of these three verses ends with the word "fire." The first is the fire that burns up the bad trees: the last is the fire that burns up the chaff, and he calls it "unquenchable;" Jesus is represented as coming among men to separate them; good men are wheat, bad men are chaff; the good he saves, the bad he burns up with unquenchable fire: the fire at the end of the middle verse is the fire that Jesus baptizes with, that is, the fire that burns up the wicked, the finally impenitent. Water was the only element that John used; but Jesus was to use two elements, the Holy Spirit for the good and fire for the bad. In proof of this, notice that whenever the good alone are referred to the Holy Ghost only is mentioned; the fire is omitted. For example, after his resurrection Jesus said to his disciples, "Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence." (Acts i: 5.) He does not say, "Holy Ghost and fire," because only the good are before him. In like manner, Peter, in speaking of Cornelius and his household, said, "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost fell on them, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost. (Acts xi: 15, 16.) Here again the fire is omitted because none but the good were there. It is absolutely certain therefore that it was the good only who were to receive

the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and the bad who were to be subjected to the baptism of fire. In Revelation xx: 14,15, we have a description of the baptism of fire. The wicked are cast into an awful lake of fire. John says: "And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." As John the Baptist took the people to much water and down into the water to baptize them, so much fire is needed for the baptism of the wicked and they are cast into a great lake of it. An awful immersion indeed!

But now to the baptism of the Holy Ghost. As all agree, it was fulfilled, in the case of the apostles, on the day of Pentecost. The Spirit came from heaven with a sound like that of a rushing, mighty wind; but there was no wind there; it filled all the house where they were sitting. The Spirit then appeared in the form of cloven tongues, and sat upon each of the apostles; the tongues were "like as of fire;" no fire there, but the tongues looked like fire. The apostles were "all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." (See Acts ii: 1-4.) In foretelling this, Jesus promised his apostles that they should be "endued" with power from on high. (See Luke xxix: 49.) "Endued," that is, clothed upon, invested. The Holy Spirit filled them, hence their spirits were clothed upon, endued, by the Holy Spirit; that is, they were *in the Spirit*, immersed *in him*. As I said before, there is a clear case of burial in the baptism of the Spirit.

This idea of being *in* the Spirit is a common one in the New Testament writings. Paul says, "But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you." (Rom. viii: 9.) Again, "If we live in

the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit." (Gal. v: 25.) And John says, "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day." (Rev. i: 10.) "And immediately I was in the Spirit." (Rev. iv: 2.)

In the baptism of the Spirit there was a pouring out of the Spirit, the bodies of the apostles were filled with the Spirit, and their spirits were clothed upon, or immersed in the Holy Spirit, according to the promise of Jesus. It was the immersion and not the pouring that is called the baptism. Water was poured out from heaven; a pool was filled; I was immersed in that pool: the Holy Spirit was poured out from heaven; the bodies of the apostles were filled; their spirits were thus immersed in the Holy Spirit. As the baptism of fire is burial in a lake of fire, so the baptism of the Holy Ghost is a burial in the divine Spirit. The abundance of the thing suggested the word baptize. The apostles were not simply sprinkled with a few drops of the Spirit, but they were overwhelmed, richly endued by the power from on high. Put a man in a hoghead and fill it with water, and you have a fair illustration of the baptism of the Spirit. The real man (the spirit) is in the body; fill the body with the Holy Spirit and you have the spiritual man immersed.

It has often been said, and may be said again, that the Spirit is not a fluid that we can be literally immersed in it. I reply there is no more trouble in conceiving of an immersion in the Spirit than there is involved in the pouring of him: the immersion is just as literal as the pouring.

There is another figurative use of the word baptize which throws a strong, clear light on the meaning of it in the New Testament. It is the baptism of sufferings. It is a common figure of speech in the Bible, to represent great sorrows, terrible sufferings by mighty, overflowing waters that

swallow one, that engulf him in the deep sea. But great sufferings are never represented by a few drops of water sprinkled upon one; such an idea would be absurd in the extreme. David, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and other Bible writers, when they had great troubles, represented themselves as being overwhelmed, swallowed up, compassed about and surrounded by deep waters. I will read you a few passages illustrating their use of this figure. Ps. xlii: 6, 7: "O my God, my soul is cast down within me; therefore will I remember thee from the land of Jordan, and of the Hermonites, from the hill Mizar. Deep calleth unto deep at the noise of thy water-spouts: all thy waves and thy billows are gone over me."

Ps. lxxxviii: 7: "Thy wrath lieth hard upon me, and thou hast afflicted me with thy waves."

Ps. lxxxviii: 15-17: "I am afflicted and ready to die from my youth up: while I suffer thy terrors I am distracted. Thy fierce wrath goeth over me: thy terrors have cut me off. They came round about me daily like water; they compassed me about together."

Ps. lxix: 1,2: "Save me, O God; for the waters are come in unto my soul. I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing: I am come into deep waters where the floods overflow me."

Ps. lxix: 14, 15: "Deliver me out of the mire, and let me not sink: let me be delivered from them that hate me, and out of the deep waters. Let not the floods overflow me; neither let the deep swallow me up, and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me." See also Lamentations iii: 52-54 and Ezekiel xxxii: 14, 15. The figure is common in all languages. We talk about being "overwhelmed in sorrow," "over head and ears in debt," and about being "buried in business," but you never heard any one speak of being

sprinkled with sorrow; such an expression would indicate the lightness and insignificance of the thing. Jesus, looking forward to the sorrows of Gethsemane, to the terrors of his trial, and agonies of the cross, said: "But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!" (Luke xii: 50.) His was not a mere sprinkling of suffering; no, no; he was overwhelmed in sorrow; the billows of a mighty sea of trouble flowed over him.

Let us now spend the few moments that remain in summing up.

1. In baptism there is a going to the water. (Matt. iii: 6-18.)
2. There is a need for much water. (John iii: 23.)
3. There is a going down into the water. (Acts viii: 38.)
4. There is in it a burial. (Rom. vi: 4.)
5. There is in it a resurrection. (Col. ii: 12.)
6. There is in it a likeness to a birth. (John iii: 5.)
7. There is a coming up out of the water. (Matt. iii: 16, Acts viii: 39.)

8. In it the *body* is washed. (Heb. x: 22.)

9. Overwhelming sufferings are represented by it.

10. The apostles were filled with the Holy Spirit, so that their spirits were immersed in the divine Spirit; hence the word baptize is applied to the case. The abundance of the gift is indicated thereby.

Now, my friends, if a man were to read the Bible without prejudice, a man who had never received any instruction on the subject further than to know that some sprinkle, some pour and some immerse, I say, if such an one were to read the Bible to find out for himself which of these ways is right, would he not be constrained to decide that the testimony is overwhelmingly in favor of immersion? So it seems

to me. And I do not wonder at the fact that all the churches admit the validity of immersion. The thing that amazes me is that any one should even for a moment suppose that sprinkling for baptism is anywhere countenanced by the word of God.

[Time expired.]

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

MR. NICHOLS' FIRST REPLY.

Brethren and Sisters:

My sympathy for Bro. Harding is very great just now. He informed you that in his other debate here he had access to *all* of the authorities on the mode of baptism, and now he is restricted to the *Bible only*. Of course he saw the trouble which awaited him when he was narrowed down to the *Bible*, and from it he must prove that immersion is the only mode of baptism, for he well knew that *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerse*, do not occur in King James' translation in connection with baptism, yet he says *immersed in Jordan*. Is that King James' translation, honorable moderators? Where did he find it? In what chapter and verse? O, yes, in the book of "*Necessary*" and at the first verse of "*Inference*;" that's it. That's the chapter and verse from which Bro. H. gets a great deal of his proof, and we must not blame him, for that is the best he can do, and we must always excuse a man when he does the best he can. I confess that I am puzzled to know why he referred to the baptism of Jesus. Baptism, he holds, is for the remission of sins—those who have never sinned, have no right to baptism—do not need it, and never will unless they sin. Then why refer to the baptism of Jesus? Did Jesus need baptism because he had sinned? Was he baptized for the remission of sins? In what name was he baptized? If

not for the remission of sins, for what was he baptized? Why did he wait until he was thirty years old before he was baptized? If Christ was baptized as an example for the people, should not all wait till they are thirty years old before they are baptized? "Now when all the people were baptized, it came to pass, that Jesus also being baptized, and praying, the heaven was opened." (Luke in: 21.)

We see that all the people who were baptized by John were baptized *before Jesus was baptized*, and do you say Jesus was baptized as an example for the people? Please tell us what Jesus was baptized for? A candidate for baptism comes to Bro. H. Bro. H. says, "you must follow Christ in your baptism." The candidate says, "I am only fifteen years old, and Christ was thirty years old—I'll have to wait fifteen years yet." "O, no," says Bro. H., "that is not important at all." Candidate says, "But I am to be baptized for the *remission of sins*, you say, and Christ knew no sin." Bro. H., "Well, that is not at all important." Candidate, "Then pray tell me what the important matter is." Bro. H., "Why I am sure *Christ was immersed*, and you must be *immersed*, or you will be damned." Is that it?

Now if Jesus was not baptized to initiate him into the office of priest, will Bro. H. please give us some intelligent reason why he was baptized? Does Bro. Harding know that the *river Jordan* is only mentioned in one place in the Bible in connection with baptism? Does he know that he connects the *river* with Jordan in all other cases wholly by his rule of "necessary inference?" Does he know that the Bible speaks of the "plain of Jordan" (i. Kings vii: 46,) and of the "land of Jordan?" (Ps. xlii: 6.) When it is stated that any one was baptized in Jordan, would it not be just as fair to suppose that it was done in the "plain of

Jordan," or in the "land of Jordan," as it is to suppose that it was done in the "river Jordan?" I undertake to say that when the brother leaves "thus saith the Lord," and enters the field of "supposition," he is like a ship at sea without rudder—no telling where he will land, or whether he will ever land. The fact is, Campbellism does not have any quarrel with the church of God about land, it is all about WATER. But great stress is put on "down into the water," and "up "out of the water." Let me say once for all that these expressions do not give us the *slightest idea* as to the mode of baptism. Let me give Bro. H. a case and get him to give us some information. In 2 Sam. xxiii: 20, we read, "And Benaiah * * * *went down* also and slew a lion *in the midst of a pit in time of snow.*" Now if Benaiah had gone down into the water and baptized somebody, Bro. H. could tell us exactly *how* the baptism was performed—will he please tell us just *how* Benaiah slew that lion? Did he pierce him with a spear, or beat him with a club? He *went down*, and slew him "*in the midst of a pit,*" and it was "*in time of snow*" so with all these important facts before him, of course Bro. H. can work the case out and tell us *just how* Benaiah slew that lion—yes, with just as much certainty as he works out the mode of baptism from the same kind of facts. But let us look at the next verse. "But he *went down to him* with a staff, and plucked the spear out of the Egyptian's hand, and *slew him with his own spear*" Now suppose I say that Benaiah *immersed* that Egyptian in a heap of spears, because he *went down to him*, and slew him *with a spear*. If he had *gone down* into the water and baptized that Egyptian with water, Bro. H. could see the Egyptian *going under*, and could prove that he was *immersed*—yes, prove it just about as clear as a moon beam in a cloudy night. Now let John tell us *how he bap-*

tized, "I indeed baptize you *with* water." (Matt. iii: 11.) "I indeed have baptized you *with* water; but he shall baptize you *with* the Holy Ghost." (Mark i: 8.) "John answered them saying, I baptize *with* water." (John i: 26.) "But he that sent me to baptize *with* water, * * * the same is he which baptizeth *with* the Holy Ghost." (John i: 33.) Jesus says, "For John truly baptized *with* water; but ye shall be baptized *with* the Holy Ghost." (Acts i: 5.) Peter says, "The Holy Ghost *fell on them* as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized *with* water; but ye shall be baptized *with* the Holy Ghost." (Acts xi: 15, 16.) Here is the testimony of John, Peter and Christ, all stating that John baptized *with* water, and Jesus baptized *with* the Holy Ghost. Now I will ask Bro. H. to give us *one case* where Jesus ever led anyone down into a stream of the Holy Ghost, and *immersed* him in the Holy Ghost. Now let Jesus and his apostles tell us just how Jesus baptized with the Holy Ghost. "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is *come upon you*," (Acts i: 8.) "The Holy Ghost *fell on* all them which heard the word." (Acts x: 44.) "I will *pour out* of my spirit upon all flesh." (Acts ii: 17.) "He hath *shed fourth* this, which ye now see and hear." (Acts ii: 33.) Baptized *with* the Holy Ghost how? By *pouring out, shedding forth, coming upon, falling on*, those who were baptized. Now how did John baptize *with* water? "By *dipping his subjects in water*" says Campbellism. Why do you say so? "Because he baptized *in Jordan*" you say. Is that it? Well, John baptized *in* the wilderness." (Mark i: 4.) Did he *dip* the people into the soil of the wilderness? John baptized "*in* Enon." (John iii: 23.) "In Bethabara." (John i: 28.) Did he dip the people *into the soil, or under homes*? Now it is clear that *in Jordan, in*

the wilderness, and like expressions, do no more than point out the place where John baptized, and no wonder Bro. H. gets things so mixed up when he tries to prove the mode of baptism from such expressions. But what was Jesus baptized for? When he went into the temple and began to teach with the authority of a priest, "the chief priests and elders of the people came unto him as he was teaching, and said, by what authority doest thou these things? And who gave thee this authority? And Jesus answered and said unto them. * * * The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or of men? * * * And they answered Jesus, and said, we cannot tell." (Matt. 21: 23-27.) Now you see when Jesus was called upon to give his authority for acting in the capacity of a priest, he referred to John's baptism as having clothed him with authority from heaven, and asked his enemies, if this does not give me authority from heaven. What? Is it only authority of men? And they said "we cannot tell," and so immersionists have been answering ever since, "we cannot tell." But do you say that immersion is a sign of Christ's burial and resurrection? Then hear Jesus' own language. The scribes and Pharisees asked him for a sign; "But he answered and said unto them, *An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas*: For as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." (Matt. xii: 39, 40.) Then if immersion is a sign of Christ's burial and resurrection, Christ just made a mistake about the matter, and immersionists have corrected it, that is all. Now look at your theory. (1.) You must be immersed because you must follow Christ in his baptism, and *we suppose* he was immer-

sed. (2.) You must be immersed because you must be born of water, and we *suppose* immersion represents a birth. (3.) You must be immersed because we *suppose* immersion is a sign of Christ's burial and resurrection although Jesus says, "*There shall no sign be given but the sign of Jonah.*" So you do not only contradict the word of God, by your theory but you *contradict your own contradictions*, and you are *inconsistent with your own inconsistencies*. Now if I ask Bro H. to tell us what the Lord's supper is a sign of, likely he would tell us that it is a sign of the death of Christ, "As often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." (1 Cor. xi: 26.) Then you say immersion is a sign of His death also, and you *contradict Jesus when you say it*. From the passages I have given you which associate water baptism and Holy Ghost baptism so intimately, by this expression, "*Baptize with water, and with the Holy Ghost*" it looks to me like it would occur to the most stupid, even to a Campbellite preacher, that water baptism is a *sign, or* picture of Holy Ghost baptism; and as all who were baptized *with* the Holy Ghost, had the Holy Ghost *applied to them*, and not themselves applied to the Holy Ghost; it would seem to almost any one that those who are baptized *with water* should have the water applied to them, and not themselves applied to the water. All of the common affairs of life would have to be *transposed* to get an illustration for immersion—cut wood *with* an ax—sweep the floor *with* a broom—curry a horse *with* a curry comb—now just think of applying the *wood to the ax—the floor to the broom—the horse to the curry comb*—yet all this, and a hundred other things, must be done to get one illustration of immersion from the common affairs of life. Now let me call your attention to a fact or two. You remember that Bro H. has whined considerably because I say Campbellite;

yet he has not called me brother during this debate. Well, this is no serious matter to me, not in the least; but it brings up one very prominent item in the faith, or creed, of all *exclusive* immersionists—well, I may not apply the remark, I am about to make to all individuals who believe in immersion, but to *immersion churches*. *They are the only true churches in the world*, IN THEIR OWN ESTIMATION. Our Campbellite friends are the only folks who will be saved, *except those who are saved through ignorance*, and the few who *may possibly get in on the "uncovenanted mercy of God"*—in their own estimation—while our Baptist friends are not quite so good as that, but immersion makes them *too holy to eat with others*. Nothing can make this vast difference between immersionists and paedo-baptists, but the *act of immersion*. So I am led to suspect that there is some wonderful power about immersion that exalts exclusive immersionists far above their unimmersed Christian friends—*on a seat of self-righteousness*. I suppose I will be allowed to say that Bro. H. was *exactly in order* (?) in his last speech yesterday in all he said about Elder Kidwill and Grub-ax. He says Bro. Kidwill "was written to about the matter, and he *came at once*." My debate with Elder Abernathy was held July 9-13. Elder Kidwill was written to soon after the debate closed, and he did not make his appearance in Giles county till October, and that *on the very Sunday the Tennessee conference was in session at Shelbyville, and the coming of Kidwill was kept a very profound secret from me till the very day I started to conference*, when a friend came to me and said, "I hear it whispered round that Kidwill has sent an appointment down here for the Sunday that you will be at Conference and that he is going for you then." So I went to Conference, and on the first day of Conference I obtained leave of absence for the remainder of the session, and met Kidwill in Bethel,

very much to his surprise, and he was gentle as a lamb, but when he left Bethel he wrote an article which was published in the Gospel Advocate, and which contained so much falsehood, that the citizens of Bethel and vicinity wrote a reply, which was signed by 33 good citizens, and sent it to the Editors of the Gospel Advocate, who refused to publish it—the citizens then paid for its publication in the county paper—Pulaski Citizen—and it has since been published in leaflet form, and any of you can have a copy by calling on me. Yes, Elder Kidwill was written to in July, 1883, and he came "*at once*" (?) to Bethel the 21st of October, 1883, at the very time it was supposed I would be at Conference in Shelbyville, 60 miles from Bethel. So you see Bro. H.'s "*at once*" was about *ninety days*! Well, that will do very well for him. If he would keep that near the truth in regard to his doctrine, he would do better than he does. But Bro. H. said what he did about Grub-ax to *cover the retreat* which they tried to make from the *Bible alone*. Yes, they tried to get me into this battle with *small arms*, and at *long range*, and it was after I wrote to Bro. Fry that I *never had*, and *never would*, admit any book but the Bible, as standard authority in a religious discussion, that they agreed to exclude all other books from this debate. But he said in his speech yesterday that children were born in the church—then in almost the next breath he proceeded to show, in his way, that no one has life in them who does not take the sacrament. I wish he had told us if it is the custom of the Campbellite church to give the sacrament to infants. According to his argument a father should make his babe eat bacon and cabbage, and do just as the other members of the family do, or just own up that the babe is not a member of his family. His argument reminds me of a cow that gives a bucket of (I was about to say good milk,) regular blue-

John and then kicks that over—but the greatest loss is the loss of time, and the labor of milking. Now I go back to his speech to-day, why did you take that long, roundabout way to try to work out the meaning of the word baptize? Why did you not take the word as defined by Jesus and his apostles? "But ye shall receive power after that the Holy Ghost is *come upon you*." (Acts i: 8.) Here Jesus defined the word, "*come upon*." Joel and Peter and God define it thus: "In the last days, saith God, I will *pour out my Spirit upon all flesh*." (Acts ii; 17.) "*Pour out*" is God's, Joel's and Peter's definition of baptize. Luke defines it thus: "The Holy Ghost *fell on all them which heard the word*" (Acts x; 44.) "*Fell on*" Peter. "He hath *shed forth this*, which ye now see and hear." (Acts ii: 33.) Spoken of in the future, it was to be "*poured out*"—" *come upon*." Spoken of in the past it was "*shed forth*"—" *Fell upon*." Now here is the *divine* definition of the word baptize, and why reject it, and get up a long list of *circumstances* to try to prove that God, Christ, Joel, Peter and Luke, all gave the wrong definition? I can see no reason for it, except to darken counsel with words." I state to you that I am perfectly satisfied with this *divine definition* of the word baptize, and as Bro. H. is not, he well knew his only chance was to "blind the eyes of the simple" with "*circumstances*." Now you know he teaches that the kingdom was not set up till Pentecost—that John the Baptist, Jesus, nor any of the apostles, were in the kingdom till after Pentecost, and as John Baptist was beheaded before Pentecost, he was never in the kingdom of Christ (?) then how beautifully consistent (?) Bro. H. is in spending most of his time with men who were not in the kingdom, and things which occurred before the kingdom was set up. (?) And he will appear even more consistent (?) when we remember that little babes were in the

Jewish church in which Christ, John Baptist, and all the apostles lived at that time, and that fact proves nothing (?) in favor of infant baptism now (?) but any *circumstance* that he thinks favors immersion *then* is incontrovertible testimony now. Dear friends, does your theory demand that you reject the *divine* definition of baptize? If so, which had better go, the *divine definition*, or your theory? Next he gives us his *wonderful conclusive argument*, by which he proves, *by circumstances*, how sprinkling came into practice. Why did he do that? Why did he not tell you that God was the author of sprinkling and pouring for baptism? Why did he not tell you that "about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, besides children;" (Ex. xii: 37.) crossed the Red Sea *on dry ground*, and that the clouds *poured out water*" (Ps. lxxvii: 17,) and that they were all "baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea?" (1 Cor. x: 2.) What did he want to hunt round for *circumstances* to make the impression that sprinkling, or pouring, is a thing of recent date? I know that immersionists try to get immersion out of the baptism of Israel as they crossed the Red Sea, and I am so anxious to see just how it could be done on "*dry ground*" I will furnish the subject if Bro. H. will demonstrate the immersion of the Israelites to us, "on dry ground," and show that it accords with the Campbellite way of immersing folks. What do you say Bro. H.? But why did Bro. H. not tell you that sprinkling was not only introduced by God himself, but that when Ezekiel spoke of how baptism would be administered when Christ should come, he said "Then will I *sprinkle clean water upon you*" (Ezek. xxxvi: 25.) Water baptism represents Holy Ghost baptism, hence the water used should be *clean*, not a dirty stream or pond; and as the Holy Ghost always *came upon* those who were baptized, so the water should always *come*

upon those who are *baptized with water*. But why did not Bro. H. tell us when immersion was first administered, and for what purpose? I'll tell you, for fear he forgets it. You can read the account in Gen. vii: 17-24. God administered it. It was administered to every living thing on earth, men, women, children and all else that had breath, and God's object was to destroy every living thing that had breath; so all that received this immersion, *died*. Here is the first immersion of which we have any account, and I have never heard a Campbellite preacher refer to this circumstance to prove his mode of baptism. Isn't that strange? The next account we have of immersion is recorded in Ex. xiv: 23-31. This was administered by God, and was done "*down in the Red Sea*" and no mistake; but it was death to all who received it; and strange to say I never heard an immersionist refer to this as proof of his mode of baptism, though this is an unmistakable case of immersion—not just *plunged under the water for one moment*, and taken out hastily, but *real immersion*. Then the two thousand hogs that were choked in the sea, completes the Bible account of immersions, and Bro. H. well knows that he cannot get up another clear case of immersion from the Bible, and no wonder he appeals to you to lay aside *all prejudice* on the subject of baptism, (a thing which no Campbellite preacher was ever known to do, and remain a Campbellite) and follow him in his "*circumstances*." Now take notice, that these are admitted by all to be clear cases of immersion, and yet they are nowhere called *baptism* in the Bible; while the pouring out of water upon the Israelites as they passed through the Bed Sea *on dry ground*, is called in 1 Cor. x: 2, baptism. Once more; did it never occur to you that these, the only clear cases of immersion mentioned in the Bible, about which all agree, are never referred to by im-

mersionists to prove their mode of baptism. Now let Bro. H. tell us *where* and *when* immersion was first practiced for baptism, and be sure to give us chapter and verse. Just leave off your *circumstances* and *suppositions*, and show us *immerse, dip, plunge, duck, dive*, or anything like this that is called baptism in the Bible, and we will put a great big feather in your hat, although it would be a contradiction of the *divine* definition of baptize. He speaks of "when infant baptism came in"—well, I have shown that it came in at the crossing of the Red Sea, and he intimates that it came in at a later date, but chapter and verse were wanting. Then he imagined sick folks who were too weak to be immersed, and so on; and wanted you to take these *supposed* circumstances as proof that pouring is of recent date. No wonder he has a strong imagination—he has had to cultivate that talent (if it be a talent, and I rather think it is with him) *immensely* to make his theory at all plausible. But he will make a knock down argument now and then that I cannot answer—hear him; "John immersed, and so do I." I just own up—that is proof too hard for me. But "what did Jesus go down into the water for" I am asked. To be immersed, Bro. H. says. To be baptized I answer; and the divine definition of baptize is "*come upon*" "*pour out*" Now I challenge Bro. H. to give us any other Bible definition of *baptize* than that given by the Father, Son, Joel and the apostles. His theory and practice both contradict this *divine* definition, and he strives to get up a contrary definition by "*circumstances*." Give us immersion as the definition of baptize, and give us chapter and verse, and I will give up this debate. You take the *Bible alone*, you say—then surely you do not need to *suppose* anything—just give us *chapter and verse* for *immerse* as a definition of baptize, and I will close the debate at once, and get you to immerse

me, and you will be immortal for six weeks at least. Next comes the eunuch's case, "a very clear case of immersion" says Bro. H. Why? "because they went down into the water and he baptized him, and they came up out of the water" you say. But the "down into," and the "up out of," were not the baptism, that took place between the "down into," and the "up out of," so you see we are thrown back to the word baptize again, and you must not forget that the divine definition is "pour out." But the eunuch was reading Isa. liii and about the 6th verse, when Philip came to him. The Bible was not divided into chapters and verses then. No part of the book of Acts was written at that time. The subject on which the eunuch was reading began at the 52 chapter and 13th, verse. The 15th, verse of Hi chapter reads, "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." This is the only language connected with the subject from which the eunuch could have gotten an idea of baptism. *Not one word* did Philip say to the eunuch about baptism until the eunuch mentioned it, so far as the record in Acts viii: 35-40 shows; but of course Bro. H.'s strong imagination will enable him to get a sermon on baptism from Philip to the eunuch, for you have noticed that it matters little with a man of such wonderful imagination what the record says, or does not say—he can soon manufacture circumstances enough to answer all his purposes. "Sprinkle," says Isa., right in connection with the Scripture the eunuch was reading, "Immerse," says Campbellism. Philip could not have immersed the eunuch without an utter disregard for the only language in connection with the case from which any idea of baptism could be obtained, as well as a direct contradiction of the *divine definition* of the word baptize. So I prefer to take the plain teaching of the word of God, rather than the "*suppositions*" of even Bro. H., as good at the business as

any man I ever struck. The jailer comes next. "A clear case of immersion," so thinks Bro. H. He has the jailer bringing Paul and Silas "*into his house,*" of course, because they preached to all that were in his house, though the 32 verse to which he referred for the proof *says no such thing*—as if Paul could not speak loud enough for all to hear in the house without being in the house himself. Then he has the jailer taking them *out of his house* to wash their stripes, and to be baptized, and 33, 34 verses are referred to as proof; but *not one word is said there about bringing them out of his house*—in the 34th, verse is the first mention of bringing them into the house at all. So you see Bro. H.'s imagination just supplies what the word fails to say, to make out a *probable* case of immersion here—or a *certain* case, as Bro. H. says. But Bro. H. says there must be one out before there can be two in's. Agreed. Then where there are two in's there must be two outs, before you are entirely out. Now take verses 23, 24. The authorities "cast them into prison." The jailer thrust them into the inner prison." Here are two in's. Now I read verse 30—"And brought them *out,*" (of the inner prison where he had put them, the only place that he had a right to bring them out of) and this is the only out mentioned until the authorities came the next day and brought them out. Bro. H. has them, the jailer, and all his house, out in the dark, going somewhere to find water to be immersed in! A good long stretch of imagination, even for Bro. Harding, and that is saying a good deal. Next comes *burial*. (Rom. vi: 4.) "We are buried with him by baptism into death." Paul included himself "*we.*" He wrote in the present tense, "*we are*" he was buried at the time he wrote. The *pouring out* of the Holy Ghost upon the inner man takes it into Christ. "If any man be *in Christ*, he is a new creature," "For by one

spirit are we all baptized into one body." (1 Cor. xii:13.) When one is baptized into Christ, he should remain in him—absorbed, swallowed up in Christ: but we are "*planted* together in the likeness of his death." No water in this chapter. To plunge a human body into the earth, and jerk it out at once, is no burial, to plunge a seed into the dirt, and jerk it out at once, is not planting. We are baptized into Christ by the Holy Ghost, and into the visible church, by water baptism, and we should remain in—that is the burial here mentioned. No reference is made to the mode of baptism. If so, a man should be held under the water till he is dead literally, if immersion is here referred to Holy Ghost and fire. (Matt. iii: 10-13.) It never would have been necessary to disregard grammar, common sense, and plain Scripture, to get good and bad men into the baptism of Holy Ghost and fire here mentioned, if immersion had not come into use for baptism. "I indeed baptize you with water. * * * He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." A ten year old school boy can see that Holy Ghost baptism, and fire were to be administered to the same class. (Acts ii: 2.) "*Sound* filled the house," Holy Ghost not mentioned in the chapter till the 4th, verse. The mode was "*pouring out.*" verse 17. The mode is what we are discussing. Several passages were referred to by Bro. H. about "being in the spirit." Rom. viii: 9.) "Living in the spirit." (Gal. v: 25.) "Walking in the spirit," by which he attempts to prove something in regard to the mode of water baptism; and I don't know what they prove on that point unless it is that we should "*be* in the water, *live* in the water, and *walk* in the water." Then comes baptism of suffering. The iniquity of us all was "*laid on*" Christ. By his *stripes* we are healed." He was *stricken*, *smitten* for us. (Isa. liii; 4-6.) Was he *plunged under* stripes, what

is the mode of administering stripes; *smiting*, *striking*? Does it look like immersion? Not much. Now let Bro. H. notice that the mode of baptism, either Holy Ghost, or water baptism, and the state into which we are brought by baptism, are very different things, and it will help him to understand such Scriptures as Rom. vi, and many others, which I see he does not understand. Hope he will tell us where the three thousand went at Pentecost for immersion—where Saul went—where the House of Cornelius went—where the Corinthians went—and those twelve whom Paul baptized, and all the rest, as he is the only man I have struck who can work out every case of baptism in the Bible, and tell us just how they managed to get immersed. Wonderful to tell.

[*Time expired.*]

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

MR. HARDING'S, SECOND ADDRESS.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

After a refreshing rest, and a hearty dinner, we come together again for the last session of this debate. Mr. Nichols' last speech was upon the whole decidedly the most comical one of the entire lot. Many of his interpretations certainly have great merit in the way of being humorous. Many of them clearly deserve a place in the comic Almanacs. For instance, what could be more ludicrous than his "divine definition" of baptize? He defines it thus: "to come upon," to "pour out," "fell on:" "shed forth;" he claims that these definitions were given by the Father, the Son, Joel and the apostles, in-as-much as the Holy Spirit is spoken of as being "poured out," "shed forth," and as coming upon them, and falling on them. I will help him out in his definition by adding that the Spirit, in the form of cloven tongues also "sat upon" them. So now we have the definition in full, according to Mr. Nichols. The word means to "pour out," to "shed forth," to "fall on," to "come upon," to "sit upon." Now it is a well known fact, which no intelligent man will call in question, that the definition of a word, when put in its place, will not only make good sense, but the true sense of the passage. Let us try Mr. Nichols' definition by that rule. It is said, (Mark i: 5) in speaking of John's baptism, "And there went out unto

him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." What, now, did John do to those people "in the river of Jordan." He baptized them in the river, and hence according to Mr. Nichols' divine (?) definition, he poured them out in the river, shed them forth in the river, fell on them in the river, came upon them in the river, or *sat upon them in the river!!!* (Laughter.) If *sitting upon* is the proper "mode" of baptism, then there are some folks that I would not like to have baptize me. Our brother Fry, for instance: he weighs too much. (Laughter.)

True enough, the Spirit is represented as being poured out, shed forth, as coming upon them, and as sitting upon them; but these acts are in no case called baptism. It is also true that the apostles were "all filled with the Holy Ghost," so that their spirits were overwhelmed by the divine Spirit; they were thus buried in the Holy Spirit; and as Paul expressly says that we are "buried with him in baptism" (Col. ii: 12,) we know that it is the burial in the Spirit that is called baptism, and not the pouring out, the shedding forth, the falling upon, or sitting upon of the Spirit. The divine definition of the word baptize is the word "bury;" and whether the baptism be of water, or of the Spirit it is a burial.

Another one of the gentleman's jokes consists in intimating that I depend upon inferences in maintaining that baptism is a burial. Of course he did not expect you to take that as a serious statement; for I had just read to you from the Scriptures that in attending to their baptisms they went to the water, went to much water, went down into the water; then Paul says of himself and the Romans that they were buried "by baptism," and of the Colossians that they were buried "in baptism;" after the baptism, they came up

out of the water; and Christians are represented as having their bodies "washed with pure water." No inference about all this; we read from the word of God every step of the way. And not only is the going down beneath the water called a burial, but the coming up out of it is called a birth; just as Jesus was buried when he was put into the tomb, and when he came out of it he is called "the first born from the dead," (Col. i: 18.) He was buried in the grave, and born from the grave; just so we are buried in water, and born of water. Yet the gentleman can't see how in baptism we can have both a burial and a birth! Well, I am not surprised at that for Isaiah spoke about just such people when he said, "Go unto this people and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand, and seeing ye shall see and not perceive: for the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." (Acts xxviii: 26, 27.) If a man will shut his eyes, and stop his ears, and harden his heart, of course he will not understand.

The Bible speaks of the "land of Jordan," and of the "plain of Jordan," and Mr. Nichols inquires, "When it is stated that anyone was baptized in Jordan, would it not be just as fair to suppose that it was done in the plain of Jordan, or in the land of Jordan, as it is to suppose that it was done in the river Jordan?" Then he gravely talks about my leaving the "thus saith the Lord," and entering "the field of supposition!" A strange man verily! Does he not know that Mark says there went out unto John all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him "*in the river of Jordan?*" Does he not know that when Jesus was baptized he came up straightway "out of the

water," showing that he was baptized in the river? Does he not know that Philip and the eunuch went "down into the water" before the baptism, and came "up out of the water" after it? Well, if the gentleman knew all of these things, (and of course he did,) why do you suppose he talked about the people being baptized in "the plain of Jordan," or "in the land of Jordan," instead of in the "river of Jordan?" Was not that wresting the scriptures? Was it not an effort to deceive you? Peter speaks about certain people who "wrest" the scriptures "unto their own destruction." I advise the gentleman to be cautious.

Mr. Nichols then tries his hand on the "down into," and the "up out of." He says that Benaiah "went down also and slew a lion in the midst of a pit in time of snow," but he claims that the going down into the pit, and the slaying of the lion in the pit, gives no clue as to how he slew him; so, he claims, the going down into the water, and the baptizing there, gives us not the "slightest idea" as to how the baptism was performed. Does it not, my friends? Let us see. We all agree that in apostolic times the water was sprinkled upon the candidate, or it was pour upon him, or he was immersed in it; do not the facts of their going down into the water and baptizing there gives us some idea as to which of these three acts was performed? Benaiah went down into the pit because the lion was down there, and there was some reason in his going down unto him if he wanted to kill him; just so Jesus, and John, and Philip, and the people of that time, had some reason for going down into the water to baptize; there is no reason for going down into the water to sprinkle and pour as our Methodist friends do, hence they do not in this respect follow the example of Christ and John and Philip and the people of the apostolic age; there is a necessity to go down into the water

to immerse, and hence immersionists do follow the examples of the ancient worthies in going down into the water; without it they cannot fulfill the divine definition by burying in baptism.

We "*are buried*" by baptism says Paul, and Mr. Nichols comments upon the fact that "*are buried*" is in the present tense. Paul was buried at the time that he wrote, he claims and hence the baptism there referred to could not be water baptism, as at the time of writing he was not buried in water. Does not the gentleman know that the present tense is used to express a *general truth, or what is habitual*? For examples we say, "Perseverance conquers all things;" "The mail arrives at six p.m.;" "We plant our gardens in the spring;" and (we immersionists say,) "We are buried in baptism;" and so we are. In this connection I will make one additional remark: I am debarred from using the revised version; you are not; when you go home turn to the sixth chapter in that version and read it; a "hint to the wise" is said to be sufficient.

Mr. Nichols quotes from Matt. xii: 39 thus: "There shall no sign be given but the sign of Jonah." He says Jesus said it He did not. The words of Jesus are, "There shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas." Mr. Nichols argues from the passage *as he quotes it*, that immersion cannot be a representation of the burial and resurrection of Jesus, because no sign was to be given but the sign of Jonah. Had he quoted the passage there would have been room for no such argument. In answer to the scribes and Pharisees Jesus said, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas." The fact that he intended to give no sign to those wicked and adul-

terous scribes and Pharisees, is no reason why he should not afterwards give memorial institutions to those who lovingly receive him. It is a matter of fact that he did afterwards give to his people both the Lord's supper and baptism; and as certainly as the one shows forth his death, so the other represents his burial and his resurrection. The baptism of John was prophetic; it looked forward to the burial and resurrection of Jesus: the baptism instituted by Jesus is memorial, looking back to the same notable events. How do you suppose, did Mr. Nichols happen to misquote that passage? Did he leave out the words "to it" by slip of the tongue? A man should be careful when he quotes the scripture. One who will misrepresent the Lord you may be sure will treat his servants in the same way. It is not strange therefore that he intimates that I believe immersion is a sign of the death of Jesus, when he knows, or ought to know, that I teach no such thing. It is a representation of burial and resurrection, not of death.

The gentleman says I shall immerse him when I give a divine definition of baptize other than "pour out," "shed forth," etc. Well, we have found the divine definition in the word "bury." The Colossians were buried "in- baptism." But I don't want to baptize him; like a good many other folks, *he is not -fit*. I don't want to build any wood, hay or stubble on the divine foundation.

Another one of the gentleman's favorite points is that John baptized "with water," and Christ was to baptize "with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." He seems to think the word "*with*" is against me, and settles the case in his favor; but that is because he has overlooked one of the commonest uses of that little preposition. When substances used are contrasted, "with" is the proper word to use even though there are immersions in those substances. One

woman says she dyes with indigo, another with aniline, and another with cochineal, but in every case they put the garment to be dyed into the coloring fluid. Just so, John in contrasting the substances used, said, "I baptize you with water," then he adds, "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire." And in the case of the baptizing the action of sprinkling is no more indicated than in the case of the dying.

Then another bright idea strikes Mr. Nichols, and he hopes to get rid of the force of John's example of baptizing in the river, by reminding you that I hold that the kingdom was not set up on earth till Pentecost, and hence that whatsoever was done by John, Jesus, the apostles, or by any one else before that time, was done by men out of the kingdom. True enough, John was not in the kingdom; he died before it was instituted on earth; but he knew what the word "baptize" meant; and I have gone to him to show its meaning. It is certain that Jesus used the word just as John did; and when the inspired Philip was carrying out the commission of Christ, he did just as John had done, he went down into the water, attended to the baptism, and then came up out of the water. A man does not have to be in the kingdom to understand the meaning of a Bible word. It seems almost like a waste of time to expose such sophistries as these, but the gentleman's speech is made up of just such foolishness, and it may be that some silly body might be misled by them, unless I show them up. Hence I intend to notice every point

Let us notice next what the gentleman has to say in answer to my argument from the case of the jailer. I claim that the circumstances of that case clearly point to immersion. The jailer brought them out of the prison into his house; the preaching took place in his house; after the

preaching he took them somewhere, and washed their stripes, and was baptized; then he brought them back into the house and fed them, rejoicing in the Lord. Now I claim that the fact of his going out of the house at the midnight hour to baptize (for of course he could have washed their backs without going out) is strong circumstantial proof in favor of immersion. No one would think for a moment of going out of doors at midnight to sprinkle a drop or two of water on a man. To meet this argument Mr. Nichols contends that Paul was not brought into the jailer's house before the preaching. He claims that the apostle was merely brought into the outer prison, that the jailer had no right to bring them out any further. He does not think it would have done at all for the jailer *to* have brought them out of the prison into his house. Did the gentleman altogether forget the fact that it is expressly stated that he "brought them into his house" after the baptism? If he could do it then, why could he not have done it before the preaching? It is expressly stated that they preached "to all that were in his house." But Mr. Nichols explains that Paul and Silas were in the prison while the people to whom they were preaching were in the house, but that Paul could speak loud enough for them to hear. Did you ever know of a minister *of* the word standing in one house while those to whom he was preaching were in another, *when there was no reason why they should not be together?* Paul and Silas were full of energy and zeal: the people were eager to hear; there was nothing to prevent their coming together; and of course they came together. And just as certain as Paul and Silas were in the jailer's house when they spake the word of the Lord "to all that were in his house," just so certain they went out of that house at midnight, attended to the baptisms, and then came back into the house; and just as certain as they were men

of sense, just so certain they did not go out at that hour to sprinkle or pour a little water on the jailer's people. Men of sense don't go out doors at midnight to sprinkle any more than they go down into the river to sprinkle.

Mr. Nichols wants to know where the three thousand went to be immersed who were baptized on the day of Pentecost. Well it affords me pleasure to give him some hints on that subject. In, and immediately adjacent to, the city of Jerusalem there were at least six great pools covering in all about fifteen acres of ground. I here give their names, and some scriptural references to them. (1) Bethesda, (John v: 24.) (2) The Kings Pool, or Solomon's, (Neh. 2: 14.) (3) Siloam, (John ix: 7.) (4) Upper Gihon, (2 Kings xviii: 17.) (5) Lower Gihon, (2 Chron. xxxii: 2, 3, 30.) (6) The Pool of Hezekiah, (2 Kings xx: 20.) Palestine is one of the finest watered countries on the face of the globe. We learn from the 5th chapter of John that the pool of Bethesda had five porches around it, and that the people were accustomed to go into it. This one pool would have furnished ample facilities for the performance of the work.

But could the three thousand have been baptized in one day? is often asked. Well, let lib see about that. Peter began his sermon at the third hour of the day, that is, at nine o'clock in the morning. Grant that he preached an hour, and that they were then two hours in getting to the water; the baptizing could then have begun at 12 o'clock, and there would have been at least six hours till sunset. Could the work have been done in six hours? Well if any body could do it in that time, we may be sure those strong, stalwart fisherman, so familiar with the water, could. In December 1879, near Franklin, Ky., a colored minister immersed ninety-six (96) persons in 70 minutes (that is, 82 in

one hour.) I afterwards immersed a number at the same place, in a small creek. It was not a particularly good place for immersing. This colored minister had not been told that he would be timed, though a number of gentlemen held their watches while he was doing the work. It has been demonstrated over and over again many times tint to baptize sixty per hour is easy work, and that a man can do it working in a very quiet, leisurely way. Well, if the one hundred and twenty brethren who were assembled to elect a successor to Judas all took part in the work of baptizing, there would have been just twenty-five apiece for them to baptize; they could have finished in half an hour, and have gotten back home by one o'clock. But while Jesus was on earth, he sent out seventy preachers; it is but natural to suppose that among those who had assembled to elect an apostle these seventy would be present; if they did the baptizing, each man would have had about forty three to immerse, and the work could easily have been done in forty minutes. If none acted as administrators of baptism but the apostles, each apostle would have had two hundred and fifty (250) people to immerse, and could have done it easily within four hours; indeed if they proceeded as rapidly as the colored man referred to they would have finished in about three hours. Hence we see there was no trouble about a water supply, or about time, for the immersion of the three thousand.

Where was Saul baptized? inquires Mr. Nichols and Cornelius, and the Corinthians, and the twelve men at Ephesus? Well, Paul was baptized at Damascus, and the river Barada (the Abana of 2 Kings v: 12) runs through the city; Corinth was situated on the sea, and was famous for her two harbor"; Ephesus was also situated on the sea at the mouth of the Cayster; Caesarea, the home of Cor-

nelius was also on the sea. So there was no trouble about a water supply in any of these cases. Indeed water is one of the necessities; where ever men live it must be; and it is easy to arrange for immersions. In fourteen years of evangelistic work I have not failed in a single case to find water enough to baptize all who wanted to submit to the rite. I have known many preachers among my brethren, and many among the Baptists, and I have never heard of one who failed to find water, though I have known of some instances in which they failed to use it as promptly as they should have done. If a thousand dollars were to be received immediately upon the attendance to the baptism, there would be very few postponements on account of a want of water. Mr. Nichols thinks the Israelites were not immersed in crossing the Red sea, for it is said that they went through on "dry ground." He thinks they were sprinkled by the clouds that poured out water, (Ps. lxxvii: 17.) He is a bright man! Did you ever see anybody walking along on dry ground while the clouds were pouring out water upon him? The Israelites did not walk on dry ground in the midst of a pouring rain, that is certain. The cloud over them was not a rain cloud at all; it was a pillar of cloud by day, and a pillar of fire by night, (see Ex. xiii: 21;) and as the Israelites parsed through in the night (see Ex. xiv: 19-24,) it was a pillar of fire over them. Paul says they "were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." They were not baptized in the cloud nor in the sea; it took both sea and cloud to constitute the baptism. As they went down into the sea, the cloud was behind them and over them, and the water was on either side of them; and thus by cloud and sea they were buried. That burial constituted the baptism. Remember the word "baptism" has no

necessary connection with water. A man is said to be baptized in anything in which he is overwhelmed, as in sorrow buffering, debt, fire, water, and, in the case of the Israelites, in the cloud and sea. The pouring out of water mentioned in the lxxvii Psalm was upon the Egyptians, after the Israelites had passed through, as any one can see by reading the passage for himself, bearing in mind as he reads that the Israelites passed through on "dry land."

We come next to the eunuch's case. "Not one word did Philip say to the eunuch about baptism till the eunuch mentioned it," Mr. Nichols thinks: At least he claims that the record does not show that Philip mentioned it. Be not too certain about that, my friend. The record says Philip "preached unto him Jesus," (Acts viii: 35,) and what is it to preach Jesus but to tell the story of Christ? Matthew, Mark, Luke and John are but four sermons on Jesus. Can a man preach Jesus fully without telling about the Spirit descending upon him, and about the Father acknowledging him in thunder tones as His Son? Well, that was at the time of his baptism. Then we must tell that he "made and baptized more disciples than John" (John iv: 1) if we would preach Jesus. And, finally, it would not do to leave out the story of the ascension in preaching Jesus; and in telling that, it would not do to omit his final instructions to his apostles; he spake unto them saying, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." It is not possible to preach Jesus without telling about baptism, hence every one of the four inspired biographers of our Lord speak of baptism.

But Mr. Nichols thinks the eunuch would have learned about baptism from the passage which he was reading in Isaiah. Speaking of Jesus the prophet says, "Many were

astonied at thee; his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men: so shall he sprinkle many nations." The passage evidently refers to the cruel death of Jesus, in which his form and visage were marred so cruelly, and to his blood called "the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel," (Heb. xii: 24.) This blood is represented as *sprinkling the heart, as purging the conscience*, (Heb. ix: 14 and x: 23;) but it is never called baptism. On the contrary it is mentioned in the latter passage in connection with the *washing of the body* which is baptism. True enough, the gentleman can find *sprinkling* in the Bible, but he cannot find it called baptism; in this case it is clearly the sprinkling of blood.

But does not God prophesy through Ezekiel, saying, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you?" Yes, but the proceeding verse (Ezek. xxxvi: 24) shows when the Lord would do that. He says, "For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean," etc. At the time that Ezekiel uttered this prophecy the Jews were scattered throughout the countries composing the Babylonian empire. The prophecy was uttered about 587 years before Christ. God told them that they should yet dwell in the land which he had given to their fathers; that the land should be tilled, the wastes rebuilt, the cities inhabited; and that the ground should produce fruit and corn in abundance. This prophecy was fulfilled about fifty years later (that is, about 536 B. C.) when Zerubbabel and fifty thousand Jews returned to Jerusalem and rebuilt the temple. Shortly afterwards Ezra went up with quite a company, and much wealth. And about ninety

years after Zerubbabel, Nehemiah went up and rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem. The cities were rebuilt and the land was prosperous, according to the prophecy of Ezekiel. I am sure that no unprejudiced man can read his prophecy, and consider the facts, without being satisfied that he referred to this time.

But how about sprinkling clean water? When a Jew became defiled by touching a dead body, or a bone of a man, or by coming into a tent in which there was anyone dead he was counted unclean; for his cleansing it was necessary that he should be sprinkled with "the water of separation," and that he should then bathe his flesh in water, (see Numbers xix: 1-20.) This "water of separation" is evidently "the clean water" of Ezekiel, called "clean" because of its cleansing efficacy; it is called in Numbers "a purification for sin." The Jews in their captivity had become defiled. God foretold that when they were restored under Zerubbabel, Ezra and Nehemiah, they should be cleansed. "The water of separation" was made thus: a spotlessly red heifer was burned to ashes, cedar wood and hyssop and scarlet being cast into the burning; the ashes thus made was laid up in a clean place, and when any one became unclean, running water was taken and into it a quantity of these ashes was put, and this mixture was the "water of separation," "a purification for sin." It represented blood. A substitute for blood was needed, as blood will not stand without coagulating. The sprinkling of the water of separation was typical of the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, and the bathing of the body in water which always followed it, was typical of baptism, Read the xix chapter of Numbers in connection with (Heb. x: 22.)

But I must not neglect to say something about Bro. Kidwill and the Grub-ax. Mr. Nichols wrote a dialogue which

he claimed to have heard between two ministers, a "Campbellite" and a "Methodist." As you heard me read in that little round which we had about the matter during intermission, he claimed "to give the dialogue just as it was spoken." In the dialogue the "Campbellite" is represented as giving up point after point, and finally as being persuaded to have his children baptized. In his debate with Bro. Abernathy, Mr. Nichols said Bro. J. M. Kidwill was the Campbellite. He claimed that he had such a conversation with him. You heard Bro. Northcross and another brother tell Mr. Nichols they heard him say Kidwill was the man. Indeed you heard Mr. Nichols admit that he said he had such a conversation with J. M. Kidwill. Kidwill denies that he ever had any such conversation, that he ever made such concessions, that he ever determined to have his children baptized—in short, he brands the statement as a falsehood. Bro. Kidwill is a strong, clear, logical man, and I know of no one who seems to be more honored and loved by those who know him best. I don't claim that he went "at once" after the Abernathy debate; on the contrary some time intervened, there had been some writing about the matter in the GOSPEL ADVOCATE, our people tried to get a hall for him to speak in, but failed; finally the Methodists agreed that he might speak once in their house; then the brethren wrote to him, and, as I understand the matter, he came at once. There was absolutely no secrecy about the time of his visit. I don't hesitate to affirm that no one who knows him will ever believe he had any such conversation as that recorded in Grub-ax; and no one who knows anything about writing books will believe that a man can report from memory a conversation that will fill a thirty two page book "just as it occurred." It is all right for Mr. Nichols to make men of straw and then tear them to pieces

if he wants to; but let him be particular about how he names his straw men. When he repents and turns to the Lord, being baptized into Christ, then I will call him brother. The gentleman wants to know why Jesus was baptized? He was baptized to fulfill righteousness, and that he might receive the Holy Ghost and thus be manifested as the Son of God. *He received the Spirit after his baptism*, as also did the apostles, the Samaritans, the three thousand, the twelve at Ephesus, and all but those at the house of Cornelius, and they received the Spirit after they believed. Jesus was not baptized as our Methodist friends are "as an external sign of an internal grace." But *how* was he baptized? That is the question; and I think it has been very fully answered. In the consecration of the Aaronic priests there was both a sprinkling of blood typical of the sprinkling of the blood of Christ, and a washing of the priest in the laver typical of baptism. That washing was a washing of the entire body in the laver.

[*Time expired.*]

FOURTH PROPOSITION.

JOHN H. NICHOLS' LAST ADDRESS.

Brethren and Sisters:

John's baptism about which Bro. H. has said so much was not Christian baptism, he did not baptize in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. "John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus." (Acts xix: 4.) This is the language of Paul to twelve men who had been baptized by John, and "when they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Verse 5. So we see under the commission for Christian baptism John's baptism was not recognized. Now in regard to the multitude going to the water to be baptized, it may surprise you when I tell you that not one word is said about the multitudes going to water—the record is—"Then went out *to him* (John) Jerusalem, and all Judea and all the region round about Jordan." (Matt. iii: 5.) "And there went *unto him* (John) all the land of Judea." (Mark i: 5.) The people *went to John*, if he baptized in the River Jordan they went to him; if he baptized *beyond Jordan* (John x: 40) the people went *to him*, if he baptized *in the wilderness* the people went *to him*; if in *AEnon* or in *Bethabara* the people went *to him*. So all that has been said about *going to water* amounts to nothing so far as it concerns the mode of baptism. But John's

camel's hair raiment, and his leathern girdle have been referred to in support of immersion.

Well, there is the same reference made to his meat being "locusts and wild honey," that is made to his raiment and girdle, and in the same verse. (Matt. iii: 4.) I wonder Bro. H. could not prove 'something in favor of immersion from John's "locusts and wild honey?" Now let me call your attention to some baptisms which took place at the place where preaching was done by the apostles, and on the same day, without the slightest intimation that they moved from the place of preaching in order to be baptized. (1.) Take the three thousand at Pentecost. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them three thousand souls. (Acts ii: 41.) No intimation here of a move. (2.) The people of Samaria—the account is: "But when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." (Acts viii: 12.) No move here. (3.) Paul was *in the house of Judas*. (Acts ix: 11.) and he "Arose and was baptized." Verse 18. *Not the most remote intimation that he went out of the house*. (4.) Cornelius, his household and friends. "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." (Acts x: 47-48.) No move here. But why multiply cases of this kind? I showed you this morning that the *divine* definition of baptism is "Come upon," "Pour out," and what do I care, or what should you care for *circumstances*, or for a cart-load of lexicons, which prejudiced men bring up to prove that God. Christ, Joel, Peter and Luke gave the word the wrong definition? The *divine* definition is good enough for me. I

am willing to accept it, though all human theories in regard to the mode of baptism should fall to the earth. My friends, will you accept the *divine* definition of baptize? Come, lay aside your prejudice—let your theory go to the "moles and bats," and take the plain word of God.

But Bro. H. says the Holy Ghost *sat upon them*, and wishes to add "*sat upon*" to complete the divine definition. I am not much surprised when he makes mistakes in referring to other parts of the Scripture, but it does puzzle me a little when he makes a mistake in referring the 2nd chapter of Acts, than which no other chapter in the Bible is a more universal favorite with Campbellites. Take the 3rd verse. "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them." The Holy Ghost was not yet mentioned in this chapter—the 4th verse makes the first mention of the Holy Ghost; but Bro. H. must call these "cloven tongues," the Holy Ghost in order to *get off* some of his wit (?) about somebody sitting upon him. I would as soon sit upon any other water-animal—even a bullfrog. He next gives us "bury" as the divine definition of baptize, and cites us to (Col. ii: 13) for the proof. Let us read from the 11th to the 12th verse of this chapter: "In whom ye are also circumcised with the circumcision *made without hands* in putting off the body, the sins of the flesh *by the circumcision of Christ*. Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins * * * hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses." (1.) The circumcision here called a burial was "*made without hands*," and therefore cannot refer to immersion after Bro. Harding's style, for he always immerses *with hands*. (2.) This baptism refers to Holy Ghost

baptism, for by it those who were "dead in sins" were quickened together with him," (Christ) and "all trespasses" were "forgiven" them. Hence in (Rom. vi: 4-11), those who are "buried with him (Christ) into death" are said (1) to be "*planted together in the likeness of his death,*" (verse 5.) Therefore the burial in (Rom. vi: 4) cannot refer to immersion in water according to the gentleman's own argument, for he says he does not teach that baptism is a sign of Christ's death, and is in a bad humor because I intimated such a thing, so you see after talking so much about slaughtering me, he turns upon his own theory and slaughters it most cruelly. (2.) This baptism *plants* us with, or in Christ, and there is nothing in plunging 'a man into the water and jerking him out the next moment that resembles planting. Therefore the burial here spoken of cannot in the most remote sense refer to immersion in water. (3.) The burial in baptism here mentioned crucifies the "old man"—destroys the "body of sin," hence it cannot be water baptism. (4.) By this baptism we become "dead unto sin, but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." (Verse 11.) The simple fact is the apostles here tells what Holy Ghost baptism does for us, and no reference is made 'to the mode of baptism, hence Bro. H. has not found the divine definition of baptize in the word "*bury*" So he utterly fails to sustain, his proposition, that in baptism "there must be a burial." Holy Ghost baptism takes us into Christ—hence Paul says, "For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body. (1 Cor. xii: 13, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." (Gal. 3: 27.) "As ye have therefore received Christ Jesus, the Lord, so walk ye in him." (Col. 2- 6.) And the admonition is, "Walk ye in the Spirit." (Gal. 2: 16.) And as we are no where ad-

monished to walk in the water, it is quite clear that we receive Christ in Spirit baptism, and not in water. All that my brother says about "down into" and "up out of" is no proof in regard to the mode of baptism, the argument he makes here is simply supposition, and that you all know very well, so I will pass it by with this observation, he sticks closely to his rule of "supposition and inference," and well he may, for he has utterly failed to sustain his proposition by the Bible. Wonder why he did not tell us just how Benaiah slew the lion—he had just the same statements in regard to the case that he has in "down into" and "up out of," in reference to baptism. But wasn't his comment on (Matt. xii: 39) funny? He pretends that I did not quote the text correctly in order to make my argument plausible. Oh, no! The passage reads just to my liking. (1.) Jesus gave baptism before that generation passed away, and if it was a sign of his burial and resurrection, it was a sign to them as well as to others, for "God is no respecter of persons." (Acts x: 34) God does not give two signs to represent one event (3.) But the positive proof that baptism is not a sign of Christ's burial and resurrection is found in his own language. "But he answered and said unto them, an evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas; for as Jonas was three days and three nights in the whales belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." (Matt. xii: 39-40.) (4.) It would be very hard to make sensible people see how putting a subject under water and taking him out the same moment, could represent a three days and three nights burial, but some folks see wonderfully when their theory is involved.

He next takes up the case of the jailer, and says, "the *circumstances* of that case clearly point to immersion." (*Italics mine.*) Yes, *circumstances!* He sticks to his *circumstances!!* Well, that is the best he can do, and all he has done, and a man ought to be excused when he does the best he can. But suppose we admit all that he says about Paul and Silas preaching in the jailer's house.

Now, Bro. H. claims that there was no reason why they should go out of the house to wash their stripes unless it was to be immersed. What! Would you have the jailer strip the apostles right in the presence of his wife and children to wash them? Verily you must be put to it for *circumstances* in this case pointing to immersion. In order to get the three thousand immersed on the day of Pentecost, Bro. H. finds about *fifteen acres* of water in, and near to Jerusalem, and this is another of his *circumstances* pointing to immersion, but we would like to have at least *some hint* from some expression found in the second chapter of Acts, that would help us to believe that the 3,000 went away from where Peter preached to be baptized, and as that expression does not occur, we beg of Bro. H. that he fall not out with us if we tell him that his *fifteen acres (?) of circumstances* are not sufficient to arouse even the *slightest suspicion* in our minds that the 5,000 were immersed, and more especially as the divine definition of baptize is "*pour out*" etc. But Bro. H. brings up the case of a Kentucky colored man baptizing so many, in so short a time, near Franklin, Ivy., to prove that the 3,000 *could have been immersed in a given time*. In the absence of any Scripture to prove that they were immersed, this was the best he could do, but my friends I would rather have *one word* of Bible testimony on this point than a thousand of his Kentucky colored "*circumstances;*" but you have noticed

that it is much easier for Bro. H. to furnish us with "*circumstanced* to prove immersion, than it is to furnish Scripture. To make it very clear (?) that Paul was immersed, he finds a river running *right through the city of Damascus*—wonder if that river ran through the "house of Judas" on the street that is called Straight?" for Paul was baptized in that house, unless Bro. H. gets him out by "supposition" or "*circumstances.*" (Acts ix; 11-19.) Now you must not forget that I have said, "the only way Bro. H. can prove immersion is by "*inference*, supposition, or circumstance. . ." I do not say this in ridicule, I say it because it is true, and I say it because the Campbellites have boasted so much about "taking the Bible alone," that I want you to notice the inconsistency between their theory and their practice.

Now take the following cases, and in none of these cases can there be found the *slightest intimation* in the Bible, that the persons baptized went away from the place of worship to be baptized, and yet Bro. H. gets them all immersed by his *famous rule*. The Bible account of the Corinthian's baptism is: "And many of the Corinthian's hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts xviii: 8.) Not the slightest intimation that they left the place of preaching, yet Bro. H. has them all immersed *because Corinth was situated on a sea*. The Bible account of the baptism of Cornelius and his friends is: "Can any *man forbid water*, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." (Acts x: 47-48.) But Caesarea, the home of Cornelius, was on a sea, therefore, from this *circumstance*, Bro. H. concludes that they were surely, and without doubt immersed. The Bible account of the baptism of the twelve men at Ephesus is: "When they

heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts xix: 5.) No intimation that they went away from the place of instruction, but Ephesus was near a sea, therefore Bro. H. from this "*circumstance*" concludes they were immersed. You can now see why I say so much about Campbellism being a system which is based upon "*opposition*" *inference* and *circumstances*" rather than on the word of God. But when I make such charges a cry of "misrepresentation" and "persecution" is heard from the various quarters, and some are so very full of Campbellism they get in a very bad humor, and say ugly things. Next he takes the case of Israel crossing the Red Sea—says the ground could not have been dry if the cloud poured out water as they were crossing. God could cause frogs, lice, flies and locusts to cover all the land or Egypt, except where Israel dwelt; he could cause murrain of beasts and boils and blains upon man and beast, among all the Egyptians, while Israel remained unhurt; he could send hail mingled with fire upon all the Egyptians and their cattle, while all was well with Israel; he could send thick darkness that could be felt and slay one in every family of the Egyptians, while all was light and health in Israel; he could make the cloud darkness to Egypt, and light to Israel; but Bro. H. seems to think that to pour the baptismal water from the cloud upon Israel without wetting the ground would have been too much for God!

If we admit all that Bro. H. has said about Israel being immersed, we would still fail to see anything in it that resembles Campbellite immersion. Now Bro. H. admits that the baptism of Israel in crossing the Red Sea is typical of Christian baptism, and as that was done in the days of miracles, he must admit that God could have turned the sea loose on Israel for a moment, and then removed it from

them; or (suiting the type to Campbellite immersion,) he could have taken the people and plunged them under the water, and taken them out the same moment, but neither of these did he do; he *poured out* the water from the cloud. (Ps. lxxvii: 17). So this baptism agrees with the divine definition of baptize. But Bro. H. says, "true he finds sprinkle in the Bible, but not in connection with baptism." Well, I say true *he has not found immersion* in the Bible and he never will. I would like to know how any unprejudiced man could say that "sprinkle" in (Isa. lii: 15) is not connected with the baptism of the Eunuch. But for the sake of argument, suppose we admit that this sprinkling refers to the sprinkling of Christ's blood, as Bro. H. claims; what then? Just one passage will show clearly that the mode of baptism is sprinkle, or pour. Take (1 John v: 7.) And there are three that bear witness in earth, the Spirit and the water; and the blood; *and these three agree in one.*' Now I have shown that Holy Ghost baptism was always done *by pouring out*, etc., and Bro. H. admits (as the Bible teaches) that the blood was sprinkled, and to agree with the Spirit and blood, the water must be poured or sprinkled for there can be no agreement between these threes except it be in the mode of their reception. So Bro. H. fails to prove that the Eunuch was immersed.

But Bro. H. thinks he finds baptism in the words "he preached unto Mm Jesus." Well, we all know that Campbellites get to water in every sermon, but Bro. H. gets baptism out of these words by his rule "*supposition*," and that only. You will not forget that I showed this morning that the *divine* definition of baptize is, "*pour out*" "*come upon*." As so much has been said about the baptism of Christ' I will say, I hope no one in this audience is capable of believing that Jesus was *immersed* for baptism, and then defined baptize, "*come upon*." (Acts i: 8.)

Let us notice (Acts xi: 15, 16.) "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost *fell on them, as on us* at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed *baptized with water*; but ye shall be *baptized with the Holy Ghost*" Here we see *the falling* of the Holy Ghost *upon the people*, was Holy Ghost baptism, *and it reminded Peter of John's baptizing with water*. But Bro. H. says John *immersed!* However, he utterly failed to give us *chapter and verse*. If you should *see* some one pour water on another do you think it would remind you of some one you had seen *dipped into the water*? Now I showed you three cases of immersion in the Bible, and the result was *death* in every case. Often Jonah in the whale's belly, Daniel in the lion's den, and the wicked in hell, are referred to in order to illustrate immersion; and Bro. H. brings out this idea in his Dutchman's story; and you will notice that all of these are *cases of punishment*, so they accord with the cases of immersion I gave you this morning. Now notice these three points. (1) Bro. H. did the best he could to get immersion out of the Bible, and failed. (2) He then tried the old worn out Dutchman story, and failed; so (3) He appealed to your good *common sense*, and here he failed utterly, for that kind of sense *cannot*, and *does not* sustain his theory. He is like the little boy who, (1) reached for the butter and failed to get it. (2) He stood up and reached his full length and failed again. (3) He said, "will some of you please hand me the butter?" Bro. H. reached far as he could into the Bible for immersion and failed to find it, then he reached his full length with his Dutchman story, and failed again; then ladies and gentleman, please just admit that immersion is the Bible mode of baptism, for I have done my best, and failed to prove it.

Now, brother, I will give you an illustration that may be

of service to you when you get into a similar strait to the one you are now in. Aunt Dilsy was greatly troubled about the mode of baptism. She got out of her trouble thus: "I tell yer Miss Jennie I'se happy; I go to de baptism this mornin' an as broder Sam led broder Tom down into de water, I said, O Lord, sho me de right mode of baptism. Den I looks an' sees broder Tom as he go under de water, an de water seem to say, bab, bab, bab; den when broder Tom comes up out ob de water, I see de water dropin' of'en him, an ever drop as it fell into de water seem to say, tizim, tizim, tizim; an I could hole In no longer, I clap my han's an shout, bless de Lord, dars de bab, an dars de tizim, an dat makes baptism." Don't forget this brother H. it comes about as near proving immersion as anything you have produced. During this debate, I have been forcibly reminded of my boyhood days when I used to make corn stalk fiddles, I'd cut off two joints of a corn stalk and raise two strings on one joint for my fiddle, and one on the other joint for my bow. I would draw my bow across the tenor string, and it would say, 'tis, 'tis, 'tis; then across the bass string and it would say 'taut 'taut, 'taut; so it has been all through this debate; Bro. H. would tell you at one time that immersion began at the Red Sea—then when offered a subject to demonstrate how a man could be immersed in water on dry ground, he would tell you that immersion began with John the Baptist, so you see, 'tis, 'taut, 'tis, 'tant, all through his speeches. No matter what kind of proof is brought, how much Scripture is quoted, to sustain a proposition, he don't see the point. He reminds me of the man who made a wager that he could show another man a thousand rats if the other would stand where he placed him. Having put the man in position, he went to an old barn, and disturbed the rats under the barn, which caused them to

run to a crib some steps away, passing by the man who was expected to see them. He cried out' "Do you see any rats?" "No," answered the other. Being surprised at this he walked round the barn, and there stood his man with both eyes closed. He ask, "did you see any rats?" "Not one; but I reckon *five hundred ran over my feet.*"

Ah, that illustrates the case. Bro. H. stands with his eyes closed, and I have run the arguments over his feet by the dozens, and he has endured very well, except when a very heavy rat got on his foot, then he would jump up and cry, "*order, order, order!*" He has been very personal in several of his remarks, but I have not called him to order one time, yet he has called me to order several times, and always when I was introducing Scripture testimony that he knew made Campbellism appear ridiculous. You noticed that Bro. H. did not refer to the three cases of undoubted immersion in the Bible to which I called his attention, and I also showed that in all of those cases immersion was death to the subjects immersed, while sprinkling and pouring, when spoken of in the Bible, always refer to a blessing. Now does it not seem strange that the "pouring out" of water from the clouds upon the Israelites as they crossed the Red Sea, is called baptism. (1 Cor. x: 1, 2.) While the immersion of the Egyptians on the same occasion, in the same sea, at the same place, and by the same God, is nowhere in the Bible, called baptism—I say, does not this seem a little strange if immersion is the only Bible mode of baptism? But we are told by Bro. H. that "John's baptism was prophetic; it looked forward to the burial and resurrection of Jesus: the baptism instituted by Jesus is memorial, looking back to the game notable events." "Well, the difference between St. Paul and Bro. H. in regard to John's baptism may be seen by reference to (Acts xix: 4.)

"Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, *that they should believe on him which should come after him, that is on Christ Jesus.*" Here Paul tells us that in John's baptism the people were obligated to believe on Christ Jesus when he came, but Bro. H. tells us that it looked to the "burial and resurrection of Jesus." Which will you believe, Paul, or Bro. H.? As for me, I am with Paul on this question. Again the difference between Bro. H. and Christ in regard to Christian baptism may be seen by reference to (Matt. xii: 39, 40.) Here in reference to his burial and resurrection, Jesus says, "*There shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the prophet Jonas;*" but Bro. H. says Christian baptism is a sign of the burial and resurrection of Christ. Now it is clear that Paul and Jesus both were mistaken, or that Bro. H. is mistaken. Who do you think has made the mistake? I must say that though Bro. H. is quite *smart*, and well posted, yet I do steadfastly believe that he has made the mistake, and therefore I stand with Paul and Jesus on these points. But I will sum up a few of the points and if you will keep them in mind, it will save you much annoyance which so many suffer from the constant cry of water! water!! water!!! which so constantly goes out from the Campbellites of this land. I showed you:

(1) That John's baptism was not Christian baptism. (Acts xix: 4.)

(2) To be consistent, Bro. H. must admit this, for he says, "John died before the Kingdom was set up," or, before the Christian church was established.

(3) That not *one word* is said about the multitudes going to water to be baptized.

(4) That the record shows that the people always went to *John*, whether he preached near the river Jordan, in the

wilderness, in Bethabara, or in AEnon, the multitudes went to *John*. (Matt iii: 5. Mark i: 5. Jno. x: 40.)

(5) That all said by Bro. H. about the people *going to the water to be immersed*, amounts to nothing more than *supposition*.

(6) That the three thousand at Pentecost were baptized where Peter preached, and not the slightest intimation in the Bible that they moved one foot from the place of worship. (Acts ii: 41.)

(7) That the people of Samaria were baptized right where Philip preached—no intimation in regard to any move whatever. (Acts viii: 12.)

(8) That Paul was baptized *in the house of Judas, Handing on his feet*, so far as the record shows—not even a *hint* in regard to a move. (Acts ix: 11-18.)

(9) That the household of Cornelius, and his friends were baptized where Peter did the preaching. No move. (Acts x: 47, 48.)

(10) That Christ, God, Joel and Peter, all define the word baptize to "*pour out, come upon, fall upon, shed forth*," therefore the mode of baptism is not immersion, but *pouring*. (Joel iii: 18. Acts ii: 17; xi: 15.)

(11) That Bro. H.'s definition of baptism will not do, for the burial referred to by him (Col. ii: 12,) was' done *without hands*" and immersion in water is not done that way. (Col. ii: 11, 12.)

(12) That *burial* will not do for the definition of baptize according to Bro. H.'s own teaching, for he says baptism does not refer to the death of Christ, and the burial spoken of in (Rom. vi: 4) was "in the likeness of his death," verse 5.

(13) That the baptism referred to in (Rom. vi: 4,) and in (Col. ii: 11, 12,) is Holy Ghost baptism, and that it

takes us into Christ. (1 Cor. xii: 13. Gal. iii: 27.)

(14) That Bro. H.'s argument for immersion is based wholly on supposition and inference.

(15) That Bro. H. differs from Paul in regard to John's baptism. (Acts xix: 4.)

(16) That Bro. H. differs from Christ in regard to Christian baptism. (Matt. xii: 39, 40.)

(17) That few sensible people can see any similarity between a burial of three days and nights, and a *dipping of one second*.

(18) That there are accounts of three cases of immersion in the Bible, and it was death to the subjects in every case.

(19) Bro. H. has made a flat failure, and his proposition remains unsustained, and I will say it is unsustainable. But I will not mention all the points that have been made, because it would take too much of my time. Now I want to ask this audience a few questions. If, as all admit, the baptism which God administered to the Israelites as they crossed the Red Sea is typical of Christian baptism, and that baptism took place on "dry ground," do you think that we Methodists commit a very grievous sin when we baptize people on dry ground? Did not God set us the example? Is it wicked in us to follow God's example? If Saul was baptized in the house of Judas, standing on his feet, is it a very great sin for us Methodists to baptize people in private dwelling houses, as we sometimes do? If, as I have shown you, God the Father, God the Son, Joel, and Peter, have defined the word baptize, "Pour out, come upon, shed forth, fall upon," is it an unpardonable sin for us to pour out, or shed forth the baptismal water, that it may come upon, or fall upon the subjects? If John baptized *with water*, as he and Christ say he did, and Jesus baptized with the Holy Ghost, and the mode of Holy Ghost baptism was al-

ways *pouring*, do you think it is a great crime for us in baptizing with water, to pour the water, especially, as water baptism is a picture of Holy Ghost baptism? I see from your bright faces that you do not believe we Methodists have committed the unpardonable sin because we pour water upon those whom we baptize. I want to say here and now that I think the tendency of the present day is to spend too much time and labor on external modes, and to give too little time and attention to the great spiritual work which must be wrought in men before they can be saved. But what are we to do? Our Campbellite friends tell our members that pouring will not do for baptism, and that if they are not immersed the devil will get them; and then they challenge us preachers to debate the matter, and when we accept their challenge, and expose their horrible teachings, they get angry, and attack our characters, and try to break the force of our arguments by charging upon us some mean thing. Of course there is no better evidence to a sensible people that a man feels that he has lost his cause, than when he makes an attack on the character of his opponent and tries to drag him into a personal wrangle. True to the custom of many of his brethren, Bro. H. has made that attempt with me, but I want to say that I did not come here to investigate Harding's character—that is no part of my business, and not in accord with the rules by which this debate was to be conducted, which rules, or agreement, was signed by both of us, and when I put my fist to a document I propose to stand by it like an honest man. As to the matter between Elder Kidwill and myself, if any of you wish to know the truth of the matter, which Bro. H. does not seem to know—at least he has not stated it) call on me, and I will give you a leaflet, which is signed by 33 honorable men who live in the community where the affair occur-

red, and know whereof they speak. This is all I have to say, except I am sorry that Bro. H. takes his defeat so hard and I offer him this consolation, he is not alone in his grief, I have seen several of his brethren just in about the same condition. My brother, if you must and will challenge men for debate, you ought to get on the right side, then you will have a better showing, for you have a very poor showing indeed, while you stand on the Campbellite platform. Now my friends, we are nearing the close of this discussion, and it may be that some of us are nearing the end of this life, and by all means let us be ready. I have put all of my energy into this discussion, and my zeal may not have been according to knowledge in every case, and if I have wounded anyone, I assure you it was not intentional, and I assure you that I have good feelings for you all, and hope to meet you in glory, for my whole soul, mind, and strength, is looking in that direction, and I will live with Jesus and the angels when this earthly pilgrimage shall close. God bless you all. Amen.

[*Time expired.*]