

DEBATE ON BAPTISM:

EMBRACING

MODE AND SUBJECTS.

BETWEEN

ELDER J. A. HARDING, (DISCIPLE),

OF KENTUCKY, AND

REV. T. L. WILKINSON, (METHODIST),

OF BRANTFORD, ONT.

HELD IN MEAFORD, ONT., COMMENCING DECEMBER 15TH, 1884,
AND CONTINUING FOR SIX CONSECUTIVE DAYS.

STENOGRAPHICALLY REPORTED BY G. B. BRADLEY, ESQ., OF TORONTO, OFFICIAL
REPORTER FOR THE HOUSE OF COMMONS OF CANADA, AND REVISED
BY THE RESPECTIVE DISPUTANTS.

TORONTO:

WILLIAM BRIGGS, 78 & 80 KING STREET EAST.

MONTREAL: C. W. COATES.

HALIFAX: S. F. HUESTIS.

1886.

Entered, according to the Act of the Parliament of Canada, in the year one
thousand eight hundred and eighty-six, by WILLIAM BRIGGS, in the Office
of the Minister of Agriculture at Ottawa.



*Fairfax Church building in
Winchester, Kentucky. Constructed in 1891*

ENDORSEMENTS.

MR. HARDING'S ENDORSATION.

The Publishers of the Harding-Wilkinson Debate, Messrs. James Anderson, John Anderson and Robert Abercrombie, have seemed desirous of giving to the public a fair, impartial report of it, and I am well pleased with the result of their efforts.

(Signed), J. A. HARDING.

WINCHESTER, Ky., Jan. 25, 1886.

MR. WILKINSON'S ENDORSATION.

I hereby certify that I have revised, corrected, and read proofs of all my own speeches as published in this book, and have no hesitation in endorsing the statements of the publishers in the "Preface," as to the circumstances attending the publication.

(Signed), T. L. WILKINSON,

PARKDALE, Jan. 21, 1886.

PREFACE.

IN introducing this book to the public of Canada, a brief statement of the circumstances of its publication will naturally be looked for by the reader. Those circumstances are as follows: In the month of August, 1884, Elder Harding, of Kentucky, who was then holding evangelistic services in the County of Grey, near Meaford, publicly challenged Rev. T. L. Wilkinson, of Brantford, to a platform discussion of the question of Baptism. The challenge having been accepted by Mr. Wilkinson, it was subsequently agreed that the debate should be held during the ensuing December in the town of Meaford. It was to occupy two sessions of two hours each, per day, and continue for six days.

Elder Harding being recognized by the Disciples as one of their ablest polemical representatives, and Mr. Wilkinson being regarded as familiar with the various aspects of the subject, and expert in its exposition and defence from the Paedo-baptist standpoint, a very deep interest was excited in the community at the prospect of this debate. Accordingly, as the time for the conflict drew near, the conviction became general that it would be a misfortune not to have a full and faithful report of the whole discussion preserved for the benefit of other neighborhoods and future generations. The outcome of this feeling was the formation of a small syndicate, or combination, to get the debate reported and published. This combination was altogether independent of either of the disputants, though its action was to be contingent on the consent of both. This being obtained, negotiations were opened with Mr. Thomas Bengough, official reporter, of the city of Toronto, resulting in an agreement on his part to furnish a full and impartial report of the whole debate. At the appointed time Mr. Ben-

gough sent Mr. G. B. Bradley, chief of the House of Commons reportorial staff, who attended all the sessions and supplied what was supposed to be, and should have been, an impartial and authentic report. As a matter of fact, however, there was a transparent discrepancy in the comparative length of the different speeches, though, with the exception of the opening addresses on each proposition, they occupied the same time in delivery. It was apparent from this that the reporter had not always been equally faithful in the performance of his task. Nor were either of the disputants entirely satisfied with the result, though it is but fair to Mr. Wilkinson to say, that as he had not preserved the notes taken hurriedly during the debate, and did not profess to be able to reproduce his speeches from memory, and being also greatly straitened for time, he only claimed the privilege of making such verbal corrections in the reporter's notes as to secure general accuracy of expression and teaching. This privilege, of course, was fully accorded to both the disputants, but as Mr. Wilkinson frequently spoke with great rapidity his speeches generally occupied a little more space than Mr. Harding's, though, owing to this fact, the latter claimed that he had suffered greater injustice at the reporter's hands than his opponent, and accordingly enlarged the scope of the privilege even to the entire reproduction of nearly everything in his part of the debate. Some of his speeches were enlarged to nearly, if not quite double their original length, and nearly every sentence cast in a different mould. This, of course, would have given him a very unfair advantage, relatively, had not Mr. Wilkinson, in view of this, claimed a like privilege—a privilege which could not in honor be denied him—after which he also, while preserving his speeches, for the most part, in their integrity, made such alterations and additions as to more perfectly meet the altered attitude of his opponent. This was more especially the case in his later speeches. While the result of all this has been to greatly delay the date of publication, and enhance the size and price of the book, it has at the same time, doubtless, greatly increased the force of the argument, thus enhancing its value and rendering it more acceptable to its readers. The loss in one direction has, we feel sure, been more than repaired by the gain in another.

Some expressions in the book, on both sides, may be regarded by some as needlessly severe; at the same time considerable latitude should be allowed for the provocation and excitement almost inseparable from a public debate.

We regret the altercation following the last few speeches of the debate under the "Addenda" headings, and did all we reasonably could to prevent it. When one party resorted to such a course, it rendered it necessary for the other to do the same; but as they sufficiently explain themselves, any further reference to the matter is uncalled for here.

It will be acknowledged by all that the book contains a vast amount of research and valuable information, and the publishers feel assured that they have done a real service to the cause of truth by its publication.

The argument on both sides is vigorous and impressive. The debate will be found, in general, not only interesting, but often racy and in many instances not a little amusing. We doubt not that the book will be read by thousands and prove a source of profitable instruction to all. The scarcity of such works in the field of Canadian literature, and the growing interest attaching to the theme, are surely a sufficient vindication of the publishers in offering a work of such a character and merit to the patronage of the Canadian public.

Each disputant has carefully examined and corrected the proof of his own speeches, both in galley and page form, hence both parties have reason to be satisfied with the result.

Under these circumstances, and for the reasons assigned, the book is sent forth by its promoters to the fulfillment of its mission, and it is ardently hoped, and sincerely believed, that that mission will be one of untold blessing.

JAMES ANDERSON,
JOHN ANDERSON,
ROBT. ABERCROMBRE

} *Publishers.*

REPORT OF DEBATE

ON THE

MODE AND SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

FIRST DAY.

FIRST SESSION.

AT the hour of two o'clock on the day indicated in the Preface the Town Hall, Meaford, was well filled with a highly respectable audience, evidently interested to know the truth relative to the vexed question of Christian baptism.

The chair was occupied by Mr. Alfred Gifford.

After devotional exercises, he announced that Mr. Harding would now open the debate by affirming the first proposition, as follows: "Christian baptism is immersion,—in it there must be a burial in water." The first speech on each side, he said, would occupy an hour, after which the addresses on this proposition would be confined to thirty minutes.

MR. HARDING said,—Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: I take it that every man who loves God, every man who has within him the Spirit of Christ, desires to know the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. I realize as I stand here that to believe that which is false could do me no good in the world, and that to lead others to believe that which is false would be very hurtful to them and very injurious to me. I want, therefore, to know the truth with all my heart.

Again, I understand that this audience will expect those who engage in this debate to display the spirit of Christians; and you

ought to expect it. I know a great many people come to these discussions expecting a wrangle, and I hope you will be very much disappointed if you have come here with any such expectation. Our Chairman has told you that he is somewhat prejudiced against religious discussions, and in the course of his remarks he referred to the fact that in secular debates the debaters very often displayed a spirit by no means complimentary to themselves. My experience in religious discussions,—and I have had some little experience in that line,—has led me to a different conclusion. I have had discussions lasting six or eight days, during the whole of which time a kind, fraternal spirit prevailed.

Christ said to His disciples, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned." These instructions are recorded by Matthew and Mark. Christ gave this great commission, this great law, under which all baptize who baptize at all, for it is agreed that our authority for baptism comes from this document, and in giving this commission He used a word which we are to consider, that is, the word rendered "baptize." The Greek word is *baptizo*. The question before us is, What does this Greek word mean? Not, What does the English word baptize as used to-day mean? That is not the question. If I were writing an English dictionary, and should come to that English word, and should consider the meaning in which it is now used,—for use is the arbiter of language,—it would be necessary to give the definition of the word as it is used to-day. And I would define it something like this: "To baptize, to initiate people into the Church by sprinkling or pouring water upon them, or by immersing them in water." But, mark you, we are not here to find out what the English word baptize as now used means, but to find out what the word *baptizo* meant when Christ used it more than 1800 years ago. I shall call your attention to the authorities as represented in lexicons, and in the Church histories, and in the cyclopaedias,—three classes of authorities. Then I shall call attention to the use of the word in the Scriptures.

I will introduce my argument by a few readings with respect to the laws governing the interpretation of words. There is scarcely a word in any language which has only one meaning. Words are used not only in their literal, but also in figurative senses,—not only in their primary, but in secondary senses.

Mr. William Blackstone says, "The words of a law are generally to be understood in their usual and most known signification, not so

much regarding the propriety of grammar as their general and popular use; but when words bear either none, or a very absurd signification, if literally understood, we must a little deviate from the received sense of them."

Bishop Taylor says, "In all things where the precept is given in the proper style of laws, he that takes the first sense is the likeliest to be well guided. In the interpretation of the laws of Christ the strict sense is to be followed."

Dr. Jonathan Edwards, the greatest of American Presbyterian theologians, has truly said, "In words capable of two senses, the natural and proper is the primary, and therefore ought in the first place and chiefly to be regarded." A greater still, Vitringa, has said, "This is accounted by all a constant and undoubted rule of approved interpretation, that the ordinary and most usual signification of words must not be deserted except for sufficient reasons." Turretine has said, "It is acknowledged by all that we should never depart from the proper and native signification of words except for the weightiest and most urgent reasons." The English Pirie says, "Law requires words and phrases of the most ascertained and unequivocal sense."

Dr. Benson says; "What can be more absurd than to imagine that the doctrines or rules of practice which relate to men's everlasting salvation should be delivered in such ambiguous terms" as to be capable of many meanings *V*

Here we have a great law called the great commission given to us by Christ, and in it the word *baptizo* occurs. The question is, What does it mean? The reason it is important to determine this is because one minister immerses the candidate in water, and says, "I baptize thee"; another pours the water upon him, and says, "I baptize thee"; and another sprinkles the water upon him, and says, "I baptize thee." The question naturally arises, Which is correct? Are they all correct, or is there but one correct and proper way? What does the word mean? I want to make a statement here which I made when I had no opponent before me. It is, that every single lexicographer testifies that this word means to dip, immerse, plunge. Not one of them says it means .to sprinkle. Here I have a stack of lexicons every one of which says the word means dip or plunge, not one of them says it means sprinkle. My opponent will not bring the lexicon that contains sprinkle, because it does not exist. What do the lexicons say?

William Greenfield (N. T. Lex.) defines "*Baptizo* (from *Bapto*), to immerse, immerge, submerge, sink; in

N. T. to wash, perform ablution, cleanse; to immerse, baptize, administer the rite of baptism."

Thomas Sheldon Green (N. T. Lex.) defines

"*Baptizo*, properly to dip, immerse; to cleanse or purify by washing; to administer the rite of baptism, to baptize.

"*Baptisma*, properly immersion, baptism, ordinance of baptism; *met.* baptism in the trial of suffering.

"*Baptismos*, properly an act of dipping or immersion; a baptism; an ablution."

John Pickering gives the following meanings:

"*Baptizo*, to dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink; in N. T. to wash, perform ablution, cleanse; baptize; *also* to overwhelm *one with anything*, to be prodigal *towards one*.

"*Baptisma*, immersion, dipping, plunging; *met.* misery, calamity, *i.e.* with which one is overwhelmed; baptism.

"*Baptismos*, a washing; baptism."

John Groves (Classic and N. T. Lex.) defines

"*Baptizo* (from *Bapto* to dip), dip, immerse, immerge, plunge, to wash, to cleanse, purify, to baptize, depress, humble, overwhelm.

" *Baptisma*, a washing, ablution; purification, baptism; the Christian doctrine, depth of affliction or distress.

" *Baptismos*, immersion in water, washing; ceremonial purification."

Edward Robinson (N. T. Lex.) defines

" *Baptizo*, to dip in, to sink, to immerse; to dip in a vessel, to draw water; in N. T. to wash, to lave, to cleanse by washing; to baptize, to administer the rite of baptism; *pass*, and *mid.* to be baptized, or to cause oneself to be baptized; to baptize with calamities, to overwhelm with sufferings.

" *Baptisma*, properly anything dipped in or immersed; in N. T., baptism; *trop.* baptism for calamities, afflictions, with which one is overwhelmed.

"*Baptismos*, properly a dipping, immersion; in N. T. *a washing, ablution* of vessels, couches; baptism."

James Donnegan (Classical Lex.) defines

"*Baptizo*, to immerse repeatedly into a liquid; to submerge—to soak thoroughly, to saturate; *hence*, to drench with wine; *met.* to confound totally,—to dip in a vessel and draw.

"*Baptisma*, an object immersed, submerged, washed, or soaked."

Cornelius Schrevelius (Greek-Latin and Latin-Greek Lex.) defines

"*Baptize*, baptizo, mergo, abluo, lavo; in *English*, to baptize, to dip, to, wash, to bathe.

"*Baptisma*, immersio, tinctio, baptisma; in *English*, immersion, dipping (or dyeing), baptism.

"*Baptismos*, baptism us, lotio; in *English*, a baptism, a washing.

"*Baptistees*, qui immergit, baptista; in *English*, one who immerses, the Baptist."

And last, but greatest of all, I introduce the great standard Greek-English definer, the lexicon of Henry George Liddell, Dean of Christ Church, and Robert Scott, Master of Balliol, Oxford. No intelligent reader of Greek would now question the authority of these distinguished English scholars. This lexicon thus defines "*Baptizo*, to dip repeatedly; of ships, *to sink* them; *pass*, to bathe, *oi bebaptismenoi*, soaked in wine; *ophleemasi beb.*, over head and ears in debt; to draw water; to baptize.

"*Baptismos*, a dipping, bathing, a washing, drawing water; baptism.

"*Baptisma*, that which is dipped; equal foregoing in N. T."

Having now examined the proper authorities, the lexicons, in order to find the meaning of the word which our Saviour used, we find that all define it to dip, or immerse, or plunge; that none give sprinkle, or pour upon, as meanings. In the first edition of Liddell and Scott, the definition "to pour upon" was given; but as no passage could be found in all Greek literature in which the word had this meaning, the words "to pour upon" were cancelled by these distinguished paedobaptists, and were left out of their second edition; and though seven editions of that great standard work have appeared, those words remain out to this day. A most significant fact!

Let us now turn to the Church historians and see what was the practice of the early Church.

The greatest living Church historian is Dr. Philip Schaff, of New York, a Presbyterian. His prominence in the learned world is indicated by the fact that he was chosen by the Church of England to form an American committee to assist in revising the common version of the Bible. I now read from the first volume of his Church history. "The usual form of the act was immersion, as is plain from the original meaning of the Greek *Baptizein* and *Baptismos*; from the analogy of John's baptism in the Jordan; from the apostle's comparison of the sacred rite with the miraculous passage of the Red Sea, with the escape of the ark from the flood, with a cleansing and refreshing bath, and with burial and resurrection; finally, from the custom of the ancient Church, which prevails in the east to this day.

But sprinkling also, or copious pouring, was practiced at an early day with sick and dying persons, and probably with children and others, where total or partial immersion was impracticable."

So testifies this distinguished paedo-baptist "divine." At just how early a day this "sprinkling" or "copious pouring" began will appear from other readings that are to follow.

The prince of all Church historians is the great German, Augustus Neander. He says, "In respect to the form of baptism, it was in conformity with the original institution and the original import of the symbol, performed by immersion as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Spirit, and of being entirely penetrated by the same."

Next after him I introduce John Lawrence Von Mosheim, scarcely less distinguished in this field of learning. He gives the history of the different centuries separately. He thus testifies:

Century 1. "In this century baptism was administered in convenient places, without the public assemblies, and by immersing the candidates wholly in water."

Century 2. "Twice a year, viz., at Easter and Whitsuntide, baptism was publicly administered by the bishop, or by the presbyters, acting by his command and authority. The candidates for it were immersed wholly in water, with invocation of the sacred Trinity, according to the Saviour's precept, after they had repeated what they called the creed," etc.

Gregory says, "The initiatory rite of baptism was performed by immersing the whole body in the baptismal font, and in the earlier periods of Christianity was permitted to all who acknowledged the truths of the Gospel," etc.

Of modern Church historians the late Dean Stanley stands in the front rank. At one time he was chaplain to Queen Victoria. He visited Russia and the East, and his history of the Eastern Church is now the standard authority on that phase of the Church question. He says, "There can be no question that the original form of baptism, and the very meaning of the word, was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters, and that for at least six centuries any other form was little known, or regarded, unless in the case of dangerous illness, an exceptional and an almost monstrous case."

Now, when it is remembered that the Eastern is the Greek Church, that it has used the Greek language from the day the New Testament was written in Greek by the inspired penmen to this hour, the fact that this Church does now practice immersion, and always has done so, is most overwhelmingly and conclusively in favor of my position.

The next witness to be introduced is Dr. William Wall, Vicar of Shoreham in Kent, a most learned and candid minister of the Church of England. Dr. Wall wrote a "History of Infant Baptism" many years ago which is distinguished by such scholarly research and acumen that it remains the standard work on that subject to this day. There is nothing in its field of literature that approaches at all near it in excellency. As it was written by a paedo-baptist, of course it is not favorable to immersion any further than it is compelled by the facts in the case—the truth of history—to be.

Dr. Wall says, "Their general and ordinary way was to baptize by immersion, or dipping a person, whether it were an infant or grown man or woman, into the water. This is so plain and clear, by an infinite number of passages, that as one cannot but pity the weak endeavours of such paedo-baptists as would maintain the negative of it, so also we ought to disown and show a dislike of the profane scoffs which some people give to the English anti-paedo-baptists merely for their use of dipping. It is one thing to maintain that that circumstance is not absolutely necessary to the essence of baptism, and another thing to go about to represent it as ridiculous and foolish, or as shameful and indecent. It was, in all probability, the way our blessed Saviour was baptized, and for certain was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism. I shall not stay to produce the particular proofs of this. Many of the quotations which I have brought for other purposes, and shall bring, do evince it. It is a great want of prudence as well as of honesty to refuse to grant to an adversary what is certainly true, and may be proved so. It creates a jealousy of all the rest that one says. * * On the other side, the anti-paido-baptists will be as unfair in their turn if they do not grant that in the case of sickness, weakness, haste, want of quantity of water, or such like extraordinary occasions, baptism by affusion of water on the face was by the ancients counted sufficient baptism. I shall, out of the many proofs of it, produce two or three of the most ancient."

Dr. Wall then proceeds to give several cases of affusion, the most ancient of which is that of Novatian, who, A.D. 251, while lying in bed from sickness, received what they called *clinic* baptism. This is the most ancient case of affusion for baptism on record.

Thus we have seen that the lexicons say the word *baptizo* means to immerse; the Church historians testify that they immersed in the first ages of the Church, and we now come to the Bible to see how the word is used there.

Remember the rule of interpretation to which your attention was called in the beginning: Words are to be taken in their "common and most known signification," unless the nature of the case, or the context, forbids. We will examine the Bible accounts of baptisms to see if there is anything to prevent us from taking this word that our Lord used, in its common and most known sense.

In Matthew, 3rd chap., we find, "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." What does that mean? It does not forbid the idea of immersion. John was at the river. The people came out to be baptized there in the Jordan. Farther on it says, "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John to be baptized of him. But John forbad 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 straight-way 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." Christ went to the Jordan to be baptized, and immediately when He was baptized He went up out of the water. That is rather significant. I now read from John 3: 23, "And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came, and were baptized." He was baptizing "because there was much water there." We need much water when we immerse, but not when we sprinkle or pour.

Next, take Acts 8:35 &c., "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 Philip said, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. 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." Here we have Philip and the eunuch coming to the water; the chariot is commanded to stand

still; then they went down into the water, and after the baptism they came up out of the water.

And at Rom. 6: 4, 5, we read, "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."

What does that mean? It means that we are buried with Him by baptism into death. I have heard it intimated that this does not refer to immersion,—that a man is a fool who would think so. So I interpret it. I have here Wesley's notes on the New Testament. He says, "We are buried with Him, (alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion), that as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we also by the same power should rise again."

Lange's Commentary on Romans (Schaff's edition) says, "To be buried is a stronger expression than to die, for the burial confirms the death and raises it beyond doubt. It withdraws the dead from our sight,—annihilates it, as it were." He adds, "Buried in death; an oxymoron, according to which burial precedes and death follows, as is illustrated in the immersion into the bath of baptism." In a note Schaff says, "All commentators of note (except Stuart and Hodge) expressly admit, or take it for granted, that in this verse, especially in *sunetapheemen* and *eegerthee*, the ancient prevailing mode of baptism by immersion and emersion is implied as giving additional force to the idea of the going down of the old and rising up of the new man." Dr. Schaff then quotes Bloomfield, "There is a plain allusion to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion." Barnes, "It is altogether probable that the apostle has allusion to the custom of baptizing by immersion." Conybeare and Howson, "This passage cannot be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion." Webster and Wilkinson, (not this Wilkinson), "Doubtless there is an allusion to immersion as the usual mode of baptism introduced to show that baptism symbolized our spiritual resurrection."

Let us pause a moment and consider what has been presented. The word *baptizo* means to immerse; we have looked into the Church histories, and found that during the first centuries of the Church immersion only was practiced; we have looked into the Bible, and have seen that they went into the water, into much water, and after they were baptized came up out of the water. Paul says in his letter

to the Colossians, 2:12, "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." In his letter to Titus, 3: 5, 6, he says, "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; which He shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." In Heb. 10: 22, we find, "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." We find not only that they went to water, to much water, were buried in baptism, but that their bodies were washed with pure water,—not simply the forehead, or head, but the whole body. At the beginning of this debate I quoted authorities to show that in interpreting words you have to take the usual and most known signification, and you have not to depart from it unless the nature of the case demands it. What is the usual and most known signification of the word *baptizo*—the word that Christ used? Immersion. And you are to take it unless the nature of the case forbids. Does the nature of the case forbid it? No. Everything makes it stronger and more conclusive that that is the meaning we are to take. We find not only that the word means immerse, but they did the very things immersionists do now. The paedo-baptists do not do as they did. They went to the water; went down into the water; talked about baptism as a burial, and about having their bodies washed with pure water. This is all true of immersionists, but not of paedo-baptists, to-day.

In the next place, let us consider the testimony of the great encyclopaedias. The first I will read is the greatest of all,—the "Encyclopedia Britannica." It says, "The usual mode of performing the ceremony was by immersion. In the case of sick persons (clinici) the minister was allowed to baptize by pouring water upon the head, or by sprinkling. In the early Church, clinical baptism, as it was called, was only permitted in case of necessity, but the practice of baptism by sprinkling gradually came in spite of the opposition of councils and hostile decrees. The Council of Ravenna, in 1311, was the first council of the Church which legalized baptism by sprinkling, by leaving it to the choice of the officiating minister. The custom was to immerse three times, once at the name of each of the Persons in the Trinity, but latterly the three-fold immersion was abolished because it was thought to go against the Trinity."

The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopaedia says, "In the primitive Church

baptism was by immersion except in the case of the sick (clinic baptism), who were baptized by pouring or sprinkling. These latter were often regarded as not properly baptized, either because they had not completed their catechumenate, or the symbolism of the rite was not fully observed, or because of the small amount of water necessarily used. * * * The Council of Ravenna (1311) was the first to allow a choice between sprinkling and immersion."

Zell's Encyclopaedia goes back a little farther. It says, "In the time of the apostles the form of baptism was very simple. The person to be baptized was dipped in a river or vessel, with the words which Christ had ordered, and to express more fully his change of character, generally adopted a new name. The Greek Church retained this custom, but the Western Church adopted in the 13th century the mode of baptism by sprinkling, which has been continued by the Protestants, the Baptists only excepted. The introduction of this mode of baptism was owing to the great inconvenience which arose from the immersion of the whole body in the northern climate of Europe. The custom of sprinkling thrice in the administration of the rite spread with the diffusion of the doctrine of the Trinity."

This authority says that dipping was the rule for the first 1300 years. The Council of Ravenna, in 1311, was the first that recognized sprinkling. Members of the Church of England will find dipping in the Book of Common Prayer; Methodists will find it in the Discipline; you will find it everywhere. All say it is right, and that it is proper to practice it. All these great authorities tell you that it was the almost universal practice for the first 1300 years. Dr. Wall gives you the very first case of affusion. Two and a-half centuries of the Christian era had passed away before it came into use. I ask you to pause and consider the evidence heaped up before you. Suppose there is a gentleman present who desires to follow the Saviour and to be baptized. I can tell you how to be baptized. I can show that every one of the lexicographers, and all the Church historians, show that immersion is the proper way and that by it you can follow Jesus step by step. If you go to the water, Christ did so. If you go to much water, Christ did so. If you are buried in baptism, so was Paul. In doing so you step along in the very words of the sacred Scriptures, and you can say, "My body is washed with pure water." That is what Paul said for himself and for the Hebrew Christians. If you pause and ask yourself the question, "Is there any Church that will not receive me because my baptism has not been properly performed?" I say that not a single Church, not a

single congregation would reject you—not one. When I consider all these facts I feel that I am indeed standing on a rock. We gather here to hunt for truth in the name of Christ. We find the word which Jesus gave in the great commission, and when its meaning is called in question we naturally go to the great dictionaries. We are not going from the Bible in doing that. If, in reading the English Bible, you meet with words you do not understand, and you turn to Webster or Worcester, you are not going away from the Bible—you are simply endeavoring to understand it. When I look at the Greek Testament and find *baptizo*, and then look up the dictionaries to find its meaning, I am not turning away from the Bible, but simply finding out what the Bible means. When I turn to the authorities I do not find that the word means to sprinkle or pour; not in a single case anywhere.

I want to call your attention to another baptism that is significant. I have already told you that words have not only a primary and literal signification, but a secondary or metaphorical meaning. I find that Christ used the word *baptizo* in that way. He was with His disciples on one occasion, and the mother of Zebedee's children came and said, "Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on Thy right hand and the other on Thy left in "Thy kingdom. But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? They say unto him, We are able. And He saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of My cup, and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with: but to sit on My right hand, and on My left, is not Mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of My Father." That baptism is the baptism of suffering. Sufferings are likened by the Psalmist to overwhelming water, Psalm 69: 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 waterflood overflow me, neither let the deep swallow me up, and let not the pit shut her mouth upon me." So in verses 1 and 2 of the same psalm: "Save me, O God; for the waters are come into my soul. I sink in deep mire, where there is no standing; I am come into deep waters, where the floods overflow me." Would it do to talk about Christ's having been sprinkled with sufferings? Did he merely have a little suffering poured upon him? Go to Gethsemane in the hour of darkness, and hear the groans of the dying Son of God. Great drops of sweat like blood stand on His brow. Go to Calvary, and hear the cry, "My

God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" These sufferings fulfilled the saying, "I have a baptism to be baptized with." He was overwhelmed in sorrow, crushed down with suffering till His great heart broke and He died on the cross for us. It will not do to call that a mere sprinkling of sorrow, or to refer to it as a slight pouring of suffering; but the great writers say it was an overwhelming suffering. I have a work here by Dr. Stuart, a paedobaptist, and one of the greatest men produced by the Presbyterian Church of the United States. He says: "Inasmuch as the more usual idea of *baptizo* is overwhelming, immersing, it was very natural to employ it in designating severe calamities and sufferings."

So when you turn to the metaphorical meaning of the word you find the same idea in it. Not in a single case do you find sprinkle or pour. If we turn to Matthew we read in the words of John: "I baptize you with water, but Christ will baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." And when we turn to Revelation, we find that the wicked were "plunged into a lake of fire."

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKINSON'S FIRST REPLY.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,—I sympathize to some extent with the remarks made by yourself, Sir, at the opening of this meeting. I have not been very strongly in sympathy with public discussions of this kind. I have been engaged in but two before in my life, and I was crowded into both of them. I did not seek them. I have never challenged any man to a discussion, but when I was challenged I had either to accept the challenge or be branded as a coward if I refused, so I have generally preferred to accept the challenge, because I am terribly proud and hate to be called a coward. In fact, I do not think I am a coward, and therefore do not like to be called one. Some people are very fond of discussion. They are always seeking it. They are always challenging people to debate. They are always branding as cowards those who refuse to debate with them, and once in a great while we have to lay a victim on the altar to gratify their ambition. And I do not know but I may as well be such a victim as any other brother, so occasionally (it is four years since I did it before), I place myself at their disposal just to give them

an opportunity of airing their peculiar sentiments. Yet I do not altogether deprecate discussions like this. I do not like to be in a thunder storm, especially if the wind is very high; at the same time I believe the air is a great deal purer after a good thunder storm and breeze. Cyclones are not pleasant things to be in, but they take away the carbonic acid gas and leave the atmosphere far more pure and healthy. I have seen the same effects with respect to these discussions over disputed points of theology. And if I can do anything to purify the air, why of course I shall be glad to do it. I am afraid, however, that I shall not be able to blow as hard as my opponent, for he has a tremendous pair of lungs. However, they are his own. I shall not complain, no matter how much he vociferates. His fists are his own too, and I shall not complain, no matter how hard he smites them together. And if he must die, I would rather he would kill himself than that the responsibility of killing him should be laid on my shoulders. (Laughter.) It is contrary to the rules of this debate for people to laugh, and I do not want you to do it, or to give expression to your feelings in any way.

I suppose, ladies and gentlemen, I need not take up your time, and especially my precious time (for I have a great task to accomplish inside an hour), in telling you how this debate was brought about. I think this community knows well enough about that matter. My opponent told you in opening that he had been engaged in a number of discussions—I think he said a good many. He has an advantage of me in this respect, as I was never engaged in but two before, and one of them had no reference to this question, so this is my second debate on this subject. I do not claim to be a specialist, either as a scholar, a speaker, or a debater. We have fifty or a hundred men in the Church to which I belong for whom I could not hold a candle to debate. And as to scholarship, when they are around I always take a back seat. But I do not depend on scholarship altogether. I do not propose to bring a cart-load of books here and ask you to believe that they are all on my side. I just came here to talk a little common sense and the Bible to you, and I may have occasion sometimes to refer to scholars in confirmation of the views I advance. Under the circumstances, considering the great disparity that exists between my opponent and myself, he being a scholar and, I understand, a graduate of some university in the United States, armed with books without measure and without number, possessing a voice of stentorian tones—to say nothing of his fists—if I should have to succumb at his hands before the six days of this debate, or the half of

them are over, I am sure you will think it nothing surprising, especially when there is such an array of scholarship on his side. Scholarship, you know, with some people, goes a great way in deciding a question.

Now let us look at the *facts*. My opponent's proposition is,—"*Christian* baptism is immersion,—in it there *must be* a burial in water." If I can produce one single instance, therefore, in which Christian baptism was not a burial in water, I have disproved his proposition altogether,—because in that case there *must not be* a burial in water. So you see I have only to bring one case, and if I do that I can sit down in my chair and defy him to bring on his lexicographers, his authorities, his scholarship, his vociferation, and his smiting of the fists, and put his witnesses in the box, because he says there *must be* a burial in water. But I will take my own way of reaching the point. Libraries are good, but you will find that *facts* are hard things to deal with.

Our purpose in holding this discussion, as stated by my opponent, and in which I fully concur, is not to make blackguards of ourselves, or to insult the people's sense of Christian propriety, or to bandy epithets, or to throw dirt,—I am not going to do that, though if dirt is thrown at me I generally cast it back,—but I came here to discuss the question honestly, fairly, fully if you like, and if one week is not enough we will take two, and if two are not sufficient we will take a month, and if a month will not do we will take three months, and we will reach the bottom of the subject if it has any bottom. I have heard men say, when the roads were about three feet deep with mud, that they were good roads when you got down to them, but they were a long way down. But to the subject.

We are told that Christ gave us the word in question in the commission, and that that word was *baptizo*. That is a matter I may have occasion to dispute, for I think, according to scholarship, on which such a premium is put to-day,—and which I do not propose to disparage,—Christ did not speak in the Greek language, and therefore did not use *baptizo* at all. I throw out this thought in passing. My opponent said, incidentally, that if he were making a dictionary to-day and wished to express the meaning of this term according to the usage of the Church, he would say it meant to initiate people into the Church by sprinkling or pouring a little water on them, or by dipping or immersing them in water, or in some such way. But he was going to appeal from usage to the meaning of the word. And what did he do? The very first "dip" he made he appealed to the lexicons. "Do

you see them," said he (pointing to the pile) It reminded me of a certain Baptist divine who in a written debate with a Methodist brother said, "As I write I have a pile of books before me as huge as high Olympus "That is pretty high My opponent's pile of books is not quite so high, but is nearly so, and far more weighty Now, how are lexicons made? Perhaps it will be interesting to you to know Take Webster and Worcester How do you think they determine the meaning of any word? By usage But my opponent is going to appeal from usage to the meaning of the word, and he then appeals to lexicons which are made from usage That may answer his purpose, but he may find that his lexicons, so far as sustaining his position is concerned, are a little lame But I am not going to the lexicons now I am just going along taking my own road to get there, and I hope to get there by and by

My opponent admitted that there was scarcely any word that had but one meaning I am very glad he made that admission, because he will try his best to hold me to one meaning, and yet there was not a lexicographer he quoted that gave one meaning only You remember how many words he read, defining *baptizo* I think the fewest words he read in any of the lexicons expressive of the meaning of this word was four, five, six, ten, and right on up The fact is that lexicographers have used, to express the meaning of *baptizo*, in its various forms, between fifty and a hundred different words, yet he will try to prove to you that it has only one meaning and that that meaning is expressed in his proposition, to immerse In that very proposition he uses two words to express its meaning In fact, these dear immersionist friends when they find one word fails them, can soon skip to another When "immerse" will not carry them clear through they take shelter in "dip." When it is shown that that word does not express the idea they take shelter in "plunge," and when "plunge" is too big for them they go to "overwhelm," and when "overwhelm" won't answer they take "overflow," and when that will not do they find some other word I have a little book here,—it is not a paedobaptist book, but a book by Dr. T. J. Conant, the greatest light of the Baptist Church in America, and President of the American (Baptist) Bible Revision Committee He is not only ranked as one of the finest scholars, but as one of the most honest men in the Baptist Church,—and that is saying a great deal, for they are all fine, honest people, I have not a word to say against their integrity,—but I think he finds it necessary to employ no less than nine English words to translate this word *baptizo*, and he sets out to

prove it has but one meaning. Yet he cannot find one English word that will translate it all the way through. And no other man can. My opponent cannot and never will, and during the present discussion you will find that out. Take note of this. I will show you, too, that it has more than one meaning. I propose to show you that it has a meaning in the Scriptures which it does not bear in the classics. And I will call your attention right here to what I propose proving, viz., That a number of the very best lexicographers distinguish between classic use, or the general meaning of the term in secular literature, and the New Testament meaning. I ask you particularly to notice this. Greenfield discriminates between the historical or classic, and the New Testament use; Pickering discriminates; Robinson discriminates; Liddell and Scott discriminate; and others, as I shall have occasion to show you. What I want to prove at present is that the Scriptures do not use the term in the exclusive sense of to immerse. But here are a few points to which I wish to call your attention, As an appeal has been made by my opponent to the meaning of the word outside the Bible, outside the Bible we will go to find what Christian baptism means! I take this position:—No human being, or living animal, was ever baptized in the primary, classical sense of the term, according to Greek writers, that is, completely buried, or immersed, and survived it. Drowning was the inevitable result. I do not deny that lexicographers give "dip, plunge, immerse," and that the word has that meaning primarily. My opponent wants to confine you to the classical meaning. We will see where it will land him. And I here declare to you that it will be at the bottom of the water somewhere, and when you get him out you will have a *real* funeral, not a sham or symbolic one. He cannot produce a single case from the Greek writers where any individual or any living animal was said to be baptized, that is, completely put under water, and got out alive, and if he does it will be the result of a huge accident.

I will take Dr. Conant's book and read you a few cases—not all I have noted—in order to illustrate the truth of what I say. Diodorus, in his account of the defeat of the Carthaginian army, describes the destruction of many of the fugitives in the river Crimissus, in Sicily, which had been swollen by a violent storm. He says, "The river, rushing down with the current increased in violence, baptized many, and destroyed them, attempting to swim through with their armor."

In the same work, describing the effects of the rapid rise of the water during the annual inundation of the Nile, he says, "Most of

the wild animals are surrounded by the stream and perish, being baptized; but some, escaping to the high grounds, are saved." Diodorus wrote his history between 30 and 60 years B.C.

Josephus, in his Jewish antiquities, describing the murder of the boy Aristobulus, who, by Herod's command, was drowned by his companions in a swimming-bath, says, "Continually pressing down and baptizing him while swimming, as if in sport, they did not desist till they had entirely suffocated him." Josephus was born A.D. 37.

The same writer, relating the same occurrence, on another occasion said, "And then, according to command, being baptized by the Gauls in a swimming-bath, he dies."

I can give nearly a dozen more examples to the same effect, every one of which resulted in the person or animal perishing. Now, did Christ command His disciples, when He used the word *baptizo*, to go and drown all nations in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,—*i. e.*, to sink them under water and leave them there? For that is what the word in its primary sense meant. There is no getting away from this fact. If Christ meant that the word should be used in that primary or literal sense for which my opponent has been preparing the way, and is trying to defend—though he had to deviate from it before he got through,—then Christ commanded His disciples to go and drown all nations. The word *baptizo* makes no provision whatever for removal from the water, or other liquid element. This same Dr. Conant, after giving the various instances where the Greek word occurs in the classics, makes some general comments, and in these comments, *Baptizein*, p. 88, 89, we read:

"The word *immerse*, as well as its synonyms *immerge*, etc., expresses the full import of the Greek word *Baptizein*. The idea of *emersion* is not included in the meaning of the Greek word. It means, simply, to put into, or under water (or other substance), without determining whether the object immersed sinks to the bottom, or floats in the liquid, or is immediately taken out. This is determined not by the word itself, but by the nature of the case, and by the design of the act in each particular case. A living being, put under water without intending to drown him, is of course to be immediately withdrawn from it; and this is to be understood, wherever the word is used with reference to such a case. But the Greek word is also used when a living being is put under water for the purpose of drowning and, of course, is left to perish in the immersing element. All this is evident from the following examples."

And Dr. Conant gives a number of examples to prove that *baptizo*

is used where living beings are put under water for the purpose of drowning. *Baptizo*, then, in the primary sense does mean—and I could have saved my opponent's time by telling him I was not going to deny it—the submerging of an object in water or any other element. But it means the submerging only; it does not mean to take out. Nor does it express any mode by which that submerging shall take place. It matters not one straw to the meaning of the word how the object gets enclosed in the fluid, so long as it is enclosed,—so that it can be said to be immersed. And so far as the meaning of the word is concerned it is supposed to remain immersed to all eternity. But when you adopt a meaning for Christian baptism that requires the individual to be pulled right out as quickly as possible, to save him from drowning, you not only depart from the primary use of the word, but get him out of the baptizing element and out of the baptized condition. Did Christ command His disciples to impose such a rite upon all who should embrace His religion,—to put them under water and leave them there without the slightest intimation that for the sake of saving their lives they were to be taken out as soon as possible? I want to illustrate this. [Taking up a tumbler partly filled with water.] There is water. Not "much water," but there is enough. My opponent in his proposition says, "Christian baptism is immersion,—In it there must be a burial in water." Now, [dropping a piece of money in the tumbler,] is that piece of money immersed] Is it buried in water? It is lying on the bottom. Is it buried in water? If so it is baptized, according to the definition of my opponent. It is Christian baptism, too, for it is immersed,—buried in water, and that is what he says Christian baptism is. I will just leave it there for a little while, for it cannot drown, and I do not think the Queen's head will suffer by the operation. Can it be possible that that is all Christ meant when He said, "Go baptize all nations"⁷ Did He mean that they should be just covered over with water, like that piece of money, and left there to perish? If so, our immersionist friends, as well as ourselves, come very far short of obeying the divine command. But the fact is, such a command is absurd, and obedience to it would be ruinous. But suppose I should take it out. [Takes the piece of money out and holds it up to the audience.] Is it baptized now? It is not immersed. It is not buried in water, therefore it is not, in that sense of the term, baptized. Now, if we confine ourselves to the primary, or original meaning of the term, the baptism will last just as long as the individual is under the water, and as soon as he is

taken out of the water the baptism ceases. And did Christ intend, when He said, "Go baptize all nations," that they should *stay* baptized, or that it should only be momentary,—that it should be undone as quickly as possible for fear of killing those baptized? He evidently intended that they should stay baptized. But if it means immerse, the people are baptized only while they remain in a state of immersion. But [dropping the piece of money in the water again,] suppose, instead of a piece of money this were a human being; and suppose I should leave it immersed till I am done speaking, what would be the consequence? Death, inevitably. A good deal of capital has been made out of what I said on another occasion about baptizing horses and skunks, and I would like to say a word about that matter. I was considered to be very irreverent and very wicked because I happened to refer, playfully, to the baptism of horses, and when that was challenged by a person present I said, "Sir, if the word *baptize* means 'to dip,' and nothing but 'dip,' and you dip a *skunk*, you baptize it." Now, if that piece of money were a horse would it not be immersed? Would it not be buried in water? If so, would it be irreverent, would it be naughty, would it be wicked for me to suggest that according to my opponent's proposition it would be baptized? If immersion is baptism, and the horse is immersed, it must be baptized. And would it not be the same if the piece of money were a skunk? And would it be naughty, would it be rude, would it be irreverent, would it be wicked for me to say it was baptized, even with Christian baptism, according to the proposition under consideration? By no means. Those who cry out in this kind of fashion against such language must have exceedingly tender consciences. I would recommend them to soak them over night in a strong decoction of alum and white oak bark to toughen them a little. The trouble is it is destructive to their pet theory, and they don't like that. But if the illustration is ridiculous it is all the worse for the theory, and my object in using it is to show the ridiculousness of the theory, and the ridiculousness of adopting, as the meaning of this term, a definition that is capable of such a breadth and absurdity of application. The meaning of the term, as I interpret it, in its relation to the Christian ordinance, is not capable of such an application. The proposition we are discussing to-day does not seek any distinctive definition whatever of the religious use of the term—none whatever for a Christian rite. It says Christian baptism is simply immersion—a burial in water. This much and nothing more. Then anything that is immersed or buried in water is baptized.

Now, I want to call your attention for a little to two classes of words—the one expressive only of action, the other of a condition resulting from some action. And I want to show the absurdity of ranking this word *baptizo* in the former class. To illustrate, suppose Christ meant, when He said "Go baptize," "go and dip." And suppose you had never heard of the Christian religion (pardon the supposition), but suppose you were living in a heathen land and had never heard of the Gospel, and suppose I appeared before you and expounded the Christian religion and tried to persuade you to embrace it, and then I told you you must be baptized, for Christ had commanded me to "go and teach all nations, baptizing them." "What is that?" you would ask. "It is to be dipped in water over head and ears. That is all it means." You would very naturally ask, even in your rude barbaric state, "And what in the world is that for?" Then I would have to enter into fuller explanations. The word itself suggests nothing. It possesses no moral significance. It is simply the name of a mode of motion. But suppose I were to tell you "you must be immersed." "Oh, that will kill us?" you would say, "because that means to put any person or thing under water and leave it there. We will never embrace the Christian religion." "But you must," I would say, "or you can't go to heaven when you die." You would then ask, "What must we be immersed for?" and I would have to go to work and explain it. The word itself possesses no self-explaining power that would serve as a clue to its design. Suppose I were to use the word "plunge." The same difficulty would exist. These words are not suggestive of any design. They are too feeble, their meaning is too limited, their sense is altogether too weak to express the idea of baptism in its Christian acceptation, therefore the scholars, as good and great and worthy as any quoted to-day, I am bound to say, who translated our Bible, when translating that word *baptizo* into English, never ventured, either in the New Testament or the Old Testament, except in one single instance, in the case of Naaman, to translate it by any English word, except *wash*, which belongs to the other class of words to which I refer as suggestive of the effect of some action. Let us look at this aspect of the case for a little. Does the word ever mean *wash*, according to the lexicographers whom we have heard quoted to-day? You will remember that quite a number of them gave this definition. I think I have found some sixteen or eighteen altogether who define it by this term or its equivalents, cleanse, purify, etc. Now suppose I should come to you as barbarians, and say, "Christ sent me to wash, or cleanse the nations, and you must be cleansed." You would say,

"We all understand that. We know we are sinful and need cleansing." If I come using a word that expresses the idea of purification, it carries its own explanation with it. And does *baptizo* ever mean to purify, to wash, to cleanse, in the Bible? Why some of the very passages quoted from the New Testament by my opponent, prove it does, especially Heb. 10: 22, "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies *washed* with pure water." He virtually admits this is baptism. But what is it to dip, or plunge, or immerse? It is merely to perform an act, and when the description of the act is complete the meaning of the word is exhausted,—it means nothing more. When we say it means to cleanse, to purify, people at once comprehend it as a word of some moral significance, or deeper meaning. We need to have our sins taken away. That is what Christ came into the world to do, and baptism is to represent that fact; and when I so explain it the untutored mind at once exclaims, "Yes, that is the idea! "Now, suppose I came to you and said, "Christ told me to sprinkle all nations." "What is that for?" you would ask. And I would have to explain, "It is to purify you." Suppose I were to say, "I pour upon you." The question would be asked, "What is that for *V I* would need to explain that I was going to pour water upon you to represent something. The same difficulties would meet me in the use of these words as in that of dip, plunge, and immerse. My opponent might have saved himself much effort and a lot of scholarship on this head, for I do not believe that the word means to pour or sprinkle any more than to dip, or immerse, in a New Testament sense. He has tried to make me responsible for such an opinion, but I repudiate it at the commencement of this debate. I do not believe it means to sprinkle. I do not wonder it is not in the lexicons. It has been omitted for a good reason, no doubt; though I think I could find it in some of the lexicons if I were to hunt for it. But I know it does not mean to sprinkle or pour. Liddell and Scott had pour in their first edition, but the Baptists made such a fuss about it that they took it out; and I can show you that a good many other words were taken out or altered. I do not care, however, whether it is in or not, for I do not hold that it means to pour. I do not appeal to lexicons to see whether it means either to sprinkle or pour. If they say it does they do not convey the truth. It does not have these meanings. But is that any reason why baptism should not be administered by sprinkling and pouring? And when I baptize in either of these ways do I do something inconsistent with my teaching? By no means. Let me illustrate. Suppose I receive a command to kill a dog. Suppose

I go and take down my old carbine, cock it, and, levelling it at the fellow, shoot him. Then suppose the man who gave me the command comes up to me with a great bluster, and says, "I never commanded you to shoot that dog. I told you to kill him." I should reply, "But did I not kill him? Do you not see him over there? You'll find he is dead enough." "But you shot him." "Yes; but I killed him—I produced the effect." But suppose I tied a rope round his neck, with a stone attached, and took him down to the bay—you know paedobaptists do not go to the water except to drown dogs—and pitch him in the water, would I not as certainly obey the command? What would the dog be worth about one hour after I had put him in the water? I would have obeyed the command. The dog would be dead. And suppose the man giving me the command should come forward and upbraid me for drowning his dog, could I not reply, "Why, sir, you commanded me to kill him!" "Yes," he might say, "but I didn't command you to drown him." "Well," I might reply, "you didn't say how I should kill him, so I took my own way of doing it." But suppose I go to a drug store, get a little poison, put it on a nice piece of beefsteak, and give it to him. In about two or three hours the dog would be breathing his last breath. Now suppose the man who commanded me to kill the dog were to come to me and say, "Sir, I did not command you to poison that dog. I told you to kill him." I would reply, "There he is, as dead as a door-nail." Now, when Christ commanded us to go and baptize, He commanded us to perform an act that would produce a result. The question is not, By what mode that result is to be produced, but What is that result? That is the question we are here to discuss. What is the result that Christ commanded us to produce, not What was the form of the act He commanded us to perform. My opponent says He commanded us simply to immerse—nothing less, nothing more. I am here to deny this, and to show you that, in addressing the apostles—if He ever used the term at all—it was in the sense of a religious purification. But, it will be said, "The word does not mean to purify." I know that. I do not say that it does; but it describes a rite which symbolizes purification. That is what I have come to Meaford to prove—that it is the divinely-appointed symbol of purity, appointed to represent outwardly to the world that our hearts have been cleansed by the blood of sprinkling. Christ is said to sprinkle our hearts from an evil conscience, but it is not the *act* of sprinkling that cleanses. It is the blood, no matter how it is applied. The effect of the blood upon our hearts, and not

the mere mode of motion by which it was applied, is the important matter. This seems so clear that every child ought to understand it. [Addressing a boy on the front seat,] "Now, my boy, if I came to you and said, 'Christ sprinkles our hearts from an evil conscience,' would you understand it was the act of sprinkling or the blood itself that cleansed?" [The boy: "I don't know."] The boy will know when he gets over his embarrassment a little. But I appeal to your intelligence. When Christ is said to sprinkle our hearts from an evil conscience, do you understand it to be the act of sprinkling that cleanses? Or is it not, rather, the contact of the blood that does it? The latter, certainly. The blood is applied, no matter how. So of the water. It is not the manner of application, but the fact of its application. No matter whether it be sprinkled, or thrown upon the individual, or he be dipped in it. But the blood is called the "blood of sprinkling." The contact of the blood, so to speak, cleanses the soul, though sprinkled on it. So, sprinkling the body cleanses it in symbol, by making the inward spiritual operation visible. I propose to prove, beyond successful contradiction, during this debate, that sprinkling the blood of Christ on our hearts is a baptism in a far higher sense than the lexicographers talk about, except when they say "New Testament, to baptize." Many of the best lexicographers, as I have already said, distinguish between the New Testament and classic use of the term. "Why? Because Greek writers never used it in a religious sense. The Greek writers were heathens, who did not know anything about Christianity, and if you use it in the same sense as they used it, it involves drowning. But Christian baptism never drowns anybody, or anything. It only cleanses, and, as I have shown, some fifteen or sixteen lexicographers, among whom are the best, define the word in the New Testament sense, and treat it with reference to the religious use of water. They define it as a washing, a cleansing, a purification, a baptism. And that is what Christ wanted the term for, viz.: to express the idea of purification, and that is doubtless the sense He attached to it when He applied it to the Christian rite. Suppose we take a few passages to prove this point. Take John's baptism. He baptized in the wilderness, and preached the baptism of repentance. What for? "For the remission of sins." Then it was for purification. If you turn to Mark 7: 4, you will find that he speaks of the "washing of cups, pots, brazen vessels and tables." The original is baptism. But what does he mean? He means that they were ceremonially purified. You know that the Jews had a constant succession of purifications extending

into the matters of everyday life, because the ceremonial law required ceremonial or legal purity in everything. And if these things were made ceremonially clean, did it matter whether the water went on them or they went into the water? Not a bit of it. Turn to Heb. 10: 22, and you find the words, "Having your hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and your bodies washed with pure water." In Luke 11: 38, you find, "And when the Pharisee saw it, he marveled that He had not first washed before dinner." Washed is here in the original *baptizo*, the very word in dispute. I want my opponent in his next speech, or in some speech before the debate closes, to state fairly and squarely, without any wriggling, twisting, squirming, or evasion, that he believes the Pharisee marveled because Jesus did not immerse himself all over before dinner. If he will do this I shall believe him to be a man of the most magnificent amount of credulity I ever met. It was a washing—a baptism—but evidently not an immersion. In Heb. 9:10, the apostle describes the "divers washings" of the tabernacle. Read the chapter when you go home. He describes the tabernacle, with its apartments and appurtenances, and then he says, "Which (tabernacle) was a figure for the time then present, in which were offered both gifts and sacrifices, that could not make him that did the service perfect, as pertaining to the conscience; which (gifts and sacrifices) stood only in meats and drinks and divers washings (baptisms, Greek), and carnal ordinances." Then there were gifts and sacrifices consisting of meat-offerings and drink-offerings, divers baptisms and carnal ordinances, offered in the tabernacle. Now, you will observe that these baptisms were either included in the gifts or sacrifices. The baptisms are as much included as the meat-offerings and drink-offerings. But the meat-offerings and drink-offerings can in no sense be said to be baptisms. And were the sacrifices baptisms? And how was it possible to baptize anything by means of a sacrifice? Let us see. We will read right on what the apostle says:

"But Christ being come an high priest of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building;

"Neither by the blood of goats and calves but by His own blood He entered in once into the holy place, having obtained eternal redemption for us.

"For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh:

"How much more shall the blood of Christ . . . purge your conscience," etc.

There you have the purification effected by sacrifices—by the sprinkling of the blood of the sacrifice, and the ashes of a sacrifice upon the unclean individual.

What were these "divers baptisms," then? What were they if they were not this? I should like my opponent to tell you what other baptisms were performed *in the tabernacle*, and not take you away to some river, and tell you how the Jews baptized their proselytes. Don't let him take you away to a river, He is sure to do so if he gets the opportunity. These baptisms were a purification—a washing. They were effected by sprinkling the blood of a sacrifice mixed with the ashes of a sacrifice on the unclean, and they were performed in the tabernacle. And now let us draw an inference. "If the blood of bulls and goats and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the *purifying of the flesh*," and was a baptism, "how much more shall the blood of Christ sprinkle your hearts from an evil conscience," and be a baptism. The former is legal baptism; the latter is spiritual baptism. The one is outward baptism, pertaining to the flesh; the other is inward baptism, relating to the heart. The one makes men clean in the eyes of the law; the other makes them spotless in the sight of God. And now we go down a little farther in the chapter, and we read:

"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 while the testator liveth.

"Whereupon neither the first testament was dedicated (margin, purified), without blood.

"For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book, and all the people,

"Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God hath enjoined unto you.

"Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the tabernacle, and all the vessels of the ministry.

"And almost all things are by the law purged with blood • and *without shedding of blood is no remission.*"

And now I will give up the whole controversy if my opponent will produce a single case of immersion that ever took place in the tabernacle. I have produced cases of sprinkling, and they were purifications. They were effected by the blood and ashes of sacri-

fices. The "divers baptisms" mentioned in verse 10 were included in the sacrifices offered in the tabernacle; hence these blood-sprinklings must have been the "divers baptisms." I repeat, lest advantage be taken of it, I do not hold that it was the sprinkling that constituted the baptism. It was only a means to an end; the act by which the effect which we call baptism was produced. It was the blood that baptized, because it cleansed. No matter how it got there, it baptized; and Christ thought sprinkling was the best way to apply it, and He has appointed it for this purpose; and we find this idea of sprinkling for purification running like a golden vein throughout the Scriptures—and this is baptism. Thus we find that God has appointed an outward rite that is applicable to all ages and all conditions of men—to all climes and to all tribes.

But let no one go away with the false impression that I define sprinkling as the meaning of the word. I define it as the mode, not the meaning. I want to distinguish carefully between mode and meaning. In the case of killing the dog I have mentioned three modes. If you produce the effect it does not matter as to the mode of producing it, and I will show that even among classic writers it does not matter to them how the effect is produced so long as it is produced. Further, the word, as used by classic writers, has a secondary meaning to express a change of condition analogous to that which takes place when the Divine Spirit enters the heart) making us new creatures in Christ. And Christ has chosen to denote this spiritual change by the Greek word *baptizo*. Yet we are told, in the eighty-fourth year of the nineteenth century, and in the last month of the year, that a plunge under water is all that Christ meant when He said, "Go, baptize all nations in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?"

[*Time expired.*]

EVENING SESSION—FIRST DAY.

MR. HARDING'S SECOND SPEECH.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN.—I will proceed briefly to call attention to a number of statements made by Mr. Wilkinson during his afternoon speech, and if I fail to cover them all it will be because I have only half an hour in which to deal with his one hour's address.

He remarked, at the outset, that he never challenged any one to a religious discussion. Well, I have. I have done it when I believed good would result,—when I believed it was proper and appropriate. I have done it in the fear of God and with a desire to promote the kingdom of Christ, and it is likely I will do it again. I have come into this discussion, as I have said, with a desire to know the truth. My friend spoke about a thunderstorm, and about the atmosphere being purified afterwards. I know such a discussion as this is a little bit exciting, that people are sometimes stirred up a little, but I am quite certain that when the time for reflection comes, it will be considered that the debate has done good. I am the more impressed with this conviction, because I find in the New Testament that the most vigorous debaters were the apostles. Paul spent years in disputations. Read the book of Acts and you will see this. So I do not regret having challenged men to debate, and I may do it in future. Our friend, however, says that we are here and that we will take one week, or two weeks, or one or two months, if necessary, to arrive at a conclusion. Yes, we will do that. I expect to be ready when the time comes.

Then he spoke about cyclones. I knew the authorities I was quoting would have a weighty effect, but I did not suppose they were reminding him of a thunderstorm, or a cyclone. He spoke about my cart-load of books, and about his not producing many books. The point of primary importance with us is the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*. My opponent can bring forward no authorities to support his views, and that is the reason he has not brought a cart-load of books. He has misunderstood the argument I made on the point under consideration: I said that if I were defining the English word baptize, I would give to sprinkle, to pour, and the reason I gave

was that use is the arbiter of language. To-day, in this land, the English word baptize is used in that way. But I said it was not so with respect to the Greek word *baptizo* which Christ used 1800 years ago. We are not to take what the word baptize means now, as if it meant the same that *baptizo* did 1800 years ago. When I went to the authorities what did I find? Do you see that stack of lexicons? Neither sprinkle nor pour is in one of them. How does it happen that Webster gives to sprinkle as the definition of the word baptize? And that Worcester does the same thing? But none of the authorities give it as the definition of *baptizo*? Because the use of the Greek word did not justify this definition, while the use of the English word to-day does. My opponent "guessed" that he would find sprinkle in the lexicons. I don't "guess" about it. I know he cannot do it. Let him stop guessing and produce a lexicon in which it can be found. I declare that there is not a lexicon on this earth that defines the Greek word *baptizo*, to sprinkle, and I invite him to bring the book. And if he wants to show that I am mistaken, let him produce it. You remember that after producing the lexicons, I called attention to the Church historians, including paedo-baptist authorities, who declare that immersion was the usual custom, but that sprinkling and pouring were admitted in cases of sick people. I pointed out that Dr. Wall said the first case of affusion was in A.D. 251. My friend cannot find an earlier case. If he finds, in those early days, one Christian baptism in any other way than by immersion, my proposition is lost. But he will never find that case while the world lasts. He intimated that Jesus did not use the word *baptizo*; that Jesus did not speak in Greek, but in Hebrew, or some corruption of it. Christ told His apostles that when the Spirit came to them He would call to their remembrance everything He had told them, and lead them into all truth; and they say that when they wrote, the Spirit told them what to write. They wrote in Greek and used the word *baptizo*. He told them to go and baptize, and when they wrote the Spirit told them how to write, and they wrote in Greek, and used *baptizo*. He says that the word has more than the one meaning, immerse. I granted that words have not only a primary, but, as a rule, metaphorical meanings. No word, however, has two meanings in the same place. Here is a great law,—the commission of our Lord. In that law *baptizo* occurs. In that place it has one meaning and only one. It cannot have two meanings in the same place. The question is, What did Christ mean when He used *baptizo*? He did not mean sprinkle. My friend gives up sprinkling. He did not mean pour upon. My

friend gives that up. I claim He meant immerse. And when I go to the authorities I find that it means immerse in its primitive sense. He told us finally what the word symbolized. I thought he would say it meant purify, but he said it symbolized cleansing and purification. Let us see about that. Suppose you take purification. Did John purify Christ? Did he symbolize that purification had already taken place? No. Christ was pure, born pure, and remained pure all the time. He never was contaminated with sin, before his birth, or at any time. My friend said in his speech at Euphrasia that infants are born pure; that they are as pure as angels. I should like to know what purification baptism symbolizes in them, when they are baptized, if they are born pure. Just then my friend mentioned Dr. T. J. Conant. I am very glad he spoke so kindly of him as one of the most able and honest scholars on the continent. This is Dr. Conant's book. Let me say a word with respect to it. He tells us he has ransacked all Greek literature and has failed to find that *baptizo* anywhere means to sprinkle; that it has the idea of overwhelming and covering wherever you find it. He tells us that *baptizo* means in classic Greek, to put under. If a ship sinks to the bottom of the sea, it is baptized. If reeds along the sides of the river are overflowed, they are baptized, in classic Greek. My opponent took up a glass of water and put some money in it. He said, "Is not that money immersed and baptized?" Presently he took it out and asked, "Is it baptized now?" No.

Mr. WILKINSON—Hear, hear.

Mr. HARDING—Yes, it was baptized; and when it was taken out it was no longer baptized. Does he not know that that is the way baptism is referred to in the Bible? There is a mis-translation of Rom. 6: 4, in the common version, which is corrected in the revised version. Let me read it. It says, "We were buried therefore with Him through baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life." Not "we are buried," as it is in the common version, but "we were;" every scholar knows it is the past tense in the Greek. Again, I read from Col. 2:12, in the revised version, "Having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of God who raised Him from the dead." That sets forth that men *were* buried and *mere* taken out in baptism in ancient days. In Acts 19th chapter we find that Paul said unto certain disciples, "Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? And they said unto him, We have not so much as heard whether there

be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism."

Paul then explained unto them that the baptism of John had been followed and superseded by that of Jesus; when they understood this they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. That is, they were baptized and taken from the water by the authority of John, and then, some time afterwards, "were buried and raised to walk in newness of life," in the name of our Lord. It is clear, then, that baptism is not, as Mr. Wilkinson seems to suppose, a *state* in which we remain; it is an act by which we are brought into a new state.

I am not baptized now. I was baptized, but that is a thing of the past. I am on this side of the line. It is said in the Bible—and I may as well refer to it now—that the children of Israel "were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." They came out of the cloud and out of the sea. It is said, "All our fathers were under the cloud and all passed through the sea." That was when the baptism took place. My opponent quoted Josephus from Dr. Conant for the purpose of showing that when *baptizo* signifies to immerse it implies that the object immersed must remain under—must be destroyed—if a man or beast. I turn to Josephus in order to show that the passages quoted from him do not sustain this idea. Take the case of the young high-priest Aristobulus. He was a very handsome, captivating young man, of a most noble family; and when, at about seventeen years of age, he was elevated to the high-priesthood, the people displayed their love and admiration for him in such a hearty, extravagant, and indiscreet way, that Herod became exceedingly jealous of him and determined to kill him. Of course he did not want his wicked jealousy to be known, and therefore he contrived the following plan: With many professions of friendship he induced the young man to go with him, in the evening, to one of his bathing-pools. What followed Josephus tells thus: "At first they were only spectators of Herod's servants and acquaintance as they were swimming; but after awhile the young man, at the instigation of Herod, went into the water among them, while such of Herod's acquaintance as he had appointed to do it, dipped him as he was swimming, and plunged him under water in the dark of the evening, as if it had been done in sport only, nor did they desist until he was entirely suffocated. And thus was Aristobulus murdered, having lived no more in all than eighteen years." *Ant. of Jews, Book 15, chap. 8, sec. 3.* I have read from Whiston's translation.

As Mr. Wilkinson quotes, "Continually pressing down and baptiz-

ing him, while swimming, as if in sport, they did not desist till they had entirely suffocated him." Here, evidently, the death was a result of repeated immersions. As he was swimming they plunged him under repeatedly, as if in sport, nor did they cease baptizing him till he died. The first baptism did not kill; the second one did not kill; but many of them, quickly repeated, did kill.

By the same author, men swimming in the sea after shipwreck are represented as being baptized by the waves. *Baptizo* means to immerse. Whether the object immersed comes above the water again or remains under is not determined by the force of the word. While it remains under it is immersed; after coming up it has been immersed.

If my opponent wants to know by what authority we take people out of the water after immersing them, I reply we have the example of Christ and his apostles. They took people into the water, buried them in baptism, raised them to walk in newness of life, and (after this immersion and emersion), they came up out of the water.

My opponent says I cannot find one word that will translate *baptizo*. The word immerse will translate it every time in the New Testament. Let my opponent quote a single passage that immerse will not translate. He asked if anyone could translate the word immerse, in certain parts of the New Testament, and he referred especially to Luke 11:38, "And when the Pharisee saw it he marveled that He had not first washed before dinner."

I have the American Bible Union Revision, which reads thus: "And the Pharisee, seeing it, wondered that he did not first immerse himself before dinner." And here is H. T. Anderson's translation, which also gives immerse at this place. Here are two translations, both of which render the word immerse, although my opponent thought it would be very amusing if it were translated in that way. That is precisely the way I translate it. During the Wilkes-Ditzler debate at Louisville, Ky., the following question was put to Dr. Kleeberg, the Jewish Rabbi of that city: "Were the Jewish ablutions immersions?" He replied, "Before eating and prayer, and after rising in the morning, they washed; when they have become unclean they must immerse." *Louisville Debate*, p. 652.

Rabbi Maimonides, perhaps the most distinguished Jewish teacher who has lived since the apostolic age, states that if even the tip of the finger remains out of the water the uncleanness remains. Before eating they washed; but if *they had come from the market* (see Mark 7: 3-4), they immersed themselves.

Again, my friend affirmed that in the various lexicons, in defining *baptizo*, from fifty to one hundred words had been used. I think about thirty different words have been used in defining *baptizo*,—perhaps more. He may be right in saying that perhaps as many as fifty have been used.

Some of these definitions, as for instance, "to draw water" (by dipping the bucket), ⁶ "to confound" (to overwhelm with confusion), cannot apply to Christian baptism at all; but observe this fact: every one of them that can possibly apply to the sacred institution is fulfilled in immersion. Let me call attention to some of these fifty; they are immerse, dip, plunge, submerge, merge, immerge, bury, cover with water, overwhelm, sink, soak, saturate, drench, wash, wet, etc. In being immersed I fulfilled every one of these definitions; I was plunged, dipped, buried, overwhelmed, covered with water; soaked, saturated, drenched; washed and wet. His baptism did not fulfill one of them; he was not dipped, nor plunged, nor washed; he was not even wet; for we never say a man is wet if only a drop or two of water has fallen on him.

Mr. WILKINSON—I got Christian baptism and you got heathen.

Mr. HARDING—Christianity has not come to him yet, for he cannot keep still while I am talking.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKINSON'S SECOND REPLY.

I am exceedingly glad that my task thus far this evening is so extremely light. My opponent has stated that I could not find an authority to sustain my view of this subject. Perhaps I cannot, but that remains to be proved. I might read a number of testimonies out of one book as he has done. I have a little book here with a few of the testimonies of scholars, hence I need not take a cart-load of books along with me. I guarantee that these quotations are correct; if not, I shall be sacrificed in consequence of their inaccuracy. Before reading these testimonies I want to make one remark, and it may perhaps clear away a good deal of misapprehension. My opponent in quoting from scholars was very careful to impress upon you very emphatically that they were paedo-baptist authors. In our day paedo-baptists very seldom believe in immersion. A few hundred years ago

all paedo-baptists were immersionists. You have the proof of that, to a very large extent, in an expression that fell incidentally from his lips, that if you referred to the Church of England Prayer Book of two or three hundred years ago, you would find the Church practiced immersion. This practice applied even to infants, and I have here, in Dr. Conant's work, a quotation from the English Prayer Book in the 16th century, where the priest in baptizing an infant was instructed to dip the child three times, first to the right or right side, second to the left side, and third with its face toward the font. They believed in immersion; they believed in immersing three times; and just as far back in the records of history as my opponent will find immersion practiced in the Church, I will find trine-immersion practiced. In Liddell and Scott's lexicon you will find the word denned "to dip repeatedly." Now, what is the meaning of so defining the term? From what usage does that come? He knows I was right when I said that the definitions of lexicons were made from the usage of the time. Why did they insert the meaning "to dip repeatedly?" That is the very first definition in Liddell and Scott, which is the only standard Greek-English lexicon, and is used in our universities. Will my opponent let his case stand on that definition? If so, as he was not dipped repeatedly, he was not baptized, neither Christianly nor heathenly, neither scripturally nor classically. And if that is the meaning of the term, why in the name of common sense does he bring the candidates out of the water before they are properly baptized, for I understand he dips them only once, and he thinks that is sufficient, I want to say, then, that those authorities he has quoted as paedo-baptist writers were, for the most part, full-blown immersionists, as much so as Mr. Harding is. *No wonder, then, they make* a claim for immersion; but of what value are witnesses of an *ex parte* character like that? I would as soon take his own statement as theirs. Here we have testimony of scholars on the other side of the question. I quote first from Turretin. He says, "The term baptism is of Greek origin, deduced from the word *Bapto*, which is to *tinge* and *imbue*, *Baptizo*, to *dye* and to immerse." He says also, "the word *baptizo*, by a metalepsis, is taken in the sense *to wash*. Mark 7:4. Nor ought we otherwise to understand the baptism of cups, of pots, and of beds, in use among the Jews; and the divers baptisms enjoined upon them, Hob. 9: 10; and *the* superstitious washings received from the tradition of the elders, Mark 7:4, 5."

Dr. Owen says, "*Baptizo* signifies to wash; as instances out of all authors may be given; Suidas, Hesychius, Julius Pollux, Phavorinus,

and Eustachius. No one instance can be given in the Scripture, wherein *baptizo* doth necessarily signify either to dip or plunge. I must say, and will make it good, that no honest man, who understands the Greek tongue can deny the word to signify to wash, as well as to dip. *Baptismos* (baptism,) is any kind of washing, whether by dipping or sprinkling; putting the thing to be washed into the water, or applying the water to the thing itself to be washed."

Whitby says, remarking on Acts 10:48, "'And he commanded them to be baptized.' Whom did he command to do this? the Gentiles? It seemeth at first sight absurd, that they who were not yet baptized should baptize others: or was it the Jews that came then with him? they seem only to be lay-brethren, who only were permitted to baptize in case of necessity; it seemeth, therefore, reasonable to say that he commanded water to be brought for their baptism, and then performed himself the office, or left it to be done by gifted persons."

Doddridge, in his paraphrase on the same passage, says, "Then Peter, yielding to the force of evidence, however contrary to his former prejudices, with great propriety answered, Can any one reasonably forbid that water should be brought." According to this view the most natural supposition is that they were baptized by pouring or sprinkling.

Dr. Lightfoot says, "The application of water is necessary for the essence of baptism; but the application in this or that mode indicates a circumstance. To denote this ablution by a sacramental sign, the sprinkling of water is equally sufficient as immersion in water, since the former in reality argues an ablution and purification as well as the latter."

Vossius says, "*Baptizo* signifies to wash or purify. It is transferred to the gift of the Holy Spirit; that is to say, because, that He might wash, or purify the soul, He is poured out, as water is poured; even as Joel speaks, 2: 28, and from thence Peter, Acts 2:17, likewise Paul, Titus 3: 6."

Beza says, "The reality of baptism is the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and the imputation of His righteousness, which are, as it were, displayed before our eyes in the sign of outward sprinkling. Are they, therefore, improperly baptized who are sprinkled with water only cast on them? No: what is in that action (of baptizing) merely substantial, (or strictly essential,) to wit, the ablution of water, is rightly observed by the Church (by sprinkling). But *baptizo* signifies to dye, or to stain, seeing it comes

immediately from *bapto*; and since the things to be dyed or stained are (commonly) dipped, it signifies to make wet and to dip."

Casaubon says, "Immersion is not necessary to baptism. The opinion (insisted on of immersing the whole body in the ceremony of baptism) has been, deservedly, long since exploded; for the force and energy of this mystery consist not in that circumstance."

I might go on and quote two or three times as many authorities, but I forbear because it is not necessary to inflict further reading on your patience. Let me ask one question. If it be true that all the scholars of any note, as you have heard this afternoon, hold that the word *baptizo* means to dip, and only to dip; or to immerse, and only to immerse; and at the same time practice sprinkling, is there not some inconsistency between their conduct and their teaching? If men are so exceedingly inconsistent as to teach one thing and practice something else, their inconsistency should invalidate their testimony in a matter of this kind. John Wesley was referred to this afternoon, and it was thought to be proved that he was an immersionist. It is known that, in the early days of Wesley's ministry, while he still adhered to the Anglican Church, he believed in her traditions, her *superstitious* traditions, with respect to immersion. I expect to show, before this debate is ended, that it is a superstition, but I will not pause to-night to dwell on that point. I will, however, say that in the early part of his ministry Wesley adopted, to some extent, the traditions of the English Church, and seemed to lean (judging by some expressions he made use of), to the practice of immersion. But, later in life, he wrote a treatise on that subject, and I propose to give you an extract from it. It may be found in his "Works," Vol. 6. page 12. He says, "As nothing can be determined from Scripture precept or example, so neither from the force or meaning of the word. For the words baptize and baptism do not necessarily imply dipping, but are used in other senses in several places. Thus we find that the Jews were all baptized in the cloud and in the sea (1 Cor. 10:2), but they were not plunged in either. Christ said to two of His disciples, 'Ye shall be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with.' (Mark 10: 38), but neither He nor they were dipped, but only sprinkled and washed with their own blood. Again, we read (Mark 7: 4) of the baptisms of pots and cups, and tables or beds. Now, pots and cups are not necessarily dipped when they are washed—the Pharisees washed the outside of them only. And as for tables or beds, none could suppose that they could be dipped. Here, then, the word baptism, in its natural sense, is not taken for dipping, but for

washing or cleansing. And that this is the true meaning of the word *baptize*, is testified by the greatest scholars and most proper judges on the matter. It is true that we read of being 'buried with Christ in baptism,' but nothing can be inferred from such a figurative expression. Nay, if held exactly, it would make as much for sprinkling as for plunging; since, in burying, the body is not plunged through the substance of the earth, but, rather, earth is sprinkled upon it."

My opponent assumes that the burial must have been an immersion, but Wesley says it cannot be proved to be such. He has appealed to Wesley, and to Wesley he must go. Further on in the same book he says, in speaking of those baptized on the day of Pentecost, "The place, therefore, as well as the number, makes it highly probable that all these were baptized by sprinkling or pouring, and not by immersion."

I will not pause during this half-hour's speech to reply to all my opponent's address; I will not pause to prove that all the authorities are not on the other side, where many writers are ranked because they make the candid admission, as I have cheerfully done, that immersion did prevail in the Church at a very early period; (and I am prepared to account for its being there); but I must express my surprise that my opponent will persist in quoting from books to prove what is not disputed. He does the same with reference to the meaning of the word. I have admitted that in the primary sense it means immerse, no one questions that; but while paedo-baptists make these candid, honest, truthful admissions, they, at the same time, contend that this is not the Scriptural sense, and that it is used in a secondary sense in the Word of God. But my opponent carefully stops before he gets to those parts of the statements. But I will quote one more authority, the distinguished Dr. Hodge, one of the leading Presbyterians in the United States, and Principal of Princeton College. In speaking of Dr. Dale's definition of the term *baptizo*, he says: "*Baptizo* is analogous to the word to bury. A man may be buried by being covered up in the ground, by being placed in an empty cave, by being put into a sarcophagus, or even, as among the Indians, by being placed upon a platform elevated above the ground. The command to bury may be executed in any of these ways. So, with regard to the word *baptizo*, there is a given effect to be produced without any specific injunction as to the manner, whether by immersion, pouring, or sprinkling." I said the effect was produced by the application of the blood—the blood of sprinkling—and that this was symbolized by the sprinkling of water on the individual to represent outwardly the inward opera-

tion. To that position I intend to hold; from that position neither scholarship nor declamation can drive me. We will see if my opponent can overthrow this position before the debate is closed. If he does so, he will be the first man who has ever done it. I have here Dr. Edward Robinson's work, which has been referred to. He says, "In the earliest Latin versions of the New Testament, as, for example, the Itala, which Augustine regarded as the best of all, and which goes back apparently to the second century, and to usage connected with the Apostolic Age, the Greek verb is uniformly given in the Latin form *baptizo*, and is never translated by *immergo*, or any like word, showing that there was something in the rite of baptism to which the latter did not correspond." A good deal has been said with regard to lexicons. I told you to be careful, as he would attempt to mislead you by seeking to make me responsible for the word pour or sprinkle. Did I not tell you that if that meaning was there, it was not the correct meaning of the word? I repeat,—*It is not the meaning of the word*. My opponent said, before the debate closed, they would see whether I would produce any lexicons giving that meaning. I will produce extracts, and I will leave him to deny their accuracy, and, if he does so, I will never rest until I have produced the works themselves, and I will probably give you more than one. I did not think it was necessary to buy, borrow, and beg lexicons to bring here to prove what I did not believe. My opponent says no word has two meanings in the same place. He might have saved himself the trouble of saying that, for no one said it had. I should like to know what that has to do with this debate. The question is, whether a word has ever two meanings, not whether it has two meanings in the same place. He might as well have stated that a man cannot be in two places at the same time, or that two men cannot be in one place at the same time. He asks, with great flourish, Did John purify Christ? Then he says that Christ was never contaminated with sin, that He was always pure. All right. I never believed that water purified anybody from sin. My opponent has that to prove. I never taught it, I never believed it, I never expect to believe it, I beg of you never to believe it, because, if you go to heaven by water, I am afraid you will get ducked before you get there. My opponent will probably make a handle of the word "ducked." If I use "souse" it will be just as bad, though he used it himself. I say that John did purify Christ. I have no qualms of conscience in committing myself to that statement. I say, moreover, that Christ was just as liable to legal defilement as you or I might have been, and my opponent will not deny it.

The ceremonial law, given by Moses, said that if any man touched a dead body he was unclean. It does not mean that he sinned in his heart, but that his body was defiled by contact with the dead body. If Christ touched a dead body would He not have been ceremonially unclean, and required to be cleansed, according to that law, before He could officiate in any office in connection with the Church? Undoubtedly He would. John's baptism was not a purification from sin, but a symbolical purification; and so, if Christ possessed the purity within, would it be inconsistent that He should receive a ceremonial purification? My opponent asks what about infants, and mentioned that I had stated that infants came into the world as pure as angels. If I did so I do not go back on it in respect to the question of baptism, because, if infants are pure I will show they have a right to the symbol of that purity. Abraham did not receive the sign of circumcision before he believed and his faith was counted to him for righteousness, but afterwards; in other words, it was after his sins were pardoned and he was justified by faith. Then he received the sign of inward purity. So we do not teach that individuals ought to be baptized by any mode, unless they are first forgiven; and, if infants are in a state of forgiveness they are entitled to a symbol of that forgiveness. If we are in a state of forgiveness, we are entitled to the sign of that forgiveness outwardly. There is nothing inconsistent in that. Mr. McDiarmid, in a recent debate, raised the same question, "Did John purify Christ?" I say, with emphasis, Yes, John did purify Christ, and I will prove it before I am done. My time is about up. I was going to launch out in other directions, but I find I cannot plunge in.

[*Resumed his seat.*]

MR. HARDING'S THIRD SPEECH.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—With pleasure I rise to continue this discussion. I desire to consider, in the first place, some of the statements made by Mr. Wilkinson in his last speech. He began by saying the paedo-baptists whom I quoted were immersionists as much as I am. Mr. Wilkinson is much mistaken about that. I believe it is not true of a single one I have quoted. There is a stack of lexicons [pointing to his lexicons] written by paedo-baptists, and Church histo-

ries written by paedo-baptists, and I believe every one, without exception, not only said that immersion was proper, but they practiced affusion, every one of them. Dean Stanley, from whom I read, states that the Greek Church now practices immersion, that in apostolic days it was the custom to baptize by immersion, but, he adds, "Who would like to go back to the ancient custom?" He says the Church has changed it, and he is glad of it. But he puts it on the ground that the Church had a right to change it. Dr. Wall says that immersion was the most usual custom in the ancient Church, and that the first case of affusion was in 251 A.D., and, at the same time, he argues that affusion is proper and good. Dr. Edward Robinson gives the definition immerse, and afterwards argues in favor of affusion. He does not do that in giving the meaning of the word, but in defending the practice. Not a single one of these authorities was an immersionist as I am. I desire it to be borne in mind that what we are discussing is, the meaning of the word *baptizo*. It is granted by Mr. Wilkinson that it is to dip, to immerse. He grants that, and said that I need not have read authorities on the point. He further grants that the word does not mean to sprinkle or pour upon. That is one point gained. But Mr. Wilkinson does not tell you what the word means in the New Testament. I answered one of his questions, and I will now ask him a question. It is this. What does *baptizo* mean in the commission? Christ says, "Go teach all nations, baptizing them." Now, I want to know, not what the word symbolizes, but what the word means in that place. He agrees with me that a word has but one meaning in one place. I want him to tell you what this word means in the commission. He will not tell you. He cannot tell you. I answered his question, and I will answer all his questions to the best of my ability. I ask him to answer, What does *baptizo* mean in the commission? If he does not tell you, I will tell you. He says that Liddell and Scott say it means "to dip repeatedly," and that candidates were dipped three times. They did give that meaning in the first edition of their work, and in several editions, but in the sixth and seventh editions they do not give "to dip repeatedly." I have here the definition given in the sixth edition. They define "*Baptizo*, to dip in, or under water; of ships, to sink them, to bathe, metaphorical, *bebaptismenoi*, soaked in wine, drowned with questions, *ophlemasi*, over head and ears in debt. To draw up wine in cups (of course by dipping them)." That is the definition given in both the sixth and seventh editions. Liddell and Scott were the only ones in the list of authorities that gave "to dip repeatedly," and their reason for thus defining was this: According to its termination (*zo*)

the word is a frequentative, that is, a word that expresses repeated action, and in their first editions, these gentlemen so defined it; but upon an examination of the passages in Greek literature in which the word occurs, it was seen that the usage of the word does not justify this meaning; and as use, not form or derivation, determines the signification of words, they dropped "repeatedly" from their last two editions, and instead thereof denned the word to "dip in or under water." Mr. Wilkinson inquires why I do not dip repeatedly. Because the definitions of the lexicons do not require it, nor does the usage of the word. If all the lexicons in their latest and best editions had defined it, "to dip repeatedly" (as they do define it to dip or immerse), and if all the circumstances connected with the performance of the rite in the New Testament had indicated trine immersion (as they do indicate immersion), I would practice trine immersion.

My friend then says that paedo-baptists were immersionists as much as I am, that some years ago they were generally so, but are not now; and he referred to the fact that immersion was in the Prayer Book; it is also in the Methodist Discipline.

MR. WILKINSON—It is not.

MR. HARDING—Every copy of the Methodist Discipline that I ever saw requires the minister to immerse if the candidate desires it. If there is one that does not so require I would like to see it. They have been revising the book lately, and if immerse does not occur in it, it has been quite recently stricken out. If Mr. Wilkinson has such a copy, I trust he will produce it.

MR. WILKINSON—I will.

MR. HARDING—Very good; I want to see the book.

"But," it is often asked, "how is it that the scholars, Church historians, lexicographers, and commentators, who testify that in the ancient Church immersion was practiced, themselves practice sprinkling?" They think it is not necessary to give an exact literal obedience to the commandments of Christ. "If one has the spirit of obedience," they say, "it does not so much matter about doing exactly the thing commanded." Although they admit that the meaning of the word and the usage of the apostolic Church indicate that Christ commanded immersion, yet they say, so that water is applied in some way, it does not matter how it is done. I am not disposed to go in that way. I want to do exactly what Christ said. The Master says, "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man," etc.

It is agreed between Mr. Wilkinson and myself that the word in

the classics means to immerse; that it does not mean to sprinkle or to pour. He thought, however, that he could find lexicons that define it to sprinkle ; but now he proposes to bring "extracts" instead of the books. I presume he will bring "extracts" from Dr. Ditzler; but I want the LEXICON, and have offered a reward for it. He spoke about buying, begging, and borrowing lexicons. I have *bought* them, because I want to know what they say, and I have not been able to find a single one that defines *baptizo* to sprinkle. I wrote to Dr. Conant, asking this question, Does any respectable lexicon define *baptizo* to sprinkle? He replied, "My dear Brother: No respectable lexicographer gives, or ever has given, "sprinkle" or "besprinkle," as a definition of *baptizo*. I have all the Greek lexicons of any name." This is the testimony of Dr. Conant. Mr. Wilkinson introduced him into this debate, and eulogized him as a scholar and an honest man. I have, many times, in public debate, in the presence of learned paedo-baptist ministers, called for the lexicon that defines *baptizo* to sprinkle. It has never been produced. I have offered one hundred dollars, and then five hundred dollars for such a book, but to this day it has not been found. Now Mr. Wilkinson says he will bring an extract. I want the book. I do not talk of bringing extracts. I have the books.

In his last speech Mr. Wilkinson read "extracts" from a little book, which he said were taken from Turretine, Owen, Whitby, Doddridge, Lightfoot, Vossius, Beza, and Casaubon, to show that *baptizo* means "to wash," and that this washing can be done by sprinkling. Well, it so happens that I have here quotations from nearly all these gentlemen. You shall hear them. Remember they are his own witnesses.

Turretine says: "For as in baptism, when performed in the *primitive manner*, by immersion and emersion, descending into the water and again going out of it, of which descent and ascent we have an example in the eunuch—Acts 8:38,39—yea, and what is more, as by this rite, when persons are immersed in water they are overwhelmed, and, as it were, *buried*, and in a manner buried together with Christ; and again they emerge, seem to be raised out of the grave, and are said to be risen again with Christ." *Frey. on Bap. p. 126.*

Whitby says: "It being so expressly declared here (Rom 6: 4, and Col. 2:12) that we are buried with Christ in baptism by being buried under water; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death being taken hence, and this *immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries*, and approved by our

Church, and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the Author of this institution, or any license from any council of the Church, being that which the Romanist still urges to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity; it were to be wished that this custom might be again of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in cases of the *clinici*, or in present danger of death." *Whitby's Com. on New Test., Rom. 6: 4.*

Doddridge, in his Family Expositor, on Romans 6: 4, says: "*Buried with him in baptism.* It seems to me the part of candor to confess that here is an allusion to the manner of baptizing by immersion."

Vossius says "That the apostles immersed whom they baptized there is no doubt, and that the ancient Church followed their example is very clearly evinced by innumerable testimonies of the fathers." *Pengilly, p. 75.*

Beza, Calvin's friend and associate, says: "Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain immersion is signified." *Pengilly, p. 72.*

Casaubon, in speaking of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles, says: "To baptize is to immerse; and in this sense the apostles are truly said to be baptized, for the house in which this was done was filled with the Holy Ghost, so that the apostles seemed to be plunged into it as into a fish-pool." *R. Fuller, p. 72.*

So testify Mr. Wilkinson's own witnesses.

The extracts he read are very different indeed from these. When these men deal with the meaning of the word, they testify as scholars; but when they argue, they argue as theologians. In a court of law the testimony of witnesses as to the facts is always important; the court does not want to know what they think. When these men testify as to the facts, they say that the word means to immerse, that the apostles immersed, and that for nearly 1300 years immersion was the almost universal practice of all Christians; but when they give their opinions as theologians, some of them think affusion will do just as well. Even father Wesley himself, in commenting, in his notes, on Rom. 6: 4, says, "*Buried with him—alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.*"

Mr. Wilkinson, like others, thinks that the three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost could hardly have been baptized by immersion, for there was not water at hand with which to immerse them. I wonder if Mr. Wilkinson forgot about the pool of Bethesda, of the Upper and Lower Gihon, of Siloam, of Solomon's pool, and

the pool of Hezekiah,—why, there were fifteen acres of water in Jerusalem, which was one of the finest watered cities in the whole world, and certainly one of those pools, the pool of Bethesda, would afford sufficient water to baptize 3,000 people. Mr. Wilkinson talks about the jailer being baptized in the prison, and says he was not immersed in the prison. The jailer came out of the prison. Paul preached the Gospel in his house, and the jailer afterwards took them out of the house somewhere, Paul baptized them, and they were brought back again. Of course the jailer took them out. Head the account in the 16th chapter of Acts, where you will see that the jailer was taken out of the house. Why was he taken out of the house at midnight to be baptized?

With respect to the purification of Christ, my friend Mr. Wilkinson is under the impression that John was down there purifying people, or baptizing people as a symbol of purification; that they were impure, and were baptized to be purified. The people came to John confessing their sins. Christ did not come to John confessing any sin, He did not come because He was impure. My opponent firmly and emphatically affirmed that John purified Christ according to the ceremonial law. But John was not purifying according to the Mosaic law, and if Christ was impure that was not the place for Him to come to be purified. John was not engaged in that work. I will show you how men were purified according to the Mosaic law, when they had become impure by touching a dead body. In Leviticus chapter 15, we read, "When any man hath a running issue out of his flesh, because of his issue he is unclean.

"And this shall be his uncleanness in his issue; whether his flesh run with his issue, or his flesh be stopped from his issue, it is his uncleanness.

"Every bed whereon he lieth that hath the issue, is unclean; and everything whereon he sitteth shall be unclean.

"And whosoever toucheth his bed shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and be unclean until the even."

All these are unclean, and if a man touch one he shall be unclean.

In verse 13 it is said, "And when he that hath an issue is cleansed of his issue; then he shall number to himself seven days for his cleansing, and wash his clothes, and bathe his flesh in running water, and shall be clean."

We have the remedy in the 14th chapter of Leviticus for cleansing the leper:

"Then shall the priest command *to take for him that is to he*

cleansed two birds alive and clean, and cedar wood and scarlet and hyssop.

"And the priest shall command that one of the birds be killed in an earthen vessel over running water;

"As for the living bird he shall take it and the cedar wood and the scarlet and the hyssop, and shall dip them and the living bird in the blood of the bird that was killed over the running water;

"And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times, and shall pronounce him clean, and shall let the living bird loose into the open field.

"And he that is to be cleansed shall wash his clothes and shave off all his hair, and wash himself in water, that he may be clean: and after that he shall come into the camp, and shall tarry abroad out of his tent seven days."

John was not performing that ceremony. He was not sprinkling with any sort of mixture. He came to prepare a people for the Lord. The Pharisees came and asked, If you are not the Christ why are you baptizing? They did not understand it. It was a new thing. He was preparing the way of the Lord. I deny that John purified Christ in any sense whatever. He baptized Him, but he did not purify Him.

I call attention to Heb. 9:10. My friend asked me what those "divers baptisms" were. Dr. McKnight, the well-known Presbyterian scholar, renders this verse thus:—

"Only with meats and drinks, and divers immersions, and ordinances concerning the flesh, imposed until the time of reformation."

A word with respect to those divers baptisms to which my friend referred. Remembering that what we are saying will be printed, I want to make a statement here that it may go into the book.

Under the Jewish law there were at least eighteen bathings in water' without any mixture of blood or ashes in it. Those eighteen different bathings, mentioned in eighteen different places, for different purposes, must have occurred many times, hundreds of thousands of times, every year. These will be found mentioned in the following places: Exod. 29:4; 40:12; Lev. 14:8,9; 15:5; 15:16; 15:18; 16:4; 16:24; 16:26; 16:28; 17:15; 17:16; 22:6; Num. 19:7, 8, and Deut. 23: 11. These bathings are all expressed by the Greek word *louo*. This means to wash. There are three words in Greek meaning to wash, viz., *louo*, *nipito*, and *pluno*. The first means to wash the entire body; the second, to wash the hands and feet, or part of the body; the third, to wash the clothes. *Louo*, as I have said,

means to wash the entire body. That word is used in regard to all bathings. In Heb. 10: 22 it says, "Having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." The word is *louo*. That act is done by immersing, not by sprinkling. The body is not washed by a little water poured on the head. The sprinkling applies to the heart.

In regard to this passage (Heb. 9: 10), my friend thinks the "divers baptisms" refer to the sprinklings of the law—that they were typical of baptism, or that baptism represents them. But not so; the "divers baptisms" refer to these various bathings. In cleansing a man from any ceremonial defilement there was first a sprinkling of a mixture of water and blood, or water and the ashes of a red heifer, and then a bathing of the body in water. The sprinkling was typical of the sprinkling of the blood of Christ; the bathing, of baptism; hence Paul says (Heb. 10: 22), "having our hearts sprinkled," "and our bodies washed with pure water."

While I am talking about the "divers baptisms," I want to call attention to the sprinklings under the law. There are eight sprinklings of blood; of blood and oil, three; of blood and water, two; oil, three; mixed water and oil, four; in all, twenty. The different sprinklings of the law are, as I have said, twenty in number; the bathings are eighteen. In those sprinklings there are six only in which there is water, and the water is never unmixed. It is mixed with blood and with the ashes of a red heifer. God never commanded unmixed water to be sprinkled on anybody.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKINSON'S THIRD REPLY.

In regard to the "divers baptisms," mentioned in Heb. 9: 10, I desire to call your attention, to the manner in which my opponent has dealt with them. You will remember I warned you not to let him drag you away to some river. Those baptisms took place "in the tabernacle," which is not necessarily the case with one of the bathings to which he has referred, therefore he has been talking aside the mark. They were blood-sprinklings, as I showed, the only kind of purifications ever effected in the tabernacle.

He says God never commanded unmixed water to be sprinkled upon any one. No, under the old dispensation it was always mixed; but by the prophet Ezekiel, He says, speaking of the present dispensation, "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," etc. But perhaps (rod did not say that! Perhaps my opponent will quote Dr. McKnight, or some one else to prove that He did not mean it. I do not know how he will get out of it, but I know he is in it.

In regard to Wesley's testimony, my opponent says that in Rom. 6: 3, 4 he sees a reference to immersion, and the same in regard to Col. 2:12. I have an extract here which I made from Wesley on Heb. 10: 22, in which he says there is a plain allusion to the mode of baptism by sprinkling. Yet my opponent wants you to believe that he and others believed immersion to have been the only ancient mode, yet fell back on sprinkling as an expedient of their own, it being more convenient, and arguing in support of their practice that they had a right to change the mode. I doubt, however, if my opponent can produce a single case where one of the writers from whom he quotes agrees tint *baptizo*, in the New Testament sense, means to immerse, and then turns round and argues for sprinkling as the mode of baptism. They admit, as I do, that in its primary, classical sense, the word means immerse. They know and acknowledge, as I do, that from a very early period the usual mode of baptism was by immersion, but they invariably undertake to prove, as Wesley states in the extract I have read, that baptisms in the New Testament were performed by sprinkling and pouring. They then go on and argue how much better and more convenient and proper for all climes and nations and conditions this mode is than the superstitious mode (it was born and bred in superstition), of dipping or immersing in water.

A good deal has been said about the baptism of Christ. My opponent has assumed, or begged the question, that the baptism of Christ was by immersion, in order to prove that immersion was the meaning imported into the Scriptures from the classics. But that is the very question in dispute, and a man must not beg the question and base his reasonings on his own assumptions in order to prove his point. It is not evidence in the case until it is proved. Now, with respect to the baptism of Christ, in Matt. 3rd chapter, we have an account of it as follows: "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him But John forbad 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." Now, I want to call your attention to Christ's own definition of this baptism. He called it a fulfillment of righteousness. "Thus," He says, (and it was His baptism He was talking about), "in this way it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness." Then, let it be understood that it was a fulfillment of righteousness of some sort. What kind of righteousness was it? and how can righteousness be fulfilled? We *obtain* righteousness by faith. We *fulfill* it by obedience. When Christ preached the sermon on the Mount, recorded in the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of Matthew, He said, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law till all be fulfilled." Then Christ proposed to fulfill righteousness by obedience to law. There is no getting back of that. If my opponent can jump this fence I will think he is pretty breachy. The baptism of Christ was the fulfillment of righteousness. To fulfill righteousness there must be obedience to law. Now, what law did He fulfill by His baptism? Was it the moral law, or ten commandments? There is not a word in these about baptism. The moral law does not deal with ceremonies, but baptism is a ceremony,—an outward rite. We must not look to the moral law, therefore, for a command to baptize. If any law was fulfilled, therefore, it must have been the ceremonial law, unless my opponent can find some other law under the obligations of which he existed, and to which he was obliged to render obedience. I know of no other law, however, except the moral and ceremonial, under which Christ lived, and the obligations of which he was bound to accept. And what part of the ceremonial law was fulfilled by Christ's baptism? Until my opponent can tell what it was, in vain will he endeavor to make it appear that it was not a purification. I affirmed it was a purification, and I repeat it. He cannot put his finger on anything in the ceremonial law which required Christ to be baptized, unless it was the induction of the priest into his office, and you will find by a reference to this that the very idea of the washing of the priests was for purification. And in reference to this, my opponent endeavored to make a point, by what I regret to characterize as an unworthy quibble. He tried to present me to you as having taught you that Christ was unclean from having touched a dead body. I taught nothing of the kind. That is a purely gratuitous inference and assumption on his part. I simply used that as an illustration. I said if Christ touched a dead body He would be unclean from the

contact as much as you or I would. I did not say that He touched a dead body or that He was a leper. What is the use, therefore, of going all through the Old Testament to tell you how lepers and people that touched dead bodies were cleansed? What I was talking about had no connection with such purifications. I was speaking about symbolizing moral purity, and that was what the priests' baptism at the door of the tabernacle meant. They had to be washed with water before they could officiate in the priestly office. My opponent tells you that Christ was not under the ceremonial law, and no doubt he will say that he was not in the priesthood of Aaron and Levi, but will he tell you by what law He was inducted into His office? He says His baptism was not a purification, but if we turn to John 1:31 we read where John the Baptist said, "That He should be made manifest to Israel, therefore am I come, baptizing with water." How did John's baptism make Christ manifest to Israel? We will turn to Mal. 3:1-3 and see just how it was. John is here called our Lord's messenger. "Behold I will send My messenger and he shall prepare the way before Me; and the Lord whom ye seek shall suddenly come to His temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in; behold He shall come, saith the Lord of Hosts. But who may abide the day of His coming, and who shall stand when He appeareth?" Why, what is the trouble about standing when He appeareth, and abiding the day of His coming? "For He 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, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." Was not Christ the world's purifier? Why did He come to this earth, if not to cleanse the world from sin? Hence John recognized Him as the great purifier of the human race, and shrank from the required task of baptizing Him, saying, "I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me?" Being pure, and the purifier of mankind, it was meet that He should receive the token of His character and work. I still argue, therefore, that Christ's baptism was a symbol of purity. I still argue, on the strength of His own statement, that it was a fulfillment of righteousness by obedience to some law; and I still affirm that there was no law which He could have been called upon to obey except the one referring to the induction of the priest into his office. God had instituted for the purpose the best mode of expressing moral purity, and that was the washing of the priest with water, hence, though of a different order from Aaron, it was appropriate that Christ should receive it. And if

He had gone into a Jewish synagogue as a public teacher without having this rite performed on Him, what would have been the consequence? A cry would have been raised by the Jews that an individual who was ceremonially unclean was standing up to teach them, and they would have refused to hear Him, though it was important that they should be taught. When the question of His authority to teach was raised, what did He say? He said, "I also will ask you one thing, which if ye tell Me, I in like wise will tell you by what authority I do these things. The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven or of men?" But they dare not tell Him, for if they said, of men, they feared the people, and if they said, of heaven, they virtually admitted His authority, for John had baptized Him and testified that he saw the Spirit like a dove descend upon Him. And the acknowledgment of this was the very thing they were anxious to avoid, hence Christ appealed to the baptism of John for His authority to teach.

My opponent has quoted authorities on the burial subject to prove it meant immersion, but I care not one straw for any authority if he does not write sense, and I will show you that whoever talks about ritual baptism as a burial, talks nonsense. Did you ever see a man buried when the corpse trotted out to his own grave? I ask you this as a serious question. I confess it is the strangest burial I ever heard of, either in civilized or uncivilized lands; either in ancient or modern times. I will guarantee that history cannot produce another such case where the corpse actually jogs alongside the sexton or priest to its own grave. A pretty lively corpse, I should say! Besides, it half buries itself by its own act, and then the preacher comes along and buries the rest. But, instead of leaving it buried, he pulls it right out again for fear the individual will become a corpse in reality, and the dead man trots back home, and the friends have a good time instead of going into mourning. That is the kind of performance they have when they convert Christian baptism into a burial, and make the patting of their candidates into water to represent the putting of a corpse into a grave. I may have been thought to use strong language in referring to such acts as superstition and nonsense. But it is surely not unchristian to say so when I regard such a performance, every inch of it, as one of the most monstrous pieces of superstition that ever was perpetrated among civilized men! Is it water baptism that Paul refers to when he speaks of our being incorporated into Christ? Is it water baptism by which the old man, with his corrupt deeds, is put away? Is it water baptism by which we are raised from

the dead to walk in newness of life? Perhaps my opponent will tell you it is. But I do not believe a word of it. I believe it is a superstition which came down to us from the early days of the Church, when they immersed people because they believed the water soaked out sin and soaked in grace, consequently people's sins could not be forgiven till they were put under water. According to this theory we' must be drowned in order to be made alive. The more you examine Rom. 6:3,4, and Col. 2:12, with the context, the more clearly you will see that it is a grand spiritual process of which the apostle speaks, by which we become incorporated into Christ, and, being united to Him, we are one with Him in all His atoning work; one with Him in His death, one with Him in His burial, one with Him in His resurrection, one with Him forever, unless we forfeit salvation by our own act. Does water baptism do that for us? I maintain that it does not. My opponent has admitted that while the candidate is under water he is baptized, and when he is taken out he is not baptized. You were baptized, but you are not now baptized, he says. But I should think that when a man is baptized into Christ, it would be better to let him stay there. But, according to his theory, he dare not let him stay there. If he did, his baptism into Christ would be a burial in the depths. But, on the supposition that Paul is speaking of water baptism in these passages, as a figure of what he describes, let us see what is involved. "So many of us as were baptized in Christ," he says, "were baptized into His death," etc. Now, first, we are said to be baptized into Christ. If this is represented by our being put into water, then the water must be a figure of Christ. But we are also put into the water to represent our being baptized into His death; therefore, the water represents His death,—two things, Christ and His death. But we are also said to be "buried with Him by baptism," therefore the water is again transformed into a grave, and the pulling out of the candidate which is the converse of his being put in, ought to represent taking the candidate out of Christ, out of His death, and out of His grave. Do you think Paul thus jumbled together things which essentially differ, by making the water represent Christ, His death, and His tomb, and the subject for baptism a corpse? When my opponent baptizes, therefore, he puts his candidates into Christ, and buries them in the grave by the same act. But he has to take them out immediately to avoid drowning them. He has quoted the case of Aristobulus to prove that a classic baptism, in the primary sense, did not always drown; but, as a matter of fact, Aristobulus was drowned. He referred to another case where the Jews, baptized in

the Sea of Galilee, popped up their heads, endeavoring to escape; but, being shot at, were obliged to pop them under again, and finally perished. When they popped their heads out they were not baptized, when they got under again they were baptized, and so they went in and out like jack in a box, but their baptism killed them, and" so it will every time, according to my opponent's theory. He has not found, nor can he find, a single case in all Greek literature, where any one was baptized, according to the primary idea, and survived it, hence I say that the whole immersion theory is the greatest superstition ever heard of, and I expect to prove it to the satisfaction of this congregation before the debate closes.. In this burial in water business, as I have said, the water represents Christ's grave, which was a rock sepulcher, entered by a door at one side, in front of which a large stone was rolled. Would that be suggested to your mind by a candidate entering the water for baptism and being put under by a preacher? Would it ever occur to you that the water was a symbol of such a grave? It reminds me of the young artist who drew on his slate what he intended for a diagram of a horse, but fearing the resemblance was so remote that it would not be recognized, he wrote underneath, "This is a horse." I would advise my immersion friends to write under all their immersions, "This is a burial," for certainly no one would ever recognize them as imitations of a burial. The idea of converting a candidate for baptism into the figure of a corpse, and transforming an ordinance, intended to symbolize the regeneration of the soul by the action of the Holy Ghost, into a funeral scene, is absurd. Does such a representation convey to anyone's mind the idea of moral cleansing and regeneration? Nothing of the kind I tell you this burial business, applied to the outward rite of baptism, is a positive superstition. Neither Christ, nor Peter, nor John, nor any one of the apostles down through the early period of Christianity for twenty-five or thirty years, ever referred to such a thing as burial in connection with baptism. It is not in the records. And when Paul alluded to it it was in a spiritual sense. Do you want proof of this? Then turn to first Corinthians 12: 13 (I presume the apostle understood his own meaning as well as Mr. Harding does), and you will read, "For by one Spirit we are all baptized into one body." If you turn to Galatians 3: 27, 28, you may read, "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 man in Christ Jesus." Are we made one in Christ by being ducked in water? But my opponent

says the authorities affirm that *baptizo* means to dip, or immerse. I repeat, I care not a straw for all the books he can pile on his table if their interpretations do not agree with the Word of God, and this interpretation does not. I prefer to manufacture my own creed out of inspired truth, but I will not pin my faith to any man's opinion. I submit to your intelligent, candid, Christian judgment whether I have not made it plain that baptism by immersion is not referred to in these passages, and that baptism with water is intended merely to symbolize spiritual truth, but not to dramatize literal events or occurrences. Can it be possible that Christ instituted a solemn ordinance in the Christian economy to commemorate an event which is of no more importance in its atoning or regenerating effect, than a little oil on your nose would be to cure the corns on your toes? (Laughter.)

[*Time expired.*]

Mr. WILKINSON—Can I offer a word of explanation, Mr. Chairman, as to what I mean by that remark?

Mr. HARDING—No, no. Your time is up.

Mr. WILKINSON (to the audience)—Then don't carry away a false impression, for I will explain it again.

(*This closed the proceedings of the first day.*)

SECOND DAY.

MR. HARDING'S FOURTH SPEECH.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—After a refreshing night's sleep, and a quiet forenoon of rest, we come before you again to continue the discussion of this important matter. Bear in mind that I am here to affirm that Christian baptism is immersion—in it there must be a burial in water. Bear in mind, further, that Christian baptism is the baptism instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and was first given to the world in the great commission given by our Lord to His holy apostles. In that commission the duty of baptism is expressed, as we have had occasion to say, by the Greek word *baptizo*. The real object of this meeting is, therefore, to bring out the meaning of that word in that document, for it is agreed by all that that document, known as the great commission, is the authority for baptism, and the only authority which man has. Jesus used this word. By His Holy Spirit He gave this word to His apostles. His apostles wrote it in the Book; and we thus have this word coming from our Lord, through the Holy Spirit and through the apostles. What does the word mean? We have been considering this matter; we will continue to consider it. I have told you frankly and fairly that the meaning of the word is to immerse. I do not mean that immersion alone is Christian baptism, but simply that the word *baptizo*, wherever you find it used in regard to Christian baptism, or anywhere else, means to immerse. Christian baptism is immersion by the authority of Christ, and into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. But *baptizo* means to immerse, and I have referred you to authorities to prove my statement. Bear in mind that I produced eight Greek lexicons, all *Greek-English but one, and that is Greek-Latin*, and every one defines the word to immerse, dip, plunge. Not one of them defines it to sprinkle or pour. I claim that it was a proper thing for me to go to the dictionaries, and see how they define the word, and I have done so. It is agreed by Mr. Wilkinson that the word in the classics means to immerse. He says I might have saved myself the trouble of producing lexicons and books to prove that it means immerse in

the classic use of it. He also admits that it does not mean to sprinkle, and that it does not mean to pour upon, and that it cannot in any case be so defined. Indeed he has never yet agreed that the word means anything but immerse. Do you remember that I called upon him to answer this question? Tell us what *baptizo* means in the commission. He and I agree that a word in one place can have but one meaning. What is the meaning of *baptizo* in the commission? I told you he would not give you the meaning. We do not want to know what it symbolizes or represents. We want to know what the word means. Christ told the apostles to do something. "Go disciple the nations, baptizing them." Do something—baptize them. What does it mean? He says it does not mean to purify or cleanse, but that it symbolizes that. He admits that in classic Greek it means to immerse, but he will not agree that it means anything else. I told you he would not answer that question in his last speech, and he did not. I prophecy that he will not answer it in his next speech, or in any speech.

Mr. WILKINSON—Of course not.

Mr. HARDING—I knew you were a coward and dare not do it, but you persist in interrupting me.

Mr. WILKINSON—I deny the charge.

Mr. Harding appealed to the Chairman to be protected from such interruptions.

The Chairman mentioned that moderators were appointed to regulate the debate.

Mr. HARDING—He interrupted me.

Mr. WILKINSON—In the absence of my moderator [who had not yet arrived] I claim the right to speak for myself. I simply appeal to the audience, through the Chairman, as to whether I have interrupted Mr. Harding in his speech.

Mr. HARDING—You spoke up to me. [Addressing the audience.] He is not going to answer that question, because he dare not do it. I will tell you the meaning of the word, because I know it. What does Christ tell His apostles to do? To baptize. My opponent does not say what it means. When you ask me the meaning of any word I am using I will give it you as far as I know it. If I don't know it I will tell you so. My opponent agrees that in the classics it means to immerse. No wonder he agrees to that.

Dr. Moses Stuart, professor of sacred literature in Andover Theological Seminary, one of the most learned and distinguished Presbyterians America ever produced, says in his work *on* Baptism

(Nashville edition), "*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into anything liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this." *Page 51*. He gives many examples illustrative of the use of these words, and then says (*page 76*), "A review of the preceding examples must lead any one, I think, to the conclusion that the predominant usage of the words *bapto* and *baptizo* is to designate the idea of dipping, plunging, or overwhelming, and (in the case of *bapto*) of tinging and dyeing."

I next read from the great Pasor, *Bapto* and *baptizo*. "To dip, to immerse, to dye, because it is done by immersing. It differs from *dunai*, which means to sink to the bottom, and to be thoroughly submerged. Afflictions are compared to a Hood of waters in which they seem to be immersed who are overwhelmed with the misfortunes and miseries of life; yet only so overwhelmed as to emerge again."

Donnegan says: "To immerse repeatedly into a liquid; to submerge; to soak thoroughly; to saturate, hence, to drench with wine. Metaphorically, to confound totally; to dip in a vessel and draw."

Mr. Wilkinson read from what appeared to me to be a scrap book, composed of matter written with his own hand.

MR. WILKINSON—It is not written. (Hands book to Mr. Harding.)

MR. HARDING—Is that your sermon? He was reading from his own sermon if I am not very much mistaken. I see it was a sermon on the subject of baptism by Rev. Henry Morris. He was quoting from a book of sermons by some member of the Reformed Dutch Church, of Unionville. N. Y. State. He was quoting from sermons preached by a paedobaptist preacher to prove that the meaning of *baptizo* is not to immerse.

I have here a "Manual on Baptism," by G. S. Bailey, President of Shurtleff College. His quotations were verified by the Book Committee of the Publication Society. The following quotations are from this work.

Bishop Smith, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Kentucky, says: "We have only to go back six or eight hundred years, and immersion was the only mode, except in the case of the few baptized on their beds when death was near. And with regard to such cases, it disqualified its recipient for holy orders in case he recovered. Immersion was not only universal six or eight hundred years ago, but it was primitive and apostolic, no case of baptism standing on record by any other mode for the first three hundred years, except the few cases of those baptized clinically, that is, lying in bed. If any one practice of the early Church is clearly established, it is immersion."—*Bliss¹ Letter on Baptism, p. 24.*

I proceed to notice some remarks offered by Mr. Wilkinson in his last night's speech. He said it was perfectly ridiculous to suppose that the burial referred to in Romans, sixth chapter, was a burial in water. In his speech at Euphrasia he said that anybody was a fool who believed that. In his speech here, in the Presbyterian Church, when I called attention to the fact that his Father Wesley gave that interpretation, he went on to explain that Wesley in that particular point was foolish in giving such an interpretation, and if Mr. Wesley were living to-day, with the light that we now have, he would not so interpret it.

A greater than Father Wesley is living to-day, that is Dr. Philip Schaff, the greatest church historian now living on earth. In his edition of Lange's Commentary on Romans, page 202, he says: "All commentators of note (except Stuart and Hodge) expressly admit or take it for granted that in this verse, especially in *sunetapheemen* and *eegerthee*, [the burial and resurrection], the ancient prevailing mode of baptism by immersion and emersion is implied, as giving additional force to the idea of the going down of the old and the rising up of the new man."

Conybeare and Howson, "Life and Epistles of St. Paul," Vol I., p. 439, say:

"Baptism was immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to a life of righteousness." Also on Rom. 6: 4, "This passage cannot be understood unless it is borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion."

Macknight, a distinguished Moderator of the Presbyterian General Assembly of Scotland, says: "In baptism, the baptized person is buried under water, as one put to death with Christ, and on account of sin, in order that they may be strongly impressed with a sense of the malignity of sin, and excited to hate it as the greatest of evils." Commenting on Rom. 6: 4, he says: "Christ submitted to be baptized, that is to be buried under water by John, and to be raised out of it again, as an emblem of his future death and resurrection. In like manner, the baptism of believers is emblematical of their own death, burial, and resurrection."

John Wesley, the founder of Methodism, in his Notes on Romans 6:4 says: "Buried with Him—alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion."

These authorities I have quoted for convenience from Bailey,

though I have the original works here, and can turn to them if it is necessary.

George Whitfield says: "It is certain that in the words of our text (Rom. 6: 4) there is an allusion to the manner of baptizing, which was by immersion."

Dr. Wall (who wrote the History of Infant Baptism to which we have already referred, and whose work is the standard authority on that subject, although it was written 180 years ago), says: "St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way of speaking, call baptism a burial."

Archbishop Tillotson, of the Church of England, says: "Anciently those who were baptized were immersed and buried in the water to represent their death to sin, and then raised up out of the water to signify their entrance upon a new life; and to these customs the apostle alludes in Rom. 6: 4."

The Edinburgh Reviewers, paedo baptists, say: "We have rarely met, for example, a more weak and fanciful piece of reasoning than that by which Mr. Ewing would persuade us that there is no allusion to the mode by immersion in the expression, 'buried with Him in baptism.' This point ought to be frankly admitted, and, indeed, cannot be denied with any show of reason."

I will now call attention to the reason given by Mr. Wilkinson for refusing to believe that the apostle Paul referred to immersion—to a burial in water—in Rom. 6: 4, his reason for ridiculing as fools all who so interpret it. He inquires, "Did you ever see a man buried who trotted out to his own grave?" This is his great reason for differing from all the scholars of the world (except two), for calling all the commentators and critics (except Stuart and Hodge), of all ages and nations, fools. Did he never hear of any one's being buried alive? It does not matter whether one is dead or alive, you can bury him. Suppose we weigh Mr. Wilkinson; imagine a great pair of balances with him upon one end, and Schaff, Wesley, the Edinburgh Reviewers, McKnight, Conybeare and Howson, Whitfield, Wall, Archbishop Tillotson, with all the scholars of all the ages, upon the other end: why, the one end would go down, and the other up, with such vim that my friend here would go right up through the roof.

But Mr. Wilkinson says he does not care for the scholars. He does not care what they say. I, Mr. Wilkinson, tell you it will never do to bury a man alive. In heathen lands it is a common thing to bury live men with the dead—to bury servants with their dead masters. He should know that when a man believes in Jesus he dies to sin; and he ought to know that when a man comes up from the

water of baptism he does so to begin a new life, and is called a new-born babe in Christ.

In this very chapter (Rom. 6), in the second verse, the apostle represents the Romans as dead to sin, and then in the fourth, as being buried and raised to walk in newness of life. We have in the passage a death, burial and resurrection.

He may talk till his head is gray, and may act as a jumping-jack as much as he pleases. He reminds me of a jack-on-a-pole that you work with a string. He is better at it than any man I ever saw. He was cut out for a clown, and he reminds me all the time of the Darwinian principle of evolution, of raising a man from a monkey.

Rev. Mr. HUNT—Mr. Chairman, I protest against such language. It is not such as a gentleman would use in a public assembly. Any gentleman would at once take it back.

Mr. HARDING—I call attention to the fact that the gentleman talked about my bellowing and shouting and clapping my fists. He talked about jumping-jacks, and I am just applying that where it properly belongs. I am here to keep up my side, and by the grace of God I will do it by every means that is fair and right, and I will not be intimidated by any body of preachers on the rostrum, or by any body of people in the audience.

Rev. Mr. HUNT—I call attention to the fact that this gentleman spoke of Mr. Wilkinson as not being fit for a clown, if I understood him correctly. Such an expression should not be used.

Mr. HARDING—Perhaps I should not have expressed my sentiments.

Rev. Mr. HUNT—No gentleman will express such sentiments.

Mr. HARDING—You may say what you please about it. I have used no such expressions as have been used on the other side. I have not called the whole of the scholars fools.

Mr. WILKINSON—Did I do that in this debate?

Mr. HARDING—You did it in a public speech.

Mr. WILKINSON—Was I debating with you then?

Mr. STERLING (Mr. Harding's moderator)—You intimated that he was a jumping-jack.

Mr. WILKINSON—I was not referring to Mr. Harding at all, but I was referring to the persons in the water whom Mr. Harding tried to prove got out of a baptized state alive, who put their heads out of the water, and when shot at put them under again. I referred to them as jumping-jacks, not to him at all.

Mr. HARDING—I will be more careful how I express my senti-

ments, and proceed with my speech. I was very forcibly reminded when Mr. Wilkinson was speaking of a story I heard concerning an old lawyer giving advice to a young one. He said, "Young man, when you go before a jury, if the law is in your favor and the testimony against you, come out strong on the law; if the testimony is in your favor and the law against you, be very strong on the testimony." Said the young man, "And suppose both the law and the testimony are against me?" "Then," replied the senior "talk round." If Mr. Wilkinson is not talking round, I do not understand what he is doing. He called on a boy to answer a question, and the boy said, "I don't know." The boy, like the rest of the people, did not know what he was trying to prove. He was talking round and raising a dust. He now tells you that he does not intend to tell you what the word *baptizo* means. Of course he will not do it, although it is the very word in debate. One of the very first rules in debating is that the words found in the proposition are to be interpreted and explained, so that there shall be no mistake. I explained them to the best of my ability, but he says he will not attempt to do so. I pass on to another point, Christ's induction into His office as priest by John's baptism

(Time expired.)

MR. WILKINSON'S FOURTH REPLY.

The old lawyer's story is very appropriate at the present time. But if I had told it, and told it as it is usually told, it would have been quite as appropriate, viz., "When you have no case abuse the plaintiff's attorney." I very much regret that my opponent has become so exasperated. I never saw a man in such a sweat as he was in last night, except the same man to-day. A man always gets exasperated when he is getting the worst of it in a contest. The whale is a comparatively harmless animal, I am told, until you harpoon him, and then he can make the water fly tremendously. I am afraid the harpoon has struck in some part which is pretty tender. I never saw a whale flounder so in my life. There is a part of the whale which they call blubber. I do not know whether there is any of that about my opponent or not. He seems to depend excessively upon those books. Now, if I had known the merits of this debate were to depend on reading extracts from books, why I would have

ordered a special train and have brought a car-load along, for we know that we can produce ten testimonies to their one, among scholars, if it comes to that. I have read many leading works on this subject, and know that I could take up your time for hours in reading authorities. I did not, however, come here to weary your patience or tax your attention by reading largely from books, and I would not have read half, nor a quarter of what I have read, only that I deemed it desirable to show you that there are two sides to this question. But, thank God, I did not have to bring my brains to Meaford in a trunk, and pile them up on my table for the congregation to look at. Do you see those brains, friends? [pointing to Mr. Harding's pile of books.] Perhaps it would be interesting for you to know what those brains are made of. Well, I can tell you. They are made of basswood, a little straw and a sprinkling of printer's ink; and if the merits of this discussion are to depend on the amount of such brains that we can pile on our stand and read to the people, then I did not understand the matter. I did not know this when I came here or I would have been better prepared. And even now I had better send down to Mr. Briggs to send me up the Book Room, for it is full of books on my side of this question. I tell you I could have given you books by the score if I had been disposed to load myself down with such trash. But we might stand here from now to eternity reading extracts from books, and settle nothing in the end. This man comes here to affirm that *Christian* baptism is immersion; not what classic baptism is. Yet he has spent most of his time telling us what classic baptism is, and he has not done that according to the primary sense of the term, for in this sense it means to put anything in water and drown it, if a human being or live animal, and if any other object, to put it under water and leave it there. He dare not baptize a candidate in that fashion, I challenge him to perform a single classic baptism if he dare. I will not turn and shake my fists in his face, and smite them together, like a rowdy from the riff-raff of Kentucky. My opponent does not retract his offensive statement that I was a coward, a clown, a rowdy and a jumping-jack, although my moderator called attention to the fact that it was ungentlemanly. He only added insult to injury by saying, sarcastically, that he would be a little more careful how he expressed his sentiments. If this debate is to degenerate into a war of this kind we had better close it with this session. I did not come here to abuse this man, or any other man. I did not come here to tell you what the word *baptizo* means. He says I will not do it, and there is a good reason. I did not assume the responsibility of doing it. He

did. I came here to negative what he affirms. I did not come here to affirm anything about the meaning of the word, but simply to bring rebutting testimony against his abominable theory that Christian baptism is immersion—a theory which in practice will everlastingly result in drowning unless an accident happens to deliver the poor victim from his fate. I stand here as a representative of Christianity to tell you that Christian baptism never means immersion, and that our Lord never used *baptizo* in the primary classic sense, for my opponent cannot produce a single classic Greek writer giving an instance of baptism according to the original, primary or classic sense that did not result in drowning. That ought to settle as much as a whole wheelbarrow full of books. Until he can find that instance, let him keep quiet about his books. I told you that if I could produce from the Bible one case of baptism not administered by immersion his whole fabric came to the ground. I *did* produce it. It is in Hebrews 9: 10. I told you he could not meet it. He has not done so. He cannot do so. I called the attention of Bishop Carman to this passage as I explained it last night. He went to the Bible and examined it in my presence, and said, "You are right." It had never struck the Bishop's attention, until I pointed it out to him, that the "divers washings" were effected by means of sacrifices. Those sacrifices involved the slaying of the victim, and the sprinkling of the blood upon the individual to cleanse him from ceremonial defilement. That was baptism according to Paul. Now, I maintain that until he has broken down that testimony his case is gone, and he knows it, and hence this bullying business. But he has treed the wrong coon this time. He woke up the wrong passenger when he challenged me with such defiance, in the little church south of here, a few months ago. I did not come here to be trampled underfoot by any great big—I will not say rowdy—but by any living man from Kentucky or anywhere else. I presume he thought Canadians were only about half civilized and but very partially enlightened, and he could come up here and corruscate with the magnificence of his immortal genius, and we would just open our mouths like young robins and swallow down anything he put in them. But he came to the wrong part of the earth, and found the wrong man. I would not have made these remarks only for the treatment I received at his hands during the last speech. If he expects this kind of thing is to settle the question—if he expects the debate to turn on this, let him keep right on, and he will find I have a tongue as long as his, and that, though I don't want to brag, as he is in the habit of doing, and although I have not as much brains

on the stand, I have quite as much in my cranium. I want him to take his bearing and point his compass in the right direction, and see if he can steer the shattered hulk of baptism by immersion into harbor. In my opinion, it is a water-soaked old craft; it has been scuttled again and again from stem to stern; there is not a timber in it that has not been splintered from end to end; it has been riddled through and through like a sieve until it will no longer hold water, and if he thinks there is anything in it worth mending, for God's sake let him run it into a dry-dock for repairs. I can follow him up on this line if it is the way to settle this question. I simply appeal now to Caesar. Last night he was so harpooned and driven into a corner, and filled with despair, that he would not allow me to add five or six words to complete a sentence, so that you might understand what was in my mouth when I had to quit. He is very exact as to time. At every little interruption he says to you, Mr. Chairman, "Mark my time. Don't let me lose a minute." He will need every minute before the debate is over, and I will be able to give him an hour to my half hour. Already he is giving you little but watery hash. "I am not mad, most noble Festus, but speak the words of truth and soberness."

And now, with regard to the statement I made last night, I say it would be a strange thing—and it would be extraordinary if scholars said anything different—that Christ would institute a sacred rite or sacrament in the Christian Church to keep in memory an event which, so far as the efficacy of the atonement is concerned, was of no consequence whatever. I refer to the mere fact that Christ was buried. So long as He died and came to life again, that was all that was essential to the efficacy of the atonement. If He had been laid on a shelf for three days instead of being entombed, it would not have detracted one iota from the merits of His atoning work, so long as He gave life to the world by His death and rose again from the dead as a triumph over death and hell, and ascended to the right hand of God. Yet, forsooth, we have to put every candidate for Christian baptism into water to symbolize Christ's burial, they say. We have to do this, observe, to represent the insignificant fact that after Christ died He was put into a grave. I have as much confidence in the death of Christ and the effects of His death and resurrection as any one, but the mere fact of His being put into a grave after He was crucified does not matter a straw. Yet we are to keep it in everlasting remembrance by a Christian ordinance!

My opponent challenges me to define *baptizo.*, I appeal to all who were here yesterday afternoon if I did not define this word as I under-

stand it. I told you then that baptism was a religious purification, outwardly symbolizing the inward purity of the heart; and that in whatever way the inward purification was produced, in that way the outward operation ought to be performed. I told you, moreover, that the blood of sprinkling on our hearts was a baptism, the inner baptism; and those very fathers that he says were all immersionists—and I can produce their names one after another—will tell you the same thing, viz., that the sprinkling of the blood of Christ was a baptism, and that water baptism is the symbol of it. Yet my opponent says we have to dip people in order to represent the sprinkling of blood. Would you imagine it had any relation to the sprinkling of Christ's blood when you see one man dip another in water? I should like to ask if the baptisms performed by the Spirit were by immersion. My opponent will perhaps tell you they were immersed by the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, but it is all in his eye. If it was any part of my present purpose, I could give him one or two more examples to chew, but I do not want to expose him too much at once. I am a little like the darkey boy who said to his master, "Massa, one of your oxen's dead. T'other one's dead too, but I thought I wouldn't tell you bof at once for fear you couldn't bore it." I find a very little intoxicates my opponent and turns his head, and I am afraid he will strike me if I give him too much at once. He has smacked his fists together in my face several times, and yesterday I had to move back in order to get out of the reach of his arms, and to-day I had to get behind the partition. I never saw a Christian minister who could smite his fists together in such a manner, and especially in the face of another person I could never have thought that a man could have become so proficient at this unless he had had a little practice as a bully in the prize ring. I do not think he is a prize fighter, but he was made for that, and as he has not turned his abilities into that channel, I presume he has mistaken his calling. He still wants to know the meaning of the word *baptizo*. I have said that it did not mean to sprinkle, or pour, though I gave a passing hint that I could produce a lexicon that gave such a meaning. For the present it will remain a simple question of veracity whether I can or not. I don't propose to be bullied into it until I get ready. The lexicons give so many different meanings that no man can fix on any one meaning and say that that is the sense in which Christ used the word in the commission. If it is a question of scholarship, quoting one scholar against another, I can produce as many scholars as he can to prove my position. But I prefer to depend on the brains God has

given me, and not on other people's brains. I did not come here to vindicate my cause by authorities. But when my opponent challenges me to produce a single standard lexicon giving to pour or sprinkle, he knows very well that Liddell and Scott is the only Greek-English one extant, and that all the others give their definitions either in Greek or Latin, or some other language. Therefore we do not find the English words pour or sprinkle in their definitions. But if my opponent says I cannot find the equivalent of sprinkle in any of the lexicons, I will undertake to accommodate him. We will take the word given by the lexicographers in Latin and interpret it with a Latin-English dictionary, and we can settle the question before we go home whether the Latin word means sprinkle or not. If he accepts my offer, we will test the question. He said last night that the New Testament was written in Greek. It is very strange if Christ spoke in some other tongue—and I understood my opponent to admit He did—that the apostles wrote in Greek.

And now I want to give him another little matter to put in his pipe and smoke until he speaks again. I want to give him a passage of Scripture in which a baptism is spoken of, and I want him to tell you whether the word *baptizo* is used in the sense in which he interprets it, or whether there is any immersion in the case. I refer to the baptism of the three million Israelites in the Red Sea. The passage is in 1 Cor. 10: 1, 2. It reads, "Moreover, brethren, I would not that you should be ignorant, how that 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." My opponent may say that that is not a Christian baptism; but this will not help his cause, because it is used by an inspired apostle who knew what Christian baptism was, and he calls it a baptism. The Israelites came to the borders of the sea, and the Egyptians were in pursuit. The cloud had hitherto gone before them to point out the way. But now "the angel of God, which went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them: and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face, and stood behind them. And it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these; so that the one came not near the other all the night. And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided. And the children of Israel went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground: and the waters were a wall unto them on their right hand

and on their left. And the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them to the midst of the sea and were drowned." There is no immersion in this case, except of the Egyptians. My opponent cannot get immersion into it. It has been a sore point with the immersionists in all ages, and will be till the end of time. He will tell you—it is a little trick that has been often exposed, but he will resort to it again—that the Israelites were under the cloud and passing through the sea at the same time, and that the cloud was resting down on the sea and made a kind of tunnel or box for them to go through—a sort of coffin; for, you know, baptism is immersion: in it there must be a burial in water! But Moses says that the cloud removed from before them and went and stood behind them while they passed through the sea, which they did on dry ground, and they were baptized, according to Paul. The Egyptians essaying to follow them were drowned. They were immersed, or classically baptized; while the Israelites, who were not immersed, were scripturally baptized. If my opponent can prove that the Israelites were immersed, he can carry off all the feathers and do all the crowing. If this kind of baptism will do which they say the Israelites received, I propose that in winter those in favor of the immersion theory should cut two large cakes of ice and set them up on edge a short distance apart; then cut another cake and lay it on the top, and let their candidates for baptism pass through, and they will be immersed in the same manner. In the summer-time they might have a water-tight box open at each end, fixed across a stream so that the water could flow over it, and then the candidates might be passed through the box and be immersed in the same orthodox fashion as they say the Israelites were, without wetting a hair of their heads or the soles of their feet. This would save a deal of trouble. The fact is that the baptism of the Israelites consisted in their deliverance out of bondage into liberty, which was effected by the guidance 'of the cloud and the passage of the sea, and Christian baptism is designed to symbolize our being born again of the Spirit and made partakers of the kingdom of heaven.

But perhaps at this point my opponent will tell me how Noah and his family were immersed at the time of the flood. Peter says they were typically baptized. But they floated in the ark while the antediluvian sinners were classically baptized. Noah and his family were only sprinkled, and they came out all right on the other shore, while those who were classically baptized were drowned. My opponent will probably tell you that Noah and his family were immersed in the ark. If so, and that will answer the purpose, we can take a ride on the bay in

a. covered boat at any time, and that will be baptism in the same way. The fact is that this old water-logged hulk of immersion is one of the greatest pieces of nonsense and superstition ever heard of, and I simply came here to punch a few more holes in it to let a little more water in. It is about time that you people who have got water on the brain should get over it, for it is a foregone conclusion that your theory cannot stand.

(Time expired.)

MR. HARDING'S FIFTH SPEECH.

Mr. Wilkinson talks about my being exasperated, but he is mistaken. I never was in better humor in 'my life. I heard before this debate began that one of my friend's strong points was his ability to exasperate, and I thought within myself that he would be mistaken in his man. I am very much pleased that we have met, and I know what the effect will be among the people.

He talks about a car-load of books that he might have brought. Oh, the "might-have-beens!" how many buoyant hopes and lofty aspirations have been destroyed by them in this world! How many castles-in-the-air have never been materialized on account of them. He might have brought a car-load of books!

I think he had better telegraph for them yet. If he had known that the merits of the discussion are to depend upon the books read, he tells us, he would have come better prepared. He ought to have come better prepared. Did he not know that the question to be settled is the meaning of *baptizo*, and that we can get that meaning only from the testimony of the lexicons, and from the usage of the great writers of the world?

He agrees that *baptizo* in the primary classic sense means to put under water, and he affirmed that it was an accident if a person ever came out alive. True, there is nothing in the force of the word *baptizo* to indicate that the baptized object should come out of the water; neither is there anything in its meaning to indicate that it should remain in the water. To baptize an object in water is simply to put it under water; its coming out, or remaining under, must be settled by other words.

He has at length given us his definition of *baptizo* in its New Testament use. He defines it by a noun—purification, a religious purification; that is, he defines a verb by a noun. So, if you will allow me to correct this blunder, according to Mr. Wilkinson the word means in the New Testament to purify: in ordinary Greek—classic Greek—to put under water; but in New Testament Greek, to purify. So, according to Mr. Wilkinson, Jesus said, "Go ye and teach all nations, purifying them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." John the purifier came purifying in the wilderness of Judea: the people "were purified of him in Jordan:" "Jesus, when He was purified, went up straightway out of the water;" Naaman "purified himself seven times in the river Jordan:" Jesus says, "I have a purification to be purified with:" "can ye be purified with the purification that I am purified with."

It is a well-known fact, axiomatic in its nature, that the meaning of a word may be substituted for it without in the least affecting the sense. Take the word baptize wherever you find it in the Bible, and in its stead put purify—Mr. Wilkinson's definition—and see how it will fill the place. He made another mis-statement which I was much astonished to hear. The gentleman said that Liddell and Scott was the only Greek-English lexicon, and that the other lexicons defined this word in Greek and Latin. What I said was that Liddell and Scott was the only *standard* Greek-English dictionary. I never intimated that it was the only Greek-English dictionary, because everybody that knows anything about lexicons knows there are a number of such. Every single one I quoted from was Greek-English, except one, and that was Greek-Latin. I have here now Greenfield, Green, Pickering, Groves, Robinson, Donnegan, as well as Liddell and Scott, all of them Greek-English. That statement gave me to understand that my friend is as ignorant of Greek lexicons as a baby. He went so far as to intimate that the New Testament was not written in Greek by inspired men. I say there is not a man in the world, that has proper information, who does not know that the language of the New Testament is Hellenistic Greek. It was formerly thought by some that Matthew wrote his gospel originally in Hebrew, and that it was then translated by himself, or some other inspired man, into Greek; but this opinion has now been very generally given up, as not sustained by the facts of history. My friend shows clearly that he knows nothing about Greek, and the other ancient languages.

My friend said he was afraid i would strike him. I will strike him with one weapon only, and that is the Sword of the Spirit—the

Word of God. I am not a striker. I would not harm a hair of his head; but it affords me a great deal of pleasure to put the Sword of the Spirit into his theories. I like to do that. I glory in doing it. I now pass on to the matter I was about to consider at the close of my last speech, the baptism of Jesus Christ. Our Lord was baptized "to fulfill all righteousness." "For thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness," he said to John. My friend argued, and he argued correctly (which is a wonder), that there must have been some law that Christ was fulfilling. To fulfill righteousness is to obey law; and so, being baptized is obeying law. Mr. Wilkinson then stated that there were two laws, the moral and the ceremonial, and that Christ must have been baptized in obedience to the one or the other. He said that Christ could not have been baptized in obedience to the moral law, because there were no religious ceremonies in that law; and, therefore, He must have been baptized to fulfill the ceremonial law. Just here Mr. Wilkinson said that Christ might have touched a dead body, or might have been defiled in some such way. I thought that the point he was endeavoring to make was that Christ was purified by John from ceremonial defilement, which affected Him from having touched a dead body, or some unclean thing. I replied by showing that He was not purified ceremonially from any such touching of a dead body, and that for every such purification according to the law there was first the sprinkling of the water of purification, and afterwards the bathing of the flesh in water. Mr. Wilkinson in his next speech denied most emphatically that he meant to intimate that Christ was ceremonially defiled by touching a dead body, or anything of the sort. He took another position, and claimed that Christ was inducted into the priest's office by baptism, and that He was baptized for that purpose. Before I consider that matter—His induction into the priestly office—let me explain to you how Christ fulfilled all righteousness. God gave laws to the people through the prophets. When these prophets were moved by the Spirit of God to give commandments to the people, either in writing or with the tongue, these commandments were laws from the Lord. Now, Christ expressly says that John was a prophet, "and more than a prophet!" He said of him, "Among them that are born of women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist." Commandments from his lips, therefore, were equally as much law—equally as authoritative—as those from Isaiah, or Jeremiah, or Moses. But John himself said that God sent him to baptize, and he commanded the people to be baptized. When Jesus submitted to this institution, he submitted to

a law of God—a law given through the prophet John. In the New Testament this baptism is called "the baptism of John." Had it been a part of the ceremonial law for hundreds of years, it would not have been called "John's baptism."

John came to prepare a people for the Lord, and that Jesus might be manifested as the Son of God. Hence he baptized the people, and hence Jesus was baptized. As He came up from the water, the heavens were opened, the Spirit of God descended upon Him, and the voice of God said, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." Then John knew Him as the Lamb of God that takes away the sin of the world.

Christ was never made a priest after the Mosaic law. John was not there making priests after that law. He was baptizing hundreds of thousands of people. He did not make Christ a priest, because he was not made a priest according to the law of a carnal commandment. I quote from Heb. 7: 11-17, "If, therefore, perfection were by the Levitical priesthood, (for under it the people received the law), what further need was there that another priest should rise after the order of Melchisedec, and not be called after the order of Aaron? For the priesthood being changed, there is made, of necessity, a change also of the law. For He of whom these things are spoken pertaineth to another tribe, of whom no man gave attendance at the altar. For it is evident that our Lord sprang out of Juda; of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood. And it is yet far more evident: for that after the similitude of Melchisedec there ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life. For he testifieth, Thou art a priest forever after the order of Melchisedec."

It is absurd to speak of Jesus being made a priest according to the Mosaic ritual—first, because He was not of the right tribe, and secondly, because He was not made a priest "after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life."

I am reminded of another point which I wish to bring before you. Mr. Wilkinson, in one of his speeches—I think it was his last—represented that Christ was placed on a shelf in a stone sepulcher. He was talking about the "burial," in the sixth of Romans. In his last speech he spoke about Christ's burial as of no consequence. I want to read in your hearing 1 Corinthians 15:1-4, "Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand;

"By which also ye are saved if ye keep in memory what I preached unto you, unless ye have believed in vain.

"For I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures;

"And that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the scriptures."

Paul calls the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus the Gospel, and by it he says these Corinthians were saved, if they kept it in their memories. He preached the death, burial and resurrection of Christ our Lord; but Mr. Wilkinson says Jesus was put upon a shelf, and that the burial was of little consequence.

Christ Himself testifies that, "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."

Put upon a shelf, indeed! I have Mr. Wilkinson standing against the scholars of the world with respect to Rom. 6: 4, calling them all fools; and now he takes position against Christ Himself. Mr. Wilkinson says, "on a shelf;" Christ says, "three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." Mr. Wilkinson says that Christ's burial is a matter of no consequence; Christ, through His apostle, calls the death, burial and resurrection of Himself the Gospel, and teaches that we are saved by it. Yet my opponent talks about my being exasperated. Who would be exasperated by such an argument as that?

Now I come to the baptism of the Israelites. Paul says, "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant, how that 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."

It is not I who say they were "under the cloud." It is the apostle Paul who says they were "under the cloud," and "were baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." It took both the cloud and the sea to make the baptism. My opponent wants to know what the baptism was. The Israelites passed through in a single night, as you will find on reading Exod. 14. The Egyptians were rushing upon them, and by command of God the waters parted and the Israelites passed through the sea, 600,000 men. It must have been a pretty wide passage. It must have been from five to eight miles wide. The waters were piled up right and left; the Scriptures say they were congealed; and down into that passage they went. The cloud came back over them as they went down, and remained between them and the Egyptians all night. They passed down into

that great passage-way into the sea, and the cloud was behind them and between them and their enemies. About a year ago I traveled on the Western and Atlantic Railway from Chattanooga to Atlanta. I passed around a mountain on the way. Its top was completely covered by a cloud. I could see the cloud come down the mountain side; the sun was probably shining on the mountain above the cloud. A man might have started above the cloud, have come down, and through, and under the cloud, and the cloud would then have been behind him, and over him, at the same time. The cloud came back over the Israelites, and was behind them, and between them and their enemies all night; and Paul says they were under the cloud, and passed through the sea. Whitby says, "They were covered by the sea on both sides, (Exod. 14: 22), so that both the cloud and the sea had some resemblance to our being covered with water in baptism. Their going into the sea resembled the ancient rite of going into the water; and their coming out of it, their rising up out of the water."—*Pengilly*, p. 50.

No less a scholar than Dr. Philip Schaff, in his Church History, bases one of his arguments in favor of immersion on that very passage. Why? Because there was a burial, they being covered by the cloud and sea. But that is not Christian baptism. It occurred hundreds of years before Christian baptism was instituted. It was a burial and overwhelming, but not a Christian baptism. Christian baptism is not found until we come to the New Testament; it was instituted by Christ. Christian baptism is not in the cloud and in the sea, but in water.

I turn to Ezekiel and read the passage referred to by my opponent to make a showing for sprinkling or pouring. He cannot find his proof in the New Testament, so he goes back to Ezekiel. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols I will cleanse you."

You remember that I affirmed that unmixed water was never sprinkled by the authority of God upon anyone. Mr. Wilkinson agrees with me so far as the old dispensation is concerned, but he quotes this passage from Ezekiel to show that the Lord here prophesies that he will sprinkle clean water (which Mr. W. assumes is unmixed water) under the new dispensation. Ezekiel was talking about the Jews being brought back to their native land and cleansed according to the ceremonial law from their defilements.

[At this point a gentleman in the audience groaned and shook his head, by way of dissenting from the speaker.] Do you, sir, think I

am mistaken in saying this prophecy related to the restoration of the Jews to their native land, and that it does not apply to the new dispensation at all? Let us read the context and see. I read Ezekiel 36:16-25:

"Moreover, the word of the Lord came unto me, saying,

"Son of man, when the house of Israel dwelt in their own land, they denied it by their own way, and by their doings: their way was before Me as the uncleanness of a removed woman.

"Wherefore I poured My fury upon them for the blood that they had shed upon the land, and for their idols wherewith they had polluted it:

"And I scattered them among the heathen, and they were dispersed through the countries: according to their way and according to their doings I judged them,

"And when they entered unto the heathen, whither they went, they profaned My holy name, when they said to them, These are the people of the Lord, and are gone forth out of His land.

"But I had pity for Mine holy name, which the house of Israel had profaned among the heathen, whither they went.

"Therefore say unto the house of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God; I do not this for your sakes, O house of Israel, but for Mine holy name's sake, which ye have profaned among the heathen, whither ye went.

"And I will sanctify My great name, which was profaned among the heathen, which ye have profaned in the midst of them; and the heathen shall know that I am the Lord, saith the Lord God, when I shall be sanctified in you before their eyes.

"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: from all your filthiness, and from all your idols will I cleanse you."

My friend groaned too soon. I said God was talking about bringing the Israelites back to their own land; and any man with three grains of common sense, if he will read the passage, can see it for himself. Farther down, talking about them after they had been brought back to their native land, He says:

"And ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers; and ye shall be My people, and I will be your God."

Still farther down He says, "And the desolate land shall be tilled, whereas it lay desolate in the sight of all that passed by.

"And they shall say, This land that is desolate is become like the

garden of Eden; and the waste and desolate and ruined cities are become fenced and inhabited."

Now in regard to the passage, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," this is the explanation. The blood of Christ cleanses from all sin; but the blood of bulls and of goats, of the lamb and of the red heifer, was typical of the blood of Christ; and the ceremonial cleansings of Judaism were typical of cleansing from sin under the new covenant. Blood is applied by sprinkling; water never is, in the Bible. But blood, when it stands, coagulates; it cannot then be sprinkled. As there were thousands and tens of thousands of cases of uncleanness every year to be purified by the sprinkling of blood, and as this would have required the slaughter of too many animals, God directed as follows: (Numbers 19.)

"This is the ordinance of the law which God has commanded, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel that they bring them a red heifer without spot, wherein is no blemish, and upon which never came yoke."

This heifer was to be burned, "and a man that is clean shall gather up the ashes of the heifer, and lay them up, without the camp, in a clean place; and it shall be kept for the congregation of the children of Israel for a water of separation. It is a purification for sin." Let me read a little further. He goes on to tell about persons who have become unclean by touching a dead body. "And for an unclean person they shall take of the ashes of the burnt heifer of purification for sin, and running water shall be put thereto in a vessel:

"And a clean person shall take hyssop, and dip it in the water and sprinkle it on the tent, and upon all the vessels, and upon the persons that were there, and upon him that toucheth the bone, or one slain, or one dead, or a grave:

"And the clean person shall sprinkle upon the unclean on the third day, and on the seventh day; and on the seventh day he shall purify himself, and wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water, and shall be clean at even.

"But the man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation, because he hath defiled the sanctuary of the Lord; the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him; he is unclean."

That will enable you to understand the passage in Hebrews 10: 22, which my friend cannot understand from his standpoint, where Paul says, "Let us draw near with true hearts, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

The hearts were sprinkled from an evil conscience by the blood of Jesus; this was typified by the sprinkling of the "water of separation," or "purification for sin:" their bodies were washed in the waters of baptism; this was typified by the bathing of the body in water, which always followed the sprinkling of the water of separation. This water of separation made of ashes of a red heifer mixed with water, was a lye that stood for blood. That the water of separation (ashes mixed with water) typified the blood of Christ is evident from these verses (Heb. 9: 13, 14): "For if the blood of bulls and goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered Himself without spot to God, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKINSON'S FIFTH REPLY.

I did not think the well would have run dry at the third session,, but my opponent, you see, is beginning to pump sand. The water is rather muddy, indicating that the supply is getting low. It might be described, in a popular phrase, as getting "as clear as mud."

Just while I think of it, I wish to say that if my opponent runs out of books, I have one or two concordances here which I will lend him. He can read books most effectively, and, as a certain old lady said, she always liked to read the dictionary, because the articles were so short.

My opponent has thrown out several insinuations about my scrap-book. I handed him the book, and then he said, "Oh, your sermon!" No more about the scrap-book, but "Your sermon, your sermon, your sermon," was the cry. At last he turned to the title-page and saw whose sermon it was, and then he accused me of reading from a paedobaptist sermon. What I read from was not anybody's sermon. He saw it was a sermon at the beginning, and jumped to the conclusion that I had read the extracts from a sermon. He is a tremendous jumper. He reminds me of the old ditty,

"Hi diddle diddle, the cat's in the fiddle,
The cow jumped over the moon."

(Laughter.) If I am not much mistaken he has been reading from a scrap-book himself, written within and without, like Ezekiel's roll—not, perhaps, with "lamentations, and mourning, and woe," though I think it would be very appropriate to get pieces of black paper and put a black margin round it. (Laughter.) If anybody has read from scraps, I guess he must be the scrap doctor. If anybody has dugged in books for brains, I think he is the book doctor. If anybody has been good at begging the question, I guess he has been the beggar. If anybody has re-hashed, I guess he has been the re-hasher. I beg to inform this audience that you will get from him a re-hash of re-hash from this to the end of the debate, or I am not a true prophet. He has gone about the length of his rope. He had just so much capital; he has spent it, and is now going on borrowed money. In fact, he has been running on borrowed capital for some time, and no doubt depended almost exclusively on borrowed capital, from the beginning, to run this immersion machine or water-mill. He even carries borrowed capital to the platform and reads volumes of extracts which are, no doubt, very edifying. They are to me, exceedingly edifying. During his remarks he drew the inference that I had never seen a lexicon, and did not know anything about lexicons. If he will hand me one I will show him whether I can read it or not. I refer to what he said about my reference to Liddell and Scott as the only Greek-English lexicon. It appears I left out the word "standard." At least this is the impression he seeks to convey. He himself acknowledged it as the only "standard" lexicon of the kind, hence all the other Greek-English lexicons from which he says he has quoted are not "standards;" yet he would have you to believe that the authors he quotes are the scholars of the world. So, if I made a slip of the tongue, he made a tremendous slip in asking you to believe that these lexicons were the productions of the greatest scholars of the world, while according to his own admission they are not even standard authorities. He said that no standard lexicon gave sprinkle or pour as a meaning of *baptizo*. But some of them, I said, gave the equivalent of sprinkle and pour in another language. I dared him to deny it, saying that if he did so I would produce the proof, and he did not dare to do it. He made the most he could out of the little slip I made in speaking; but the main point I brought up was passed over as if it were not there. I have seen one or two lexicons in my life, but not being a professional debater, I do not keep all the paraphernalia for this kind of business. I sometimes have to go into investigations in order to defend my belief; but as I do not expect to

follow the debating business, it will not pay me to spend \$100 or \$200 in buying lexicons to pile on my stand as a substitute for brains; and as I do not like to run on borrowed capital, I do not borrow. But I have taken the trouble, when I met a lexicon, to extract from it the meaning of this term, *baptizo*, and during this debate I may read some such extracts.

With regard to Christ's purification, we are told it was in obedience to prophecy, and not to law. We shall need a new term, therefore, to describe this idea of fulfilling prophetic law. We will call it prophetic law, or legal prophecy, whichever you like. He tells you that the command God gave John the Baptist was the law under which Christ was baptized. Was it? John baptized with water unto repentance for the remission of sins. Was Christ baptized unto repentance for the remission of sins? Now, I should like him to repeat what he said, that Christ was baptized under the law God gave John to baptize those miserable sinners, the Jews. Some were called Pharisees and Sadducees, steeped to the lips in corruption, and others were called a "generation of vipers," and they were asked by whom they were warned to flee from the wrath to come. And they were to be baptized to prepare them for the coming of the Lord. So the Lord, I suppose, was to be baptized for the remission of sins, and to prepare Himself for His own coming! Will my opponent please tell us how it was? But perhaps he has more than one string to his bow; and perhaps he will hang out another flag and let it flutter.

I do not know that it is necessary to say anything more about this matter, except to mention that my opponent has told you that Christ was not a priest according to the order of Aaron. I did not say He was. I said He was not. I said He was a priest after the order of Melchisedec. But in Malachi 3: 2, 3, it is stated that this Christ, (who is evidently predicted there), who should suddenly come to His temple, should "Purify the sons of *Levi* and purge them as gold and silver." Now, I should like to know, if there is no connection between the order of Melchisedec and Aaron in their typical relations, why Christ is predicted in the Old Testament as coming to cleanse the sons of Levi. If He is to cleanse the sons of Levi, then He must officiate as a priest, for such was the business of the priest, and to cleanse the sons of Levi was the function of the Aaronic priesthood. The fact is, that the Aaronic priesthood was included in, and constituted a part of, the priesthood of Melchisedec, and the latter was not abolished during the 1,500 years of the former, but comprehended by it in an important sense, and so perpetuated in an unbroken line but under a

somewhat different form. Perhaps, after a refreshing night's sleep and a forenoon's nice rest, my opponent will be able to clear up this matter to-morrow.

Regarding Christ's burial my opponent did not say anything of any consequence. He quoted some passages to prove that Christ was buried. The Lord knows I never denied that. He quoted a passage to prove that it was predicted that Christ would be three days in the bowels of the earth. But I never denied that. This has no more to do with what I said than the inhabitants of this world have to do with the inhabitants of Jupiter. What did I say? I said that the burial of Christ, which I took for granted was a fact known to the world, had nothing to do in affecting the validity of the atonement. I had a debate with one of the Campbellites—but, I believe, they don't like to be called Campbellites—indeed, I am at a loss to know what to call them. I will not recognize their claim to be called the Disciples of Christ, by way of pre-eminence, for I do not know that they are any better than other disciples of Christ. They can talk as roughly as I can, and that is bad enough, the Lord knows. We are at a loss for some name by which to call them. We must not call them Campbellites, so we had better call them Troutites, because that has more affinity with water. I had, I was about to say, a debate with a gentleman of this same persuasion about four years ago this winter. After he had set up and knocked down several men of straw, I asked him if he could tell what value the mere fact of Christ's burial added to the atonement, as we would then have acquired some knowledge; but he could not tell. I cheerfully admitted that it was an important link in a chain of exceptionally important events, and was mentioned as a connecting link in that chain of events; but if this link had been left out of the prophecies, and out of the New Testament, and out of the facts of history altogether, would the atonement, I asked, have been less complete than it is to-day? Now, I hope my present opponent will deal with the real question at issue, and not manufacture questions. Nor did I say that Christ was laid on a shelf in a stone sepulcher. I said if he had been laid on a shelf and not entombed at all during the three days, it would not have detracted in any degree from the efficacy of the atonement. I terribly hate a man to make up something I never said and put it into my mouth. I am willing to swallow my own pills, but do not want my opponent to make pills and put them into my mouth. I am not here to eat his pills. He can take his own medicine.

With respect to the Israelites' baptism. I am glad my opponent

went down to Chattanooga and saw a mountain with a night-cap on, because if he had not seen that night-capped mountain I do not know what he would have done for an illustration. He could not have made out his case. I did not say the Israelites were not under the cloud. He told us nothing new when he read from Paul. I knew they were under the cloud; that it went from before them and got behind them; and to get there it, no doubt, took the short cut and went over them. But the Scriptures do not say that it was over them when they were in the sea. My opponent says they went down, down, down. One would have thought, from his description of it, that the whole night long they were sliding down hill—a hill, as it were, like the Chattanooga mountain. I thought the passage was through a nice little hollow, and that the men, women and children got through in a night. It would not have been nice for little children to have toddled down a steep hill. I do not believe it was so. I have seen lots of places where, when the water was low, there was a nice, gentle declivity; and I guess God did not choose a very bad place for the Israelites to go through the Sea. The mountain illustration will hardly hold water. My opponent has not proved his case under this head. If he will tell me whether the ice-cake and box modes will not do as well I shall be much happier. But he says this Red Sea baptism was not Christian baptism. It was a Christian apostle who called it a baptism. Do you see how these men, when cornered, can hop, skip and jump? Christian baptism! I never dreamed but that my opponent came here to discuss *Bible* baptism. If not, cut out half the Bible and say, "Yes, you can prove baptism by sprinkling back there," (he has nearly acknowledged that, as I shall show you); "but you cannot prove it by Schaff, by Macknight, by Wesley, by the heathen Greek authorities and the lexicographers. You can prove it by Moses and by the ceremonial law, and you can prove that Paul said there was a baptism without any immersion, without any plunging, or burial, away back several hundred years ago. But that," you say, "does not amount to anything." I reply, we have found this recorded in the New Testament, and no matter if it transpired in the moon, or some other world, or even in some other age, still it is recorded in the inspired Word of God, and written down as a baptism; and as it is written by a man who was writing to Christians, and who understood what Christian baptism was as well as these Troutites do, there must have been something pretty near to Christian baptism in it. And what was there in it that resembled Christian baptism? It was simply the taking of them out of their state of bondage and

bringing them into liberty; taking them from their state of slavery under Pharaoh, and placing them under the government of Moses. And when you want to know how men are baptized into Christ, I would say, that so long as they are brought from a state of sin and slavery into a state of pardon and liberty they are baptized, without the necessity of going through a dramatic performance to represent it. I will illustrate this point. Some of you are, doubtless, members of secret and other societies, and know something about the induction of members. How do you do it? Before the candidate is initiated you say he is outside, and after he is initiated you say he is inside. How do you get him in? Do you duck him in water to symbolize his entrance? Why it does not matter if you merely put a little mark with a pencil on the end of his nose, and recognize that mark as his initiation into the society; that will admit him. Before the mark is there he is out; when it is there he is in. Suppose the candidate comes before the chief officer who pins a badge on his coat. That may declare him a member of the society. But these people do not seem to be able to comprehend anything unless it is acted out. They must get a man into water and drag him out again to represent putting him into Christ. It is a violation of all known rules and usages of language to call such a performance a figure, or symbol. It is an act. If you go to a theatre you will see some literal transaction, or supposed transaction, acted out by another literal transaction. That is a drama, a scene. Putting a person in water to represent a burial is something like that—a dramatic representation of a funeral. But it is one of the most awkward representations of a burial scene that men or angels ever witnessed. "But the scholars say it is so and it must be so." Let us see. Suppose some famous scholar takes it into his head to write a commentary on the New Testament, and he comes to Rom. 6: 3, 4, and undertakes to explain it. He has not given much thought to it, but he knows that through hundreds of years the Roman Catholics and nearly all religious teachers had been in the habit of regarding the text as an allusion to the ancient mode of baptism. He will, no doubt, write it down that such is the case. He cannot minutely examine every point. Dr. Clarke and Wesley thus speak of it as a "probable allusion" to the ancient mode of baptism by immersion. Does it follow that all scholarship must be held responsible for the unguarded statement thus made by a commentator? If you take all the little doubtful expressions in the Bible, and sit down to give each one a thorough investigation, and bestow careful thought on each, no man would even get through the book of Exodus. I will appeal to

my ministerial brethren present if that is not so. [Cries of "Yes."] On that principle no commentator could ever have got a commentary-written to the end of Exodus, not even my opponent. Therefore, you may quote this man, and that man, and the other man, who, in his commentary or history, has made statements about things of which he is no better qualified to judge than I am—things transpiring before our eyes, about which we can exercise our intelligence as well as they. They are not questions of history, but simply matters of fact, and we have a right to exercise our judgment about them. I exercise my judgment in respect to this particular matter under discussion; and I am not alone in the opinion I have formed. There are hundreds of scholars who take the same view of this passage as I do. I will guarantee that my view is substantially the view of the scholars of to-day, and that nine out of every ten of them will endorse it.

Regarding Ezek. 31: 25, referring to the time when the Jews will be restored to their native land in the remote future, I beg leave to deny that they will ever be thus restored. And if my opponent wants to discuss that question for a week, I am here. I do not throw this out as a challenge, for I never challenge men. Christ has forever wiped out all religious distinctions between Jews and Gentiles, and He tells us by the apostle Paul that, under this dispensation, "he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; but he is a Jew which is one inwardly." He tells us in Ephesians, second chapter, that the middle wall of partition between the Jews and Gentiles is removed, and Christ came that by His cross He might make of twain one new man, so making peace. The apostle in Galatians, third chapter, tells you that if you are Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, (Abraham's seed were Jews); that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female. There are none of these fleshly distinctions recognized in the Church of Christ, but ye are one all in Him.

[*Time expired.*]

EVENING SESSION—SECOND DAY.

MR. HARDING'S SIXTH SPEECH.

MR. HARDING—I desire once more to call attention to the fact that the task before us for the first three days of this discussion is to answer one question, and that is, what the word *baptizo* means where Jesus tells His disciples to go and teach all nations, baptizing them. I want to call your attention to the line of argumentation which I have presented, and to notice briefly some of the points that have been attacked.

In the first place, we have shown from the very best legal authorities that a word in law is to be taken in its common and best known signification; and that there is no exception to this rule unless the context, or the nature of the case forbids. The first question, therefore, which naturally arises in the mind is, "What is the common and most known signification of *Baptizo*?"—the word which we call "baptize" in English. I called your attention to eight of the great Greek lexicons of the world (among them was the greatest of all) that you might hear their testimony. Seven of them are Greek-English, and one, that of Schrevelius, Greek-Latin. All of them define the word to dip, immerse, or plunge, but none of them give to sprinkle, or to pour upon. I spoke of Liddell and Scott's as the only one which, properly speaking, could be called a *standard* Greek-English lexicon, and Mr. Wilkinson endeavours to ridicule the idea of my producing authorities that are not *standards*. He displays his ignorance on this subject more and more. A word of explanation concerning this matter. The day was when Donnegan was a standard, and Schrevelius would have ranked high as a standard English-Latin; but as years roll on, and as men make greater research into Greek literature, they become better able to make lexicons, and hence in these later days there is but one standard—Liddell and Scott; about this scholars are agreed.

But all along the line, in the different ages of the world, they define *baptizo* to dip, plunge, immerse, but never to sprinkle. I conclude, therefore, that to dip or immerse is the common and most

known signification of the word. My friend himself testifies that to put under water is the meaning of the word in classic Greek.

You will remember that after we had considered the lexicons, another class of witnesses—the Church historians—was introduced. I hold that if we can ascertain what the first Christians did, we will know to a certainty what the word means. So I introduced seven Church histories, including all of the greatest of the world. Four of these, Neander, Mosheim, Schaff, and Stanley, stand at the very top in their line of learning. These testify, without a single dissenting voice, that the custom of the primitive Church was to immerse. Neander and Mosheim are particularly clear. But affusion was practiced at an early day, in case of the sick who were supposed to be dying. The first case of this kind these authorities show was that of Novatian, A.D. 251.

After considering the lexicons and Church historians, we turn to the Bible in order to see if their teaching is maintained by the Scriptures. We find that baptism took place in rivers; that Christ and others went to the water; that they went down into the water before their baptism, and after it came up out of the water; their *bodies* were washed in baptism; and in baptism they were buried.

At this point my friend made an attack upon my line of argument. He denied that there is any reference to immersion in water in the burial mentioned in Rom. 6:4. I called his attention to the fact that the scholars of the world, including his father Wesley, declare that this passage has reference to the ancient mode of baptizing by immersion. I quoted Dr. Schaff, the greatest Church historian on this continent, who says that all commentators and critics of note, but two, say that here is a reference to immersion. Looking over my books at home this afternoon, I found Meyer on Romans. This man, who is the greatest of all Biblical exegetes, and a paedobaptist, upon this passage comments thus: "The recipient—thus has Paul figuratively represented the process—is conscious, (*a*) in the baptism *generally*: now I am entering into fellowship with the *death* of Christ; (*b*) in the immersion *in particular*: now am I becoming *buried* with Christ; (*c*) and then, in the emergence: now I *rise* to the new life with Christ."

So I claim that my position is strongly maintained. I feel that I am in good company, although it has been said by my opponent that none but fools would give it that interpretation. I stand with all the lexicons, all the Church historians, and, on Rom. 6: 4, with all the great critics and commentators of the world (except two).

Mr. "Wilkinson then made an attack upon my line of argument by taking an affirmative position of his own. He said that Christ was baptized by John in fulfillment of the ceremonial law, to be inducted into the priest's office; and hence was sprinkled. I replied, first, Christ was not made a priest according to the Mosaic law, because He was not of the tribe of Levi, but of Judah, "of which tribe Moses spake nothing concerning priesthood." In the second place, the Bible expressly says that He was made a priest, "not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life;" He was a priest after the order of Melchisedec," and not "after the order of Aaron;" and the Bible adds, "the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." Jesus was greater than Moses and belonged to a higher order of priesthood than that of the Mosaic law, and therefore was not inducted into it by John.

In the third place, John did not do, at His baptism, as did Moses in inducting Aaron into the priest's office. Moses washed Aaron's body with water, clothed him with the priestly garments, anointed him with oil, and put blood upon his right ear, right thumb, and right great toe. (See Ex 29.) John did none of these things except to wash the body of Jesus. My friend wants to know, then, what Christ's baptism was for. I turn to John, 1st chapter, and find that John the Baptist explained the matter himself. Let us see what he says:

"The next day John seeth Jesus coming unto him, and saith, Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world. "This is He of whom I said, After me cometh a man which is preferred before me, for He was before me.

"And I knew Him not: but that He should be made manifest to Israel; therefore am I come baptizing with water."

John here gives the explanation. He was not down there consecrating priests. He was there preparing people for the Lord, and baptizing, that Christ might be made manifest to the people. The people flocked around John, and John baptized them. And finally Christ was baptized, and the Spirit of God descended in the form of a dove, and the voice of God said, "This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased." There were two points in John's baptizing; first, to prepare a people for the Lord; and, second, to manifest Christ to the world. What was Jesus baptized for? That He might be manifested to the people; and in submitting to this law of baptism which God gave to John, He fulfilled righteousness, and was thus manifested as the Son of God. These two attacks have been made on

my line of argumentation—feeble ones both of them. My first position, that to immerse is the primary and most common meaning of the word *baptizo* has not been assailed. When Mr. Wilkinson said that John purified Jesus, the people actually hissed. That was one time when I thought a hiss was not inappropriate. In that connection he talked about the possibility of Christ's having touched a dead body, and of the purification that would then be necessary. But when I read the law for cleansing one thus defiled, showing that there was first a sprinkling of a mixture of ashes and water (equal to blood) and then a bathing in water, he changed his ground and said He was baptized to be inducted into the priest's office; but, as we have seen, this position is as untenable as the other.

During all this argumentation I have pressed my friend, from time to time, to tell us what *baptizo* means in the commission. He first said that he would not do it; that I was on the affirmative side, and had to prove my case. I insisted that we are seeking light on a great Bible question, and that he ought to be willing to give us all he had. He finally said, in the most positive way, that he would not tell. Of course I ridiculed him for not being willing to tell you the meaning of a Bible word, when the express object of our meeting here is to find out the meaning of that very word. Knowing that the gentleman is not a little proud, and believing that he could be forced to take a position, I pressed it upon him. At last he did tell its meaning. He said it meant a religious purification. A day or two ago he said that it did not mean to purify, but, being driven into close quarters, he had to say something, so he said baptism is a purification; to baptize is to purify. Let us see about that. Here is a Greek-English concordance. I want to substitute purification in the place of baptism, for it is a rule of interpretation, that if words are synonymous, you can substitute the one for the other in a sentence. Take the sentence, "They were baptized of Him in Jordan." Can we substitute the word "purify" for "baptize?" Can it be said, "Purified also the household of Stephanus?" Or, "What shall they do which are purified for the dead if the dead rise not?" Or, "Are ye able to drink of the cup which I drink of, and be purified with the purification that I am purified with?" When my friend takes a little infant as pure as heaven, does he purify it in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit? Is that the primary meaning of the word? If baptism is a purification, the question still remains, How is it performed? I grant that many lexicographers define *baptizo* by the words wash, cleanse, purify, in addition to the words dip,

plunge, etc. If you dip a thing in water, it is washed; hence as *baptizo* means to dip, it may "by consequence" mean to wash, to purify. Nothing is said to be washed when only a few drops of water are sprinkled upon it. Yes, the word means to wash—to wash by dipping, not by sprinkling or pouring upon.

Just here I am reminded of a statement made by my friend concerning the lexicons. He said that he had extracts, written out in his own hand, from lexicons that define *baptizo* by Latin words that mean to sprinkle. He intimated that I would not dare to deny it. I do deny that there is a Greek-Latin lexicon on the face of the earth that defines *baptizo* by a word whose first definition is to sprinkle. Here is a square issue. Now come on with your extracts. I will go a step farther. There is not a lexicon defining the Greek into Latin, German, French, or any other language, that defines *baptizo* by a word whose first definition is to sprinkle.

Just here let me call your attention to a singular fact. I can take up the line of argument adopted by my paedo-baptist friends to prove that *baptizo* means to sprinkle, and by the same method show that our common English word "dip" means to sprinkle. All of the English dictionaries, as Webster, Worcester, Walker, etc., define "dip" to wet; but you can wet a thing by sprinkling; therefore, according to paedo-baptist logic, to dip means to sprinkle. They say *baptizo* means to dip, and also to wash; but you can wash by sprinkling; therefore *baptizo* means to sprinkle. Grand logic, indeed!

But now, about that burial. My friend cannot get away from it. He likes to talk about the corpse "trotting along" beside the preacher. I thought of the Methodist preachers who often have to trot out to the water with the candidate. I reminded my friend that his Discipline requires the minister to immerse, when the candidate demands it—that the Discipline has immerse in it. He said it did not; and when I called for the book, he said he would show it to me.

MR. WILKINSON here handed the speaker the Discipline of the Methodist Church.

MR. HARDING requested Mr. Wilkinson to open to the place.

MR. WILKINSON—No, you can find it yourself.

MR. HARDING handed the book to his Moderator and requested him to turn to the place. I will show you, he said, that the thing is there by implication if not in so many words. Taking the book back from Mr. Sterling, he said, Here is the place, and read,

"1. The proper subjects of baptism are infants and believing adults, who have not been baptized in infancy.

"2. The mode of baptism is by sprinkling, or pouring; but should any candidate for baptism prefer another mode, the officiating minister may comply with his request."

What is that other mode? It is dipping in all other editions of the Discipline. This comes out later, 1878. It was dip up to that time; now it is sprinkling, pouring, and another mode. What is that "other mode?"

MR. WILKINSON—Where is immerse?

MR. HARDING (laughing)—It is that "other mode."

I desire to call your attention to another slip made by my friend. Turn to the passage concerning sprinkling clean water, Ezek. 36: 25. My opponent agreed with me that in Old Testament times unmixed water was never sprinkled, by authority of God, on anybody. Then, you remember, I called your attention to the making of the water of purification, or clean water. It was made by mixing the ashes of a red heifer with running water. When my opponent brought up the sprinkling of Ezekiel, I read the passage showing that God's people had been dispersed among the nations on account of their wickedness. And God told them He would bring them back to their own land and sprinkle clean water upon them, and cleanse them from their idolatry which they had contracted in distant lands, and that he would cause their land to be again fruitful. My opponent rose and declared that he did not believe the Jews would ever be brought back to Jerusalem. That prophecy of Ezekiel was made 587 B.C. Their return to Jerusalem under Zerubbabel was 536 B.C.; that is 51 years after Ezekiel's prophecy. That prophecy was therefore fulfilled 536 years before Christ. Fifty-one years after Ezekiel wrote that prophecy, Zerubbabel with about 50,000 Jews returned to Jerusalem and rebuilt the walls of the ancient city, as Ezekiel had prophesied he would do. Nine years afterward Nehemiah went to Jerusalem and rebuilt the temple. Years passed on, the land became fruitful, villages were built, and when Christ came the temple was still standing. Ezekiel's prophecy had then been fulfilled for 536 years. My friend will convince us directly that he knows as little about chronology as he does about lexicons.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKINSON'S SIXTH REPLY.

I am glad, if I am not a very good speaker, that I am a splendid prophet. I told you this afternoon that you would get re-hash. How does it go down? About two-thirds of the half-hour my opponent told you what he had told you again and again. That is quite right, of course, and he can spend the whole of his next half-hour in telling you what he told you in this if he likes. I will try to tell you something he did not tell you, and something I did not tell you. We have been treated again to a little discourse about the literal use of words. My opponent is very strong on the literal use of words, and he is exceedingly strong on Schaff. I quote from Schaff's "Apostolic Church," pages 610 and 611. He says: "The spirit of the Christian revelation shows itself in the province of language, not so much in coining new words and phrases, as in making a new use of old ones. The apostles made words already at hand the vehicles of infinitely profounder ideas than they had ever conveyed before, or continued to express afterwards in heathen authors. Even the Seventy were compelled to put into many Greek expressions an Old Testament idea, which it requires a sympathy with the whole spirit of the divine revelation to understand. To a far greater extent is this the case in the New Testament, which contains a universe of new ideas, throwing even the Old Testament far into the shade. The very terms of most frequent occurrence, and of the greatest importance for Christian faith and practice, as light, life, truth, resurrection, atonement, redemption, Saviour, apostle, church (assembly), election, calling, justification, sanctification, faith, love, hope, peace, liberty, humility, blessedness—darkness, flesh, unbelief, sin, debt, condemnation, etc., have a far more comprehensive and profound sense than in any profane writings, or, in most cases, even in the Old Testament; though this sense is certainly agreeable to the natural import and the etymology of the word. In this view it may be said, that, as Christianity is the perfection of humanity, so the Christian language is the full development of the natural."

I also desire to make a few quotations from lexicographers to show that they give not only a secondary meaning, differing from the primary classical meaning, but that many of them distinguish between the New Testament and secular use of the term, and that their New Testament definitions are in harmony with the definition of Christian baptism for which I have been contending. You will remember that my claim has been that Christian baptism is a religious purification. Now, what say the lexicographers?

Kouma, a native Greek of this century, after defining the word in a secular sense, says, "3. In an ecclesiastical sense, to baptize."

Schaetgennius gives, "2 To wash, to cleanse, (Mark 7:4; Luke 11: 38.) 3. To baptize in a sacred sense." Metaphorically it means, first, to pour forth abundantly (Matt 3: 11; Acts 1:5, etc.); second, to be subjected to great dangers and burdens."

The editor of Robinson's lexicon of the New Testament says, "In the N. T. first, to wash, to lave, to cleanse by washing; second, to wash one's self, *i. e.*, one's hands, or person, to perform ablution; third, to baptize."

In a note he says, "While in Greek writers, from Plato onward, *baptizo* is everywhere to sink, to immerse, to overwhelm, either wholly or partially, yet in Hellenistic usage . . . it would seem to have expressed, not always simply immersion, *but the more general idea of ablution, or affusion.*"

Stokius, long paraded by immersionists as having no superior, gives, "*Baptizo*, to wash, to baptize; passive, to be washed, to be cleansed. ('Washed' is from *lavo*, which, according to Freund, is "to wash, bathe, lave; to wet, moisten, bedew.")

In a note he says, "Generally, and by the force of the word, it obtains the sense of dipping or immersing. Specially, (a) Properly, it is to immerse or dip in water, (b) Tropically. (1) By a *metalepsis*, it is to wash (*lavare*) or cleanse (*abluere*), because anything is accustomed to be dipped or immersed in water that it may be washed or cleansed, *although also the washing or cleansing can be, and* GENERALLY IS, *accomplished by* SPRINKLING THE WATER, (Mark 7:4; Luke 11: 38). Hence it is transferred to the sacrament of baptism."

You will observe that, according to this authority, it is transferred to the sacrament of baptism because the "washing or cleansing can be, and *generally is*, accomplished by the *sprinkling of water*" yet you have been assured that not one of the authorities give "sprinkle" as a meaning of the word

Schleusner says, "Now, because not unfrequently a thing is immersed, or dipped in water that it may be washed; hence, second, to cleanse, to wash, to purify with water. Thus it occurs in the New Testament, Mark 7:4; Luke 11: 38." He says, "*Baptizesthai* not only means to wash, but to wash one's self, etc., hence transferred to the solemn rite of baptism."

Certainly *wash* is not the primary, classical meaning of *baptizo*, for the Greeks never used it secularly in this sense. Therefore, when it is "transferred to the solemn rite of baptism" because it means "to wash," it must be employed in a secondary sense.

Gazes gives as one of the meanings of the word, "to wash. 3. To wash the hands or to wash one's self. 4. Among Christians to baptize."

I have more, but I forbear. You see that this question is not one-sided, and that the authorities are not all on one side. But I am ashamed to stand here and have to heap up authorities outside the Bible when the proposition is, "*Christian* baptism is immersion, in it there must be a burial in water." When I produce an instance from the Bible where Paul refers to the baptism of 3,000,000 Israelites, my opponent says that is not a Christian baptism, and seems desirous to rule it out as evidence. It is in the Bible, however. But my opponent seems to think that the lexicons are as good as Paul and even better; hence I hope this will settle it, since I have shown you that the lexicons on which he places so much reliance are actually on my side. They give dip, plunge, immerse, etc., as the primary meanings of the word, which I concede; but they also give wash, cleanse, purify as the sacred sense, which I also claim. I do not want to go over this business about authorities again. All the great historians, too! I will read from a history which is a standard work in all the theological colleges of the country at the present day. It is Killam's "Ancient Church History." It says: (Sec. III., Chap. 2, page 196) "The Scriptures furnish no very specific instructions as to the mode of baptism, and in its administration the primitive heralds of the Gospel did not adhere to a system of rigid uniformity. Some have asserted that the Greek word translated baptize in our authorized version always signifies *immerse*, but it has been clearly shown that this statement is incorrect, and that baptism does not necessarily imply *dipping*. In ancient times, and in the lands where the apostles labored, bathing was as frequently performed by affusion as immersion, and the apostles varied their method of baptizing according to circumstances. The ordinance was intended to convey the idea of *washing* or purifying, and it is obvious that water may be applied in many ways as the means of ablution. In the sacred volume, *sprinkling* is often spoken of as an equivalent to washing." Now, this Church historian, whose testimony is equally as good as those quoted by my opponent, distinctly testifies, in harmony with what I have contended for from the beginning, that the ordinance in Scripture "was intended to convey the idea of washing or purifying," and that the water might, obviously, be applied in many ways, while "in the sacred volume sprinkling is often spoken of as an equivalent to washing,"

I again affirm, therefore, that authorities by the score and the hundred can be produced on this same line. Meyer, who according to my opponent is the greatest of all Biblical exegetes, has been referred to. I have Meyer in my library. But as I did not bring my brains in my trunk, I left it at home with my wife so she would have something to read. But my impression is that Meyer coincides with my interpretation of Rom. 6: 3, 4. If my opponent will let me see his copy I will be glad. [Mr. Harding hands him the book, which he said he would examine at his leisure.]

And now with respect to Christ's priesthood. My opponent has endeavored to prove that Christ was not made a priest after the law of a carnal commandment; but I never said He was. I never dreamed He was. He was made a priest by the fiat of Almighty God, but as He is revealed to man as the great Teacher sent from God, it was necessary for Him to meet the demands of their expectations which had been raised by the very law of God under which they had been living. My opponent says He was made manifest to Israel by His baptism. How did John make Jesus manifest to Israel by baptizing Him? John was Christ's representative, and every man he baptized he taught to believe on Him who was to come, and declared that the great Redeemer and Purifier of the world was coming. And how did he foretell this? He said, "I indeed baptize you with water, unto repentance, but He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." He introduced Christ by the rite he performed, as well as by his ministry, as the great Purifier of the world by the Holy Ghost and fire. If in this way we have Christ manifested to Israel, then it is as a Purifier, because the Holy Ghost coming on men purifies them. And if John's baptism with water was to represent Christ's baptism with the Holy Ghost, then I should think the water should come down on the people as the Holy Ghost and fire are represented as doing. That is what I would infer; but as I do not get my brains out of my trunk I may be wrong, and I will stand corrected by the authorities if I am.

My opponent wants me to define baptism. I said it was a purifying rite, and yet I said it did not mean to purify. This he thinks is inconsistent, but I do not take back anything I said on this point. The meaning of the word is not to purify merely, but I said it was applied to a *religious* purification. A mere cleansing of the hands is not a baptism. In the primary, classic sense it never had the remotest relation to a purification. He cannot find an instance among Greek writers—I have been over them all—where, in the primary, classic

sense *baptizo* ever meant to purify; but I have told you that some sixteen or eighteen lexicographers give wash, cleanse, purify, etc., as the meaning of the term. If I say it is a religious purification when an individual is baptized, do I thereby say that the meaning of *baptizo* was to purify? I know there is another Greek word which implies directly to purify; but it is not used to describe a baptism because to baptize is not merely to purify, but to purify in a religious sense. And it describes such purification without any reference to the mode by which it is to be performed. We go right back to the Old Testament, however, and see how religious purifications were effected. From the beginning to the end sprinkling was God's mode of cleansing, no matter how the passage in Ezekiel "I will sprinkle clean water upon you," applies to the Jews. That is a point which I wish you to keep in mind.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. HARDING'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

I feel gratified at the pleasant and amiable way in which we are getting on. My opponent calls my speeches "a re-hash." It is evident he is not pleased with the way in which I conduct my part of this discussion. But I did not expect to please him. I have had two reasons for recapitulating the points made during the discussion. In the first place, the audiences are different; (many country people attend in the afternoons, and not in the evenings, while many of the business men of the town come out to the evening sessions only); and in the second place, I desire to keep before you my line of argument, that you may see the solid rock upon which I stand.

I will now consider the points advanced by my opponent in his last speech. He read from Schaff to show that in the New Testament words have different meanings from what they bear in classic Greek. It is true that the classical meaning of a word is often modified by its usage in the New Testament, but the primitive idea of it is rarely, if ever, lost; for example, "savior" in classic Greek means that which saves anyone from anything; in the New Testament it designates Jesus the Son of God, who saves us from our sins;

baptizo in classic Greek means to immerse anything into any fluid; in the New Testament, in the commission, it signifies to immerse one who wants to follow Jesus, in water, into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; the radical ideas "to save" and "to dip" are retained. Any man who can read classic Greek can also read New Testament Greek. It is true the meanings of words are often modified, but they are modified by the contexts, and he who reads can readily catch the new shades of meaning that are thus given. It has been seen that there is nothing in the New Testament use of *baptizo* to indicate that, in that book, it has lost its primary and most known signification, to dip, to immerse; on the other hand, the Bible use of the word emphasizes this meaning.

Again, anyone who can read classic and New Testament Greek, can read modern Greek, with the help of getting the meaning of new words occasionally. When my class was undergoing its last, examination at college, the Professor of Greek wrote upon the blackboard for translation some extracts from a modern Greek newspaper. He told us that we could not find all of the words in our lexicons, but if we would exercise our common sense, we could read them from the context. We did translate those sentences, and obtained from them an account of the assassination of President Lincoln. The Greek, in the past 1800 years, has changed so little that we were enabled to read it this time from our knowledge of the ancient dialects.

My friend quoted from the definition of *baptizo* by Stokius. I have not that authority, but I have quotations from him by Wilkes, and Graves, and Ditzler on this word. As they agree in their citations, there can be no doubt about their accuracy. I read, from Wilkes, Stokius' definition of the verb *baptizo* (to baptize) as follows:

"Generally, and by force of the word, it obtains the notion of a dipping and immersion. 2. Specially, (a) Properly, it is to immerse and to dip into water, (b) Tropically. 1. It is, by metonymy, to wash, to cleanse, because anything is accustomed to be dipped and immersed in water that it may be washed or cleaned; although washing or cleansing may, and is accustomed to be done by sprinkling water also, (Mark 7:4; Luke 11: 38)." *The Louisville Debate*, p. 477.

From this great New Testament lexicographer we get the following points:

1. *Baptizo* generally, and by the force of the word, obtains the idea of dipping, immersion.
2. Specially and properly, it means to dip or immerse into water.
3. By a metalepsis, or metonymy, it means to wash or cleanse, be-

cause, as a rule, anything is dipped or immersed that it may be washed or cleansed.

4. But washing may be done by sprinkling, and, says Stokius, is accustomed to be done in that way.

Mr. Wilkinson, no doubt, refers to this definition because of this last point, Stokius says the washing may be done by sprinkling—*is accustomed to be done by sprinkling*. Does not Mr. Wilkinson know that in the days of Stokius, many hundred years after the apostles, sprinkling generally prevailed? To this fact he refers; he says it is *done*, not was done. He does not say that the word means to sprinkle, nor that the apostles sprinkled, but he teaches exactly the reverse, as the following reading will show. I now give you his definition of the noun *baptisma* (baptism) from Wilkes. It is as follows:

"1. Generally, and by force of the original, it denotes immersion or dipping. 2. Specially, (*a*) Properly, it denotes the immersion or dipping of a thing into water, that it may be cleansed or washed. Hence, it is transferred to designate the first sacrament of the New Testament, which they call of initiation, namely baptism, in which those to be baptized were, formerly, immersed into water; though at this time the water is only sprinkled upon them, that they may be cleansed from the pollutions of sin, receive the remission of it, and be received into the covenant of grace as heirs of eternal life." *Louisville Debate*, p. 477.

So testifies Mr. Wilkinson's own witness, the great Stokius. His testimony was introduced because he said the washing of baptism "can be, and generally is, accomplished by sprinkling the water," Had my friend also given his other statement, viz., that "those to be baptized were, formerly (in apostolic times), immersed into water; though at this time the water is only sprinkled upon them," he would have brought out the whole truth, and would have spoiled his speech.

Mr. Wilkinson next introduced the testimony of Edward Robinson, the distinguished American Presbyterian lexicographer, who says:—

Baptizo, "to dip in, to sink, to immerse." "In N. T. to wash, to lave, to cleanse by washing." "To baptize, to administer the rite of baptism." He refers to Mark 1: 9, and in his translation of it says Jesus was "*baptized into the Jordan*." After illustrating these meanings at great length, he closes his definition, and appends to it a note, in which he says:—

"NOTE.—While in Greek writers, as above exhibited, from Plato onwards, *baptizo* is everywhere to sink, to immerse, to overwhelm

either wholly or *partially*; yet in Hellenistic usage, and especially in reference to the rite of baptism, it would seem to have expressed not always simply *immersion*, but the more general idea of *ablution* or *effusion*" etc. Dr. Robinson's honesty makes him define like a scholar, and tell us that Jesus was "baptized into the Jordan "; but his prejudice makes him argue, in the note, like a Presbyterian. Mr. Wilkinson talks about the "*editor* of Robinson's lexicon!" Does he not know that Robinson was an American, and that his lexicon had no editor but himself? Mr. Wilkinson would doubtless do better if he had the originals instead of "extracts."

Schleusner is quoted by Mr. Wilkinson thus:—" Now, because not unfrequently a thing is immersed, or dipped in water, that it may be washed; hence, second, to cleanse, to wash, to purify with water. Thus it occurs in the 1ST. T., Mark 7:4; Luke 11: 38." Yes, he does say that, but unfortunately for Mr. Wilkinson in defining the noun, he adds this: (*Louisville Debate*, p. 512.) "*Baptisma*, (1). Properly, immersion, dipping into water, washing. Hence it is (2) transferred to the sacred rite, which is called baptism, in which those formerly baptized were immersed in water, to obligate them to the true divine religion." When we get the whole truth from Schleusner, the greatest of all the Greek-Latin definers, we find that his testimony is like that of Stokius; it does no good whatever to Mr. Wilkinson's cause. His own witnesses are most emphatically against him. He quotes a number of authorities to show that the word means to wash. Well, what of it? They refer to "the washing of cups, pots, and brazen vessels," Mark 7: 4. Are not such things put in the water to wash them? If a tiling is immersed it is washed, but it would be foolish to talk about washing cups, pots, and brazen vessels (or people either) by putting a few drops of water on them. Besides, these authorities are careful, to tell us that the word (*baptizo*) means to wash, *because things are immersed that they may be washed*.

Just here I would call the attention of the audience again to the testimony of Dean Stanley, the distinguished and scholarly historian of the Eastern (that is, the Greek) Church. The Dean was a clergyman of the Church of England; he died recently. He says, in speaking of the distinguishing characteristics of the Eastern and Western Churches, that the Eastern is like the East, stationary, conservative, and attached to the ancient customs; while the Western is like the West, vigorous, progressive, and given to changes. He illustrates these different tendencies by referring to the history of baptism. He says:—

"There can be no question that the original form of baptism—the very meaning of the word—was complete immersion in the deep baptismal waters; and that for at least four centuries any other form was either unknown or regarded, unless in the case of dangerous illness, as an exceptional, almost monstrous case. To this form the Eastern Church still rigidly adheres; and the most illustrious and venerable portion of it, that of the Byzantine empire, absolutely repudiates and ignores any other mode of administration as essentially invalid." *History of the Eastern Church*, p. 117.

Again, he says: "With the few exceptions just mentioned, the whole of the Western Churches have now substituted for the ancient bath the ceremony of letting fall a few drops of water on the face. The reason is obvious. The practice of immersion, though peculiarly suitable to the Southern and Eastern countries, for which it was designed, was not found seasonable in the countries of the North and West. Not by any decree of Council or Parliament, but by the general sentiment of Christian liberty, this remarkable change was effected." *Christian Institutions*, p. 18.

The Greek Church, the Church which uses the language in which the New Testament was written, immerses to this very day, nor has it ever practiced anything else for baptism. My friend would have you imagine that Dean Stanley favored immersion. He did not. On the contrary, he thinks the change was a "great advantage to Christian solemnity and edification;" and said it was made "by the general sentiment of Christian liberty." (*See Christian Institutions*, pp. 18 and 19.) He was not in favor of going back to the ancient custom.

My friend goes back to the Old Testament to find out what Christian baptism is. His own Methodism shows that that is not the place to go. I have here the Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church South. There are so many Methodist Churches it is difficult to keep track of them. I do not know to which he belongs, though I understand there has been a union of them all here in Canada, and I suppose a new name has been given to the united Church. This is the Discipline of one of the Methodist Churches of the United States In article 16 (p. 19) it is said, "There are two sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel: that is to say, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord." This correctly teaches that baptism is a New Testament institution—an institution ordained by Christ, in the Gospel. But though you cannot find Christian baptism in the Old Testament you can find types of it there in the clean sings from ceremonial defilements, in the consecration of the priests, and in the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea. From Numbers 19: 17-20 we learn that in

cleansing the unclean, after "the water of separation" (water mixed with the ashes of a red heifer, a lye representing blood, v. 9) was sprinkled upon him, he washed his clothes, and bathed himself in water, and thus became clean. In the New Testament, from Hebrews 9: 13-14, we learn that this sprinkling of "the ashes of an heifer" is typical of the sprinkling of "the blood of Christ"; the bathing of the body in water was typical of Christian baptism; hence we read in Hebrews 10: 22, in the same connection, that we have "our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."

My friend said that I would not find bathings in the tabernacle. I find at the door of the tabernacle a brazen laver. (See Ex, 30: 18). And in later times, when the temple had taken the place of the tabernacle, the laver was supplanted by the molten sea with five lavers on each side of it. The sea was circular, about 8 feet deep, 16 feet in diameter, and held, it is supposed, about 15,000 gallons. Each of the ten lavers contained "forty *baths*" that is, about 300 gallons; each laver was about 6 feet square, and about 5 feet deep. (*See Smith's Dictionary of the Bible, Art. Laver*). The priests in going into the temple from day to day washed their hands and feet (Greek *nipto*); but at their consecration, when they were first set apart to their work, their bodies were washed (Greek *louo*). "The sea was for the priests to wash in."—2 Chron. 4: 6.

I understood my friend to say that Stokius gave "bedew" as a meaning of *baptizo*. He is mistaken; he did not. Let him give me the Latin word. If it is *lavo*, its first meaning is "to wash, to bathe," not to sprinkle, or bedew.

My friend is distressed about my authorities: he brings scraps in his own handwriting. I have brought only one extract in manuscript; that was the letter of Dr. Conant, in his own handwriting, in which he says, "No respectable lexicographer gives, or ever has given, sprinkle or besprinkle as a definition of *baptizo*;" and in which he shows that "to pour upon" has been dropped from the later editions of Liddell and Scott's great lexicon, as a definition of it. By the way, Mr. Wilkinson's idea that these most distinguished of all Greek-English definers dropped this definition because the Baptists raised a fuss about it, is not only an uncalled for slander upon them, but it is evidently incorrect, seeing that these gentlemen are members of the Church of England, and that their lexicon was prepared for a country where there are hundreds, perhaps thousands, of paedo-baptists to one immersionist. Would they run the risk of displeasing a thousand to

please one? Who can believe it? No, they took "to pour upon" out, because they could not find a passage in all Greek literature where *baptizo* has that meaning; and the fact that such men did take it out, is one of the most startling and conclusive arguments against affusion for baptism.

The Septuagint uses *baptizo* in expressing the seven dippings of Naaman, 2 Kings, 5:14. The case is briefly this: Naaman, commander of the hosts of Syria, a great man with the king, was a fearfully afflicted leper. Through the faith of a little Jewish maiden, a captive, he was sent to the prophet Elisha, who said to him, "Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean." At first he was angry that the prophet did not come out and cleanse him by some ceremony very different from this; but being persuaded by his servants, "he went down, and dipped (Greek *baptizo*) 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." The word "dip" here is *baptizo* in Greek, and *taval* in Hebrew. The Septuagint, a Greek version of the Old Testament often quoted by the apostles of our Lord, renders the Hebrew *taval* by *baptizo*; but in our common version *taval* is always rendered "dip," or "plunge."

Mr. Wilkinson seems to be under the impression that he has found something to help his cause in Malachi 3: 3, "He shall sit as a refiner and purifier of silver; and He shall purify the sons of Levi," etc.; but I do not see the point. There is nothing about sprinkling for baptism there. I don't see the connection. Perhaps his idea is this: Christ was made a priest according to the Levitical law that he might purify the *spiritual seed* of Levi; but in the consecration of the priests—the sons of Levi—the type of the spiritual seed, there was a sprinkling. It is true that the priests were typical of Christians,—we are said to be "kings and priests unto God,"—but if there was a "sprinkling" in that ceremony of consecration, it must not be forgotten that there was also a "bathing" of the body in it. If my friend could make out that Christ was inducted into the priest's office according to the Levitical ritual (which he can never do), he would not get rid of the bathing of the flesh in water. So this passage does not help my friend's case. The idea which he intends to convey is not in it. It simply sets forth that Christ would come and purify the people. In this process of purification we have our hearts sprinkled with the blood of Christ, and our bodies washed with pure water. No sprinkling for baptism here.

[Time expired.]

MR. WILKINSON'S SEVENTH REPLY.

I am glad we see the end of the debate on this proposition.

My opponent tells us that when Naaman went, at Elisha's command, and dipped himself in Jordan, the word as given in the Greek Septuagint is *baptizo*, and in the Hebrew *tabhal*. That is perfectly correct. And my opponent says this is the very word that Christ used in the commission, and if we can settle the meaning in this instance we will know what Christ meant. I rather think we can come at it, for what Elisha told Naaman to do was to go and wash, and the word wash does not express any mode. There is a condition contained in this command. Elisha said, "Go wash seven times in Jordan and thou shalt be *clean*." Did Naaman understand the command. Evidently so, for he said, "Are not Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, better than all the waters of Israel? May I not *wash* in them and be *clean*?" What was he going to wash himself for? or dip himself for? He was going to wash with a view to being made clean, and he went and *tabhalled* himself. But did he do what the prophet commanded, or something else? He was commanded to *rachats*, and he *tabhalled*. Evidently, therefore, *tabhall* must be the synonym of *rachats*, because the prophet said, "Go wash and be clean," and if he did something he was not commanded to do it is not likely that the divine power would have been given to make him clean and heal him of his leprosy. Do you think a man would be miraculously healed if he were performing an act of disobedience at the time? I maintain that it is as invincible an argument as can be produced that he must have fulfilled the command to "Go and wash," for he went and *tabhalled* "according to the saying of the man of God." The seventy Jews who translated the Old Testament into Greek 270 B.C., in describing what he did used the very word employed by Christ in the commission. As Naaman was commanded to go and wash, and did as he was commanded, he must have performed some kind of washing in order to be made clean. Therefore, according to the judgment of these seventy learned Jews, to baptize is to wash, with a view to purification. Is not this what I have told you during this debate, that *baptizo* in the commission has reference to a religious purification? Here you have the proof of it. But our English immersionist translators have used the word "dipped" in this place. I call them "immersionist translators," and even

Alexander Campbell, the father of the children here, admits it. He distinctly testifies that the translators of King James' version, did not, in their renderings, in any case, lean to the view I represent in this debate. So if they translate the word "dip," my opponent cannot say it was paedo-baptists, in the present sense of the term, who did it. Paedo-baptists in our day are not immersionists, but Alexander Campbell admits that these men were immersionists. My opponent cannot go back on that without going back on his own father; and I hope that, as he has chided me for going back on Wesley, he will not commit the same fault.

That same word *tabhal* is found in Genesis 32nd chapter, where Joseph's coat is said, in the English version, to have been dipped in the blood of a kid. Those same seventy Hebrew scholars, in this case, translated *tabhal* by the Greek word *molunein*. If my opponent will turn up to Liddell and Scott he will, perhaps, find what that means in English. It means to wet, moisten, stain, sully, defile, sprinkle, etc. Can I prove that? Yes, and I stand here to do it; therefore the word in the commission means to wet, moisten, stain, sprinkle. We have got at it at last. I will not take time to quote authorities unless they are called for. I deny that the word *tabhal* means to immerse. My distinguished opponent in his proposition has undertaken to prove that Christian baptism is immersion. He told you that our Lord, who gave the commission, used the same word that the Hebrew scholars used in translating *tabhal*, and I claim that *tabhal* must be, to a large extent, the equivalent of *rachats*, which means to wash; but it seldom, if ever, in the Bible, means a complete immersion. Take notice whether he proves that it means a complete immersion, a burial in water, for that is his proposition. If it does not mean a burial in water in every case, then he has forestalled himself by the loose manner in which he has stated his proposition, which sets forth that there *must be* a burial in water. But I claim that there is not necessarily a burial in water in this case. I never did believe that Naaman dipped himself clear under water seven times. If he did it would be as bad a case as that of Aristobulus, who was dipped under and drowned.

My opponent says the brazen sea at the door of the temple was for the priests to bathe *in*. I believe there is one passage in which it is rendered "in," but in more than one it is rendered "thereat," or as it is properly expressed in the Greek, "thereout." I am prepared to prove that. Besides, don't you suppose it would be an indecent thing, according to our ideas of propriety (I don't know how it would

be regarded in Kentucky), for men to wash their hands and feet in the same dish. When an unclean thing was washed in water the water became unclean, according to the law. We want to have the chapter on cleansing read again. We will know it by heart if we hear it once or twice more. As a matter of fact, if they had washed *in* the vessel when unclean, they would have made both the water and the vessel unclean. Thus every time they washed their hands or their feet they would have had to purify the vessel by burning, and they would have had to bring water and fill it again. Consider, too, that the sea in front of the temple was about twenty-one feet high, round on the sides, the water in it about eight feet deep, and that the priests, every time they went to the altar to minister, would have had to climb up the sides of this vessel and get down into eight feet of water to wash their hands and feet. The authorities say (and my opponent is great on authorities) that there were spigots at the bottom of this laver, to draw water off in which to wash their hands and feet. I presume that was the way in which it was done. Where, then, were the immersions "in the tabernacle?" My opponent undertook to show. He read the chapter on purification or cleansing from legal defilement. Bathing in water after the sprinkling of the blood and ashes was what cleansed he says. That was the purification, was it? The chapter from which he quoted says: "But the man that shall be unclean, and shall not purify himself, that soul shall be cut off from among the congregation, because he hath defiled the congregation of the Lord: *the water of separation hath not been sprinkled upon him, he is unclean.*" Was it the water of separation, according to this, or the subsequent bathing of the body that cleansed him. I maintain that it was the sprinkling of the water of purification; but this, being mixed with blood and ashes, had to be washed off afterwards, just as when you put ointment on your flesh to heal a wound. When the desired effect is produced you wash the ointment off. It is not the washing that cures, but the ointment that you wash off. So the water of purification had to be washed off from the flesh and the garments because it was composed of ashes and blood. Besides, the bathing which he insists constituted the baptism did not take place "in the tabernacle," but I have shown that the "divers baptisms" *did* take place in the tabernacle and were effected by the sprinkling of blood. Moses purged the tabernacle itself, and the vessels of the ministry and almost all things by the sprinkling of blood. My opponent recognizes these "divers baptisms," as being typical of Christian baptism, but he claims that it was the bathing of the flesh and not the sprinkling of

the blood that constituted the type. **But** I claim it was the blood that did the business—not the act of sprinkling, but the blood which was sprinkled. Parties were cleansed by *means* of sprinkling, but not *because* of sprinkling. If God had appointed pouring or dipping, the effect would have been all the same, not because of the form of act, but because of the effect. But, as a matter of fact, God never did command that one man should put another man in and under water. My opponent has not yet brought a case to prove it, nor does the man exist who can do so. I have proved that every command God ever gave for the cleansing of people, where the mode was specified at all, was by the application of the cleansing element to the individual, and not by the putting of the individual into the cleansing element. When He baptizes men by His Spirit, and cleanses them, it is always by pouring out, never by dipping in. But our immersionist friends actually try to make plunging out of that. In fact, they take the word of the Lord apart and then put it together again to suit themselves. It has been done here. But we have got this matter settled. The word our Lord used in the commission was the same word that was employed in the case of Naaman, and that describes a washing for purification, therefore it means the same thing in the commission. I came here to disprove my opponent's proposition that Christian baptism is immersion, and I have done it. And I claim that the discussion on this proposition ought now to close unless he can disprove this position.

Referring to Acts 16th chapter, he told you last night that the jailer and his family were taken out somewhere to be baptized, but he did not know where. Of course he did not, and there is a good reason why. We will just examine the matter for a moment. In that chapter we read, "And the keeper of the prison awaking out of his sleep, and seeing the prison door open, he drew his sword and would have killed himself, supposing that the prisoners had been fled." Why should he have done that? We find the explanation in 12: 19, "And when Herod had sought for him and found him not, he examined the keepers and commanded that they should be put to death." Why? Because, as any sensible man or woman will see, there must have been a law in that country to put to death any keeper of a prison who should allow a prisoner to escape. What right had Herod to command them to be put to death if such a law did not exist? Do you suppose he was such an imperious autocrat that he held the death penalty in his hands? He, as governor of that province, must have governed in accordance with law, and he commanded

the keeper to be put to death because the prisoners had escaped. Here is another prison-keeper whose prisoners he thought had escaped, and he drew his sword and was going to plunge it into his body, because, rather than be put to death by the authorities, he would prefer to die by his own hand. Under these circumstances, is it probable that this jailer, in contravention of law, and at the risk of his own life, took those apostles out of doors somewhere during the midnight darkness, to dip him and his family in some remote pond, mud-hole, or other place? To me it is the most improbable thing I ever heard of, and because of this improbability a good many Baptist writers have gone to work, and in their imaginations have manufactured a big tank or some sort of a receptacle inside the prison into which the poor fellows were plunged one after another, all the dirt being washed off in the same water. The more you look at it and turn it over and view it kaleidoscopically, the more you will not wonder that I repudiate this miserable dipping business with all the emphasis of my soul. I tell you again it is a superstition. It was born and bred in the lap of superstition, and it is not fit, as a mere matter of decency, to be imported into decent society. It is dangerous besides, and I can produce the proofs that individuals have perished by being immersed, and because of that danger it is a violation of the law that God has stamped upon his works. And the same God that enacted the laws of nature, and wrote them on the face of nature, and stamped them on *our* nature, wrote that Bible; and when you can convince me that the laws of God in revelation and in nature are in conflict, you can convince me that I ought to be an infidel.

I guess we have got to the end of this business. Perhaps we will get some further astounding information. (A voice, "hash.") I hear a gentleman say "hash," and no doubt we shall have some more of that. We have had an argument spun out pretty fine. But I don't want you to suppose that my brains are worn out or that my evidence is exhausted. I have a lot over here. If you do not believe it, give me one week after this debate is over to go on night after night, for the whole evening, and I will show you about how much can be said on this subject. I have been over the ground, and consequently I come to this platform with this gentleman, as I will com with any other gentleman, I do not care whether he is white or colored, whether he comes from Kentucky or Halifax, without the least degree of trepidation, or the least disturbance of my nerves,—and I am about as nervous a man as I know of,—knowing that we have the truth of the eternal God on our side. Most of you will believe that.

I was going to plunge into John's baptism, but I have not time to strike out, as my half-hour is nearly up. I have all the New Testament baptisms also, to examine yet. But you can judge from what I have given you that the rest is dry—a little too dry to chew well, and too dry to digest easily. However, it may swell out in my opponent's stomach. And this reminds me of a story of a boarder who said that they lived very cheaply at his boarding-house, for they ate dried apples for breakfast, drank cold water for dinner, and the apples swelled for supper.

I will give my opponent the rest of my time.

[*Time expired.*]

The benediction was pronounced.

MR. HARDING'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

I am more and more impressed with the fact that when we want to make an impression on the people for good, it is exceedingly important that we should display the spirit of the Lord Jesus. We have not had, since this debate began, a single violation of the rules of decorum and propriety, which, I am quite sure, has not been injurious to him who violated the rules. I desire to express a hearty amen to that petition, in the prayer, for decency and good order; and for my part, I want afresh to endeavor to conduct the debate in a manner which should characterize Christian gentlemen. I was delighted with the discussion yesterday, and with the service of the evening, until that little episode which followed the speaking. That was unfortunate; especially the hot debating that took place all over the room. I want with renewed energy to present these matters as they should be presented, from a Christian standpoint.

At the beginning of the service this afternoon, I want to call your attention again, very briefly, before we take up the thread of argumentation where it was left last night, to the present state of the discussion. In order that I may present the matter in a different light, and that you may consider it from a different standpoint, consider the following facts: (1) I practice immersion; Mr. Wilkinson favors affusion; (2) all the lexicons define *baptizo* to immerse, or dip, or

plunge; none define it to sprinkle; (3) all the Church historians testify that immersion was practiced by the ancient Church; the first case of affusion for baptism on record is that of Novatian, A.D. 251; (4) the encyclopaedias, those marvelous repositories of the learning of the ages, testify that for thirteen centuries immersion was usually, almost universally, practiced; that affusion ("clinic baptism") was permitted only to the sick in case of necessity; that those that received it were often regarded as not properly baptized; and that the Council of Ravenna (1311) was the first to allow a choice between sprinkling and immersion; (5) all the great critics and commentators of the world (except two) testify that in Rom. 6: 4 Paul refers to immersion; (6) in the Bible accounts of baptisms, they went to water, to much water, down into the water, and (after the baptism) came up out of the water; they were buried in baptism, raised to walk in newness of life, and had their *bodies* washed with pure water.

Now suppose that our positions were reversed: suppose that Mr. Wilkinson had produced a stack of lexicons, every one of them defining *baptizo* to sprinkle or pour upon, not one giving the definition to immerse; suppose all the Church histories had testified that sprinkling was the almost universal practice of the ancient Church, and that the first case of immersion for baptism occurred two centuries and a-half after the beginning of the Christian era; suppose all the encyclopaedias had agreed to this, explaining that immersion did not become general for thirteen hundred years; suppose all scholars (except two Baptists) had said of some passage of Scripture, that it referred to "baptism by sprinkling," and that it could not be understood unless so interpreted; suppose, furthermore, that Mr. Wilkinson had shown that in apostolic times they brought the water for baptism, and that they baptized where there was but very little water; that the candidates were spoken of as bedewed, as having their foreheads moistened, etc.; then suppose I had come forward in reply, saying that some of the lexicons define *baptizo* to wet, and that you can wet a thing by immersing it in water, therefore, in the Bible, baptism is immersion. Would not Mr. Wilkinson under such circumstances have gained a most overwhelming victory? and would not my defence have been feeble indeed? Ah, but he has not done as supposed! I have brought the lexicons, the Church histories, the encyclopaedias, the scholars, the favoring circumstances from the Bible, etc. And he replies, *Baptizo* means to wash, and you can wash a thing by sprinkling it. Yes, and you can wash a thing by immersing it, too, and that is what you will do, if you baptize according to the Scriptures.

I will refer briefly to the case of the jailer. My friend read one verse and then stopped. Had he read all the verses, he would have seen that everything I have said about it was correct. What I said was that the jailer took them out of his house to be baptized. I know that it is argued that the jailer was baptized in his house, or in the prison, and that therefore the baptism must have been by allusion. But it is a simple matter of fact that he took them out of the house, and that fact is made plain to every one who reads the chapter. They were thrust into the inner prison, and their feet were made fast in the stocks (see Acts 16: 24); at midnight an earthquake occurred which hurled every door open, and loosed every prisoner's bands (ver. 26); the keeper of the prison being aroused from his sleep, and supposing that his prisoners had fled, was about to kill himself, when Paul cried with a loud voice, saying, "Do thyself no harm, for we are all here;" the jailer, trembling with awe and amazement, obtained a light, and came in, and brought them out of the inner prison into his house; they then preached the word of the Lord to all that were in his house; after the preaching, he took them, and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway; then he brought them back into his house, and set meat before them. As the preaching took place "in his house," and as he brought them back into the house after his baptism, anybody who has sense enough to know that you cannot enter a house twice without going out once, knows he took them out of the house, and was baptized.

But, it is asked, did not the jailer know that he would violate the law, and endanger his life, if he took them out of the house? No, he did not; for such was not the case. He knew if he let them escape his life would be in danger. But he knew they did not want to escape; they had a chance to flee, but refused to go. The jailer was satisfied that they were what they professed to be—servants of the Most High God. Why did he take them out of the house at midnight?—to be sprinkled? Nay, verily! Here is another case of going to the water, and that too at a very unseasonable hour, to be baptized.

I pass from the case of the jailer to that of Naaman. My friend said that this case settles the question. No doubt it would have done so, had it not been settled from the first speech in the debate. You will find the record concerning Naaman in the 5th chapter of 2 Kings. The prophet Elisha said to this great warrior, who was so dreadfully afflicted with the leprosy, "Go and wash in Jordan seven times, and thy flesh shall come again to thee, and thou shalt be clean." In

obedience to this command, 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." The word rendered "*dipped*" in the common version, is *taval* in the Hebrew, and *baptizo* in the Greek; that is, King James' translators testify that the Hebrew *taval*, the equivalent of the Greek *baptizo*, signifies *to dip*. *Taval* occurs fifteen times in the Old Testament; in the common version it is rendered *dip* fourteen times, *plunge* once. This is the Hebrew word for baptism.

Mr. Wilkinson says that King James' translators were immersionists and therefore rendered *taval* to dip. I do not accuse my friend of willfully slandering those men, but he has made a great mistake. They were not immersionists; neither did Mr. Campbell admit that they were immersionists, for he knew better. I have here "The Twenty-four Books of the Holy Scriptures," carefully translated according to the Massoretic text, by Isaac Leeser. This Isaac Leeser is a Jewish scholar, and he says he translated "after the best Jewish authorities." He renders 2 Kings 5: 14 thus: "Then went he down, and dived seven times in the Jordan, according to the saying of the man of God, and his flesh was restored (healthy) like the flesh of a little boy, and he became clean." Verse 10, he renders thus: "And Elisha sent a messenger unto him, saying: "Go and bathe seven times in the Jordan, and thy flesh shall be restored (healthy) to thee, and thou shalt be clean." *Rachats* (wash) he renders "bathe;" *taval* (dip) he renders "dive." Not even Mr. Wilkinson, I presume, will say that Rabbi Leeser and these Jewish authorities were immersionists. Neither were King James' translators partial to immersion. On this point, Dr. Wall, who wrote his "History of Infant Baptism" 180 years ago, thus testifies' (*History of Inf. Bap. Vol. 1. p. 581.*) "In the latter times of Queen Elizabeth, and during the reigns of King James and of King Charles 1., very few children were dipped in the font." He explains that through the influence of Calvin over the ministers who had fled to Geneva from Queen Mary's bloody reign, backed by the influence of such men as Dr. Whitaker, of Cambridge, together with the inclination of the people, sprinkling was substituted for dipping, although the latter was requited by the rubric, except in case of weakness. Be it remembered, that it was during the reign of this King James, when, as Dr. Wall shows, sprinkling had almost entirely taken the place of dipping, that our common version was made. The translators inserted the word *dip* into the Bible because the Hebrew *taval* means to dip. I have here the Wilkes-Ditzler debate, which was held

at Louisville, Kentucky. During the debate Mr. Wilkes stated that the Jewish Rabbi Kleeburg had told him in a conversation that *taval* means to immerse; Dr. Ditzler said, "I should like to see that in writing." Sometime afterwards it was produced in writing, in these words:

" 1. What does *taval* mean?

" It means to immerse, to dip.

" 2. Does it ever mean to sprinkle or to pour?

" It never means to sprinkle or to pour.

" 3. Did the Jews always immerse their proselytes?

" They did. The whole body was entirely submerged.

"4. Were the Jewish ablutions immersions?

"Before eating, and prayer, and after rising in the morning, they washed; when they have become unclean they must immerse.

" DR. L. KLEEBURG.

"Louisville, Ky., Dec. 23rd, 1870."

This letter is copied from the *Louisville Debate*, page 65^l2. It is agreed between Mr. Wilkinson and myself, that the Hebrew word to express the action of baptism is *taval*; that it occurs fifteen times in the Old Testament, and in our common version is rendered clip fourteen times, plunge once. Yes, as my friend said, Naaman's case does settle the question. The prophet told him to wash—or, as the Jew Leeser translates—to bathe seven times in Jordan; he went down and dipped—baptized—*tavalled* himself seven times in Jordan, or, as Dr. Leeser says, he *dived* seven times in Jordan. It is certain that he did not sprinkle himself, or pour himself seven times in Jordan.

Let us consider the Septuagint on this case. This is a translation made out of the Hebrew into the Greek, by seventy Jewish Rabbis (as is supposed), long before the days of our Saviour. In the account of Naaman's cleansing, the Hebrew *rachats* (to wash) is translated by the Greek *louo*. *Louo*, as we have had occasion to say before, is used to indicate the washing of the body; *nip to*, of the hands and feet; *pluno*, of the clothes. As I have made this statement several times, it might be well for me to prove it, that you may have the proper authorities, and not my word only. Liddell and Scott define:

"*Louo*, to wash, anything; especially to wash the body, *nip to* (or *nizo*) being used especially of the hands and feet, *pluno*, of clothes."

Donnegan defines: "*Louo*, to wash, to bathe. *Louo* is said of the body, *nip to* of the hands, and *pluno* of the clothes."

These seventy Jewish scholars who translated their Scriptures out

of their own tongue into the Greek, understood the prophet to direct Naaman to wash *his body* seven times *in Jordan*; and they expressed the way in which he did it by saying that he baptized himself seven times in Jordan. Certainly this case does settle the meaning of the word *baptize*

The consecration of the Aaronic priests was typical of our being consecrated as priests to God; consequently you will find in the ceremony of consecrating Aaron and his sons, a type of Christian baptism. Of this ceremony we have one account in Exodus 29: 1—37, and another in Lev. 8th chapter. Aaron and his sons were brought unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation, and Moses then "washed them with water" (*elousen en hudati, bathed them in water*). The act of washing is expressed by *louo*, and the preposition "with," (*en, in*) is the same that is used in Matt. 3: 6, to tell that John baptized the people "in Jordan." After the bathing in water, the priestly garments were put upon them: then Aaron was anointed with oil: after this, the bullock and the two rams were slain; and the oil and blood were sprinkled, etc. As Moses washed the body of Aaron in water, John baptized Jesus in the Jordan; as Moses clothed Aaron and his sons with priestly garments, so Christ and his followers in being baptized "fulfill all righteousness," and, therefore, are clothed in robes of righteousness; as Moses anointed Aaron after his bath with the anointing oil, so God anointed Jesus, as he came up from the waters of baptism, "with the Holy Ghost and with power." The bath was typical of baptism; the anointing with oil, the anointing with the Holy Ghost; the sprinkling of blood, of the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus. In Acts 2: 38, Peter commands the people saying, "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." The order is (1) Repentance (which implies faith); (2) Baptism; (3) Remission of sin (robes of righteousness); (4) The Gift of the Holy Ghost.

My friend opposes immersion, among other reasons, because it is dangerous; he has heard that people have died from being immersed. Well, suppose they have? What of that? Did he never read in the Scriptures about people dying from the performance of duty to God? Does not Jesus teach us that we must be ready to give up our lives for Him? Did He not die for us? But then Mr. Wilkinson thinks it so indecent, so vulgar! It is so shocking to his delicate sensibilities to see men and women come up in dripping garments from the water! It is a commandment of the Lord, and it is nice. Anything Jesus

tells us to do is nice; and it is pleasing to me to see people doing it. With regard to people being killed by being immersed, I have received into the Church, within the last eleven years, more than 2,000 people; and all these have been immersed by my own hands, or it has been done by others in my presence; often the ground was covered with snow, and the water with ice; among those baptized were men, and women, and children, of various ages from 9 to 75 years, of almost every condition of life; some were strong and robust, and others were so feeble it was thought they might die in the water; yet in all these years, among all these people, I have not known of one who was in anywise hurt, who even so much as caught a cold from his immersion; nor have I ever been in the least injured from attending to this duty. I have heard it rumored that somebody said that it was reported that some other body, somewhere, had been injured by being immersed; but I have never been able to find the man; nor have I ever seen an immersionist who could tell me of one such case in his experience.

[Time expired.]

MR. WILKINSON'S EIGHTH REPLY.

We are again reminded, friends, that all the lexicons, all the Church histories, all the encyclopedias, and all the scholarship are on one side in this discussion; that I stand alone on the opposite side. That would be very pleasant for my opponent, if it were true; but I have shown you that it is not true. It is a *carte blanche* statement that neither my opponent nor any other man can prove; and is not in accordance with facts. He always feels better after a good long intermission, and comes prepared to give you a few more authorities. Dr. Dale, who has written an able work on baptism, consisting of five large volumes, goes over the whole ground. No man of any age has gone so thoroughly and exhaustively into the history of the word in question, in all its aspects, bearings, and usages. Dr. Dale is a scholar, every inch of him, and his work is recognized in all the paedobaptist colleges and institutions in the United States and elsewhere as a masterly and scholarly work. He asks, "What is the name of one man who during a thousand years after the institution of baptism wrote, or said, or believed, that dipping into water was Christian

baptism? In other words, tell us of one man among the millions of ten centuries who believed the theory, or would have thought it worthy of consideration. Do not mistake my demand. The inquiry is not for one who practiced the covering of the body in water in ritual baptism; nor is it for one who interpreted such baptism as a burial and resurrection; there is not only one such, but one legion; but what is sought is quite other than this, to wit: one who believed that *this covering with water* was Christian baptism." Dr. Dale has for all time to come knocked the bottom out of the immersion theory by this work, and it only remains for the work to be known and understood to cause the whole thing to vanish like "the baseless fabric of a vision." If you take my copy of this work you will find it marked almost from the beginning to the end, and I am so full of it that every time my nose bleeds it runs out of me. Dr. Dale further says:

"If it should be asked why these ancients 'covered with water' in baptism, I answer: For the same reason that they baptized men and women naked. And precisely here, (in the absolute nudity of the ancients and in the water-tight india-rubber vestments of the moderns), is revealed the antipodal character of these baptisms. The ancients believed that there was a *vis baptismatis* in the water which, applied to the body, reached to the soul, and thus effected Christian baptism; therefore this water was applied to the whole body naked for the better development of its baptizing power." (*Christic Baptism, page 24*). That is the point. My opponent has proved by lexicons, Church histories and encyclopaedias, and by "all scholars" that immersion was practiced. We all admit it. Dr. Dale admits it. But where is there one scholar for the whole of the first 1,000 years of the Christian era that interpreted the *fact* of being dipped in water as Christian baptism? I will leave my opponent to follow that point, and I will chase him up every inch of the way.

And now, suppose our positions were reversed. Suppose I were trying to establish a claim for exclusive sprinkling; that I had proved it to be the usual mode of baptism for the first thousand years, or more, of the Christian era; that all the lexicons, Church histories, and encyclopaedias said it was so administered; that my opponent admitted the fact cheerfully, but adduced proof to show that this practice was the offspring of a superstitious belief on the part of the early fathers, not one of whom practiced it because the word, in its religious sense, necessarily meant sprinkle, but because of their erroneous notions; and suppose he should produce examples of immersion from the Bible as clear as the cases I have produced to the contrary,

such as the "divers baptisms," of Heb. 9: 10, the "Ark baptism," 1 Peter 3: 20, 21, and the "Red Sea baptism," Exodus 14: 19-31, would not any sensible person say, I had failed to establish the exclusive claims of sprinkling? Especially would this be the case if he succeeded in proving that all the standard lexicographers, and all impartial scholars, recognized a secondary meaning to the word having no necessary reference to sprinkling, in which secondary sense the word was used in the Scriptures, it will be apparent to all unprejudiced persons that the claim for exclusiveness in behalf of sprinkling must be given up.

With respect to the burial. He quoted Meyer last night. The impression was strong on my mind that Meyer favored my interpretation of Romans 6: 4. You remember I said it was not ritual baptism but the baptism of the Spirit by which we are made new creatures in Christ, incorporated into Him spiritually, and brought into fellowship with Him in the whole work of the atonement. What says Meyer? You remember that Mr. Harding told you that Meyer was the greatest Biblical exegete under heaven. I think I now have another little weight in my end of the scale. I only wish we could have three months of this sort of thing, and you would see to which end of the scale the scholarship belongs.

MR. HARDING.—YOU can have as much as you want.

MR. WILKINSON.—We could build a tabernacle, sit up nights and have a kind of picnic. Mr. Harding could send down to Cincinnati for that "office editor" who reported that he thrashed me badly when I met him in Acton, and cowed me out of a second debate. It was reported all round Meaford that I had backed out. These "Disciples of Christ" are circulating the story. But, I trust, if they have the truth of Christ in their hearts, they will investigate the case before they tell it again. Go down to Acton and see how the case stands. He can bring the "office editor" and bushels of books, and I am ready for him. I don't like to indulge in boasting of this kind; but I have been driven into it by the blustering tone imported into this debate from the very start. It has been bellowed into my ears as though I were deaf, and when noise would not do, it has been hammered in with fists right under my nose. There is a little blood left in me yet. I am only human. When any man undertakes to pound anything into me I will resist it. Now, what does Meyer say? He says:

"We who were baptized in reference to Christ Jesus (we who through baptism became those specifically belonging to Him), were baptized in

reference to His death; i.e., we were brought, through our baptism, into the fellowship of His death; so that we have a real share ethically in His death; through the cessation of all our life for sin This interpretation, namely of the spiritual *fellowship* produced through baptism (prepared for by this repentance and *pistis* [faith] that preceded baptism, accomplished by the baptism itself, Gal. 3: 27; Col. 2: 11f.; Tit. 3:5;) is required by the context in ver. 2, 4, 5, etc. It is therefore not the idea of *imitation*, but that of the *dying along with*, unto which, in order to the accomplishment of which in us, we were baptized. The *efficient cause* of this fellowship of death is Divine grace which forgives sin and grants the Holy Spirit to him who becomes baptized; the *means of this grace* is baptism itself; the *appropriating cause* is faith, and the *causa meritoria* the death of Christ."

In a foot-note to this extract Meyer says, "*Baptizein eis* never means anything else than *to baptize in reference to, in respect to* undoubtedly the name 'Jesus' was named in baptizing. But the conception of *becoming immersed into Christ* (in Ruckert and others, and again in Weiss, *Bibl. Theol. p. 343*) is to be set aside, and is not to be supported by the figurative expression in Gal. 3: 27. The mystic character of our passage is not produced by so vague a sensuous conception,—which moreover has all the passages against it in which *baptizein* is coupled with *onoma*, (Matt. 28: 19; Acts 2: 38; 10: 48; 19:5; 1 Cor. 1: 13)—but is based simply on the ethical consciousness of that intimate appertaining to Christ, into which baptism translates its recipients."

He distinctly teaches, therefore, that this baptism is a spiritual operation, the giving of the Holy Spirit and bringing us into fellowship with Christ thereby, but not an imitation of a burial. And this is the very view I presented. He does say, farther on, as my opponent read, that the candidate in ritual baptism is *reminded* of the fellowship when he is immersed, but he distinctly teaches that it is a spiritual fellowship effected by Divine grace. If a baptism in water can do this, then perhaps Meyer is to be understood as my opponent would have us believe, but I claim that it is the baptism of the Spirit which brings us into this relation with Christ and gives us fellowship with Him in His death which was by crucifixion and not by drowning; and his own illustrious witness, Meyer, teaches the same thing. Paul says in first Corinthians 12: 13, "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit." We will take another quotation. Dr. Robinson says: "The Romans




DIAGRAM illustrating God's method of making visible, under the two dispensations, the two great fundamental, or pillar-truths of Human Redemption—Atonement and Regeneration—by means of visible symbols, and showing the peculiar relation of the symbolic ordinances to the truths they are respectively intended to represent.

and the Lord's Supper to symbolize Christ's death, or the atonement only; and when we put the one ordinance in the place of the other we vitiate the teachings of God's Word. They are as distinct from each other as day and night, If any man can overturn that position he is a better man than my present opponent. I have shown that Meyer and Robinson hold substantially the same view as I have presented. Dr. Dale says on this point:

"A false interpretation once taught, that the words of Scripture meant all that could be put into them, the theory adopts this principle in its interpretation of ritual baptism. Out of the elements entering into this ordinance are selected as symbolic, the water, the believer, and the double action of putting into and taking out of." Again he says: "The water appears in three offices: 1, of a grave; 2, of a womb; 3, of the blood of Christ. As a grave the living 'believer' is put into it: (1.) As dead with Christ; (2.) As dead by natural death; (3.) As the old man, dead, to be buried and to be left in the grave. And he is taken out of the grave: (1.) As risen with Christ; (2.) As risen at Christ's second coming; (3.) As risen 'a new man' to holy living. This would seem to be enough of symbolization for one transaction. It is, however, only the beginning. The water must, again, appear in a wholly new office, that of a womb. The interpretation, here, is not so complex but is more perplexed; since the putting into the water and the taking out of the water are both represented as a birth." Thus Dr. Dale exhibits the absurdity of this interpretation. My opponent says I am alone in my end of the scale. I shall have illustrious company before we get to the end of this debate.

A moment with respect to that jailer. The record says he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and he was baptized and all his house. If he took them out to some distant river or pond, he took them out to wash their stripes. Did he need to take them to a river to wash their stripes? Might he not have done that somewhere in the jail, or in the back room of his house? The record nowhere says he took them out of the house. They were in the "inner prison," and he brought them out of that into the *outer* prison. Then he took them—probably to a wash-room—and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway. A great deal is said by my opponent about the jailer's taking them out of the house and bringing them back again, just as though the jail and the house were half a mile apart. I never saw them that distance apart in this country; I do not know how it was in Judea. I pre-

sume they were in the same building, and that the prisoners could be easily taken from the one to the other without being taken out of the enclosure. What is the use of raising difficulties where there are none, for the sake of resisting the force of an argument?

A word with regard to Naaman's case. Dr. Young, author of the greatest concordance of the present day, of which Spurgeon said that Cruden's was as child's play in comparison, translates the word *tabhal* "to moisten, besprinkle." If there were time I could bring plenty of authorities to show that such was the primary meaning of the word, but I cannot enlarge on that point at present.

My opponent's argument about the baptism of the priests, and the analogy which he has pointed out between it and the baptism of Christ, very clearly proves the correctness of my position, that Christ's baptism was a consecration to the priesthood. But he has not proved, nor can he prove, that any priest was ever immersed at the door of the tabernacle. They were washed (Hebrew, *rachats*, Greek, *louo*), but neither of these words express or imply the idea of immersion, therefore there is no proof either that the Levitical priests or our Lord were immersed.

[Time expired.]

MR. HARDING'S NINTH SPEECH.

Wherever my friend finds the word "sprinkle" he brings it in. But, unfortunately for his cause, he does not find that *baptizo* is ever defined to sprinkle. He has not even brought the "extracts" from lexicons that define it to sprinkle. At first he "guessed" he could find such lexicons; then, feeling the need of more boldness, he hotly affirmed that he *could* find them, but said he would take his own time about it; he would not be driven. He has not produced the book yet, nor will he. It don't exist. I grant you that a great many scholars agree with him in preaching affusion; that a great many agree with him in arguing that "the jailer was baptized in the house, and therefore *must have been* baptized by affusion:" they think it is "hardly possible that the three thousand were immersed;" but not one single lexicographer will say that *baptizo* means to sprinkle; not one scholar of world-wide fame will say, as he does, that affusion or aspersion was practiced in apostolic times, and that immersion is of post-apostolic

origin—an outgrowth of superstition and ignorance. Church historians may argue in favor of affusion, may evidently be favorable to the practice of it • but when it comes to testifying to a matter of fact, there is not one of them who does not testify that immersion was almost universally practiced in the ancient Church; not one of them who mentions an earlier case of affusion than that of Novation, A.D. 251.

Referring to my books, Mr. Wilkinson said that he had left his lexicons at home for his wife to read while he was away. The next time there is to be a debate, instead of sending for Mr. Wilkinson, our pa¹ Jo-baptist friends would do better to send for his wife, as she has the books.

He says I do better after a rest. I should like to return the compliment, but I honestly believe he does worse every time.

With respect to Dr. Dale's theory: Dipping into water is not Christian baptism. No man that I know of has ever so held. The Doctor need not have stopped with the first thousand years; he might have said, No man has ever held, at any time, that mere dipping into water is Christian baptism. No, as I told you in a former speech, [my fourth], we do not hold that "immersion alone is Christian baptism, but simply that the word *baptizo*, wherever you find it, whether used in regard to Christian baptism or anything else, means to immerse. Christian baptism is immersion by the authority of Christ, and into the name of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. As *baptizo* means to immerse, and not to sprinkle nor to pour upon, in New Testament times every baptism was an immersion, whether Jewish, Christian, or pagan. I do not hold that every immersion is Christian baptism; but I do claim that every Christian baptism is an immersion. Let my friend consider the difference between these two statements.

I have shown that the scholars of the world say that immersion was practiced in ancient times—though affusion began to be practiced with the sick at an early day. I have brought forward such authorities as Dr. Wall and Dean Stanley, who testify that the Greek Church has practiced it all through the ages, even to this day; but, since my opponent calls for scholars, I will read from Tertullian, who lived and wrote A.D. 200; that is, about one hundred years after the apostle John died. He says, quoting Horn. 6: 3:—"Know ye not that so many of us as were immersed into Christ Jesus, were immersed into His death?" *Tertullian On the Resurrection of the Body*, ch. 47.

A few lines further on he adds: "For by an image we die in bap-

tism; but we truly rise in the flesh, as did also Christ." Again he says, speaking of the Saviour's command: "And last of all, commanding that they should immerse into the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit." *Tertullian Against Praxeas*, ch. 26.

Referring to trine immersion, he says: "Then we are three times immersed, answering somewhat more than the Lord prescribed in the gospel." *Tertullian On the Soldier's Crown*, ch. 3.

In telling what Christian baptism is, he says: "As of baptism itself there is a bodily act, that we are immersed in water; a spiritual effect, that we are freed from sins." *Tertullian On Baptism*, ch. 7.

Remember, this man was born about the middle of the second century (A.D. 150), and that he wrote within 100 years after the days of inspiration. Even "clinic baptism" by affusion had not begun then, and hence he says nothing about it. He simply says, "We are immersed;" Christ commanded "that they should immerse," etc.

Ambrose (Bishop of Milan, born about 340 A.D.) says: "Thou wast asked, 'Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty?' Thou saidst, 'I believe;' and thou didst sink down, that is, wast buried." *Ambrose On the Sacraments*, Book II. ch. 7.

The same writer (Book III. ch. 1, sec. 1) says: "Yesterday we discoursed respecting the font, whose appearance is, as it were, a form of sepulcher; into which, believing in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, we are received and submerged, and rise, that is, are restored to life."

If this is not teaching that Christian baptism is immersion, it is getting pretty close to it;—he whose heart has been changed by faith is immersed into the holy names by the authority of Christ.

My friend would like to get some help from H. A. W. Meyer, the greatest of all New Testament commentators, and hence he continues to quote from him on Rom. 6: 3, 4. But Meyer has no comfort for him, as the following statements clearly show. He says (*Commentary on Romans*, ch. 6, v. 4): "The recipient—thus has Paul figuratively represented the process—is conscious, (a) in the baptism *generally*: now am I entering into fellowship with the *death* of Christ; (b) in the *immersion in particular*: now am I becoming *buried* with Christ; (c) and then, in the emergence: now I *rise* to the new life with Christ." He says (commenting on verse 3): "In baptism man receives forgiveness of sins through faith." Evidently Mr. Wilkinson and Dr. Meyer are on different sides of this question clear through.

I have not said that every scholar is with me; but I do affirm that the great body of the scholarship of the world is with me in this, viz.,

in teaching that, in commanding baptism, Christ used a word which means to immerse, and that the apostles and first Christians did immerse in obeying the command. Remember Schaff's testimony concerning "all commentators of note (except Stuart and Hodge)" on Rom. 6:4. In his *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I., p. 123, he teaches that the usual form of the act was immersion, and that this is plain from the original meaning of the words *baptizo* and *baptismos*, then he adds: "But sprinkling, also, or copious pouring, was practiced at an early day with sick and dying persons, and probably with children and others, where total or partial immersion was impracticable. Some writers suppose that this was the case even in the first baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, since Jerusalem, especially in summer, was very poorly supplied with water and private baths."

Observe the testimony of this greatest of all living Church historians as to affusion. He says it was practiced *at an early day*, where total or partial immersion was *impracticable*, with sick and dying persons, and *probably* with children and others. Although his church connection, early training, and social influences all tend to bias him in favor of affusion or aspersion, this is the most that he can say for it. I can say exactly that much for it myself.

My opponent is very much exercised about the case of the jailer, although he brought it up himself. I would not have referred to this case at all but for the fact that he, and others on his side, rely on it to show that the jailer could not have been immersed, seeing, they say, that he was baptized in the house. From a careful reading of the passage (Acts 16: 19-39) it clearly appeared that he did take them out of the house, and was baptized, and then brought them back; then my friend made quite a speech to show, (notwithstanding the testimony of Luke was clear to the contrary), that the jailer could not have taken the prisoners out, for he would have been risking his life. It was then shown that he was in no danger unless his prisoners escaped, which they were not disposed to do; Paul and Silas did not want to run away. They could have been sprinkled in the house; but they could not have been immersed there; therefore, though it was the hour of midnight, they went out.

My friend says he is full of matter. He intimated that he had been studying this subject for months; and he says he only wishes we could have three months of this sort of thing. Well, there is nothing that I know of to hinder our going on till Mr. Wilkinson is satisfied. I am willing. J3ut, he says, if you think he has run out of matter,

just give him a week when the debate is over, and he will show you. He could go on for a whole week by himself! No doubt of it; and he would do a great deal better, too, having it all to himself, than he is now doing. But let not my friend flatter himself that any such good fortune is awaiting him; for I don't intend to go till he does; I will stay here till this time next year, if he does, if I have to send for my family to come up. When he was sent for last summer to come up and demolish my teaching, by lecturing on baptism, I staved till he left; and I intend to do so again. This Kentuckian likes to be with Canadians; they have been very kind to him; and this is a grand country; so he is not going to leave till he knows that Mr. Wilkinson has gone—unless they go by the same train. We might have a debate right along as long as we stay. If there is anything I enjoy it is debating, even though there is a little row occasionally, which, however, I do not like.

My friend quotes: "For by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit."—1 Cor. 12:13. Just so; all Christians are baptized by one Spirit (the Holy Spirit), into one body (the Church, which is the body of Christ). But the question arises, How are they thus baptized? It is also true that the gospel is preached "by the Holy Ghost sent forth from heaven." How is it thus preached? The Holy Spirit came down to earth, and entered into men, into the apostles of our Lord; and through them He preached; Jesus said to them: "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father that speaketh in you."—Matt. 10.20. The Holy Ghost preached through men; just so He baptized; that is, through men. When the apostles baptized, they did it under the command, and according to the instructions of the Holy Spirit. And just so it is now. When baptism is properly performed, it is done under the command and according to the instructions of the Spirit of God, as they are revealed in the Holy Word of God. Hence the question, What does the word *baptizo*, which the Spirit used in giving the command, mean? is one of superlative importance; for if we do anything else, the baptism is not of the Spirit. When Christ commanded His apostles to go into all the world to preach to the people, and to baptize them, He did not permit them to start at once; He directed them to wait till they had received the promise of the Father, till they had been endued with power from on high; for the preaching and the baptizing were to be by the Spirit, and, of course, they could not do the work till they had received the Spirit. But the

baptism of the commission (about which we are debating) is not, as my opponent seems to think, baptism in the Holy Ghost; it is baptism in water. Jesus did not direct His disciples to go about baptizing people with the Holy Ghost; Philip did not baptize the eunuch in the Holy Ghost, but in water, down into which they both went. Christ Himself performs the baptism in the Spirit; that is His business, not ours. According to the gospel rule, after men were baptized in water Christ gave them the Holy Spirit.

Just here I want to call attention to another matter. It is sometimes said that water-baptism should represent baptism in the Spirit; that as the Spirit was "poured out" upon the apostles, "shed forth" upon them, that therefore the water should be poured, or shed forth, upon the people now in baptizing them. If it could be shown that the *act of pouring* constituted the baptism in the Spirit, I grant you there would be much force in this argument. But did it? Dr. Ditzler, the most distinguished Methodist divine on this continent as a debater, made an argument like this: If Christ had wanted to teach immersion, why did He not teach it? "The Greek," says the Doctor, "has words for dip, both partial and thorough dips—*dupto* and *embapto*, *bapto*—not once are they used for baptism, nor *kolumbo*. In Greek *pontidzo*, *enduno* [another form of *enduo*, *buthidzo*, *kata-pontidzo*, *kataiduno*, all mean definitely *to immerse*."—*Graves-Ditzler Debate*, p. 171. The word *enduo*, which Dr. Ditzler says means to immerse, definitely *to immerse*, is the very word which our Lord used when He said, "And, behold, I send the promise of My Father upon you; but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be *endued* with power from on high."—Luke 24: 49. They were *endued* with power from on high when the Spirit came upon them; that is, according to the great Methodist, Dr. Ditzler, they were immersed, as this word means definitely to immerse. It is the Greek word to indicate putting on the clothes. When the Holy Spirit was given to the apostles there came from heaven the sound of a rushing, mighty wind. (There was no wind, but the Spirit in descending made a sound like unto that of a mighty wind.) It filled all the room in which they sat; cloven tongues, like as of fire, sat upon each of them; they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, endued with power, and they began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. Dr. Ditzler says *endued* means *immersed*; very good. In this case, then, there was both a pouring out of the Spirit and an immersion in the Spirit. Which is called the baptism? Evidently the immersion; for *baptizo* means to immerse, as all the lexicographers state; whereas

it never means to pour upon. This idea of immersion *in* the Spirit harmonizes with the sayings of the apostles, too, in other places. Observe the following: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's day."—Rev. 1: 10; "And immediately I was in the Spirit."—Rev. 4:2; "So he carried me away in the Spirit into the wilderness."—Rev. 17:3; "But ye are not in the flesh but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you."—Rom. 8:9; "If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit."—Gal. 5: 25 The apostles were *in* the Spirit; that is, they were immersed. Do you inquire how that can be? The Bible represents the body as being a tabernacle or dwelling-place. Man is dwelling in this tabernacle; and if it is filled with the Holy Spirit, he is in the Spirit—immersed in the Holy Spirit.

In order to show you that I am not alone in giving this interpretation, but that it is supported by the best scholarship of the world, I quote the following:

Dr. Edward Robinson, in his Greek lexicon of the New Testament, *art. bap.* p. 118, says: "*to baptize in (with) the Holy Ghost, and in (with) fire, i.e., to overwhelm, richly furnish, with all spiritual gifts, and to overwhelm with 'fire unquenchable,' Matt. 3:11, Luke 3: 16.*"

Dr. Geo. Campbell, Presbyterian, of Scotland, says: "The word baptism, both in sacred authors and classical, signifies to dip, plunge, immerse. It is always construed suitably to this meaning." "*Notes on, New Testament*" Andover, Vol. II., p. 20.

Neander, whose great work we have had occasion to quote before, says: "Baptism was performed by immersion as a sign of entire baptism into the Holy Spirit—of being entirely penetrated by the same." *History of Christian Religion*, Vol. I, p. 310.

Casaubon says: "To baptize is to immerse, and in this sense the apostles are truly said to be baptized; for the house in which it was done was tilled with the Holy Ghost, so that the apostles seemed to be plunged into it as into a fish pool." *R. Fuller*, p. 72.

Gurtlerus, in his *Institut. Theo.*, says: "Baptism in the Holy Spirit is immersion into the pure waters of the Holy Spirit, for he on whom the Holy Spirit is poured out is, as it were, immersed into Him." *See R. Fuller*, p. 19.

Archbishop Tillotson, *on Acts 2:2*, says: "It (the sound from heaven) filled all the house. This is that which our Saviour calls *baptizing with the Holy Ghost*. So that they who sat in the house were, as it were, immersed in the Holy Ghost, as those who are buried with water, which is the proper notion of baptism."

Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, A. D. 350, says: "As he who is plunged

in the water and baptized is encompassed by the water on every side, so they that are baptized by the Holy Spirit are also wholly covered." *Pengilly*, p. 75. Remember, this Cyril lived in the very city where this baptism occurred, was the principal leader of the Church there, and that, too, only about three centuries after the baptism happened.

These scholars, you see, my friends, sustain my position. It is not the pouring forth of the Spirit, but the immersion in the Spirit that is called the baptism.

My friend read a passage in his last speech to show that the baptism mentioned at Rom. 6: 4, is not water baptism, but that of the Holy Spirit. In that baptism it is expressly stated that we were buried,—buried by baptism: if that is the baptism of the Holy Ghost, then in it there is a burial; and this agrees exactly with what Dr. Ditzler says about the meaning of *enduo*; exactly with the teaching of the apostles, when they write of being in the Spirit, of walking in the Spirit, of living in the Spirit; they wore overwhelmed and immersed in the Spirit.

With respect to the chart which my friend has displayed, he has told us that he does not make any great pretension to scholarship, and consequently he could not reasonably expect me to pay much attention to his chart. He has displayed such a lack of information about the simplest matters of fact, I cannot rely upon his productions. For example, he thought the water of separation was made of *blood*, ashes, and running water. When I explained the passage in Ezekiel about sprinkling clean water, by saying that God here promised that the scattered Israelites should be brought back to their native land, and be purified by having the water of separation sprinkled upon them, he said he did not believe the Jews would ever be brought back, he did not know that they were brought back forty or fifty years after the prophecy was uttered by Ezekiel. He said that Liddell and Scott's was the only Greek-English lexicon; that all others define in Latin or some other tongue; and that, therefore, I was safe in saying that none define by "sprinkle," seeing that is an English word. He did not know that I had lying on my table here nearly a dozen Greek-English lexicons, and that I had been quoting from them. It would be unreasonable to expect that I should care much for *his* maps and charts; but I do care for his Scriptural quotations. He constructs an argument by his chart from the Passover, the slaying of the paschal lamb, and the deliverance of the children of Israel. The facts in this case are these: the lamb was slain, its blood was sprinkled, its flesh eaten; then the children of Israel arose and fled, and, after three

days' journey, came to the Red Sea; here they were baptized unto Moses "in the cloud and in the sea;" and here they caught the last sight of their enemies, for they left them drowned in the sea.

The lamb that was slain, and whose blood was sprinkled, was a type of Christ; their baptism unto Moses, a type of our baptism into Christ; the blood was sprinkled, but in their baptism the cloud was over them, and the sea on either side of them; they were buried "in the cloud and in the sea." We pass through the water, are buried in it, and are thus baptized into Christ.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKINSON'S NINTH REPLY.

My opponent said there was not a single case under the old dispensation where God ever commanded or enjoined the sprinkling of clean water on any one. I quoted Ezekiel 36: 25, in which it speaks of sprinkling clean water. He has frequently said that that referred to the restoration of the Jews; that when they were brought back to their native land that prophecy would be fulfilled. I then proved that as God had blotted out all religious distinctions between Jews and Gentiles, their restoration would not be literal, but spiritual, consisting in their conversion to Christianity, and that then this prophecy would be fulfilled. He then claimed that it was fulfilled 530 years B.C. But if it happened away back there, why did he say God never commanded any one under the old dispensation to sprinkle clean water? He will please reconcile this discrepancy. A man who can thus contradict himself must be getting childish. He will soon require a nursing-bottle.

With respect to Tertullian's testimony. My opponent quotes from him to the effect that in baptism there is a bodily act and a spiritual effect. This is substantially what I have been contending for all the time, viz., an action, *any* action by which a certain effect may be produced. That effect is, according to my theory, symbolic purity, and it is the effect and not the action by which it is produced that constitutes the baptism, With this teaching Tertullian agrees. And if there was a bodily act and a spiritual effect required in order to a baptism, then the bodily act of being put under water was not the whole of it. There is something else besides, and that is the spiritual effect.

But this does not agree with the primary signification of *baptizo*, which had no reference to any particular action, but was the name of a state or condition produced by some action. And I have contended that it is used in the secondary sense when applied to the Christian ordinance, viz., an action looking to some effect. And so says Tertullian. Therefore this witness agrees with me and not with my opponent. But Tertullian's testimony betrays his erroneous belief in another respect. I have told you that this whole immersion business is a superstition. I will now tell you where it originated. Under the old dispensation ceremonial purifications were cleansings in a legal sense, not in an actual or real sense. They did not propose to wash dirt off the people, but there were certain classes of things that were legally unclean and others that were legally clean. That distinction was kept up until the sheet from heaven came down to Peter, or the beginning of the Christian dispensation. When anything legally clean came in contact with anything legally unclean it had to be legally purified, and purification removed that legal defilement. The Jews who embraced Christianity in the early days of this dispensation carried that idea with them and applied it to Christian baptism. Baptisms under the law made them actually clean in the eyes of the law; and they thought, "Now, surely this Christian rite, typified by those old ceremonial purifications, must cleanse us really, also, not only in body but also in our soul." And they began to believe that the soul could be washed from its sin by this baptism. When they thus got to believe that the soul was cleansed from sin by baptism they began to administer the ordinance by the superstitious mode, which my friend claims is according to Bible doctrine. They found it taught in Genesis that the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters. They believed in this way spiritual efficacy was imparted to the waters, and they called that spiritual efficacy *vis baptismatis*. Then they taught that because of the presence of the Spirit in the water, when applied to the body, it purged the soul from sin. And this was the doctrine of Tertullian. He says: "The nature of the waters having been sanctified by the Holy, it receives itself the power to sanctify. . . . All waters, therefore, have the power to effect the sacrament of sanctification, God being invoked. For immediately the Spirit from heaven comes and is above the waters sanctifying them by Himself, and so they, being sanctified, *imbibe the power* of sanctifying, . . . therefore, the waters having received healing virtues through the intervention of the Angel, both the soul is corporeally purified by the waters and the body is spiritually "cleansed by the same." According

to these early fathers it was not the putting of the individual in the water, nor the putting of the water on the individual that constituted the baptism, but it was the communication of the Spirit by reason of the application of water to the body that purified the soul, and that was Christian baptism according to their notions. Tertullian is no authority, therefore, on the question of mode; but he testifies to my contention that it was a bodily act resulting in an effect. When they began to cherish this superstition about the Spirit being in the water, and cleansing the soul, they then had to determine how the desired result could be most effectually realized. They naturally reasoned that if the Spirit was in the water, and communicated by the contact of the water with the body, the less there was to interfere with that contact the better. Supposing that the clothing would be an obstacle to such contact they said, "Off with the coat." No one knew where the sin might be situated, whether in the head or the heart or all through the body. The doctrine of natural depravity was one that applied to every part of man, so they said, "Pants off, too." (A voice, "Shame!") Don't cry "Shame" at me. I am here to establish the truth, and I shall not allow any false sense of delicacy to stand between me and my duty. It's a fact that they stripped themselves bare. And as far back as my opponent can prove immersion I can prove *nude* immersion. They baptized—excuse me, ladies—men, women, and children, *nude*, and there is no fact better established in history than that the baptism of the early Church was nude baptism. Why did they do it? Because of that Spirit power and efficacy that was in the water, which they thought effected a cleansing and regeneration, and that is why they talk about being buried in the Spirit. If my opponent quotes ten thousand million of those early fathers to prove that when a person is baptized he is immersed in the Spirit, you can now easily understand it. Immersionists now-a days immerse with their clothes on, and sometimes with india-rubber water tight garments at that; but I think my opponent has a little of the ancient superstition remaining. He has not established from these fathers that a dipping in water is Christian baptism. Was it dipping in water *accompanied* by the Spirit that they believed was Christian baptism? No. Neither was it the water immersion that effected baptism; it was the Spirit, communicated through the water as a medium that effected the work. That was baptism according to the early fathers. That superstition you can trace back to the very door of the Apostolic Church, and the whole immersion business was born, bred, and nurtured there, and when that superstition gets out of men's minds the whole immersion fabric will be demolished.

My opponent again refers to Meyer. He quotes from that writer to show that the candidate is *conscious* of the fellowship when he goes into the water and comes out; but he cannot quote Meyer to show that this was a symbol of burial and resurrection. And this is what he teaches. But the question is, whether it is a spiritual baptism or a mere dipping in water that is meant in Rom. 6: 3, 4 and Col. 2:12. I contend for the former, and Meyer agrees with me, as I have proved. So much for another of his witnesses.

As to the jailer and the midnight baptism. It is quite a common thing for some people to believe in midnight baptisms. Here is another case which my opponent can put with the jailer's baptism. At one time the Jews were invested by the army of the Assyrians. The Jews were entrenched in the fortress of Bethulia, and we are told in Judith 6:11 that the fountains of water were "under Bethulia," and in chapter 7 that Holofernes, the commander of the invading army, took possession of the fountains, and in verse 17 of the same chapter we are told that "they pitched in the valley, and took the waters, and the fountains of the children of Israel." (An army marching must have water). A beautiful Jewess by the name of Judith undertook to betray the opposing army into the hands of the Jews. She went into the camp of the invading army as if she were a refugee coming there for succour. They took her into the camp. The Assyrian general was very much attracted by her beauty. The record runs:

"She slept till midnight, and she arose when it was towards the morning watch, and sent to Holofernes, saying: Let my lord now command that thine handmaid may go forth unto prayer.

"Then Holofernes commanded his guard that they should not stay her: thus she abode in the camp three days, and went out in the night unto the valley of Bethulia, and washed (Greek, *baptizo*) herself in the camp 'at the fountain.'" (Dr. Conant's rendering). These fountains of water were valuable to the Israelites. They needed them, doubtless, for cooking and drinking. The invading army took possession and cut off the Israelites from them. This lady goes out by night and baptizes herself in the camp at the fountain. Perhaps my opponent will tell you it was an immersion. Do you think they would allow such a thing, or that a lady would go and dip herself, head, neck and feet, in the fountain from which the army were constantly drawing water for their own use? Can you believe it? It is very nearly as likely as that the whole family of the Philippian jailer were taken out at midnight to some distant river and immersed. If it was the law of the land that

if a prisoner escaped the jailer's life should be sacrificed, it must have been contrary to law to take prisoners out of prison. No matter what personal faith he might have in their integrity, he had no right to let them outside the prison. It is not a question of personal faith. He was there as custodian of the prisoners on behalf of the people, and whatever confidence he might have in the prisoners he must observe the law. Yet these are the kind of probabilities, or rather improbabilities on which the immersion theory is founded. Surely a cause that is driven to such straits as these must be in a forlorn condition!

My opponent says the Gospel was preached by the Holy Spirit, and therefore baptism by the Holy Spirit was effected in the same way. Is that the inference he intended to convey? The apostles were baptized by the Spirit before they dared to preach the Gospel. They were told to remain in Jerusalem until they were endued with power from on high by the baptism of the Spirit, and then being baptized themselves, the Spirit being in them, they should go forth and preach the Gospel to others. The baptism of the Spirit is spoken of as a very distinct spiritual operation upon the individual, and not through the agency of the individual, who acts in obedience to His instructions, and is spoken of invariably as a pouring out or shedding down of the Holy Spirit. But according to my opponent's theory the Spirit does not baptize any one since the days of the apostles; it merely baptizes people in water, by means of some person. This is a new way of being baptized with the Holy Ghost! The baptism of the Spirit is referred to by the apostles. Paul says, We are saved "by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost which He shed on us abundantly." So when Peter saw the Holy Spirit descending upon the Gentiles who were gathered together at the house of Cornelius, he was reminded of the baptism they had received at the beginning. As to the burial, Rom. 6: 4. My opponent says it represents the baptism of the Holy Spirit by being immersed in it. That is purely begging the question. I am not going to haggle over that sort of evidence. As I understand it, and as a great many Christians understand it, the Holy Spirit pervades a man; it does not go inside the body and around the soul. It breathes in his every action; it controls his thoughts, motives, desires, impulses, affections. This idea of the soul being immersed within the body is a superstitious and contemptible notion that has been put forward by my opponent. He got it from the "office editor" at Cincinnati, who used it in his argument with Dr. Watson at Tonawanda, and I am astonished that he **should** have brought it before an intelligent audience.

Dr. Wall is quoted to prove that at the time King James' translation was made very few children were dipped. What has that to do with the question? I said Alexander Campbell admitted that our present version was made by men who favored immersion. My opponent does not deny it, he cannot deny it, unless he goes back on his own father. He has taunted me a good deal about going back on my father. Wesley, Alexander Campbell is as much his father as Wesley is my father. They stand in the same relation to us exactly. What does Campbell say? He says

"The translators of the common version were all, or nearly all, genuine Episcopalians, and, at the very time they made the version, were accustomed to use a liturgy which made it the minister's duty, in the sacrament of baptism, 'to take the child and dip it in the water contained in the font. I have seen copies of King James' version, printed in 1611, which contain the psalms and the service of the Church, in which frequent allusions are made to immersion, all indicative of the fact that it was then regarded as the primitive and proper baptism, consequently, these translators accepted the king's appointment and restrictions, to retain baptize and baptism, and on no occasion favored the innovation of sprinkling by any rendering, or note marginal, in that translation." *Christian Baptism*, p. 140.

I want him to deny that Campbell said that I do not care whether he said it or not, only I want to know if my opponent is prepared to go back on his father. If not, he has got to admit that the men who made King James' version leaned to the immersion theory.

With respect to *louo*, washing of the body—does it follow that it means the *dipping* of the body? In his references to what Paul calls "divers baptisms," my opponent speaks of washings which were performed outside the tabernacle, not inside. But suppose those bathings were the baptisms of Paul, is a bathing of the body necessarily an immersion of the body? Is a washing an immersion? If he can prove that bathing or washing is necessarily an immersion, then he can prove that *rachats*, *louo* and all those words mean immerse. I said the word *taval* was translated the first time it ever occurred in the Bible—in Genesis—*molunein*, when Joseph's coat was dipped in blood, and those who translated it *molunein* in this case translated it *baptizo* in Naaman's, though *molunein* signifies to sprinkle. My opponent said that those men understood their own language. Of course they did, and if they did not know it, who did? And if they were consistent in translating the same word by a word signifying immerse in the one case, and by a word signifying sprinkle in the other case, it implies

that immerse means to sprinkle and to sprinkle means to immerse. That would be sprinkle-immersion or immersion-sprinkling. If immersion means to wash, then when you whitewash you white-immersion, or immerse-white. Put these thoughts in combination, and you will find the immersion theory does not hold together. This fact is as clear as a sunbeam, and will always stare you in the face and become more apparent every session of this debate, that the Old Testament is full of ceremonial washings all of which had reference to purification. They did not mean to purify simply, but to purify religiously. To purify simply is to wash off dirt, but to purify religiously is to symbolize the washing of the soul by the influence of the Holy Spirit. All those baptisms, whether expressed by sprinkling or washing, whether effected by blood or water, I have no doubt, typified Christian baptism; and therefore Christian baptism is, like them, a purification; and the visible element ought to effect the outward cleansing as the invisible power effects the inward cleansing.

My opponent still harps on my inability to produce a lexicon defining *baptizo* by the word sprinkle, as if my whole cause depended on that; whereas I have told you, from the very first speech, that *baptizo* does not mean sprinkle, and if any lexicographer so rendered it he would mislead. I contend for sprinkle, not as the meaning of the word, but as the divinely appointed mode of producing the effect described by it. What object can he have in view by such haggling, except to raise a dust and divert attention from the real question"? Besides, I have told you that the lexicographers sometimes erroneously define the word by the equivalent of sprinkle, and challenged him to deny it; but all the denial he could make was that they did not give this equivalent as the *first* meaning.

My opponent also persists in misrepresenting me. He accuses me of saying that I have left my books at home with my wife; and in a previous speech he accused me of saying I had left my extracts at home with my wife, when, in point of fact, all I did say was that I had left Meyer's Commentary at home, not supposing I should require it.

He also thinks I do worse and worse in every speech. But I expected he would think that. Each successive speech is worse for him, and will continue so to the end. But he seems to be shifting his base. Doubtless his mind is changing on the subject under debate. He came here to prove that "Christian Baptism is Immersion,"—this and nothing more. Now, however, he says, "Dr. Dale need not have stopped with the first thousand years; he might have said, 'No man

has ever held, at any time, that more dipping into water is Christian Baptism." He also says he "does not hold that every immersion is Christian baptism." He should have been a little more prudent, therefore, in his definition, for he certainly believes, according to his own proposition, that immersion and Christian baptism are synonymous; and if *baptizo* merely means to immerse, when a thing is immersed it must be baptized.

Again, my opponent misrepresents my sentiments when he says I think the baptism of the Commission is the baptism of the Holy Ghost. I think nothing of the kind. He drew on his imagination for that.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. HARDING'S TENTH SPEECH.

We are now drawing to the close of the discussion of the first proposition, and I want to call attention here to a rule which has been one of the rules regulating every discussion in which I have been engaged except this one. This discussion is a little peculiar, from the fact that no rules for the regulation of it have been agreed upon. The rule referred to is this: "No new matter shall be introduced in a final negative." The leading characteristic of a debate is that the matters under consideration are discussed by both parties, considered from both standpoints. Of course, new matter in a final negative can be considered by one speaker only; hence the rule which I have just quoted has been generally adopted. We have not agreed to it for this debate, and I shall not insist on it to-night.

MR. WILKINSON—I agree to it at once.

MR. HARDING—That is just and fair. No new matter shall be introduced into my last speech on the next proposition.

Now, concerning my friend's quotation from Alexander Campbell: I have been called upon frequently, in debate, to endorse what he wrote. I accept his writings just as I receive the writings of any other man; when they accord with the truth—the teachings of the word of God, or the truth of history—I receive them; when they do not, I reject them. But never, in debate, has a quotation from him been presented to me that I could not endorse; not in a single instance, so far as I can remember. My friend said that King James'

translators were immersionists; that Mr. Campbell said that they were; that they leaned to the immersion theory. I knew he was wrong about that; I was certain that Mr. Campbell had never said any such thing; he was too well informed to have made such a blunder. Mr. Wilkinson, in endeavoring to sustain his statement, quoted from him as follows:

"The translators of the common version were all, or nearly all, genuine Episcopalians, and, at the very time they made the version, were accustomed to use a liturgy which made it the minister's duty, in the sacrament of baptism, 'to take the child and dip it in the water' contained in the font. I have seen copies of King James' version, printed in 1611, which contain the psalms and the service of the Church, in which frequent allusions are made to immersion, all indicative of the fact that it was then regarded as the primitive and proper baptism; consequently these translators accepted the King's appointment and restrictions to retain baptize and baptism, rather than translate them, and on no occasion favored the innovation of sprinkling by any rendering, or note marginal, in that translation." *Campbell on Baptism*, p. 140.

But, by a fortunate accident, I understood Mr. Wilkinson to say page 144; I turned to that page, in the first place, and read as follows:

"Evident, then, it is, not only that the English translators did not even translate *baptizo*, or its lineage, by the words pour, sprinkle or purify, but that they could not so translate them from their knowledge of the ancient customs and the classic and sacred use of these terms.

"Thus, then, we have, by a new, distinct, and independent class of witnesses, of the highest celebrity for eminent literary attainments and for highly cultivated and refined conscientiousness, furnished another argument in proof of our first proposition, which, without regard to any other, would seem sufficient to establish it beyond the possibility of refutation. For, will not that distinguished doctor, Common Sense, whom all believe, naturally conclude that so many learned, conscientious, and religious men, having so much at stake themselves, continually sprinkling in the name of the Lord, would, if they could, have given some countenance to their own favorite practice, by translating some one or more of these one hundred and twenty-six occurrences of those terms in a way favorable to their own beloved practice. Certain it is, then, that their practice had some other foundation than the meaning of the word in the apostolic commission,

concerning which foundation we may hereafter speak." *Campbell on Baptism*, p. 144.

In this last extract, Mr. Campbell says of King James' translators that they were "continually sprinkling in the name of the Lord;" and he calls sprinkling "their own favorite practice." So I will not have "to go back" on my father (to adopt the *elegant* (!) language of my opponent) after all. He did not say that the translators of our common version were immersionists. Nor were they. As I have said, Dr. Wall, the distinguished writer of the History of Infant Baptism, who was a member of the Church of England, and who wrote about 180 years ago, plainly teaches that dipping, by the time of the later years of Queen Elizabeth, had very generally gone out of use, and that sprinkling had taken its place. I have heard it said a number of times that King James' translators were immersionists. There never was a greater mistake. They were not. It is a well-established fact that sprinkling had come into general use about that time. About 1311 the first decree was issued making sprinkling or immersion optional with the administrator, and by 1500 sprinkling had come into very general use in England; and in 1611, when King James' translation was made, it is a matter of history that very few dippings took place. In the ritual of the Church immersion was retained; in practice it was dropped. These things understood, Campbell's statements are seen to be perfectly harmonious with themselves, and with the truth.

Now, with respect to the clean water of Ezekiel: We agree that under Judaism water unmixed was never sprinkled by authority of God. I have called attention to Ezekiel's prophecy, "I will sprinkle clean water upon you." Mr. Wilkinson claims that that was a reference to future times when God in the fullness of time would draw the people to Himself through Christ. I deny that. I claim that that was a prophecy delivered by Ezekiel, when in captivity in Babylon, in which he prophesied that God would restore the Jews to their native land, and then He would sprinkle this clean water upon them. But did you not say that clean water was never sprinkled upon anybody under Judaism? I said water unmixed was never sprinkled; it was always mixed with ashes, or something else. But does not this passage speak of clean water? Yes, but remember that the ashes of a red heifer and running water, mixed, formed what is called in the Bible "the water of separation," "a purification for sin." This "water of separation," on account of its cleansing efficacy, is called here by the prophet "clean water." When the deliverance of the

Jews had come, when they had been *separated* from their idolatry, and from the idolatrous people among whom they had been scattered, it was necessary that the water of separation should be sprinkled upon them, to cleanse them from their ceremonial defilements. This is the clean water of Ezekiel. Mr. Wilkinson did not know that that prophecy was delivered before the return of the Jews under Zerubbabel, as he said he did not believe that they would ever be brought back to their native land. Then I called his attention to the fact that fifty-one years after the prophecy was delivered they did come back to their native land, and the walls of Jerusalem were rebuilt; and sixty years after that Nehemiah came back and the temple was rebuilt; all this was 500 B.C. He did not know that before. Not only is he ignorant of Greek lexicons, but he is ignorant of the common history of the Bible. When I quoted that passage from Ezekiel, and said it was a prophecy concerning the children of Israel being brought back to their native land, some of the audience expressed their dissent. I turned to the passage and read it. You can read it when you go home. God told them that because they had disobeyed His law He had scattered them among the nations, but in His own time He would bring them back to their native land, and their cities would be rebuilt and their lands made fruitful. Then He would sprinkle the clean water, the water of separation, upon them and they should be clean, "From all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you," said He. Remember this water is typical of the blood of Christ, with which no one is ever said to be baptized.

With respect to the Red Sea baptism, Mr. Wilkinson asked me another question; he wants to know if the cloud was over them while they were in the sea; if it did not pass over them before they entered the sea. X like to answer his questions, and to give him information, for I see he needs it badly. For a reply to his question let him consider the following passage: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that 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." 1 Cor. 10: 1, '2. Paul says they were under the cloud, and passed through the sea, and were baptized unto Moses "*in the cloud and in the .sea.*" Now, it is evident that if they were under the cloud at one time, and passed through the sea at another time, there would have been two baptisms—one in the cloud, **and** another in the sea. But no one holds that there were two baptisms here: all agree that the Israelites were baptized but once

"unto Moses." Hence, it follows that while they were in the sea the cloud was over them: they were buried in the cloud and sea. It was not a baptism in the cloud; nor was it a baptism in the sea: both cloud and sea were required in the performance of the baptism. It seems to me that even a blind man could see this; but there are none so blind as those who will not see.

Just here Mr. Wilkinson takes occasion to say again that there is more in baptism than mere dipping. Certainly. No one supposes that *Christian* baptism is a *mere* dipping! As Tertullian says: "Of baptism itself there is a bodily act, that we are immersed in water; a spiritual effect, that we are freed from sin." As Peter expresses it (Acts 2: 38): "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." "Yes," says my opponent, "a spiritual effect;" that is what I have been claiming all the time." Yes; and there is a bodily act, and that is what I have been talking about. Christ attends to the spiritual effect. He forgives sins; He gives the Holy Ghost. It is our business to attend to the bodily act. When Jesus commanded His apostles to preach the Gospel to the people, and to baptize those that believed it, it was the bodily act that was expressed by the word baptize. When Peter told the people to "repent and be baptized," it was the bodily act he wanted them to submit to: he assured them that the spiritual effect would follow. Nobody denies a "spiritual effect;" but the question to be settled by this debate is, What is the bodily act?

But, as Mr. Wilkinson talks much about water baptism symbolizing the washing of the soul by the Holy Spirit, I will call your attention briefly to the impartation of the Holy Spirit. The Gospel rule is that the Spirit is given after baptism in water—not before. To this rule there has been but one exception since Christian baptism was instituted. This exceptional and peculiar case was also miraculous, and therefore not an example for all time. Observe the rule: After Christ came up from the waters of baptism He received the Holy Spirit, which descended upon Him in the form of a dove; the apostles received the Spirit after their baptism; the three thousand, on the day of Pentecost, received the Spirit after their baptism—they were told to repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins, and they were promised that they should receive the Spirit. Philip preached at the city of Samaria—(see Acts 8: 5-17)—and multitudes both of men and women believed his preaching, and were baptized, and afterwards received the Holy Spirit. There were a number of

men—about twelve—at Ephesus, who had been baptized by the baptism of John, whom Paul instructed in the way of the Lord more perfectly, and then baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus, to whom the Spirit was then given, upon the laying on them of the hands of Paul. So in every case of the impartation of the Spirit: whether it was the ordinary gift, or a miraculous manifestation, it was preceded by baptism in water, barring the one exception already referred to. I mention this matter, although it has nothing to do with the action of baptism, because Mr. Wilkinson has been talking about it. If he wants to debate the question of the Spirit's work, let him get his brethren to endorse him. My brethren will endorse me, and we will discuss it next week, or whenever it suits him.

My friend refers to another irrelevant question—to "nude immersion." I am not going to say much about that matter. I do not think it should have been introduced. I grant you that people were immersed while naked. Ladies went into the baths with deaconesses, and they were taken into the water up to the neck. Then the officiating minister came in, placed their heads under water, and turned and went out. Then they were brought out by the deaconesses, who were, of course, women. I would not have referred to that fact if Mr. Wilkinson had not brought it up, not to prove anything that I can see, but simply to ridicule an institution that, as I understand it, Christ gave to His disciples. There is no argument in it one way or the other. Though, if there is any force in it so far as this question is concerned, it is in favor of immersion. So at least thinks Moses Stuart, the great Presbyterian. I read from him as follows: "Still, say what we may concerning it in a moral point of view, the argument to be deduced from it, in respect to immersion, is not at all diminished. Nay, it is strengthened. For if such a violation of decency was submitted to in order that baptism might be performed as the Church thought it should be, it argues that baptizing by immersion was considered as a rite not to be dispensed with."—*Stuart On Baptism*, p. 151. I do not make that argument, but Stuart, as great a Presbyterian as ever lived on this continent, does.

Now I come again to that midnight baptism of the jailer. (I am following my notes on Mr. Wilkinson's speech.) It is an undoubted fact, that we have a host of passages, in and out of the Scriptures, clear and strong, teaching immersion. What my friend wants to find is one case where immersion could not have been performed. He goes to this case of the jailer: the jailer was baptized in the house, he thinks, and therefore could not have been immersed. A careful

reading of the passage, however, clearly shows that he was taken out of the house. Hence, instead of an argument in his favor, it proves to be a boomerang, which comes back and destroys him. Why should he have gone out with his prisoners and family unless it was to be immersed? Would he have gone out with all these simply to be sprinkled?

My friend, in the next place, commented at some length on the midnight baptism of Judith; though why he did so is a mystery, seeing that every point that can be made from it is altogether against him. The case is recorded in the apocryphal book Judith. This Jewish lady desired to betray the Assyrians into the hands of her own people: and so, professing to be a deserter, she entered into the camp of Holofernes, their general. Her stratagem succeeded; she was kindly received. She claimed to be a prophetess, and to have been sent to the Assyrians by the Lord. On account of her wonderful beauty, her attractive manners, and great wisdom, she was fully believed by Holofernes and his men. She was accompanied by a maid-servant. She requested the privilege to go out by night to pray to God that she might receive revelations from Him. Her real object in thus going out was to cleanse herself according to the Jewish customs. (See Judith, chapters 11 and 12.) Verse 7 of chapter 12 reads thus: "Then Holofernes commanded his guard that they should not stay her. Thus she abode in the camp three days, and went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia, and washed (*baptizo*) herself in a fountain of water by the camp." Then, it is said, "she came in clean." What did she go out, at midnight, into the valley of Bethulia for?—to sprinkle herself with three or four drops of water? She went out, at midnight, into a valley, to a fountain of water, and *baptized* herself. The Greek verb used to indicate what she did is *baptizo*. My friend would have you believe that she did all this to sprinkle herself. He must think you are credulous, indeed! The word rendered "valley" means a ravine, or chasm. On Jewish bathings the great Rabbi Maimonides says: "Wherever, in the law, washing of the flesh, or of the clothes is mentioned, it means nothing else than dipping the whole body in a laver; for if a man dips himself all over except the tip of his little linger, he is still in his uncleanness." And again, he says: "Every one that is baptized [upon coming from the market] must immerse the whole body." This Maimonides is regarded by the Jews as one of the greatest of their race. They consider him inferior only to Moses. They call him *The Doctor, The Great Eagle, The Glory of the West, The Light of the East*. [See *Encyclopaedia Americana*.]

Mr. Wilkinson gets back to *taval*, the Hebrew for *baptizo*. You remember I quoted Kleeburg as to its meaning; you have now heard also the testimony of Maimonides. In addition to these Jewish teachers, consider the following:—

Robinsons Gesenius' Heb. Lex., p. 364: "*Taval*, to dip, to dip in, to immerse, to dip or immerse one's self. Example: 2 Kings 5: 14, *He went down and dipped himself seven times in Jordan.*"

Parkhurst, p. 255: "*Taval*, 1. To dip, immerse, plunge; 2. To tinge or die with a certain color, which is usually performed by *dipping.*"

Robertson's Heb. Dict., by Joseph, p. Ill: "*Taval*, 1. He dipped; 2. He was dipped."

Stokius' Vet. Test., Vol. I., p. 421: "*Taval*, dip, dip in, immerse, submerge."

Schleusuer, Art. Baptizo, defines *taval*, in defining *baptizo*, thus: "To immerse, dip, plunge into water, from *bapto*, and corresponds to the Hebrew *taval.*"

Davidson's Heb. Lex.: "*Taval*, 1 To dip, to immerse; 2. To stain."

Buxtorf's Heb. Lex.: "*Taval*, to dip, to dip into, to submerge, to immerse."

(See *Brent's Gospel Plan of Salvation*, pp. 302, 303.)

But, above all, as to the meaning of this Hebrew word which expresses the action of baptism, remember it occurs fifteen times in the Old Testament, and is translated in our common version "dip" fourteen times, and "plunge" once. This gives you to understand what King James' translators, who, as we have seen, were sprinklers, thought of its meaning.

Mr. Wilkinson thinks "it is a superstitious and contemptible notion" that the Spirit fills a man's body and surrounds his soul. The apostles were endued with power from on high when they received the Spirit; and *end no*, says Dr. Ditzler, means immerse—it means to be "clothed upon." The Christian is said to be "in the Spirit." The body is represented as being the dwelling-place of both the human spirit and the Holy Spirit, by the apostle Paul. I am free to confess that I do not understand how a Divine person can be in a man's body—how the man can be immersed in Him; but it is not more incomprehensible than that a Divine person should be "poured out" or "shed forth" upon a man. I don't understand either; I believe both.

Mr. Wilkinson understood me to admit that some foreign lexicons define *baptizo* by words that are equivalents of sprinkle, and merely to deny that these words were given as the *first* meaning. He is very

much mistaken; I made no such admission. What I did say is this: No lexicon which defines Greek into another tongue, whether Latin, German, French, Italian, or any other tongue, defines *baptizo* by a word whose first meaning is to sprinkle. In getting the meanings of definitions, the common and most known significations must always be taken, since there can be nothing in the context to forbid. In no lexicon known to me is a word used to define *baptizo*, whose first—that is, whose common and most known—meaning is to sprinkle. I know a German lexicon, that of Passou, by Host and Palm, which, after defining *baptizo* "to dip in, to immerse" gives, as a derived or consequential meaning, in a few cases, a word whose first meaning is "to water;" this word (*begiessen*) sometimes means to sprinkle, seeing that things are sometimes watered by being sprinkled. But does this show that *baptizo* means to sprinkle? As I have already said, in exactly the same way I can show that "dip" means "sprinkle;" for all the leading English dictionaries, as Webster's, Worcester's, Walker's, etc., give to wet as a definition of *dip*, as a consequential meaning, in a few cases; but you can wet a thing by sprinkling it; therefore, I suppose, to dip means to sprinkle! It certainly does, just as much as *baptizo* means to sprinkle.

[Time expired.]

MR. WILKINSON'S TENTH REPLY.

With respect to the translators of King James' version not being immersionists, I told you in my former speech, and I read from Alexander Campbell's book, p. 140, to prove it, that according to the liturgy of the Church of England about the time the translation was made, the priest was required to take a child and dip it three times in water.

It appears from another quotation from Alexander Campbell that they did not dip but they sprinkled. Is it not a somewhat singular coincidence, that the Church whose chief mode was sprinkling should have prescribed in its liturgy that the priest should dip the children? If there was any excuse for sprinkling at all, one would naturally suppose it would have been valid in the case of infants; for if anybody could have been excused from being put under the water it was infants, and if sprinkling would apply anywhere, you would think it would

apply to little children; yet the liturgy refers to little children as being dipped. "The priest," (not *may* but) "*shall [in naming the child] dip it in water thrice*. First, dipping the right side: second, the left side. The third time dipping the face toward the font. So that it be discreetly and warily done. And if the child be weak, (showing that sprinkling is to apply to the weak, and surely the children are weaker than adults), it shall suffice to pour water upon it, saying the prescribed words." I quote from *Baptizein*, by Dr. Conant. Besides, you will remember that in the quotations I read from Campbell he says: "The translators of the common version were all, or nearly all, genuine Episcopalians, *and at the very time they made the version, were accustomed to use a liturgy which made it the minister's duty, in the sacrament of baptism, 'to take the child and dip it in the water contained in the font.'*" Also that they "*on no occasion favored the innovation of sprinkling by any rendering, or note marginal, in that translation*" According to this, their leaching and practice must have disagreed. I leave my opponent to harmonize Campbell with himself. With respect to the clean water of Ezekiel: I certainly understood my opponent to say that the sprinkling mentioned by Ezekiel referred to the future restoration of the Jews. Now he says it refers to a restoration that took place 500 years B.C., and that this blessed promise which God makes through Ezekiel, that He would sprinkle clean water upon them and cleanse them from all iniquity, did not mean clean water but water mixed with blood and ashes, the water of separation. It was something surprising to me to learn that the water mentioned by Ezekiel was the water with blood and ashes put into it away back 1500 years B.C. Then it appears that that was nothing new; it was only a promise that He would do the same thing He had been doing all along. That water of separation, which my opponent has read about so often, when it was sprinkled upon the people to make them clean, had to be washed off before they were *pronounced* clean, because it made them also unclean, That was the bathing that took place after the sprinkling of the water of purification. He tells you it was clean water. I am glad he acknowledges it was a type of sprinkling of the blood of Christ, because that is baptism; consequently the sprinkling of the clean water by Ezekiel was also a baptism—though it was a sprinkling and not an immersion—and therefore out of his own mouth he has been confounded, and out of his own mouth he stands defeated on the question that Christian baptism is immersion and that in it there *must be* a burial in water. There is no burial in these instances. I will give you two or three

testimonies of the early fathers, who, my opponent says, were all immersionists.

I quote from Jerome V. 341, 342. Commenting on Ezek. 36: 25, he paraphrases the passage thus:

"And I will pour out (or sprinkle) upon you clean water ... so that upon the believing and those converted I will pour out the clean water of saving baptism, and will cleanse them from their abominations, and from all their errors, with which they have been possessed, and I will give them a new heart, that they may believe upon the Son of God, and a new spirit, of which David speaks: Create in me a clean heart and renew a right spirit within me, (Psalms 50: 21). And it is to be observed, that a new heart and a new spirit may be given *by the pouring or sprinkling of water.*" Let it be observed that St. Jerome calls this the clean water of saving "baptism," though it was to be *sprinkled*. Hence, according to Jerome, water that was sprinkled baptized. Yet he is claimed as an immersionist.

Hilary I., 238, says, "But sprinkling according to the law was the cleansing of sin, through faith purifying the people by the sprinkling of blood, (Psa. 50: 9); a sacrament of the future sprinkling by the blood of the Lord, faith, meanwhile, supplementing the blood of the legal sacrifice."

Didymus Alexandrinus, 713, says, "And the very image of baptism both continually illuminated and saved Israel at that time—as Paul wrote (1 Cor. 10:1, 2); and as prophesied Ezek. 36:25, 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean from your sins;' and David (Psa. 50: 9): 'Sprinkle me with hyssop and I shall be clean.'" Then, according to this author, water sprinkled was "the very image of baptism," though he is claimed as an immersionist.

Cyril of Jerusalem, 418, says, "Thou seest the power of baptism.—Be of good courage, O Jerusalem, the Lord will wash away all thy iniquities. The Lord will wash away the uncleanness of His sons and daughters by the spirit of judgment and the spirit of burning. He will sprinkle upon you clean water, and ye shall be purified from all your sins." According to this father, "the power of baptism" is seen in the cleansing away of sin by the sprinkling of clean water.

Cyprian says, 1082, "But it is necessary that the water be first purified and sanctified by the priest, that it may be able by its own baptism to wipe off the sins of the baptized man. And through Ezekiel, the prophet, the Lord says: 'And I will sprinkle you with pure water.'" Here this illustrious father, who lived only a little over a century after the death of John, clearly identifies the purification of the soul from sin by sprinkling the clean water, with baptism.

He says, 1148, "Whence it appears that the sprinkling of water, also, like the saving washing, obtains divine grace."

Thus these early, so called, immersionist fathers of the Church all testify that sprinkling clean water was typical of Christian baptism, because it was said to cleanse, showing that it was the effect, and not the mode of action, that they regarded as baptism.

My opponent has tried several times to prove that it was the subsequent bathing after the sprinkling of the water of separation that constituted the baptism; and as, of course, a bathing must involve complete immersion, according to his teachings he cannot wash the dirt off himself without getting under the water.

With respect to the Israelites' baptism: My friend adopts the old motto, "Any port in a storm." If the Israelites were baptized at two different times, once in the cloud and afterwards in the sea, he says, there must have been two baptisms. Unfortunately for himself he said it took both to make one, and so it does not matter much whether the half was before they entered the sea and the other half afterwards, or both while they were in the sea, the two halves are put together and my opponent gets one baptism. He has relieved me of the responsibility of proving there were not two. I appeal to the record in the 14th chapter of Exodus. It distinctly says, as plainly as the English language can speak, and it is speaking of the time before the sea was divided, before Moses stretched out his hand, before the passage was opened for them to go through the sea:

"And the angel of the Lord which went before the camp of Israel removed and went behind them; and the pillar of the cloud went from before their face and stood behind them: and it came between the camp of the Egyptians and the camp of Israel; and it was a cloud and darkness to them, but it gave light by night to these." So the cloud passed from before them and went behind them, before they entered the sea. It went over them, but I do not know whether it swept along the ground or not; I only know that they were "under the cloud" as it was passing over them, and after it got behind them they went through the sea. No man can get out of this dilemma. Hence the proposition that baptism, in this instance, is immersion is simply a proposition that cannot be proved. It will never be proved while grass grows and water runs. With respect to his reference to my statement that the effect produced was the baptism, according to the early fathers, I know Tertullian said that it was the effect produced while under the water that he called baptism. My opponent admits now that the effect was a baptism, hence the dipping was not

the baptism. Accordingly dipping is not Christian baptism, for dipping is merely the act by which the effect is produced. Therefore dipping is not the equivalent of baptism, according to his own admission. Therefore his proposition, according to his own admission, is foundationless. He said the effect was a baptism; consequently the act which produces the effect cannot be the baptism, else there must be two baptisms, as in the case of the Israelites. In this case he says it takes two to make one, and he has to put them together to make one baptism, therefore my exposition this afternoon is recognized as correct. It is acknowledged by my opponent, and he cannot escape from the unpleasant dilemma. It is no pleasure to squeeze a man against the face of invincible truth, but when he takes a false position I have either to squeeze the man or sacrifice the truth, and so here goes the squeeze.

To further establish the idea that the Spirit was communicated after the water was administered, my opponent says that Christ received the Spirit after he came up out of the water. Now, He never came up out of the water, according to the correct rendering of the word. Look at the revised version. It says "came up *from* the water." The translators with one accord translated it "from." Christ never came up "out of" the water as far as the correct rendering of the Greek shows. In the case mentioned in Acts 8th chapter, was it after baptism that the Spirit came upon the people? Was it after or before baptism that the Spirit came upon Cornelius? It was when Peter saw the Spirit descending on those to whom he had preached the Word that he said, "Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" Was the Spirit given before or after the baptism? When we come to discuss the interesting question of the Divine Spirit how shall we get along with this passage? *

He has admitted that ladies were baptized in a state of nudity, but says that deaconesses attended them, and that Dr. Stuart argued that this was a strong point in favor of immersion. It was a strong point in favor of my contention, that the superstition at the bottom of the whole immersion fabric was that people thought they could not get their sins forgiven unless they were put under water, every inch of them, in order that the Spirit could get at them at every point, and be soaked in at every pore. If he will father the superstition then he can argue

* My opponent, in re-writing his speeches for this work, has anticipated this objection. He did not do this in the debate, according to the reporter's MS, with which my recollection of the matter harmonizes.—T. L. W.

on consistent ground for that kind of immersion, otherwise he cannot.

Now about the jailer: My opponent admits that he could have washed the apostles' stripes in the house, but he says he must have taken them out to be baptized by them, and that as a matter of fact he did take them out. If he took them out it was either to be baptized by them or to wash their stripes. The record says "he took them the same hour of the night and washed their stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." Was it necessary that he should take them out to a river to wash their stripes? He admits it was not. Yet, according to this record, he took them out, if he took them out at all, for both purposes. There is the same evidence exactly that he took them out to a river to wash their stripes as that he took them out to be baptized; and if it is not necessary to assume that he took them out to some river to wash their stripes, neither is it necessary to assume that he took them out to some river to be baptized. It is the exigencies of my opponent's theory which demand this interpretation, but not the rules of a sound exegesis. His argument from this passage, therefore, is based on a mere assumption. Is it reasonable, however, that this jailer took these prisoners out of the prison, at the midnight hour, in contravention of law, either to wash their stripes or baptize them? I hope my opponent will answer this question and not raise side issues, and dodge the real objection under the cloak of something of his own imagining.

Now as to Judith. I read from Dr. Conant, who is an immersionist and an able scholar, and a very honest man, but he is not infallible. I read from his version, and he says she went forth in the night into the valley of Bethulia and baptized herself *IN* the camp *AT* the fountain. He tried to get her outside the camp, to some remote river, like the jailer, in order to perform an immersion. I really cannot swallow anything so preposterous as this. The idea of taking the jailer and his whole family, a father and mother, I suppose, and one would naturally infer, some children,—but perhaps they had an old bachelor as a jailer—out at midnight to be baptized is absurd, and the idea of Judith having immersed herself in the drinking fountain in the camp is, if possible, still more so.

With respect to the washings of the priests. My opponent says they washed *in* the laver. Josephus says they washed their hands and sprinkled their feet *at* the laver. In John 2: 6 we read:

"And there were set there six waterpots of stone after the manner of the purifying of the Jews."

I suppose, according to that Rabbi mentioned by my opponent, every time they came in from the market, and every time they had to take a ceremonial washing, they had to do it as the ancients did: the women had to go into some place by themselves and dip, and the men into some other place and dip. But on this occasion there were six waterpots in the room where the guests were, and I suppose they had to dip over head and ears in these waterpots. But Christ told them to bring in water and fill up the pots. I will guarantee there was not water in all sufficient to get in and jump clear under. Yet Christ converted the entire contents of these waterpots into wine after the people had been washing and bathing all over in them! Pshaw! Talk about indecency! Call shame at me! Is not that a nice piece of propriety among people noted for their cleanliness? Yet they got their wine right out of the washpots! I will not call them by any worse name, but they must have been washpots if the people got in to dip themselves all over; and then, according to the theory I combat, they were afterwards turned into wine vessels and they drank wine out of them. I am glad I was not there.

I will now quote two or three authorities with respect to the meaning of the word *tabal*. Rabbi Fürst, "the latest and most scientific Hebraist that has lived for ages," and whose lexicon is said to be "the greatest Hebrew lexicon ever yet produced," gives: "*Tabal*, to moisten, to wet, to sprinkle; to immerse. The root is *bal*. Compare the words derived from the same root with kindred meanings—to flow, drop down, pour, pour water on, stream forth, sprinkle."

In his later lexicon, where he brings out all the results of his labors, 1867, this distinguished Jewish professor of Leipzig thus defines *tabal*, the Hebrew word rendered *baptizo* by the Seventy: "To moisten, to sprinkle, *rigare*, *tingere*; therefore to dip, to immerse. . . . The fundamental signification of the stem is to moisten, to besprinkle." (Quoted from Dr. Ditzler.) Dr. Young, the author of the great Analytical Concordance, gives "to moisten, besprinkle." I dare my opponent to read from Liddell and Scott the meaning of *molunein*. It is the Greek word by which *tabal* is translated in Gen. 37: 31, where Joseph's coat is said to have been "dipped" in the blood of the kid, and *taval* is the word used to describe Naaman's baptism in Jordan.

If the seventy scholars who translated the Hebrew intended to convey the same idea in the translation in both places, even though they used two separate words, they must have used words of similar import. If my opponent will tell us what is the import of *molunein*

as given in Liddell and Scott, we shall have some idea of the word in Naaman's case. I have told you it means to sprinkle, and Liddell and Scott gives a similar definition.

I could give you other authorities in the same line, but I forbear.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. HARDING'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.

I want to commence my last speech by calling attention to a blunder which is the greatest my friend has made yet, and that is saying no little. I asked him the other day if he had read up the revised version. He said he had not. I advised him to do it. If he had done so he would have saved himself from the remarks I feel constrained to make. I have laid great stress on the fact that Jesus, after He was baptized, came "*up out of*" the water. Mr. Wilkinson, in his last speech, said, "He never came up out of the water, according to the correct rendering of the word." Then he added that the revised version says, "came *up from* the water." Let him turn to the first chapter of Mark, and he will read as follows:

MR. WILKINSON—I quoted from the 3rd of Matthew.

MR. HARDING—Cannot Mark tell the truth as well as Matthew? Is not the Gospel of Mark found in the revised version? The truth is, I doubt not, my opponent did not know what Mark says, according to the revised version. Perhaps he has not read this version further than the 3rd chapter of Matthew. I read from Mark 1:9, 10, "And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth in Galilee, and was baptized of John in the Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, He saw the Heavens rent asunder, and the Spirit as a dove descending upon Him." There it seems Christ came out of the water. My friend did not say that he was quoting from Matthew, or from whom he was quoting, but stated simply that the revised version did not say that Christ came up out of the water.

You remember he told us that Liddell and Scott's is the only Greek-English lexicon; that all other Greek lexicons define in Latin, and other tongues; he said that blood was *in the* water of separation, and intimated that the bathing which always followed the sprinkling was to wash it off; and now he tells us the revised version does not say that Christ came "up out of" the water: but he can raise a laugh,

with his "Hi diddle diddle" poetry, among those that enjoy that kind of literature, no matter how little he may know about the lexicons, or the Bible.

He said that the Greek preposition translated *out of* is *apo*; in Mark it is *ek*. Let him refer to the Greek. I do not believe he can read Greek. If there is any one here who can, let him come forward and read this passage.

MR. WILKINSON—Right here.

(Mr. Harding handed him the Greek Testament to read the clause in dispute, which he did).

MR. HARDING—I had it marked upon the margin, or I doubt if he could have found the place. You see the preposition is *ek* (out of) as I said, not *apo* (from) as he claimed, in the revised Greek text. Mark says He came up out of the water, Matthew says He came up from the water; both tell the truth; for when Jesus had come up *out of* the river, He then came up *from* its brink; of course He did not stay down at its edge forever.

Now let us consider *molunein*, about which my friend talked so much this evening. The word means to stain. In Gen. 37: 31, telling of Joseph's coat, it is said they "dipped the coat in the blood;" "dip" in this passage in the Hebrew is *taval*, in the Greek is *moluno*. *Baptizo* is not connected with the passage in any way. But as *taval* is translated by *moluno*, at this place, and by *baptizo*, in the case of Naaman, he would have us believe that *moluno* is equal to *baptizo*. Here is his argument: *Taval* is rendered by *moluno*; *moluno* means to stain; you can stain by sprinkling; therefore *taval* means to sprinkle: but *taval*, in another place is rendered by *baptizo*; therefore *baptizo* means to sprinkle. As I have said, by the same argument exactly you can show that "dip" means "to sprinkle;" it is done thus: One definition of dip is "to wet;" you can wet by sprinkling; therefore to dip is to sprinkle. What proves too much proves nothing.

My friend dared me to read Liddell and Scott's definition of *moluno*. When I went home I looked through my eight lexicons for the meaning of the word; I have three of them lying here on the table; every one of them gives such a definition as this: *Moluno, properly, to stain, sully; to defile, contaminate morally.*" *T. S. Green's New Testament Lexicon*, p. 120.

Robinson's Lexicon gives, "To soil, to stain, to defile." Liddell and Scott define it, "To stain, sully, defile." And then they quote the words "*molunein aleuro*," and translate them "*to sprinkle with flour.*" Liddell and Scott do not give sprinkle as a definition, but they quote a

passage in which it occurs, and translate the passage "to sprinkle with flour."

MR. WILKINSON—As ashes and blood.

MR. HARDING—My friend is again blundering about that water of separation. No blood was put into it; it was ashes and water. If you put ashes into water, they settle to the bottom; and when the water is sprinkled upon one, there is nothing to wash off.

My opponent has intimated that I believe that the Jews dipped in the waterpots, the contents of which Christ converted into wine. I never believed any such thing. I don't know why he brought the matter up, unless it was that he might have an opportunity to exercise his peculiar talent for saying vulgar, indecent things. Dr. Kleeburg says, "Before eating" the Jews washed; this washing was often done by having the water poured upon the hands; for this purpose the waterpots were there. These are Kleeburg's words: "Before eating, and prayer, and after rising in the morning, they washed; when they have become unclean they must immerse." In the revised version, Mark 7: 3, 4 reads thus: "For the Pharisees, and all the Jews, except they wash (*Gr. nipto*) their hands diligently (marg. or, *up to the elbow*) eat not, holding the tradition of the elders, and when they come from the market place, except they wash (*Gr. baptizo*) themselves, they eat not." That is, if you will allow me to coin a word, ordinarily they *niptize* their hands before eating; but when they are denied, they *baptize* themselves. This statement of Mark harmonizes perfectly with what Dr. Kleeburg says. I never thought nor intimated that the waterpots were used to bathe in; and my opponent had no reason for making the speech that he did about it, except that it furnished him an opportunity for raising a laugh by saying things that are not nice. I have not endeavored to equal him in a conflict of that kind. I could go out to one of these whiskey or beer saloons, and hire a man for fifty cents, I have no doubt, who could even equal Mr. Wilkinson in saying indecent, unkind things; but I do not want to enter into a contest of that sort.

MR. WILKINSON—You do not need to hire anybody. You can do your own dirty work, and do it well.

MR. HARDING—I am glad to know that I am not regarded as at all equal to my friend at that sort of work.

Mr. Wilkinson calls attention to the fact that the liturgy of the Church of England, in the time of King James, required the children to be dipped. Yes, except when the child was weakly, it did. But they did not *live* up to their liturgy; first in order is the change in

practice; then the change in the creed; for about five hundred years the paedo-baptist churches have been drifting more and more from immersion, but none of them that I know of have gotten dip or immerse out of their creeds entirely, except Mr. Wilkinson's branch of the Methodists; they have gotten rid of the *word*, but not of the *thing*. All the liturgies of all the paedo-baptist churches that I know of require their ministers to immerse, as well as to sprinkle, or to pour. But this part of his creed my opponent despises, and he will not follow it. So it was with many ministers in the days of King James.

With respect to the authorities quoted on Ezekiel's prophecy, I have this to say: The sprinkling was understood by these fathers, as I understand them, to refer to the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, which they believed to be received in baptism. They believed the proper act of baptism to be immersion, and so they practiced, with rare exceptions, as I have abundantly shown. But as years passed on, they favored affusion, at first, and then aspersion, more and more. It was not long, then, till they began to try to defend these last practices from the Bible.

Mr. Wilkinson spoke about Josephus, and represented him as saying that the priests, before going into the temple, washed their hands and sprinkled their feet. Well, it is a fact, clearly expressed in the Bible, that in their regular daily ministrations, before going into the temple, they washed their hands and feet at the brazen sea, as is explained in 2 Chron. 4: 6. The word which expresses this washing is *nipto*. But it is also true that at the first consecration of the priests, they themselves were washed at the door of the tabernacle. The word that expresses this washing is *louo*. If these two washings are the same, why are two different words used to express them? Daily they *niptized* their hands and feet; but in being made priests they *were baptized* themselves. A significant difference!

But Mr. Wilkinson denies that in washing the body the Jews dipped. I quoted Maimonides, the most noted Jewish teacher who has lived since the days of inspiration. He says the washings of the body were immersion. So testifies Rabbi Kleeburg. So teaches the Jewish translator Leeser. As to *taval*, which is used to tell how Naaman obeyed the command to wash (*louo*) himself, all the lexicons say it means to dip; none say it means to sprinkle (but one); and in our common version, it is translated dip, or plunge, every time—fifteen times.

I desire now to devote the time that remains to me to summing up the matters brought out in the course of the debate. I was to prove

that "Christian baptism is immersion; in it there must be a burial in water." The Bible teaches us that there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism." This one baptism is the baptism *in water* of a penitent believer, in the name of Jesus Christ,— a physical act,—which act, according to the Gospel rule, is followed by the forgiveness of sins, and the reception of the Holy Spirit,—a spiritual effect, or result. But the baptism is one. Jesus commanded His disciples to baptize the people; they did baptize them—many thousands of them. What did Jesus want them to do? what act did they perform? were the questions to be settled by this discussion. We searched through the lexicons for the meaning of the word; all of them gave dip, immerse, as the primary and most known meaning of it; none define it to sprinkle. The Church historians all say that the ancient Church immersed. The encyclopaedias give a full history of the rite; they tell us that immersion was almost universally practiced for thirteen hundred years, and that sprinkling came in gradually, in spite of great opposition.

As all scholars, even Mr. Wilkinson himself, testify that *baptizo*, in classic Greek, means to immerse, definitely to immerse, we turn to the Bible to see if there is anything in its use in the divine book to indicate that it has a different meaning there. We find it but once in the Old Testament, and there it is rendered dip—Naaman dipped himself seven times in the river Jordan. In the New Testament we find them going to the water to attend to baptisms—to this same river Jordan in which Naaman dipped himself, they go down into the water; after the baptism they come up out of the water; in the baptism it is said they were buried, raised to walk in newness of life, and their *bodies* were washed. Jesus was baptized "*into the Jordan*" as Dr. Robinson properly translates Mark 1: 9, which translation the revised version shows, in a marginal note at this place, to be correct. When the refined and beautiful Judith would baptize herself, she goes out at midnight into a valley; a very sensible thing for her to do, as baptism is an immersion, but the perfection of folly were it only a sprinkling of a few drops of water. The jailer, with his whole family, and some prisoners, goes out at midnight to be baptized—of course not merely to have a little water sprinkled on him—that could have been done in the house. All of these facts, instead of influencing us to look for a new meaning for this old word, that had meant immerse time out of mind, serve to emphasize and enforce its old, common, and most known meaning.

But my friend thinks it would have been awful for Judith to have

bathed herself in the stream or fountain which the army used for drinking water. Why not? The people of Louisville, Cincinnati, Pittsburg, and a hundred other towns, empty their sewerage into the Ohio river, as well as bathe in it, and then drink from its waters. We bathe in the waters of this bay, and then drink of them when we travel in a boat.

When we consider the "baptism in the Holy Ghost," we find that those baptized were represented afterwards as being "in the Spirit" "endued" or "clothed upon" by the Spirit; and the greatest Methodist debater on this continent tells us this word *endue* (*enduo*) means definitely to immerse, and others tell us that in Rom. 3: 4 "spiritual baptism" is referred to; if so it is a burial, and water baptism, in order to represent it, which they claim it must do, must be a burial too. All scholars, with scarcely a dissenting voice tell us that the apostle, in Rom. 6: 4, refers to immersion—"the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." But Mr. Wilkinson says I got my argument from *enduo* from my old friend and classmate, Mr. McDairmid, office-editor of the *Standard*. I have not read his and Mr. Watson's debate, though I have intended to; I have doubtless missed much in not doing so. Mr. Wilkinson seems to want to debate with Mr. McDairmid—I suppose, because he is not here. He is tired of what he has on hand, and would like a change.

MR. WILKINSON—I want to meet both of you.

MR. HARDING—We will see how ready you are to go on, when these six days are over. I delight in debating, because I can speak to so many that I cannot reach in any other way, and I am prepared to go on as long as you please. If you want to discuss another proposition, we will go on next week.

Now, my friends, you have the case before you. What do you propose to do about it? This is a grave matter, in settling it, a question of obedience to Jesus Christ is involved. Do you want to be certain that you are building on the rock, the rock of everlasting truth? There is a clear road before you. Choose that which is right, certainly right, which all admit to be right, in preference to that which at the best is but doubtful, and which many of the wisest and best of men positively affirm to be wrong. Even Mr. Wilkinson's own Discipline teaches that immersion is proper; it allows sprinkling, pouring and "another mode." All the creeds of all the Churches teach immersion. But, above all, in being immersed you can walk in the footsteps of Jesus and his holy apostles every step of the way. If you go to the water, so did Jesus; if you go to much water, so did He; if you go

down into the water, so did Jesus, so did Philip and the eunuch; when you come up out of the water, you are still following them, for so did they; if you are buried in baptism, so was Paul, so were the Romans, and so were the Colossians; then you can join Paul and the Hebrew Christians in saying: I have had my heart "sprinkled from an evil conscience," and my body "washed with pure water." What do you say, my friends, what do you say? Will you build upon the rock of truth—the very words and deeds of Jesus and His apostles, or upon the sandy foundation of doubt?

Why, the only definition Mr. Wilkinson is willing to give to the word is immerse. He gave that in the beginning of the debate, and has stuck to it to the end. In the classics, he says, it means to put under water. At first he said he would not tell what it means in the New Testament; but when I insisted that we ought to give the people all the light that we have, that we ought to explain the words about which we are debating, and, above all, when I intimated that he was afraid to tell the meaning, he said it means to purify religiously; but, unfortunately for his consistency, he had said before that it did not mean to purify. Verily, "the legs of the lame are not equal;" and the "way of the transgressor is hard."

What did Christ mean by *baptizo*? What did John do in the Jordan? What ought you to do? My friends, I leave you to answer the question.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKINSON'S ELEVENTH REPLY.

It must be a matter of considerable surprise to you that a professional debater, one who perambulates the country challenging everybody, one who is supposed to be a real scholar and always ready for the fray, should have come to Meaford from Kentucky and spent six hours in attempting to prove the proposition under debate, and then have so ignominiously failed. It is no credit to him. I shall not throw back the mean, unchristian, unkind, ungentlemanly insinuations that he has hurled at my head twenty, I was going to say fifty times about my ignorance. I am satisfied to leave my scholarship—of which, thank God, I have not boasted before you—as compared to my friend's scholarship, in the custody of this congregation.

I was taunted by the "office editor" with not knowing a Greek letter from a chicken-track; they have tried every way to throw dirt on me; what they cannot do by argument they try to do by insinuation. You must accept this as my excuse for having been several times during this debate betrayed into the use of language that may have seemed severe and unbecoming. You do not know what I have suffered at their hands, because, thank God, a good deal of it has passed from my own memory; and if I cannot recollect the statements made, you do not know a thousandth part of what has been said. You remember he tried on this platform to prove me an ignoramus, simply because I, with a passage in Matthew before my mind, said it was *apo, from*, and not *out of* whereas he, the illustrious scholar that he is, the embodiment of all wisdom, found a passage somewhere else, where it was *ek* in the original, a word rendered *from* no less than 171 times in the New Testament. How true it is that drowning men catch at straws. If I am the ignoramus he represented me, and he the scholar he professes to be, with all the scholarship of the world on his side, it is all the greater shame for him that he has made such a miserable attempt at maintaining his cause in this debate. I am satisfied to leave it to the judgment of any number of competent men to hear us read, pronounce and translate Greek; perhaps my opponent can translate Greek, and perhaps he cannot, but several of the scholars of Meaford say he cannot. He would be glad to make himself appear illustrious by representing me as a greenhorn; that is the amount of it. He does not like the close-fitting arguments that have been adduced in this debate, just as I found the "office editor" did not like them. But he will have to do as the old lady did whom the minister tried to console. He was quoting the comforting promises of the Bible to her when she said, "Yes, I have taken a great deal of consolation out of that precious promise which says, 'you must just grin and bear it.'" He has quoted from some lexicons where *molunein* is given as to stain, defile, pollute, etc.; but he does not find one in which the first signification is to immerse. Yet it is the equivalent of *tabal*. Joseph's brethren did not dip his coat, they drabbled it in blood to stain it. *Molunein* means that. If Naaman went and drabbled himself in the Jordan he did not immerse. My opponent says there was no blood in the water of separation. I had not read the chapter since I came, and might not even Elder Harding of Kentucky make an accidental misquotation? It is the old story of magnifying molehills into mountains. In Hebrews 9: 10 we have the divers baptisms (washings) which I proved were effected by sprinkling the blood of

bulls and of goats and the ashes of an heifer on the unclean; and that being on my mind when I spoke of purification, I referred to blood. He has failed to prove to you that baptism by immersion ever took place in the tabernacle since Moses laid its foundation. All that took place in the tabernacle were sacrifices. Let me quote here from Creemer, one of the lexicographers of whom he has been speaking. This is on the question of *louo*, which is to wash the whole body; and because it means to wash the whole body, he assumes it means to dip the whole body, because some Hebrew scholar of note says it means to immerse from the finger tips. Creemer says: "The verb and noun (*louo*, *loutron*), are used for religious washings, or purifications." My opponent admits that *louo* is the equivalent of *baptize*, and Creemer here testifies that *louo* is used for a religious purification, the very thing I have contended for in connection with baptism. Hence another of his own witnesses testifies against him.

I have also proved that these blood sprinklings in the tabernacle were purifications. If there had to be a bath taken afterwards to get off the ashes it was not that which constituted the purification but it was the sprinkling of the blood on the unclean. Moses distinctly said so, as I showed last night. It is not the action or motion of the water that constitutes the purification or baptism, but the effect of the sprinkling as a symbol to shadow forth the application of the blood of Christ to the conscience; and they conveyed the idea to those who were looking, through the eye, and that is what symbolic purifications are for. If that is not plain I cannot make it so; but some men are not able to see a point unless you cut a couple of feet off the end of it. I am not going to chase my opponent all over, for I want to make my review. In this debate L conceded that *baptizo*, in its primary heathen usage, signifies to dip, plunge, immerse, so far as these words can express an enclosed condition within an enveloping element. In this sense, when applied to living men it always involved drowning. Consequently, whenever a Greek baptism was performed according to the primary meaning, drowning was the result. On this point there is no dispute. My opponent dare not baptize according to primary classic usage. Hence I have looked for another meaning. A secondary meaning is that a man may be baptized into insensibility by sleep. You may say it was immersion in a figure. I do not care, as the man did not require to be immersed in order to be baptized. Sleep changed his condition, and that was baptism. An individual taking a drug which changed him into a condition of stupor was said by the heathen Greeks to be baptized. An individual be-

coming intoxicated with wine was said by the Greeks to be baptized with wine. An individual stained with his own blood was said to be baptized with his blood. In Revelations 16: 3 we read: "And He was clothed with a vesture dipped in blood: and His name is called the Word of God." In the revised version the translators have instead "a vesture baptized with blood," but certainly it was not dipped, plunged, or immersed.

MR. HARDING;—Or sprinkled.

MR. WILKINSON—How could His vesture have been immersed in blood when He was hanging on the cross, where He was bleeding and dying? In this second sense the Greek writers frequently used it. I have shown that under the old dispensation, long before Christ, it was applied to purification to express a changed condition, no matter how it was brought about. I have acknowledged that immersion, as a mode of baptism, can be traced to a very early age in the Christian Church, but I have shown that the immersion itself was not, according to the fathers of that day, what constituted the baptism. It was the condition considered necessary to a baptism by these superstitious fathers of the Church, the baptism itself being the *effect* produced on the soul of the candidate while in a submerged condition, by the life principle supposed to be imparted to the water by the Spirit. I have also shown that the candidates were baptized naked, both men, women and children, in order to give the Spirit a better chance to penetrate and cleanse the soul. I have shown that this doctrine was a false and superstitious belief transferred from the actual legal purifications of the Jews, who were so surrounded by the darkness of the existing age as to be susceptible to such superstitions. Along with this superstition was its twin sister, viz., Transubstantiation, and a host of others, such as anointing with dirt, rubbing spittle on the candidate, insufflation, exorcism, etc. I have shown, also, that the verb *baptizo* has a secondary sense, expressive of the great change wrought in man by the Spirit of God, viz., cleansing and regeneration. That purifying rites had existed among the Jews for fifteen hundred years, typifying and symbolizing this great change, and this has been admitted by my opponent. Now these Jewish or Judaic baptisms, in type and symbol, were almost all performed by sprinkling; therefore the Christian rite, which symbolizes the same truth, should be by sprinkling. I have proved that the blood of Christ sprinkling the unclean effects a spiritual purification; hence its symbol, water, should be applied by sprinkling. Also the gift of the Spirit, which in the New Testament is described as a baptism, is

invariably represented as being communicated to men by a descent upon them; therefore its symbol, water, to be appropriate and efficient in making this descent visible, must also descend upon the individual, especially so as it is a gift of God to man, and not a gift of man to God. A herculean effort has been made by my opponent to prove that the baptism of the Spirit is an immersion; but it is a singular fact that it is always effected by pouring out. No mail is ever represented as being dipped, or immersed in the Spirit, but it invariably comes down on him; and as water baptism is designed to make the Spirit's operations visible, it must also descend upon the candidate. It matters not whether the design is to cover the individual all over or not. Whatever the design, it is said to be effected by pouring, or shedding down; evidently not because the Spirit itself is literally poured out, but because its symbol (water) was; hence the form of speech is conformed to this idea. But my contention is true in any case—not that the word means to pour or sprinkle, but that the contemplated result is produced by pouring or sprinkling. I have proved that the Israelites were not immersed, though Christianly baptized; that the Egyptians were immersed, though not Christianly baptized. Next, the antediluvians were immersed, not baptized; Noah and his family were baptized, but not immersed. Naaman was cleansed, whatever the form of baptism, proving that baptism is a purification. It has not been, nor can it be, proved that he was immersed. The burial business has been so badly shattered that it will not pay any man to attempt repairs. The baptism of Christ was a cleansing, not an immersion, unless the priests were immersed in the laver, which has not been and cannot be proved. My opponent has proved nothing that I have not admitted. His whole ground is gone from beneath his feet and he is left afloat where it would be appropriate, when he feels good, to sing, "Cling to the lifeboat, sailor, and pull for the shore."

Ladies and Gentlemen, such truths as I have been presenting to you to the best of my ability, and with earnestness and zeal, have led the great mass of Christians in the present day to cast aside the shackles of superstitious bigotry by which the people of former ages were bound. Thank God, we are emerging from that state of darkness when the people revered hoary-headed superstition and bowed down and worshipped it; when they ascribed spiritual, saving efficacy to the sacraments of Christ, converting baptism into spiritual regeneration, and converting the Lord's Supper into the real body and blood of Christ. These two superstitions are twin sisters, they were born at the same time and have gone hand in hand unto this day, and

what superstition has joined together let them stay together, if they will; but do not let any one try to impose such quackery and superstition on us now. We shall resist it every time. You may depend upon it that as scholarship continues to improve, and as the subject is ventilated in public discussion and otherwise, that old superstition will pass away like the clouds before the rising sun; and the grand millennial glory shall envelop this earth as the waters cover the sea, and then God shall "sprinkle clean water upon you and you shall be clean; from all your filthiness and from all your idols will He cleanse you and a new heart will He put within you." The Lord knows how to cleanse by sprinkling; my opponent and his friends do not. They have converted the beautiful rite of Christian baptism, symbolizing the purification of the soul, into a superstitious burial and resurrection scene, imitating the actual burial of our Lord in the grave, and His being raised up again from the dead. When I come to exhibit my chart again you will find that baptism, which is the symbol of regeneration, has been taken beyond its proper sphere, and made to dramatize atonement, or that which pertains to the atonement, and has no direct reference whatever to regeneration. I accuse them (I say it advisedly, not because I want to hurt feelings but because it is important to the truth,) of vitiating the purposes of the Divine ordinance. What Christ intended to be symbolized is not presented by this rite in immersion. I say that God's truth is made of none effect by these traditions and speculations of men. I have proved this, and will continue to prove it to the end, and the next time we meet in debate my opponent will not be able to accuse me of not having authorities present.

I heartily thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your attention. You have heard rue with the utmost patience and consideration. I came here at the solicitation of one of your resident ministers to assist him in putting the truth before his people. I was driven into this debate. My opponent who had no special business at my lecture, rose, and in a most defiant and ungentlemanly manner challenged me to debate, and he has had to take the consequences; and if they have been hard for him to bear, I affirm that it has been a very painful experience to me to inflict them.

[*Time expired.*]

(*This closed the debate on the first proposition.*)

SECOND PROPOSITION.

"That Infant Baptism is of Divine authority, and has been practiced by the Christian Church from Apostolic times."

FOURTH DAY—AFTERNOON.

According to the original agreement, Mr. Wilkinson was to affirm the SECOND PROPOSITION; accordingly he speaks first during the last three days, and Mr. Harding responds. The opening speech by each disputant on each proposition occupied one hour.

MR. WILKINSON'S FIRST SPEECH.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,— It devolves upon me to affirm that "Infant Baptism is of Divine authority, and has been practiced by the Christian Church from Apostolic times." I understand the entire Bible to be given "by inspiration of God, and profitable for doctrine, and instruction in righteousness," hence I shall feel free to make my appeal to any and all parts of the Bible for proof of this proposition. If it can be shown that God appointed this rite, or its equivalent, at any time, and that such appointment has never been revoked, or disannulled, then it follows that it still remains in full force and virtue as truly as it did on the day of its appointment. Evidently, if God appointed it no other authority could have revoked it, hence we will proceed with our investigation in order to determine, if possible, whether we have any Divine authority for the observance of this rite.

In Christianity we have two rites, called SEALS, or SACRAMENTS.

These seals or sacraments represent, respectively, the two fundamental and essential doctrines of our holy Christianity—the two great

pillars of truth which stand, so to speak, at the gate of the temple. In order to understand the better the nature of these truths, and the import and design of their outward symbols, we will need to remember that man as a sinner is under a twofold curse: (1) *The curse of a violated law, and* (2) *The bondage of depraved affections.*

To deliver him from the first, atonement was demanded, hence we have, appended to the curse, the promise of a Saviour.

To deliver him from the second, his nature must be renewed, hence a divine spiritual operation was demanded.

During the early ages of our world's history, when the great scheme of redemption was as yet but imperfectly unfolded, the fact is recorded that men offered sacrifices to God in order to atone for their sins, and fire was sometimes given in connection with their offerings, doubtless as a symbol of the purifying operations of the Divine Spirit. At all events, we know that at a very early age God found a man in Ur of the Chaldees, called Abram, whom He called to go out of his country, and from his kindred, and his father's house, into a land which He would afterwards give to him for an inheritance, promising to make of him a great nation, and bless him, and make his name great, and make him a blessing to all the families of the earth. The descendants of this man subsequently became bondmen in Egypt, a state or condition strikingly typical of the enslaved condition of mankind under the bondage of Satan. These people were a *peculiar* people, and though they were *in* Egypt and evil entreated for 430 years (Acts 7 :6), yet they were not of Egypt. God blessed them and multiplied them, as He promised Abram, until they began to be a terror to the Egyptians, who oppressed them very sore, illustrating the tyranny and antagonism of the world towards the followers of the Lord in all ages. 13ut it was God's purpose to deliver that people from their bondage and plant them in the land He promised to Abram, hence an admirable opportunity presented itself for illustrating to them and to the world the great plan of salvation for the world through Jesus Christ our Lord. Accordingly a lamb is to be chosen out of the flock for each family (as in Christ, the seed of Abraham, all *the families* of the earth were to be blessed), and it was to be slain, and its blood sprinkled typically at the entrance to their houses, so that the destroying angel could not hurt them without passing through the blood, which he was not allowed to do. Therefore, when he came to the houses of the Israelites he *passed over* them, typifying the manner in which we are delivered or preserved from wrath by the sprinkling upon us of the blood of Christ. The flesh of this Lamb was to be

eaten, and its blood sprinkled, resulting in the preservation of the people. A feast was by Divine appointment instituted among the Israelites, to be observed every year in commemoration of this event; a lamb must be slain as at first, and its flesh eaten. This feast was called the feast of the Passover, and the lamb is usually called the Paschal lamb.

Now, that this circumstance was typical of Christ, is evident from the fact that Christ is especially pointed out by John the Baptist as "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world," and Paul says (1 Cor. 5: 7), that "Even Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed for us." Now, if Christ is our Passover Lamb, then that other Passover lamb must have been a type of Him. Further, the eating of that lamb was typical of the people's reception of the benefits of the victim by whose blood they were delivered, or at the expense of whose life they had been redeemed. The Lord's Supper stands in precisely the same relation to the Lamb of God as the Passover feast did to the Paschal lamb. The type, however, is done away, and the symbol remains; for that feast, like the ceremonial cleansings, was both typical and symbolic. The Lord's Supper is symbolic only, and is observed in commemoration of the world's deliverance from sin, through His death. No one would ever be found to deny this only that it stands sadly in the way of a favorite theory. This illustrates the fact that God has provided in a special manner for keeping the great fundamental doctrine of the atonement before men's minds by means of visible types and symbols, from the days of Moses, at least, and will do so to the end of the world.

But what about the regenerating feature of the divine plan?

This is a twofold operation, including cleansing and renewal, and must have been effected the same as it is now, by the inward action of divine grace. But because of its importance, like the atoning feature, God would make it visible to the mind, through the eye, by outward signs and symbols. But as human kind were not, in that comparatively infantile age of the world, as capable of perceiving moral truths as now, God employed two symbols for the exhibition of this twofold operation, one for the cleansing and the other for the regeneration. By the washings, cleansings, purifications, or properly typical baptisms of the law, the people were taught the nature and imperious necessity of inward purity. Whether they enjoyed it or not, they were impressed from day to day with its necessity. By circumcision they were taught the imperious necessity of having fleshly passions and lusts crucified and removed, however painful it might be

to the carnal nature. Hence this rite was also instituted and enjoined by God's command, and must be observed under pain of being cut off, in figure, from the benefits of the covenant. It may be said, however, that circumcision was instituted long before the legal baptisms, hence, during that interval the people had no rite to represent cleansing, I reply that circumcision itself involved cleansing, and represented it, but the people did not clearly and impressively perceive it, chiefly, no doubt, because of their moral perversity rather than their natural imbecility, hence "the law was added because of transgressions, till the seed should come to whom the *promise* was made" (Gal. 3: 19), which promise refers to the covenant of redemption made with Abraham (Gen. 12: 1-3 and 17: 1-8), in which God promises to be Abraham's God and bless him, and make him the father of many nations.

In this covenant God also promised Abraham that in his seed, viz., Christ, all the families of the earth should be blessed, or justified. He then sealed the covenant with a seal indicative of moral purification and regeneration.

And now do you require any proof that baptism under the new dispensation includes both these ideas? We have it in Titus 3:5, where the apostle says, we are saved "not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to the mercy of God, by the *washing* of regeneration and the *renewing* of the Holy Ghost." This passage, my opponent has admitted, refers to baptism, and it distinctly teaches both cleansing and renewal, therefore this twofold truth is embodied in and represented by this Christian ordinance.

And now do you want any proof that baptism and circumcision are identical in their nature and import? Well, this same apostle has, by inspiration of God, married them together in Col. 2: 11, 12 (I quote from the revised version as being a more literal and accurate rendering): "In whom (Christ) ye were circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with him in baptism," etc. That is, having been buried with Him in baptism we are circumcised with Him, thus proving plainly that circumcision is effected by baptism, and *vice versa*, by which they are shown to be identical. And they are joined together by the authority of God, and "what He hath joined together, let no man put asunder."

To make this point clear, I want to call your attention again to this chart (the one previously exhibited and explained, see p. 114), in which Christianity is represented under the figure of an arch, supported by

two great pillars, representing the fundamental truths to which I have referred—atonement and regeneration. As explained on a previous occasion, this pillar, representing atonement, was made visible during the old dispensation by the Passover; and under the new, by the Lord's Supper, as shown in the diagram; hence the Lord's Supper and the Passover are not two things, but two different forms of the same thing, both being outward shadows or patterns of the same truth. So during the old dispensation this other pillar truth, was represented by circumcision, baptism (ceremonial cleansing) being subsequently added to make the twofold aspect of the truth more manifest; while under the present dispensation baptism alone is employed for the symbolic illustration of this truth. Circumcision and baptism, therefore, are not two separate things, but two different forms of the same thing, each adapted to the genius of its respective dispensation, but both serving the same end. If, therefore, circumcision was by Divine authority applied to children, so must baptism be, unless God himself forbids it, which He has never done. Therefore, instead of demanding a command from us to baptize infants, we have a right to demand a command from our opponents not to baptize them. God put them in this covenant and ordered the seal applied, and until He puts them out of the covenant and forbids the application of the seal, the Divine arrangement must stand. This is our authority for the administration of this rite to infants, and unless my opponent can prove that circumcision and baptism are not identical in nature and design, or that God has revoked the covenant of which circumcision was the seal, the argument for the baptism of infants is simply irresistible.

At this point I want to remove an impression that may have obtained in some quarters, viz., that God made three separate covenants with Abraham, and that circumcision was only the seal of one, and that one is now abrogated. Let us see:

In Gen. 12: 1-3, we read, "Now the Lord had said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will tell thee;

"And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing:

"And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

Paul quotes from this passage as the covenant of spiritual blessings, in Gal. 3: 8, "In thee shall all nations of the earth be blessed," thus identifying this with the covenant of grace. But on this point there is no dispute.

On receiving this command and promise—it is called a covenant here—Abram went to Canaan. God appeared to him there (Gen. 13: 14-16), and said unto him:

"Lift up now thine eyes, and look from the place where thou art (in the neighborhood of Bethel), northward, and southward, and eastward, and westward.

"For all the land which thou seest, to thee will I give it and to thy seed forever.

"And I will make thy seed as the dust of the earth," etc., thus renewing the promise made in chapter 12: 2, "I will make of thee a great nation."

In Gen. 17: 1-8 we have another record of this covenant. It reads:

"And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord appealed to Abram, and said unto him, I am the Almighty God: walk before Me, and be thou perfect.

"And I will make My covenant between Me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly.

"And Abram fell on his face and God talked with him, saying:

"As for Me, behold, My covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of many nations.

"Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee.

"And I will make thee exceeding fruitful, and I will make nations of thee, and kings shall come out of thee.

"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.

"And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession: and I will be their God."

It certainly must be clear to all right thinking persons whose minds are not obscured by prejudice, that these covenants are but repetitions and enlargements of the same thing at different times.

You will observe that in these passages God promises Abraham the land of Canaan, not only, but He promises also to make of him "a father of many nations;" and Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, quotes this very clause to establish the spirituality of the seed to whom these promises are intended to apply. He says, in chap. 4: 13, etc., that "the promise that he should be the heir of the world was not to Abraham or to his seed through the law (his legal descendants), but through the righteousness of faith.

"For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect:

"Because the law worketh wrath; for where no law is there is no transgression.

"Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all (Jews and Gentiles).

"(As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations)," etc. This passage identifies the covenant recorded in Gen. 17, with the covenant of spiritual blessings intended for all nations—blessings to be procured by faith, including justification. Therefore the covenant promising the land of Canaan was a spiritual covenant, or the covenant of grace. This truth is made still more manifest by the fact that in this same covenant Isaac is promised, who was to be the progenitor of the Messiah, the author of all spiritual blessings. I will read from verse 15:

"And God said unto Abraham, As for Sarai thy wife, thou shalt not call her name Sarai but Sarah, shall her name be.

"And I will bless her, and give thee a son also of her; yea, I will bless her, and she shall be a mother of nations; kings of people shall be of her.

"Then Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed, and said in his heart, Shall a child be born unto him that is an hundred years old? and shall Sarah that is ninety years old, bear?

"And Abraham said unto God, O that Ishmael might live before thee!

"And God said, Sarah thy wife shall bear thee a son indeed; and thou shalt call his name Isaac: and I will establish my covenant with him for an everlasting covenant, and with his seed after him.

"And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: Behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly: twelve princes shall he beget: and I will make him a great nation.

"But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, which Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year."

Now, here we have the promise of Isaac who is distinctly set forth by the Apostle Paul in Gal. 4: 22, etc., as the representative of the spiritual, as distinct from the national covenant. The passage reads:

"For it is written that Abraham had two sons; the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman.

"But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise.

"Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar.

"For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children.

"But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all.

"For it is written, Rejoice thou barren that barest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not; for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband.

"Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise.

"But as then he that was born after the flesh persecuted him that was born after the Spirit, even so it is now.

"Nevertheless what saith the Scripture? Cast out the bondwoman and her son: for the son of the bondwoman shall not be heir with the son of the freewoman.

"So then, brethren, we are not children of the bondwoman, but of the free."

It is somewhat strange, if the covenant in Gen. 17 contained a promise of earthly blessings only, that Isaac, who was begotten by the intervention of the Divine Spirit and made the representative of the spiritual dispensation, should be connected with that earthly covenant alone. The truth is, and it is very transparent, that the covenant recorded in Gen. 17 was a covenant of spiritual blessings. And it was this covenant of spiritual blessings that was sealed with the seal of circumcision, for God said to Abraham in Gen. 17; 10-14:

"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.

"And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt Me and you.

"And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations; he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed.

"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."

Circumcision is here called a "token" of the covenant. For an explanation of this we turn to Rom. 4:11,12: "And he (Abraham) received the *sign*, of circumcision, a *seal* of the righteousness of faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised." Now, "righteousness," or justification, obtained by faith, was a spiritual blessing, yet it was sealed to Abraham by what some people would have us believe was the seal of temporal blessings only. There is something very strange, indeed, about this. And he received this seal, "that he might be the father of all them that believe, though they be not circumcised," *i.e.*, of all Gentile believers, who obtain the same blessing (justification) in the same way, or "who walk in the steps of that faith of our father Abraham which he had before he was circumcised," showing that it sealed this same spiritual blessing to all his spiritual seed. And the same seal, or "token" was applied to Isaac at eight days old. Did it seal some different blessing to him from what it did to his father? Did it mean one thing in the one case and quite another thing in the other case? And, if so, where is the proof? The fact is that the Scriptures are silent concerning such double meaning; and this is sufficient to condemn such an interpretation. Therefore it must have sealed the same blessing to Isaac and to all other Jewish children, that it did to Abraham, and nothing but the stern demands of an erroneous theory would think of questioning a truth so plain.

If this reasoning is correct, then God put children originally into the covenant of grace made with Abraham, and caused the seal of that covenant to be put upon them in common with believing adults, and until that covenant is revoked, or God himself arrests the operation, we must continue to affix the seal to such.

In further illustration of this position I want to add:

1. That the covenant made with Abraham was an "everlasting covenant."

This being the case it must still be in force, and as the seal was to be co-extensive with the covenant, at least so long as new candidates are received into it, hence the seal, in some appropriate form, must still be applied. Baptism, as we have shown, means the same thing and answers the same end as circumcision, therefore it should be applied to all persons possessing the requisite qualifications. Children possessed the requisite qualifications and were sealed with circumcision, hence they possess the requisite qualifications and should also be sealed with baptism.

2. It was a covenant on God's part that He would be a God unto Abraham and his seed after him forever.

The fact that the phrase "in their generations" occurs in connection with the promise, by no means limits the blessing to Abraham's natural seed, as it was one of the most common expressions among the Jews to denote unbroken perpetuity. In fact, the term "generation" is employed in dozens of instances in the Bible as a mere measurement of time, denoting in general about the average length of human life. But what ought to settle this question beyond any reasonable doubt, is the fact that Peter (1 Ep. 2: 9) speaks of believers, or the spiritual seed of Abraham, as a "chosen generation," etc. Surely this has no reference to natural generation, as some would have you believe. The Psalmist (105: 8) says, "He hath remembered His covenant forever, the word of His commandment to a thousand generations," or practically forever.

3. In this covenant, through Abraham's seed, "all the families of the earth shall be blessed."

In this part of the covenant the seed had special reference to Christ, and consequently the blessing must have had reference to the blessings secured to the world through Him, viz., the blessings of redemption. Paul says (Gal. 3: 16), "Now to Abraham and his *seed* were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy *seed* which is Christ." There is something significant in this limitation of the term "seed" to Christ. As spiritual blessings chiefly are secured to the world through Him. it teaches very distinctly that the blessings promised to the world through Abraham's seed were spiritual blessings pre-eminently. Also the limitation of the promise to Christ proves that the blessings promised were intended especially for the spiritual seed of Abraham, all believers being identified and reckoned as one with Christ. "Therefore they who are Christ's are Abraham's seed and his heirs according to the promise" (covenant).—Gal. 3: 29.

4. Circumcision was the appointed seal of this covenant. The covenant, or its token, was to be in their flesh for "an everlasting covenant."—Gen. 17:13. Therefore, until the covenant of spiritual blessing to mankind through Christ is revoked, this seal or "token" must be applied under some divinely-appointed form to all persons claiming the promised blessings. If the seal has been removed from the covenant, we have no guarantee as to the validity of the said covenant, or the certainty of the promised blessings. We know that God has removed that form of seal called circumcision, and if He

has substituted nothing in its place we have great cause for alarm. We have no guarantee that God considers Himself as bound by that covenant at all; hence when a man succeeds in proving the abrogation of circumcision and the substitution of nothing in its place, he succeeds in blotting out the world's hope. This may be illustrated by the case of a deed. Suppose you received a deed of a farm, and it was duly signed, sealed, and delivered, and laid by for safe keeping. Now, let it be remembered, that it is the seal that gives validity to this document in law. But suppose that you take out your deed some day and find no seal on it. What would you think? You would consider your claim to the farm virtually worthless unless the seal could be restored. So, too, in regard to this covenant. If the seal has been removed the covenant has been annulled, and the nations are robbed of all hope. In Christ. This is a terribly serious consideration. But if we have the same seal under an altered form still affixed to the covenant, then have we "hope toward God through Jesus Christ our Lord."

5. That the covenant has never been abrogated.

Paul says (Gal. 3: 17, 18), "Now this I say: A covenant confirmed beforehand by God, the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul, so as to make the promise of none effect. For if the inheritance is of the law, it is no more of promise, but God hath granted it to Abraham by promise." Heb. 8: 6-10, 13, "But now hath he obtained a ministry the more excellent, by how much also He is the mediator of a better covenant, which hath been enacted upon better promises. For if that first covenant had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a second.

"For finding fault with them, He saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that 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 forth out of the land of Egypt; for they continued not in My covenant, and I regarded them not, saith the Lord.

"For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put My laws into their mind, and on their heart also will I write them: and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people."

"In that He saith, A new covenant, He hath made the first old. But that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto vanishing away." (Revised version.)

This, you will observe, was the covenant that God made with the fathers "in the day when He took them by the hand to lead them forth out of the land of Egypt," which may be called "the covenant of Sinai," or "the covenant of ceremonies;" and this is the only covenant that God has abrogated. Therefore, the covenant He made with Abraham 430 years before, and which neither the enactment nor abrogation of the law could disannul, is still in force. And if the covenant is in force, its seal must be valid. And if the first form has been altered, we have a right to look for its equivalent in some other form; and we find it in baptism. This seal, before the alteration of the form, was applied to infants, therefore we argue it should be applied still unless it can be shown that God has ordained otherwise.

6. The seal of that covenant had a spiritual import. The following passages are given in proof of this:—

Deut. 10:10. "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff-necked."

Deut. 30: 6. "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live."

Jer. 4:4. "Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your heart, ye men of Judah, and ye inhabitants of Jerusalem."

Col. 2: 11. "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ."

In v. 13 an unregenerate state is called the "uncircumcision of the flesh."

Rom. 2: 28, 29. "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh;

"But he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter, whose praise is not of men but of God."

7. The seal was to be applied to all of Abraham's children. Rom. 4:11-17; Gal. 3:26-29. They who are Christ's are Abraham's children and heirs. Little children are Christ's, therefore they are "Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise."

8. The child character is the standard of admission into the divine kingdom.

"Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall in no wise enter into the kingdom of heaven."

"Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

9. The Church is the same under both dispensations.

This is illustrated by the apostle Paul by the olive tree, which was a figure of the Jewish Church, the trunk of which remains, and the Gentiles are grafted into it. There is no new olive tree planted, but the old one perpetuated under a new form. The apostle says:

"And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou, being a wild olive tree, wert grafted in among them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree;

"Boast not against the brandies. But if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee.

"Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off", that I might be grafted in." Rom. 11: 17-19.

The same truth is represented under other figures in Eph. 2: 13-22. The apostle says •

"But now in Christ Jesus ye who sometimes were far off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.

"For He 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;

"And that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby;

"And came and preached peace to you which were afar off, and to them that were nigh.

"For through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father.

"Now therefore ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God;

"And are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone;

"In whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord;

"In whom ye also are builded together for an habitation of God through the Spirit."

Under both dispensations we have the same God, the same Saviour, Jesus Christ, the same Holy Spirit, the same covenant, the same law, the same conditions of salvation, the same olive tree, the same

kingdom, hence I argue that the Church is the same and the membership the same.

Little children were members of that Church under the old dispensation; why not now?

That Peter recognized the continued existence and authority of the covenant made with Abraham, and the rights of children to a recognition by its seal, is evident from his great inaugural address on the day of Pentecost. It will be remembered that this was the grand inaugural day of the new dispensation, a large body of Jews were assembled at Jerusalem to celebrate it, and Peter was the chief speaker. In addressing those Jews he said, Acts 2: 38, 39:

"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.

"For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even to as many as the Lord our God shall call."

By the "promise" here, he evidently meant the covenant. The blessings promised are "remission of sins (justification), and the gift of the Holy Ghost," showing that these were the blessings included in that covenant. These blessings are promised on condition of repentance and baptism, (not circumcision now), and the covenant for the bestowment of these blessings is said to be to them, as Jews, and to their children, which we certainly know included infants, (and so every Jew must have understood it, their children having always been regarded as belonging to the covenant and sealed with its seal), "and to all that are afar off," by which Gentile nations are doubtless meant. And now I reason, that if the infant children of Jews were included in the "promise," then the infant children of "them that were afar off" must have been included also. Thus God, as if to guard against any misapprehension on this point, has included Gentile children in the covenant of promise along with the infant children of Jews.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. HARDING'S FIRST REPLY.

It affords me pleasure, ladies and gentlemen, to stand before you to debate this great and important question. I agree most heartily with Mr. Wilkinson in saying that what we want is truth. I know well enough that what is false will do me no good, and by the grace of God I intend to stand on the right side. The man who stands on the side of truth is strong; he has God on his side; he is in the majority, and will come out conqueror in every conflict. I want to be a conqueror; I want to be in the majority; wherever, therefore, I find truth, I will stand right there.

Mr. Wilkinson thinks he has the truth on this question, and he is here to show it to you, viz.: "That Infant Baptism is of Divine authority, and has been practiced by the Christian Church from Apostolic times." If that is the truth, I have not found it. I have three little children, and if that proposition be true, I should like to have them baptized. If God has any blessing for my babies, I want them to have it. One of them has been baptized; two have not, the one because he was old enough to understand, and of his own free will to come forward to serve God. But I do not want to hold back any blessing from any of them. If infant baptism is authorized by the Word of God, and is of Divine authority, let our children have it. The Discipline of Mr. Wilkinson's Church—the one that does not have the word dip in it—says, "The Holy Scriptures contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."—page 14.

If, therefore, infant baptism is taught in the Holy Scriptures, it is right, proper, and scriptural that we should practice it; if it is not, even according to the Discipline, it is not to be required of any man. To the law and to the testimony let us go. Is it taught in the Holy Scriptures? Not one unprejudiced mind has been able to see that Mr. Wilkinson has produced a single passage of Scripture which teaches infant baptism. Indeed, I will show you that men on his own side, men far more learned than he is, and as anxious to prove infant baptism, cannot see infant baptism in any of the passages he has quoted. I am going to stand by the authorities still. Do you inquire, What for? why not read directly from the Bible? I answer, If I had time to read the whole Bible through, I should be able to show

clearly that infant baptism is not taught there-in. I have not time to do this, so I will produce the testimony of men on his own side of the question, who have read it through many times, while studying this very question, and who testify that it is not to be found in the Book; I will also produce the testimony of men on his own side of the question, who will say of his arguments, that they do not prove his position.

My friend says his duties are pleasant and light under this proposition. I am neither a prophet, nor the son of a prophet; but if his burdens do not become heavier and his work more unpleasant, day by day, till this discussion ends, his fate will be different from that of any paedobaptist I have ever met in debate. He is on the wrong side of the question.

Now to the authorities: Dr. George E. Steitz, a well-known Lutheran, in his treatise on baptism (*Herzog's Encyclopaedia*, Vol. XV., p. 4 31) asserts that "among scientific exegetes it is regarded as an established conclusion that not a trace of infant baptism can be discovered in the New Testament."

As was shown to you on the former proposition, the greatest of all these "scientific exegetes" is Dr. H. A. W. Meyer. In his commentary on Acts 10: 15, he says: "This passage, and verse 33, with 18 8, and 1 Cor. 1:16, are appealed to in order to prove infant baptism in the apostolic age, or at least to make it probable." After making several remarks, showing clearly that these passages do not teach the doctrine, he adds: "The baptism of the children of Christians, of which no trace is found in the New Testament, is not to be held as an apostolic ordinance, as indeed it encountered early and long resistance; but it is an *institution of the Church*, which gradually arose in post apostolic times in connection with the development of ecclesiastical life, and of doctrinal teaching, not certainly attested before Tertullian, and by him still decidedly opposed, and although already defended by Cyprian, only becoming genera^l after the time of Augustine in virtue of that connection." *Meyer on Acts*, pp. 311, 312.

Neander, the greatest of Church historians, testifies: "Baptism was administered at first only to adults, as men were accustomed to conceive baptism and faith as strictly connected. We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution, and the recognition of it which followed somewhat later, as an apostolical tradition, serves to confirm this hypothesis."—*Neander's History of the Christian Religion and Church*, Vol. I., p. 311.

Mosheim touches (see his *Ecclesiastical History*, Book I., chap. 4, sec. 13,) that in the second century, people were not baptized till "after they had repeated what they called the *creed* (*symbolical*), and had renounced all their sins and transgressions, and especially the *devil* and his *pomp*." He substantiates this by the quotation of a very full and complete account of their manner of receiving new converts into the Church, by Justin Martyr, which was written about the year 150 A.D.

Dr. Schaff (see *History of the Christian Church*, chap. 4, sec. 37, p. 121) says: "The apostolic origin of *infant* baptism is denied not only by the Baptists, but also by many *paedo* baptist divines." He says also, on the same page, that "The New Testament contains no express command to baptize infants."

Mr. Wilkinson teaches the mothers of the land that it is then-duty to have their infant children baptized; that the Bible requires it at their hands; and yet these "scientific exegetes," such as Neander, Meyer, Steitz, and the "many *paedo*-baptist divines" mentioned by Dr. Schaff, cannot find a vestige of it in the Bible. How then does he expect the plain, unlettered women of the land to find it there? These men wanted to find it; their Churches practice it and require them to do it; but, in spite of their own practice and of the practice of their Churches, their honesty compels them to say it cannot be found in the Book.

My opponent says that man's nature is depraved; that he is under a twofold curse; that his nature must be renewed. Well, if all that were so, what has it to do with the question we are discussing *I* Does he baptize the infant to get him from under the curse? Does he baptize the little ones to save them? I want him to tell us plainly, without any equivocation, what their baptism is for. Does he baptize them to save them from the wrath of God? or, because they *are* saved from it? To bring them into Christ's Church? or, because they *are* in it? He intimates that my doctrine would send them to hell. Does he believe that baptism saves them from hell?

MR. WILKINSON—Not much; nor adult baptism either.

MR. HARDING;—Then you do not believe the doctrine of your Discipline; for it plainly teaches that infants are baptized that they may be delivered from the wrath of God, and that they may be received into the ark of Christ's Church, and may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, and come to the land of everlasting rest. But I will read to you, my friends, from the Discipline, that you may know for yourselves the doctrine of his Church, the doctrine that he said he believed,

when he was received as a preacher, and that he obligated himself to support. Before doing so, however, a word of explanation is necessary concerning the terms "visible Church," and "invisible Church." These are not Scriptural expressions, but they are much used by paedobaptists, and if you would understand their literature you must understand their use of them. In Article XIII. of the Discipline of the Methodist Church of Canada (p. 17) it is said: "The visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered." It is evident from this definition of the "visible Church" that infants are not received into it; for they are not *faithful* men—they have no faith at all—the Word of God is not preached to them, and the Lord's Supper is not given to them. If, therefore, they are received into any Church, it must be into what is known as the "invisible Church." This "invisible Church" they understand to include all that are in Christ, all that are saved through the death of Christ. (See the testimony of Dr. Ditzler, *Louisville Debate*, p. 17.)

Bear in mind, now, that into what the Discipline calls the "visible Church" infants cannot come, from the very nature of the case; and then, with this in your mind, read the following prayer, which the minister is required to pray just before he baptizes a baby:

"Almighty and everlasting God, who of Thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family in the ark from perishing by water; and also didst safely lead the children of Israel, Thy people, through the Red Sea, figuring thereby Thy holy baptism, and has set apart water for this Holy Sacrament; and who hast condescended to enter into gracious covenant with man, wherein Thou hast included children as partakers of its benefits, declaring that, "of such is the kingdom of heaven;" we beseech Thee for Thine infinite mercies that Thou wilt look upon this child; wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost; that he, being delivered from Thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church, and being steadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in love, may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, that finally he may come to the laud of everlasting life, there to reign with Thee, world without end, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

"O merciful God, grant that the old Adam in this child may be so buried, that the new man may be raised up in him.

"Grant that all carnal affections may die in him, and that all things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in him."

The minister, after he reminds the Father that He saved Noah from

perishing, that He saved the children of Israel from their enemies at the Red Sea, says, "We beseech Thee for Thine infinite mercies that Thou wilt look upon this child; *wash* him [he regards him as unclean], *sanctify* him [he regards him as unsanctified, unholy] with the Holy Ghost; that he, *being delivered from Thy wrath* [he regards him as being under the wrath of God], may be received into the ark of Christ's Church." He then prays that the old Adam may be buried in him, and the new man raised up in him. He does not regard the "new man" (Christ) as being in him yet.

Evidently, according to the Discipline, babies are baptized in order to be brought into the invisible Church, to be saved from the wrath of God, saved from hell. It would not be strange, if Mr. Wilkinson believed the doctrine of his Discipline, that he should say that my doctrine sends them to hell, seeing that I do not baptize them. But he does not believe that doctrine. He says they come into this world as innocent as angels. But, notwithstanding this, he lifts his hands over them and prays that they may be washed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, and delivered from the wrath of God; that the old Adam may die in them, and the new man be raised up. A strange prayer to pray over a being as innocent as an angel; a being no more under the wrath of God than Gabriel! Then he talks about their being under a twofold curse!

But, says he, were not infants circumcised in ancient days, under the Mosaic economy? Yes, they were; but that fact has nothing whatever to do with infant baptism. Mr. Wilkinson's entire address, in which he is supposed to lay the foundation of his argument in defence of infant baptism, is devoted to what is known as the "Argument from the Covenant of Circumcision." If this argument is worthless, then all that he has said in his speech of one hour amounts to nothing—absolutely nothing. It seems a pity to spoil the results of so much labor, but it must be done. Listen to the following startling statement from the most distinguished Methodist debater on this continent. I read from the *Graves-Ditzler*, p. 692, as follows:

[NOTE BY REPORTER.—As Dr. Graves was about to commence, Elder Ditzler motioned him to his seat, where a short conference was held, at the conclusion of which Elder Ditzler arose and said:—

"We have agreed not to debate the question of the covenants further, as I here express my conviction that the covenants of the Old Testament have nothing to do with infant baptism."

DR. GRAVES.—I want it to be recorded alongside of that frank admission, that I am rejoiced to hear him say this. The Old Testament

covenants have been the basis of this rite heretofore, and I am glad this ground is at last abandoned by Methodists. So much is gained by this discussion. From this day onward, so long as Elder Ditzler bears the endorsement of the Bishops of his Church, that he is a representative of their doctrines, let no Methodist elder or preacher in all the South ever go back to the old covenants with Abraham, or the Jews, to find a ground for infant baptism. I was never better prepared to discuss the covenants, one and all, than now, but Elder Ditzler has at last fully surrendered them. I close the Old Testament. After this mutual explanation, Dr. Graves commenced his sixth reply.]

It must be exceedingly distressing to my opponent, after that hour speech on the covenants, to hear his noted brother Dr. Ditzler say: "I here express my conviction that the covenants of the Old Testament have nothing to do with infant baptism." But there are many Presbyterians present, and perhaps some of them would like to hear a little Presbyterian testimony. In his day, Dr. Moses Stuart, of Andover Theological Seminary, was the greatest Presbyterian light on this Western continent. Concerning the covenant argument he testifies thus: "How unwary, too, are many excellent men in contending for infant baptism on the ground of the Jewish analogy of circumcision Numberless difficulties present themselves in our way, as soon as we begin to argue in such a manner as this." Again, "The covenant of circumcision furnishes no ground for infant baptism."—*Stuart, on Baptism* (Nashville edition), p. 32.

And now, there is here, no doubt, a third class, people who are anxious to hear what the Bible says. They care more for the sayings of inspired men than they do for those of Methodists and Presbyterians, howsoever learned and distinguished they may be. Let them consider the following facts:

1. According to the Scriptures, males only were circumcised; males and females both are baptized.
2. It was proper and right for a man to circumcise himself; one has no authority to baptize himself.
3. Either parent could circumcise the child.
4. When a Jew bought a servant—a male—he was required to circumcise him; in the days of slavery in the States, I never heard of a paedo-baptist's baptizing his men-servants *because they were his servants*. Mr. Wilkinson's Discipline would not allow him to do it.
5. Circumcision did not belong to God's peculiar people, the Jews, only; but it was observed by all the descendants of Abraham: Ishmaelites, Edomites, and the children of Keturah, as well as the Jews;

whereas, in the New Testament, baptism is given only to those who are disciplined to Christ.

6. No intellectual nor moral qualifications were required as pre-requisites to circumcision; for every male descendant of Abraham, and all of their male servants, from eight days old and upwards, big and little, old and young, philosophers and idiots, good and bad, were entitled to circumcision; this is not true of baptism, for, among Protestants, all agree that of adults only believers in Christ are entitled to it.

7. Circumcision was a visible mark; baptism is not.

8. All Jews not circumcised were cut off from their people; few paedobaptists of our day are willing to say that of the infants that are not baptized.

9. I have reserved for my last point the most conclusive of all. It is perfectly clear and explicit, perfectly conclusive and satisfactory, in settling the question; it shows beyond the possibility of a reasonable doubt that baptism did not come in the room of circumcision. It is this: *both were practiced by inspired servants of the Lord at the same time.* Men were baptized who had been already circumcised, and men were circumcised who had been already baptized, and that, too, by the authority of God. Christ was circumcised when eight days old, and afterwards baptized; so were the apostles; so were the three thousand who were received on the day of Pentecost; so were the tens and hundreds of thousands of Jews who were baptized by John the Baptist, Jesus, and the apostles. On the other hand, after Timothy had been baptized, Paul circumcised him. (See Acts 10: 1-3.) Of course baptism did not come in the room of circumcision, notwithstanding my opponent tried so hard, in that long speech, to prove it. It is a question settled—settled by facts, and facts are stubborn things.

Paul circumcised Timothy because there was Jewish blood in his veins; but Titus was a Greek, and him he would not circumcise; he was stubborn in his refusal, for, he argued, being a Greek he had no claim to the rite.

If a Jew should be converted to Christ to-day, under my ministry, and should ask me the question, "Shall I continue to circumcise my children." I would reply, "Yes, by all means." If I should be asked for my authority for so saying, I would show that it is a fact concerning which there is no room for doubt, that Jewish Christians continued to practice circumcision all through the apostolic age, with the knowledge and approval of the apostles. In the seventeenth chapter of Genesis, one of the chapters from which Mr. Wilkinson

read, the chapter in which the covenant of circumcision is given, it is said of it (ver. 13), "My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant." God intended it to last until the end of the ages. In proof of this consider the following facts:

1. The great question which divided the Church in the apostolic age was, whether or not the Gentile Christians should be circumcised. The Judaizing teachers in the Church said unto them (Acts 15: 1): "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved." This discussion was waged hotly even till towards the end of the days of inspiration. Now it is perfectly evident to every reflecting mind, that it could never have arisen had the Jews themselves ceased to circumcise their children upon entering the Church of Christ.

2. About the year 52 A D., Paul and Barnabas went from Antioch up to Jerusalem to lay the matter before the apostles and elders for their decision. They were kindly received, and patiently listened to, while they laid the whole matter before them. After much discussion and disputation (see Acts 15: 1-7), it was unanimously agreed by the apostles and elders as follows: "That we trouble not them which from among the Gentiles are turned to God; but that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood."

3. About a year after this, Paul became acquainted with Timothy and circumcised him; showing clearly that while the Gentiles were not to be circumcised, it was still lawful for those of Jewish blood. (See Acts 16:1-3.)

4. About seven years after this, Paul came up to Jerusalem on his last visit to the city (A. D. 60), and on the day following he went in unto James and the elders, and declared all that God had wrought by his hand among the Gentiles. "And when they heard it they glorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law; and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs. What is it therefore? The multitude must needs come together; for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say unto thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads; and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are

nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law."—Acts 21: 20-24.

If baptism had taken the place of circumcision, it is certain that Paul, and James, and these elders had never found it out; for the "many thousands of Jews" that believed wore practicing both, and that, too, with the approval of these apostles and elders. This passage shows that they regarded it as *disorderly* for a man to teach Jewish Christians not to circumcise their children. These are the same parties that, eight years before, had written to the Gentiles to "observe no such thing." (See ver. 2".) I want to teach and practice just as the apostles did.

But did not Paul tell some people that they must not be circumcised; that if they wore, Christ would profit them nothing? Yes, but he was writing to Gentiles when he said this.

Let us now consider the Abrahamic covenants. I will call your attention to two; one of them is found in the 12th, and the other in the 17th chapter of Genesis. The first reads thus:

"Now the Lord had said unto Abram, get thee out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will show thee; and I will make thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing: and will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed. So Abram departed, as the Lord had spoken to him; and Lot went with him: and Abram was seventy and five years when he departed out of Haran."

This covenant (contract) you see was this: Abram, the party of the first part, was to leave his country, his kindred, his father's house, and go unto the land which God should show him: God, the party of the second part, upon the condition of his doing this, agreed to make of him a great nation, to bless him, and to make his name great; He bound Himself further, saying, "I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

Abram arose at once, and fulfilled his part of the contract: he went forth into the land of Canaan, journeyed through the land, and then, on account of a famine, having fulfilled his part of the contract, he went down to Egypt—according to the received chronology, all in one year.

The covenant of circumcision mentioned in the 17th chapter was given to Abram when he was ninety-nine years old. So, nearly twenty-

five years had passed away from the giving of one covenant to the giving of the other. You cannot change a covenant after the contract has been finished. God told Abram, in the 12th chapter, to leave that country, and go to the land He would show him. That was Abram's duty, and God said, then "I will bless thee." And He adds, "And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed." Abram arose and fulfilled his part of the contract, and traveled under it for nearly twenty-five years. This was the covenant concerning Christ, given 430 years before the law. It was given B.C. 1921, the law B.C. 1491, a difference of 430 years exactly. After about twenty-five years we come to the covenant of circumcision (Gen. 17: 1—14). The first verse tells us Abram was ninety-nine years old. Mr. Wilkinson tells us that this is the same covenant enlarged; that God added to his requirements the rite of circumcision. Do you suppose that God, after his faithful servant had been operating under that covenant for twenty-five years, would then add to it, or change it? Even a man would not do that. Listen to Paul: "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men, though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto." (Gal. 3: 15.)

Let us consider this covenant of circumcision (Gen. 17). From it I read the following extracts:

"I will make My covenant between Me and thee, and will multiply thee exceedingly." (Verse 2.)

"Neither shall thy name any more be called Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for a father of many nations have I made thee." (Verse 5.)

"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." (Verse 7.)

"And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." (Verse 8.)

"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. (Verse 10.)

"And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every man child in your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any stranger, which is not of thy seed. 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." (Verses 12-14.)

Mr. Wilkinson said God *had made* this covenant with Abram twenty-four years before this; that this is the same covenant as that recorded in Genesis 12; but the Lord here says, "I *will make* My covenant between Me and thee," etc. Mr. Wilkinson comes square up against the Holy Scripture: God says, "I will make;" Mr. Wilkinson says, You have made it already, twenty-four years ago. Which will you believe, my friends, the Lord, or Mr. Wilkinson? the word of God, or the word of man?

Mr. Wilkinson argues that the Church of Christ is built upon this covenant; that it is the same, therefore, as the Jewish Church; that it has, therefore, the same membership; and that as the Jewish Church had infant membership, so has the Christian.

How about the servants bought with one's money? How about the females? Circumcision did not admit one into the Jewish Church; its membership was born, or bought into it; and then, if one was not circumcised he was cut off. How about that, if baptism has taken the place of circumcision? No wonder Dr. Stuart said, "How unwary, too, are many excellent men, in contending for infant baptism on the ground of the Jewish analogy of circumcision. *Numberless difficulties present themselves in our way, as soon as we begin to argue in such a manner as this.*" *Com. O. T.* ch 22. And no wonder he concludes, "The covenant of circumcision furnishes no ground for infant baptism." (*Lecture on Galatians.*)

In the 10th verse of the 17th chapter, God says to Abraham, "This is My covenant." Mr. Wilkinson interjected a word, and made the passage read "this is the token of my covenant."

MR. WILKINSON—Turn to Genesis and you will find it there.

MR. HARDING—You can do so when your time comes.

The promise concerning Christ is given in the 12th chapter: the covenant of circumcision and the promise concerning Canaan in the 17th, twenty-four years later.

Mr. Wilkinson quoted from Gal. 3: 17; though why he did so I can't imagine, for it ruins him. The verse reads thus: "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 God of more effect." This verse shows that the Abrahamic covenant concerning Christ was confirmed 430 years before the giving of the law. This takes us back beyond the 17th chapter of Genesis, and the covenant of circumcision, to the day

when Abram was 75 years old. (Gen. chap. 12.) The count is made thus: It was 25 years till Isaac was born, Abraham being 100 at his birth (Gen. 21:5); Isaac was 60 years old when Jacob was born (Gen. 25: 26); Jacob was 130 years old when he went down into Egypt (Gen. 47: 28). And, according to the received chronology—that of Archbishop Usher and Sir Isaac Newton—the sojourn was 215 years. $25 + 60 + 130 + 215 = 430$. This goes back 24 years too far for Mr. Wilkinson's purposes—it ruins his argument. The covenant in Gen. 12 is fulfilled in Christ, Abraham's spiritual seed. That in Gen. 17, concerned his fleshly offspring, had a fleshly seal, circumcision; and a temporal reward, the land of Canaan.

I want now to read to you about the covenant under which we now are. You will find that in it there are no infants. I read from Jeremiah 31:31-34:

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that 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 that I took them by the hand, to bring them out of the land of Egypt; which My covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord;

"But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel; After those days, saith the Lord, I will put My law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts, and I will be their God and they shall be My people.

"And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know Me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord: for I will forgive their iniquity, and I will remember their sin no more."

Under the old Jewish covenant it was often necessary for a man to instruct his neighbor, and to tell him about God; for they were born into it, and bought into it, and were often even ignorant that there is a God. Not so under the new. God says the new covenant is this: "I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts." The new covenant is for those who can receive the law of God into their minds and hearts. Paul quotes this passage from Jeremiah in the 8th chapter of Hebrews, and applies it to the Christian dispensation. In establishing this dispensation, Jesus said, "Go ye, therefore, and *teach* all nations, baptizing them," etc. (Matt. 28:19.) "Go ye into all the world, and *preach the gospel* to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," etc.

The teaching first, and then the baptism after the teaching and preaching had been heard, understood, and believed. Under the old covenant, circumcision came first, and afterwards the teaching. It was a flesh and blood affair. Under the new we have a spiritual religion—one that appeals to the mind and heart. Into it no one can come except he be born again.

But that Mr. Wilkinson's Church is not the Church of the new covenant is certain; for, as every one knows, there are a great number in it that don't know the Lord, nor anybody, nor anything else. What does the little infant know of the Lord, upon whom the minister sprinkles water, and prays that it may be delivered from the wrath of God? The little one of whom we are told at one moment that he is as pure as an angel in heaven, and in the next breath that he is under a twofold curse? What does he know about the Lord?

MR. WILKINSON—I will give my opponent an extra half-hour if he will answer a question at this point.

MR. HARDING—Sit down until your time comes. What does a little babe know about the covenant of the Lord? Nothing. But everybody under the new covenant knows the Lord, from the least to the greatest.

MR. WILKINSON—I will give him an hour if he will answer my question.

MR. HARDING—Excuse Mr. Wilkinson, my friends; it makes a Methodist wonderfully restless to show up his inconsistencies and the blunders of his creed; it is almost impossible for him to keep still.

My friend absolutely came out with the statement that "ye must be born again," in talking about these covenants! What! Does he agree that infants must be born again to enter the new covenant? Does he know what it is to be born again? Listen. "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God."—1 John 3: 1. "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth."—Jas. 1: 18. "Being born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God which liveth and abideth for ever. . . . And this is the word which by the gospel is preached unto you."—1 Peter 1: 23-25. In order to be born again one must believe the proposition that Jesus is the Christ. Can infants do that? He must be begotten by the word of truth. Can infants hear and understand the word of truth? Are the babies begotten again of God? Do they know Christ and love Him /

Dear friends, the Church is not for infants; it is for the lost, for those that need to be saved. The infant does not need to be saved.

I will go further and say that an infant is not saved. It is safe, not saved. It will go to heaven because it is safe. Infants are not lost; they never were lost. The Bible says "sin is the transgression of the law," and God says "the soul that sinneth it shall die,"

When infants become old enough to sin, it is necessary for them to be saved; but while they are in their infantile purity they are not lost. They cannot fulfill any law, they do not violate any law; they are under no curse two-fold or otherwise. I would rather that my tongue should cleave to my mouth, than pray for the delivery of infants from the Divine wrath, when they are not under His wrath. Infants are as pure as the angels in heaven. My opponent admits that they do not need the Lord's Supper. But what is the reason he does not give the Lord's Supper to infants, as he gives them baptism? Is baptism more important than the Lord's Supper to save them from the wrath of God? If this chart exhibited by my opponent proves anything—which it does not do—it involves this, that the Lord's Supper, as well as baptism, should be given to infants; and, indeed, in the Greek Church they give the Lord's Supper to infants.

MR. WILKINSON—They immerse them, too.

MR. HARDING—My friend will talk about immersion, he cannot get away from it. Now, as he is so anxious for more on that subject, I will give him one other little point. Section 1. (p. 13) of his Discipline reads thus: "The Doctrines of the Methodist Church of Canada are declared to be those contained in the twenty-five Articles of Religion, and those taught by the Rev. John Wesley, M.A., in his Notes on the New Testament, and in the first fifty-two Sermons of the first series of his discourses, published during his life time." But Wesley, in his Notes, says Rom. 6: 4 refers to immersion. So then this interpretation which Mr. Wilkinson said none but a fool would give, is *the doctrine of his own Church*. On page 73 of the Discipline, this question is asked of preachers: "Do you sincerely and fully believe the doctrines of Methodism as contained in the Articles of Religion, and as taught by Mr. Wesley in his Notes on the New Testament, and Volumes of Sermons?" To this question Mr. Wilkinson said, Yes, upon becoming a preacher. He is a nice man, is he not, to accuse his Church, his father and himself of being fools?

While I am on the matter of consistency, you may take another point. There is a minister on this platform [Mr. Paterson, Presbyterian,] who said in a public speech that Irenaeus mentioned infant baptism. I shook my head. He vociferated, "I will stake my word and honor as a Christian and a minister that he did do it." I have

just read in your hearing a statement from the great Meyer, who says it is not certainly attested before Tertullian. But Tertullian, you know, wrote after Irenaeus. What of the gentleman's word and honor? Gone, gone forever.

My opponent referred to the Commission: "Go ye therefore and teach all nations baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and 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." He then argued that as infants are in the nations, they should be baptized. Did he not notice that "teaching" came before "baptizing." That is the covenant we live under. The first thing we must do is to teach. In Mark, Christ gave this command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be damned." "Go teach," says Matthew. "Go preach the gospel," says Mark; so teaching comes first and afterwards baptizing. And after the baptizing, they are taught to observe all things which God had commanded them.

The late Dr. A. T. Bledsoe, editor of the *Southern Review* (Methodist), ranked high among the honorable, accomplished, and scholarly men of the United States. He practiced infant baptism: but concerning the Commission he thus writes in a discussion with his brother Dr. Miller:—

"Take this command for example, 'Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature.'—Mark 16: 15. Now, here the 'class' is every creature. But stocks and stones and dumb brutes are 'a part of this class.' Shall we, then, in obedience to Mr. Miller's logic, preach the gospel to stocks and stones and dumb brutes? Reason and common sense forbid! These compel us, in spite of his logic, to limit the preaching of the gospel, first to human beings, and then to that portion of the class thus limited who are capable of hearing and understanding the gospel." *The Southern Review*, July, 1874, p. 176.

Dr. Bledsoe, learned and astute though he was, devoted to Methodism, given to the practice of infant baptism, nevertheless could not see it in the Commission, which is our only authority for baptizing any body. Were they not to baptize the nations? Yes, they were to *teach* all nations, baptizing them; that is, baptizing *the taught*.

My opponent is in a bad way. He points to a passage of Scripture and says, "Here is infant baptism." One of his own brethren steps up, a man more learned, more critical, more distinguished by far than

himself, and, after looking carefully at the passage, says, "I cannot see it." He has gone to the covenant of circumcision; but such men as Ditzler and Stuart say, "It is not there." He goes to the Commission, but Bledsoe, Neander, and Meyer say it is not there. He goes to the "new covenant;" but behold! God says, "I will put My law in their inward parts." Then He says of those under this covenant, "All shall know Me, from the least to the greatest." Then, through Dr. Schaff, we hear many paedo-baptists shouting, "Infant baptism is not of apostolic origin at all."

Dr. Bledsoe says, "Tertullian is the first writer in the Church who makes any express mention of the custom of infant baptism." *Southern Review*, April, 1874, p. 339.

But Tertullian wrote about A.D. 200, that is, 100 years after John, the last apostle, died. The passage from Irenaeus (who wrote about thirty years before Tertullian) that is by some supposed to refer to infant baptism, reads thus:—

"Therefore as He was a master, He had also the age of a master. Not disdaining nor going in a way above human nature; nor breaking in His own person the law which He had set for mankind; but sanctifying every several age by the likeness that it has to Him. For He came to save all persons by Himself: all, I mean, who by Him are regenerated unto God—infants and little ones and children and youths and elder persons. Therefore He went through the several ages: for infants being made an infant, sanctifying infants; to little ones He was made a little one, sanctifying those of that age; and also giving an example of godliness, justice, and dutifulness; to youths he was a youth," etc. *Wall's Infant Baptism*, Vol. I., p. 45.

It is argued that by the word "regenerated" Irenaeus meant "baptized." That he did not so mean is evident from the following quotation from him on the next page: "And again, when He gave His disciples the commission of regenerating unto God, He said unto them, 'Go teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit,'" where the "commission of *regenerating*" plainly means the commission of *teaching* and baptizing. To regenerate a man according to the Bible, with which Irenaeus agrees, is to fill his heart with loving faith in Jesus by teaching him, and then to baptize him. Tertullian is the first writer that ever mentioned infant baptism, so far as any mortal knows. This is what he says:—

"Therefore, according to every one's condition and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of baptism is more profitable, es-

pecially in the case of little children. For, what need is there that the godfathers should be brought into danger? Because they may either fail of their promises by death, or they may be mistaken by a child's proving of a wicked disposition. Our Lord says, indeed, Do not forbid them to come unto Me. Therefore, let them come when they are grown up; let them come when they understand, when they are instructed whither it is that they come; let them be made Christians when they can know Christ. What need their guiltless age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins? Men will proceed more warily in worldly things; and he that should not have earthly goods committed to him, yet shall have heavenly. Let them know how to desire this salvation, that you may appear to have given to one that asketh.

"For no less reason unmarried persons ought to be kept off, who are likely to come into temptation; as well those that never were married, upon account of their coming to ripeness, as those in widowhood, for the miss of their partner, until they either marry or be confirmed in continence. They that understand the weight of baptism will rather dread the receiving it than the delaying of it. An entire faith is secure of salvation." *Wall's History of Infant Baptism*, Vol. I., p. 58.

Origen, who wrote about ten years after Tertullian, is the first writer to speak favorably of infant baptism. *He thought babies ought to be baptized to wash away the guilt of original sin.* He says.—

"Having occasion given in this place, I will mention a thing that causes frequent inquiries among the brethren. Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. Of what sins? Or when have they sinned? Or how can any reason of the laver in their case hold good, but according to that sense that we mentioned even now: none is free from pollution, though his life be but the length of one day upon the earth? And it is for that reason, because by the sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away, that infants are baptized." *Wall's History of Infant Baptism*, Vol. I., p. 65.

[Time expired.]

EVENING SESSION—FOURTH DAY.

MR. WILKINSON'S SECOND SPEECH.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—I will endeavor as rapidly as is consistent with clearness to run over, by way of review, what my opponent advanced in his hour's speech this afternoon. Let it be borne in mind that this review will cover an hour's speech instead of half an hour, hence it may occupy a little more time than usual, but as soon as I get over it I will advance something further in support of my proposition.

My opponent introduced his authorities again, and endeavored to create the impression that the great scholars were nearly all on his side, though he was aware of the fact that he could not array quite so many under this proposition as he did under the former. He quoted from Geo. E. Steitz, a book I have not got. I do not know whether he has been correctly quoted or not. His quotation from Dr. Meyer is no doubt correct. I have read a good many paedo-baptist authorities, and know that they make concessions as I have done during this debate. But if you read all they say, instead of a mere fraction of it, it sounds very different. If you read part it sounds very nice for the other side. Suppose my opponent goes home to Kentucky and tells the people that an unfortunate Methodist minister in Canada endeavored to refute his argument that baptism is immersion. Suppose he were to say that this unfortunate Canadian admitted that the word *baptizo* did mean to immerse. Of course people would say he was a strange Methodist preacher, to try to prove it didn't mean immerse while admitting it did. But would that be the truth? Yes, as far as it goes. Would it be the whole truth? Not by any means. Would it give a fair impression of what I said? Not at all. And if you left the statement thus it would amount to a downright falsehood. So the truth by being quoted in fragments is left open to an entirely false construction. This trick has often been resorted to. I do not know that it has been very extensively by my opponent, but by those who uphold his side of the question, and I can prove it, and I think I can show that a little of it was done by my opponent before the debate on this proposition began. You will remember that he made reference to some great scholars, and among others quoted from Dr.

Stuart, who should have said that there was no authority for infant baptism in the New Testament. I may not be able to produce the same quotation and show that it does not fairly represent Dr. Stuart's sentiment, but I will show how Dr. Stuart has been misrepresented on the question of mode. He was quoted as saying that *baptizo* meant to "dip, plunge, immerse," etc., and the impression was sought to be conveyed to the audience that in this he was in accord with my opponent and opposed to me; but what are the facts? That Dr. Stuart was asked what were the meanings of *bapto* and *baptizo*, in the classic, not in the Bible sense, and he gave the meaning quoted by my opponent. But why did he not give the whole facts? Dr. Stuart says on page 308 that these words in the New Testament signify "to wash, to bedew, to moisten." My opponent's proposition involved Christian baptism: why, then, did he not tell us what Dr. Stuart said about baptism in the Bible instead of the classics, if he wanted to be an honest man, tell the truth, and go from here with a good reputation? On page 313 Dr. Stuart says, "There is no absolute certainty from usage that the word *baptizo*, when applied to the rite of baptism, means to immerse or plunge." Did he quote Stuart correctly? Let him answer that question. At page 388 Stuart says, "My belief is that we *do obey* the command to baptize when we do it by affusion or sprinkling." All the scholars of the age on his side, forsooth, when as a matter of fact they nearly all agree with my position when their true sentiments are known. On page 381 Stuart, addressing the Baptists, says, "If you take your stand on the ancient practice of the Churches in the days of the early Christian fathers, and charge me with a departure from this, in my turn I have a like charge to make against you. It is notorious and admits of no contradiction, that baptism in those days of immersion was administered to men, women and children, *in puris naturalibus*, naked as Adam and Eve before the fall. The most delicate and modest females, young or old, could obtain no exception where immersion was practiced. This practice was pleaded for and insisted on because *it was thought to be apostolic.*"

Now, I ask, is it fair to give you the testimony of this author as to the meaning of *baptizo* in its classic sense, with which I have not disagreed from the beginning, and conceal his definition and testimony as to the Scripture sense, when the discussion has reference to the latter and not to the former? I maintain that it is dishonest, and shows that his quotations are not to be depended on.

He insisted that I should tell him what infants were baptized for. He wanted to convey the impression that I could not do it, that I

was a coward, as he said the other night. When I showed the chart, and explained that the great pillar of regeneration had in the former dispensation been symbolized outwardly by ceremonial washings and circumcision, and that baptism coupled those ideas together, as Paul explained in Tit. 3: 5, and Col. 2: 11, 12, to represent this two-fold operation, cleansing and renewal, my opponent need not have asked what infants were baptized for, or what infants were circumcised for. Whatever they were circumcised for, as a symbol of spiritual truth, they are baptized for, and that is, as I explained fully and clearly, to make visible to the mind, through the eye, the great spiritual truths of cleansing and renewal. I have explained that to be the meaning of a symbol all through. Infants are baptized that you may see in the visible symbol the spiritual operation that Christ performs in their hearts through the efficacy of the atonement. Shall I again be asked what infant baptism is for? That is my answer. When my opponent rises and repeats that question again you will know that he is doing it to kill time; that he has nothing to say, and wants to put in a little time until he can find some book in which he has a page turned down in which he has something to read. If he fails to have a quotation ready he will go back to the old passages and read them over again.

My opponent has made quite a handle of the Methodist Discipline, and has sought to point out that the minister prays to God to deliver the child from divine wrath. I will read some clauses from the Discipline, and then you will see how its meaning has been distorted. In interpreting language it is fair to interpret it in its scope, not taking a little bit from its context and examining it apart from its connections. Let us read this prayer over again and see if it contains the monstrous heresy my opponent is endeavoring to rind in it. Let it be remembered that the infant candidate for baptism is a human being, subject to all the vicissitudes, evils, and temptations incident to this life, and we frame our prayers to cover the whole ground, past, present, and future. We say, "Almighty and everlasting God, who of Thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family in the Ark from perishing by water; and also didst safely lead the children of Israel, Thy people, through the Red Sea, figuring thereby Thy holy baptism; and by the baptism of Thy well-beloved Son in the river Jordan, didst sanctify water for this holy sacrament, we beseech Thee, for Thine infinite mercies, that Thou wilt look upon this child; wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, that he, being delivered from Thy wrath, may be received into the ark of

Christ's Church; and being steadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in love, may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, that finally he may come to the land of everlasting life," etc. Now, it will be remembered that the Methodist Church has always recognized the fact that little children being in the kingdom of heaven, they are already delivered from (rod's wrath. That clause in the prayer, therefore, points to something that at present actually exists. My opponent can make a terrible hullabaloo about our crying to God to deliver children from His wrath, but we never do thus cry. Therefore it creates a false impression, and that, conveyed intentionally, is an untruth. If my opponent did not intend thus to tell an untruth, he made a big mistake, because he stated what was false, though not a falsehood. He makes a great many mistakes that I let pass, but this is a pretty serious one. Besides, it will be seen that we ascribe the deliverance of the child from God's wrath, to the washing and sanctification of the Holy Ghost, and not to water; hence it is not to deliver the child from God's wrath that we baptize him. As to the expression in the prayer, "may be received into the ark of Christ's Church," we believe that the infants belong to the invisible Church which we teach and believe to be the same as the kingdom of heaven into which we recognize they are already brought by the Spirit through the atonement, and therefore we only mean that they may thus pass visibly to the eyes of the people, representing what has already occurred invisibly. I want to read another part of our Discipline to show how passages can be construed. "Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood," etc. It could be said by an opponent who was discussing the question of the Lord's Supper, that as Methodists pray to the Lord to help them so to eat the flesh of His Son, and so to drink of His blood, that certain results may accrue to them, that therefore they believe in transubstantiation, as does the Church of Rome. Yet no one really thinks that the Methodist Church holds any such belief. The passage I have quoted is fully explained in another clause, which reads:

"Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine, according to Thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed Body and Blood."

So also with regard to baptism. I turn to our articles of faith in the first part of the Discipline and read respecting baptism:

"Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference

whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized, but it is also a *sign* of regeneration, or the new birth."

That is what we teach. Is it fair, therefore, for a man to take a scrap away from the context and ring the changes on it, and strive to make the impression that we teach some heresy which we have always repudiated? But in this way the teachings of the Bible, or any other book, may be made to appear ridiculous, and such a principle of interpretation is exceedingly unjust. To act fairly with any Church we must interpret their teachings according to their own interpretations of them.

The "office editor" of the *Standard*, four years ago, used the same argument about Methodists crying to the Lord to save little children from His wrath. But the people got sick of it: it was hash, hash, and rehash. I think the people here will get sick of resurrection hash too; and if my opponent has any respect for himself or his friends he will bury the stinking thing out of sight. If you don't get more from my present opponent, it will be an agreeable disappointment to the congregation.

He accuses me of saying that his doctrine would send infants to hell, because he does not baptize them. I deny that I said so. The "office editor" was very much in the habit of taking hold of my statements and trying to misconstrue them, and he did this so persistently that on the fifth evening of our debate I publicly offered five dollars to any person for one argument that I had brought forward, and which he had attempted to reply to, which he had not first twisted out of shape. It is my solemn impression that my present opponent put that statement in my mouth with the intention of giving a false impression. If he apologizes, I will take this back.

Mr. HARDING—I will not do it.

Mr. WILKINSON—No, he never apologizes for anything he says, no matter how mean or unjust the statement is. I will repeat what I said, and I challenge him to say that I am not repeating it correctly. I said that his doctrine would logically consign children to hell. Tonight I am going to prove it.

God made a covenant with Abram in Gen. 12: 1-3, in which all the *families* of the earth were to be "blessed." This blessing must include whatever benefits are procured for man by the atonement, for my opponent himself claims it was the covenant of redemption securing spiritual blessings, as distinguished from the covenant in the 17th chapter, which he says was a covenant of temporal blessings. Now, families include little children, especially "*all* the fami-

lies of the earth." Consequently, the covenant of redemption included little children who are saved by means of the atonement. But my opponent now excludes little children from the blessings of salvation, because they cannot "know the Lord." Jesus says, "This is life eternal, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent." The children cannot meet the conditions, according to my opponent, therefore cannot inherit eternal life. This is why I say that his doctrine logically sends the little ones to hell, and I cannot, for the life of me, see how he can escape from the conclusion.

He quoted something about the Graves-Ditzler debate to prove that Dr. Ditzler agreed not to debate the question of the covenants, because he admitted that they had nothing to do with infant baptism. I doubt if Dr. Ditzler said anything of the kind. In the foot-notes of his own work on Baptism, Dr. Ditzler has pointed out where his sentiments in that debate were misrepresented, misquoted, and distorted all through the book. I will give you a sample. He says on page 139, in a foot-note:

"After the rebuke we gave Dr. Judd, and him at Carrollton, which he never resented *there* (pp. 146-7), Dr. Graves, in his last speech—*not as delivered*, but as *re-written* by him after I had returned to Kentucky (p. 530)—repeats the shameful untruth, and says, '*Amad* in Syriac, AS ALL STANDARD LEXICOGRAPHERS TESTIFY, PRIMARILY SIGNIFIES TO IMMERSE!' A more willful falsehood was never uttered by any perjurer, oath-bound member of a robber clan on earth. Those, with hosts of other statements in these last speeches on Mode, and all subsequent parts of the so-called debate, account for their not sending to me a single proof-sheet after my sixteenth speech on the First Proposition, though I requested it, and gave them my address."

If necessary, I can give more examples, which I have here. But, for the present, I forbear.

My opponent tells you that under the old dispensation only males were circumcised. Under the old dispensation Abraham's seed were justified by faith and circumcised. Only those circumcised were to be admitted to the Passover. As a matter of fact, females were justified by faith, partook of the Passover, and therefore must have been *accounted as circumcised*, though excused from any outward operation except purification by water. Why do we baptize females? Because this dispensation is the dispensation of the Spirit. Males and females are one in Christ, and in both the original and the revised version we read "all *one man* in Christ." In that spiritual sense no one but the

"one man" is baptized. The female, therefore, was included in the male in circumcision, and the female is included in the male in baptism.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. HARDING'S SECOND REPLY.

I observe that Mr. Wilkinson is very much out of humor this evening; and I am not at all surprised at it. Had I received such a "dressing down" as he did, I would have been out of humor myself. He says that I have been out of order, that I have made insinuations, and so forth; he doubts whether or not I have properly represented the authorities, and he is certain that I have misrepresented the Discipline. I don't care what he says about me, how many insinuations he makes about my being unfair, nor how many doubts he expresses. It is not what a man *says*, nor what he *doubts*, but what he *proves*, that does the damage. If he would destroy the force of my quotations, let him show that I have misrepresented at least one of the authors quoted.

I propose to follow him right along, and to show him up as I go, and to keep in a good humor, too, while about it.

He started out by intimating that I had scrapped the prayer of the Discipline which is used at the baptism of infants. I read it right through, and I will read again the part which he claims I misrepresent; and you shall see that it is he that distorts and misrepresents his own Discipline. It reads thus:

" We beseech Thee, for Thine infinite mercies, that Thou wilt look upon this child; wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost; that he, being delivered from Thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church, and being steadfast in faith, joyful through hope, and rooted in love, may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, that finally he may come to the land of everlasting life; there to reign with Thee, world without end, through Jesus Christ our Lord."

"O merciful God, grant that the old Adam in this child may be so buried, that the new man may be raised up in him."—(*Discipline*, p. 168.)

Mr. Wilkinson claims that the expression, "being delivered from

Thy wrath," implies that the child was delivered from God's wrath before his baptism, before this prayer; and that he is baptized because he has been delivered from God's wrath: I suppose, then, that the expression, "being steadfast in faith," used in the same period, means that the child was steadfast in faith before the baptism, and before the prayer! Astonishing logic! The whole context shows that Mr. Wilkinson's interpretation is a gross perversion of the meaning of the prayer • for God is not only asked to wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, but He is also entreated to grant that the *old Adam* may be buried in him, and the *new man* raised up: according to the prayer, therefore, the child is unwashed, not sanctified by the Holy Ghost, is full of the old Adam (*sin*), and has not yet in him the new man (Christ). Just before this prayer the minister says, "All men are conceived and born in sin;" that "except a man be born of water and Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God;" and then he asks the audience to pray "that he (the child), being baptized with water, may also be baptized with the Holy Ghost, be received into Christ's holy Church, and become a lively member of the same." So the Discipline regards the child as not yet baptized with the Holy Ghost, not yet received into Christ's holy Church. By the way, we have here again the present participle, "*being baptized* with water." Does that mean that the child has been already baptized with water? Oh, no; these words are uttered by the minister to the audience before the prayer, and before the baptism: just so, "being delivered from the wrath of God" does not mean already delivered from His wrath.

Now, my friends, I ask you who perverted the Discipline? Who made the false impression? You remember that I showed you in my last speech that Origen is the first writer who mentions infant baptism to favor it, and he says: "None is free from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one day upon the earth. And it is for that reason, because by the sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away, that infants are baptized." (*Wall's Hist. Inf. Bap.*, Vol. 1, p. 65.) Nothing can be more certain than that infant baptism was designed in the first place to wash away the guilt of "original sin;" and the framers of the Discipline intended to convey that idea in their ritual for the baptism of children. Mr. Wilkinson, in talking about my quotation from this prayer, said that my presentation of it was false; that if I *intended* to create a false impression, I was guilty of an untruth; that if the false statement was unintentional, I had made a big mistake. Of course he would not make a statement that

is not literally and accurately correct to save his soul! So he would have us believe. But, my friends, he is one of the last men living to use the word "false" so freely. Since this debate began, he has made statement after statement as false as false can be. He said the revised version does not say that Christ came up out of the water. That is false. He told us that Alexander Campbell had said that King James' translators were immersionists. That is false. Campbell said no such thing, but exactly the reverse of it. He gave as a reason that he could not find "sprinkle" as a definition of *baptizo*, that Liddell and Scott's is the only Greek-English lexicon; he said all others define in Latin, Greek, etc. Upon being shown his error, he said he had accidentally left out the word "*standard*;" he meant to say Liddell and Scott's is the only *standard* Greek-English lexicon, apparently overlooking the fact that this word would have spoiled the point of his first remark. Oh, but Mr. Wilkinson was only making mistakes! Then he should be a little more particular in making charges against others.

Now, concerning the Graves-Ditzler debate: I have here the book [holding it before the audience]. Mr. Wilkinson says that Ditzler's sentiments were misrepresented, misquoted and distorted all through this book; he says that Ditzler himself so testifies. Let us see about that; I turn to the first of the book, and find the following statement:—

"MEMPHIS, Tenn., Feb. 15th, 1876.

"We, the parties to the debate embraced in the present volume, hereby declare that we have read and corrected the whole work, which is now a faithful transcript of what we said in the discussion at Carrollton, Mo.

"J. R. GRAVES.

"J. DITZLER."

This debate was published by the Southern Baptist Publication Society. From their introduction, written by their secretary, W. B. Mayfield, I read the following:

"With all these facts before us, the society felt justified in making arrangements to report, at great expense, the whole discussion. This we have done. And in order that there might be no doubt as to the fact that the authors are truly represented, we have paid Dr. Ditzler \$500 to correct the MSS. of our reporter, and read the proof as the work went through the press. Dr. Graves has done the same work free of charge. So the reader may be sure that in the pages of this book the speakers are fairly reported."

So it appears that Dr. Ditzler corrected the MSS. of the reporter, so far as his own speeches were concerned, before they went to the printer, and then read the proofs as they went through the press; and for this work he received \$500: moreover, he declares the book to be a faithful transcript of what was said in the debate. Observe this, too: Mr. Ditzler, in the passage quoted by Mr. Wilkinson, does not say *his* speeches were tampered with, but he charges that his opponent, Dr. Graves, re-wrote his own speeches; the proof-sheets they did not send him were the proof-sheets of Graves' speeches. [Mr. Wilkinson's readings about this affair were not from the Graves-Ditzler debate—the book in question—but from Ditzler on Baptism, a book published by Mr. Ditzler some time after the publication of the debate.—J. A. H.]

My courteous and gentlemanly opponent also referred to my quotation from Meyer, He was careful not to say that it was incorrect. This greatest of New Testament commentators, although a member of a paedobaptist Church, boldly and positively affirms that "The baptism of the children of Christians, of which no trace can be found in the New Testament, is not to be held as an apostolic ordinance, as, indeed, it encountered early and long resistance; but it is an *institution of the Church*, which gradually arose in post-apostolic times," etc. *On Acts 16: 15, p. 311*. In making this statement the great commentator is in perfect accord with the greatest of Church historians, Neander, who, being also a member of a paedobaptist Church, nevertheless says: "Baptism was administered at first to adults, as men were accustomed to conceive baptism and faith as strictly connected. WE HAVE ALL REASON for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution." *Ch. Hist., p. 311, Vol. 1*,

Mr. Wilkinson said that when he was debating with Mr. McDiarmid that gentleman read from the Methodist Discipline until he got sick. I venture to say that Mr. Wilkinson was the sick man. He looks sick now. It is enough to make any one sick to defend and explain that Discipline; to deliver such stuff as he has been belching forth here.

Do you see this book? [Exhibiting a volume to the audience], Mr. Wilkinson had a copy of it lying on his table yesterday. I found this copy, accidentally, to-day. It is McKay on Baptism. The author is a Presbyterian. On the back of the book is a picture of a king and queen kneeling in a bath-tub, *naked*, while the minister pours water on them. I wonder why Mr. Wilkinson did not ridicule affusion because it was practiced thus? He knew it, for he had this book. In being immersed the sexes were baptized separately, the

women (as I told you) being led into the font to the neck, before the priest entered, by deaconesses. But how about the affusion? I do not propose to ridicule this practice, for there is nothing in it, *pro* or *con.*, bearing on our discussion. My opponent introduced it, doubtless, because he wanted something low and dirty to talk about;—that is the channel in which his mind runs. But I am glad I found McKay's book, because he sums up the baptisms of the New Testament; he says there are in the New Testament ten separate instances of baptism, and he names them thus:

1. The three thousand on the day of Pentecost, Acts 2: 41.
2. The Eunuch, Acts 8: 2G-40.
3. Saul of Tarsus, Acts 9: 18.
4. The Samaritan Converts, Acts 8: 12.
5. The Twelve Men at Ephesus, Acts 19: 1-7.
6. Lydia and her Household, Acts 16: 15.
7. The Jailer, Acts 16: 33.
8. Crispus and his House, Acts 18: 8,
9. The Household of Stephanas, 1 Cor. 1: 16.
10. Cornelius, Acts 10: 48.

Here now, according to this paedo-baptist, we have all the cases of baptism to be found in the New Testament. We will look through them carefully, and see if we can find an infant among them all.

1. Of the three thousand it is said, "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls." Acts 2: 41. Here there were no infants, for they were all old enough to receive the word gladly.

2. This case, that of the eunuch, is that of one man; of course there is nothing for infant baptism here.

3. And so of this case, that of Saul of Tarsus.

4. 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 8:12. No babies here.

5. The fifth case is that of twelve men. Acts 19: 1-7.

Of course there were no babies among these.

6. This is the only hope for the paedo-baptist, this case of Lydia and her household; for as I have shown in the former cases that no infants were present, by clear and unmistakable evidence, so will I in those to come. I repeat it, if there is a vestige of infant baptism to be found in any of these New Testament cases it is here. But there is no proof that she was married. Granting, for the sake of

argument, that she was married, there is no proof that she had any children. Granting that she was married, and that she had children, there is no proof that there were infants among them. Granting that she was married, and had children, and that there was at least one infant among them, there is no proof that she had it with her, seeing that she was not at Thyatira, her own city, but at Philippi. Finally, it is said (Acts 16: 40), "And they [Paul and Silas] went out of the prison, and entered into the house of Lydia: and when they had seen the brethren, they comforted them and departed." Those in Lydia's house were old enough to be *comforted*, and to be called *brethren*. On this case Meyer says (*Com. on Acts*, p. 311.): "If, in the Jewish and Gentile families which were converted to Christ, there were children, their baptism is to be assumed in *those* cases, when they were so far advanced that they could and did confess their faith in Jesus as the Messiah; for this was the universal, absolutely necessary qualification for the reception of baptism. If, on the other hand, there were children still incapable of confessing, baptism could not be administered to those to whom that, which was the necessary presupposition of baptism for Christian sanctification, was still wanting." Just so, if there had been ever so many infants in her house Paul would not have baptized them; for he was sent to turn people from darkness to light; to preach the Gospel and baptize believers; not to sprinkle water on the little innocents. Observe these facts, before we leave this case: Lydia is represented as being engaged in business; she said, "Come into *my* house;" not a word is said about a husband, not the slightest intimation is made that she had one; after their imprisonment it is said that Paul and Silas entered into *Lydia's* house; all these facts indicate that she did not have a husband.

7. There were no infants in the household of the jailer; this is evident from the following statements: it is said, "they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." (Acts 16: 22.) After the baptism it is said, "And when he had brought them into his house, he set meat before them, and rejoiced, believing in God with all his house" (verse 3-1). So it plainly appears that his household was old enough to hear the preaching and to believe it.

8. This case is narrated thus: "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." (Acts 18: 8.) So it is very evident that in this case there were no infants. Only believers were baptized.

9. In 1 Cor. 1: 16, Paul says, "I baptized also the household of

Stephanas." In the 16th chapter of the same letter, at the 15th verse, Paul says, "I beseech you, brethren, (ye know the house of Stephanas, that it is the first fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints,) that ye submit yourselves unto such, and to every one that helpeth with us, and laboreth." Now, this letter was written about five years after Paul had planted the Church at Corinth, and not longer than six years after his entrance into Achaia. If there were any infants in the household of Stephanas, they must have developed wonderfully, for within six years they had addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints, and Paul exhorted the Church at Corinth to submit to such as they were. Babies that can be so well developed in six years that they are qualified to be rulers in the Church of God, I freely grant, are fit subjects for baptism.

10. About this case we learn the following things: All those assembled at the house of Cornelius were there to hear all things that God had commanded (see Acts 10: 33). "The Holy Ghost fell on all those that heard the word" (verse 44). Peter commanded those upon whom the Holy Ghost had fallen to be baptized (verses 47 and 48). All these were saved by the words that Peter told them,—of course by hearing, believing, and obeying the words (see Acts 11:14). Of course there were no infants here.

Yes, I am very glad that I found Mr. McKay's book. He has summed up for us all the cases of baptism recorded, or referred to, in the New Testament; and, upon examining them, we find in every case (but one) proof positive and clear—proof so conclusive that not the least room for doubt remains—that no infants were among those baptized. This one exceptional case is that of a woman and her household. In examining this case, we have seen that there is no proof that she had infants, no proof that she had children, no proof that she had a husband, and, of course, in the case there is no proof for infant baptism.

But does the New Testament ever speak about little children at all? Oh, yes! about blessing little children, praying for them, feeding them, traveling with them, and so on, but never a word about baptizing them: in this last connection "believers," "men" and "women," are spoken of, but children never.

The following extracts from the Scriptures illustrate this: "Then were 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." Matt. 19: 1344. "And they that had eaten were about five thousand men, besides women and children." Matt. 14: 21. "And they that did eat were four thousand men, beside women and children." Matt. 15: 38. When Paul and his company left Tyre, the disciples there accompanied him, "with wives and children," till they were out of the city; then they kneeled and prayed, and separated (see Acts 21: 5). Thus men, women and children were mentioned; but not so when Church membership or baptism were spoken of. Then the records run thus: "And believers were the more added to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women." Acts 5: 14. "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 8:12. A difference in phraseology which is very significant indeed.

Mr. Wilkinson holds (as paedo-baptists generally have done, though we have seen that some of the greatest minds among them have recently given up the position as untenable), that baptism comes in the room of circumcision—that the two ordinances are different in form, but the same in substance. But the uncircumcised man-child was "cut off" from God's people (Gen. 17: 14); is that true of unbaptized children? Are the little babies cut off from God's people if they are not baptized? This must be true of them, if baptism has now taken the place of circumcision.

Then he tells us that the little ones are baptized to bring them into the *visible* Church. But they were born into the visible Jewish Church, and were cut off from it afterwards if they failed to be circumcised. Moreover, according to his disciples, a "visible Church" is a congregation of "faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments duly administered," etc. Of such a Church infants cannot be members. By no law of language known on earth can you call infants "faithful men." Therefore, according to the Discipline, they cannot be in the visible Church. No, the framers of the Discipline evidently believed that by baptism they are brought into the "invisible" Church.

[Time expired.]

MR. WILKINSON'S THIRD SPEECH.

In my last address I called for an explanation regarding the quotation made by my opponent from Dr. Stuart, about the meaning of *baptizo*. He has not, however, condescended to give us any explanation, thus virtually admitting that my charge, to the effect that he had misrepresented the authorities, is true. He has boasted, crowed and threatened like a rowdy (of course he is not a rowdy, however), and like a bully (but of course *he* isn't a bully), the dear man! He is a pink of propriety, but his conduct has reminded us very forcibly of such characters. He has done his best to drive me off the platform by his demonstrations on that line, he then interprets his rowdyish gesticulations as arguments, and has the audacity to stand before this congregation and crow about the "dressing" he gave me. This is what I would call "whistling to keep his courage up." He had better allow the congregation to judge about the "dressing," and then he will not expose himself to the charge of "tooting his own horn." But since he has had so much to say about the Paedo-baptist authorities which agree with him, and disagree with me, I have a challenge to make. It is this: That he accepts the appointment of a committee of either four or six persons, any number you like, of scholars, half on each side, to take the authorities from which he has quoted in this debate, and examine them and see if they really favor immersion and only immersion; also as to whether they have been correctly interpreted before this audience; and if the committee, after examining the books, say they have been correctly quoted and represented, then I shall think he has been acting an honest part, that he means business, and that there is something in his position. With respect to the quotation from Dr. Ditzler, I have only to say that I read from him correctly.

Mr. HARDING—Let me see the book.

Mr. WILKINSON—(Handing Mr. H. the book), I read from page 140. If there is a lie anywhere it is not between my opponent and myself, but between Dr. Ditzler and the publishers of that debate; and it is impossible for me to settle the question here. I intend, however, to get at the bottom facts of this matter and publish them to the world. I am satisfied that if all the facts were known a satisfactory explanation could be given, and I shall have it if it is to be had.*

* The reader is referred to pp. 8-10 of Dr. Ditzler's work on Baptism where the trickery practiced on him is clearly exposed.—T. L. W.

My opponent has asked why Christ was circumcised and afterwards "baptized? Christ was circumcised as a Jewish child, and He was baptized as a candidate for the priesthood. I am prepared to verify this explanation and to follow it up to its ultimate conclusion in every particular. In such a debate as this, however, it is impossible to go into all the details. I explained that under the old dispensation baptism was used for washing, circumcision for regeneration, that those two outward rites symbolized inward truth, and were perpetuated until the coming of Christ. But when the Christian dispensation was established those who had received circumcision under the former, because of its peculiarly Jewish character, received the new rite, which was more especially distinctive of the Christian economy. Suppose, for example, the Dominion of Canada were to be annexed to the United States. At present we have a seal, as a Dominion, to all our documents. If annexation were to take place we would pass under another Administration and have a new seal, and there would be no inconsistency in affixing the new form of seal to all old documents as well as to all new ones. And when Christianity was brought in, and they wanted to recognize the fact that the old system was no longer in force, was it not proper that a new seal should be put upon those who embraced religion under this dispensation and accepted Christ as their Messiah, even though they had formerly received the form of seal peculiar to the old dispensation? Especially is this the case in the present instance, because of what was involved. It was one thing to accept the Jewish religion, and quite another thing to accept Christ as the seed of Abraham and the Saviour of the world. A man might easily believe the promises of the Old Testament concerning the coming of a Messiah without receiving Christ, when He came, as that Messiah; hence it was important that he should receive the seal involving the latter, as well as the seal involving the former.

My opponent said he would still circumcise a Jew or advise him to be circumcised. Would he also baptize a Jew?

Mr. HARDING—Yes.

Mr. WILKINSON—Then a Jew lives still under the old dispensation, where there was circumcision and baptism both. To the Jew the old economy has not passed away. Under this dispensation as many as are baptized into Christ are "one man" in Christ. Would the Jewish Christian be one with the Gentile Christian according to my opponent's theory?

Mr. HARDING—He would.

Mr. WILKINSON—The Bible says that of those who are baptized into Christ, and have put on Christ, there is neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, but they are all one in Christ.

Mr. HARDING—Men and women still, for all that.

Mr. WILKINSON—And they are circumcised, having been buried with Him in baptism. And this is as true of women as of men. Make a note of that.

Mr. HARDING—I will do it.

Mr. WILKINSON—My opponent said that in Genesis 12th chapter Abraham was seventy-five years old, and in Genesis 17th chapter he was ninety-nine years old; and he undertook to prove that God had made a covenant with Abraham when he was seventy-five years old, and he said that it was absurd to suppose that He could add anything to that covenant when Abraham was ninety-nine years old, because in Gal. 3: 15 it says that though it were a man's covenant no man disannulleth or addeth thereto. Is putting a seal on a covenant adding to it? Suppose you and I make a deed, and afterwards attach our seals? Do we add to the deed? I always thought that the putting of a seal to a document ratified it. I was not aware that it added anything to its conditions, but thought it simply confirmed them. But when a favorite cause is in danger men can cavil over a very small matter, and raise objections where no objections exist. Besides, this was God's covenant. A covenant with God is simply accepting God's terms, and conforming ourselves to them. A covenant with God in which He promises to give certain blessings to man, is not a contract on man's part at all, except to abide by God's terms. God can, moreover, add as many more blessings to the covenant as He pleases. Surely it does not invalidate a promise to add more promises! But did not the first covenant include everything? Was it not the scheme of redemption in embryo? In Genesis 12th chapter we see the same blessings are given as in the 17th, but in the former they are like the opening buds, and in the latter we see them coming into full bloom, and in the New Testament we gather the fruit. That covenant included Abraham and his children. It was the same covenant as that under which we live—the Christian covenant. Therefore, it still includes Abraham and his children, and all who are Christ's are Abraham's children and heirs according to the promise. In Genesis 12th chapter God said He *would* make a covenant with Abraham. In the 17th chapter He *did* so. We will read the passage:

"Now the Lord *had* said unto Abram, Get thee out of thy country,

and from thy kindred, and from thy father's house, unto a land that I will shew thee:

"And I will make of thee a great nation, and I will bless thee, and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing:

"And I will bless them that bless thee, and curse him that curseth thee; and in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

Did God make another covenant after the twenty-four years had elapsed between giving the first promise and the second? He simply repeated what He had previously said. Yet my opponent wants to make it appear that there were two covenants, and that they had no connection with each other. It is said that God did not change Abraham's name in Genesis 12th chapter, but He did so in Genesis 17th chapter. Certainly, because he was to be the father of many nations, and Abraham signifies "father of a great multitude." But this was to be fulfilled in a spiritual sense. Let us look at Romans 4:16:

"Therefore it is of faith that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all.

("As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations.")

And this covenant that Abraham should be a father of many nations is recorded in Gen. 17th, and sealed with circumcision. So Paul is evidently quoting from that chapter, and not from Gen. 12th chapter, which says, "I will make thee a great nation," to prove that Abraham should have a numerous spiritual posterity. But I turn to Galatians and find that he quotes there, for the same purpose, a clause from the covenant as it is found in the 12th chapter, showing that it was the same covenant in both places. The passage reads: "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the Gentiles by faith, preached the Gospel beforehand unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations be blessed." That, I say, is from 12th Genesis; the other quotation is from 17th Genesis; and they are both quoted by the apostle to show that God made a covenant with Abraham involving justification through faith, thus proving them to be the same covenant. I therefore claim there is only one covenant. In 17th Genesis the seal was added. It was under that covenant, so sealed, that children eight days old were circumcised. I have shown that circumcision referred to spiritual blessings; that circumcision in the flesh was the sign and seal of a spiritual condition. To prove this I referred to Romans 4:11:

"And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteous-

ness 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."

It is a covenant involving faith all the way through. Faith secured the blessing, circumcision sealed it to Abraham and all his children. Therefore his children were in the covenant, and visibly recognized as being in it when they were eight days old; and that was a *sign* and *pledge* that they were renewed in heart and nature. My opponent says I interjected "token," and made the passage read "token of the covenant." God used the very phrase I quoted, Gen. 17: 11. So my opponent, with all his books, can be mistaken. If I made a slip of memory, and said that Christ came up "from" the water, and not "out of" the water, it was because I had only one passage in my mind at the time. Now, he says I used a word which was not in the passage, that is in it. So I guess we are about even on that score.

He quotes Jeremiah 31: 31, etc., to prove that a new covenant was to be made with the house of Israel, and he turned to Hebrews 8th chapter and quoted a passage to show that it was "a better covenant to be established on better promises." Do I understand my opponent correctly that this is the covenant of redemption referred to in Jeremiah?

Mr. HARDING—Yes, the covenant of God.

Mr. WILKINSON—That is a better covenant, established on better promises! Yet he said that under the covenant sealed with circumcision infants were brought in. When they were brought in they had to be taught to know the Lord, but under the "better covenant" it would not be so, because they would *all* know the Lord. So there would not be any children in that covenant, according to my opponent's principle of interpretation. Yet it is a better covenant, although it excludes children from its provisions! So, I repeat, that his doctrine logically consigns children to hell, and he cannot get out of it, unless he goes back on his own interpretation; because, if everybody shall know the Lord, and if infants are excluded because they are not capable of knowing the Lord, then there is no covenant including the children, and if there is no covenant to include the little ones, they have been left outside to perish. If they are not in the Christian covenant, they are not in Christ, hence they are not Abraham's seed; and if not Abraham's seed, they are not sealed, and they are not heirs of the promise unless they are Abraham's seed. Where, then, are the infants going? My opponent must either annihilate them or send them to perdition; there is no room in the

kingdom of heaven for them. Let him get out of this position if he can. But let me remind him that this covenant was to be "with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah," and if he rejects infants because they cannot know the Lord, I must insist on rejecting the Gentiles because they belong neither to the house of Israel nor Judah. Therefore, it cannot be the Christian covenant at all. And this is the result of allowing no elasticity in the interpretation of language. By adopting the principle of cast-iron literalness we can easily destroy the meaning of all Scripture. And this principle is only resorted to to overthrow theories which stand in our way. By the exercise of a little common sense, it will be seen that infants are not necessarily excluded from this new covenant by the phrase "All shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest." It is well known that, though infants were sealed under the Abrahamic covenant at eight days old, they were not reckoned as members of the congregation or church until they were twelve years old. By that time they could be taught to know the Lord, though the duty was too frequently neglected. But, under the new dispensation, a time shall come when parents will not thus neglect the religious training of their children, but all shall know the Lord, as Timothy knew the Scriptures, from their youth. By adopting my opponent's rigid principle of interpretation, however, I can rule children in as easily as he can rule them out, for if one shall not say to another, "Know the Lord," then all shall know the Lord without being instructed at all. There will be no such thing as religious instruction. All will know the Lord intuitively, or by direct inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and surely, if God can effect this for adults, He can effect it for infants, and thus "out of the mouth of babes and sucklings ordain praise." But my opponent himself will surely not accept this interpretation. Also, by his own principle of reasoning, all females are ruled out of the Christian covenant, for Jeremiah says: "And they shall teach no more every *man* his neighbor, and every *man* his brother," etc., but there is nothing said about women, therefore, only *men* will be saved under the new covenant. But he will not accept this conclusion either, though it is just as fair as for him to try to rule infants out, because they cannot know the Lord. And the very same remarks are applicable in the case of the household baptisms about which he has said so much. Infants are not specifically mentioned, because the term household is a generic term including different classes, and language is constructed on the principle that man's intelligence can supply the needed conditions and limitations in all such cases. But

when men are sore pressed for arguments, they sometimes try to extract comfort from very small quibbles Who does not know that the same language would be employed whether there were any infants in those families or not? So it is not necessary to bandy words about the matter. I shall, doubtless, have occasion to refer to it again. Of course, he was going to trample me down. No doubt, if everything depended on noise, I should stand at a great disadvantage. He reminds me of a certain domestic fowl which, no matter how much it gets beaten in a fight, runs away and gets on a fence and crows. Those who are defeated always make the most noise. Let him get the children out of purgatory or annihilation, into which he has got them according to his interpretation, if he can. He could demolish my arguments, but he would not let me ask a question even if I allowed him half-an-hour extra time. He shouted out "sit down." I do not think that was gentlemanly. Then I said, "Accept one hour and let me ask a question?" That was no violation of the rules, for he could have answered "Yes" or "No." This is the question I wanted to ask him, Are there any children saved, according to your interpretation of the covenant? I ask it now, and I await his answer.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. HARDING'S THIRD REPLY.

I am glad to see that the drubbing which I was compelled to give to Mr. Wilkinson has improved his frame of mind. I am much pleased with the improvement in temper shown in the last speech. There is nothing like a good, vigorous Hogging to make some people behave themselves.

"Are little children (infants) saved?" he inquires at the close of his speech. No, they are not. Only those can properly be said to be saved who are lost, or in danger of being lost. Infants, *as long as they are infants*, are neither lost, nor in danger of being lost. They are *safe*, not saved. In this new covenant all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest. As infants cannot know the Lord, I argue they are not in this covenant. Mr. Wilkinson thinks this is a dreadful doctrine; that it logically consigns the little ones to hell. I don't see why he should think so; for only sinners go to hell, and we agree that infants are born pure. There is no doctrine in heaven, earth, or hell, that I know of, that logically consigns the *pure* to hell.

Let me call your attention for one moment to this new covenant. "This is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel after those days, saith the Lord; I will put My laws into their mind, and write them in their hearts; and I will be to them a God, and they shall be to Me a people: and they shall not teach every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for all shall know Me, from the least to the greatest. For I will be merciful to their unrighteousness, and their sins and iniquities will I remember no more." Heb. 8: 10-12.

The points of this covenant are these:

1. God will put His laws into their minds and hearts.
2. He will be their God, and they shall be His people.
3. All of them shall know Him; so that they will not have to teach one another about Him.
4. He will be merciful to their wrong-doings, and will forgive their sins.

God expressly says "*this is the covenant,*" Now, it is perfectly clear—it seems to me that a blind man ought to see it—that infants can have no part in this contract. God's laws are not in their minds and hearts; and, in the very nature of the case, they cannot be: they do not know God, and hence they have to be taught about Him; they do no wrong, are as innocent as angels, and hence have no sins to be forgiven. This contract is for those that need to be saved; not for those who are safe.

"What becomes of infants when they die?" They go home to their Father's house, to a place in which they have never forfeited their right by sin. The Bible doctrine is, "Sin is the transgression of the law;" and, "The soul that sinneth it shall die." There is nothing except sin that can consign any soul to hell. Whom did Christ come into the world to call? He answers the question Himself. He says, "I came not to call the righteous, but sinners to repentance." But infants are not sinners; they are perfectly righteous; hence Christ did not come to call them. But are they not in some way benefited by the death of Christ? Yes, just as all, good and bad, great and small, wise and foolish, are benefited; that is, by virtue of the resurrection of Christ, the bodies of all of the human family will come up from their graves: the bodies of the worst and oldest of sinners, as well as the bodies of the innocent babes. "As in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." Then, all the wicked will be cast into hell; and all the sinless—those that have never done wrong, and those that have been forgiven—will go

together through the gates into the great city of God, to enjoy the glories of the Father's house for evermore. No one need be disturbed about his darlings that die in infancy. It is necessary for a man to be converted, and to become as a little child, in order to enter the kingdom of heaven, as Jesus Himself says; but the spirit of the little one needs no conversion, needs nothing to prepare it for the Father's house.

In the chart displayed by Mr. Wilkinson he has the Passover and the Lord's Supper, as well as circumcision and baptism; he tells us that as baptism has taken the place of circumcision, so the Lord's Supper has come in the room of the Passover. Why not, then, give the Supper to infants? He baptizes them because formerly they were circumcised: but formerly they ate of the Passover; therefore, according to his logic, they should now eat at the Lord's table. The paschal lamb was eaten by the household, and all of it was consumed • and, in addition to this, in keeping the feast, unleavened bread was eaten for seven days: no leaven was allowed in their houses. I ask again: How does it happen that our Paedo-baptist friends give baptism to the little ones, but withhold from them the Lord's Supper? Why give one and not the other? Does not the one belong to the new covenant as much as the other? If baptism is given because it is an institution of the new covenant, the Lord's Supper should be also, for the same reason; it, too, is an institution of the new covenant. The fact is, infants are not in the new covenant. The new covenant is a contract which God makes with sinners for their salvation. Its design is to bring the wicked back to the innocency of childhood, and thus to prepare them for heaven. The Greek Church, arguing that man's spiritual nature is depraved at birth—by virtue of his connection with Adam tainted with sin—claims that infants must be redeemed according to the provisions of the new covenant; and hence it gives to the babies both baptism and the Supper. Mr. Wilkinson and his people, holding to precisely the same view concerning the nature of the child, give baptism, but not the Supper. If the logic of these parties is correct, and their premises true, the Greeks are evidently right in practice, the Methodists wrong. But neither of the parties are correct in argument, nor are they in practice. Our spiritual natures are in no wise corrupted by virtue of Adam's sin. All infants are safe in Christ till they are old enough to sin.

Mr. WILKINSON—How old is that?

Mr. HARDING—Whenever they are old enough to understand and to violate the law of God, they are old enough to sin; when they have

actually violated the law, they are sinners; and then, and not till then, they need all the provisions of the new covenant. But they can eat long before they can understand the law.

My opponent gets back to our first proposition, to the action of baptism, and makes me a challenge. He wants to have a committee appointed to examine the authorities that I have been quoting, to see if they favor immersion, *and only immersion*; and to see whether they have been correctly interpreted by me. With quite a flourish he challenges me to the appointment of this committee. Does not the gentleman know that I have taken pains from the beginning to emphasize the fact that nearly all these authorities are Paedo-baptists, who practice affusion and aspersion for baptism? They candidly admit that *baptizo* primarily and usually signifies to immerse; that immersion was almost universally practiced for many hundred years; that sprinkling and pouring gradually came into use; that certain passages of the New Testament plainly refer to immersion—that they cannot be understood unless that practice is kept in mind; but some of them immediately turn about and argue that it is hardly possible that immersion was always practiced, even in apostolic times, and that aspersion will do just as well. I never claimed that these men favored immersion, and *only* immersion. My opponent knows well that in talking about Robinson's lexicon, I stated that he defined *baptizo* to dip, immerse, etc., but never to sprinkle; and then immediately added, that, in a note appended to his definition, he makes an argument to show that "in reference to the rite of baptism, it would seem to have expressed not always simply *immersion*, but the more general idea of *ablution* or *affusion*."

My opponent, with a great show of boldness, challenges me to do something which he knows I don't want to do; to affirm that which he knows I do not believe; which he has heard me say I do not believe. Let him challenge me to affirm something I believe, or to deny something I do not believe. Let him challenge me to deny that "In conversion the Holy Spirit operates immediately upon the sinner's heart;" or to affirm that "Christian baptism is for the remission of sins;" and he will see how quickly I will take him up. Since challenging is the order of the day, I will give a challenge right here: I challenge Mr. Wilkinson to discuss either of the propositions just mentioned, provided any Paedo-baptist Church of this town will endorse him to represent it in the discussion. My brethren will endorse me. If he says so, we will continue the debate next week.

Mr. WILKINSON—What do you mean?

Mr. HARDING—I mean exactly what I say. Do you accept this challenge?

Mr. WILKINSON—What do you mean by "endorse?"

Mr. HARDING;—I want some body of Paedo-baptists in this town to call upon you to debate for it—to represent it in the discussion. Let the Methodist, or Presbyterian, or any other Church, thus endorse you, and then we will debate next week.

Mr. WILKINSON—Our Church does not run on that line, and never did.

Mr. HARDING—NO; your Church does not want this discussion continued; neither do you; these are the simple facts in the case. Now, ladies and gentlemen, you see how much of meaning there was in this gentleman's challenge. When he invites me to a conflict he is careful so to express himself that I cannot take issue with him. He knows if he steps out on proper battle-ground he will be met every time. If he challenges me to meet him upon anything concerning which we differ, he will have to fight every time; there is no doubt about that. But let me not be misunderstood: I do not mean to fight with my fists, nor with any other weapons, except the sword of the Spirit, the Word of God. I do not believe that a Christian is ever justifiable in using physical force in his conflicts with error. "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal." But to use the "sword of the Spirit" he should ever be ready. I hold myself in readiness to go into this war whenever called upon to do so. He who uses that weapon properly can never be defeated; he who does not, should be; therefore I am so ready to give challenges.

Concerning my use of the authorities, it is sufficient to say that my opponent has not as yet shown that I have in the least twisted or perverted one of them. One who does this intentionally is guilty of a mean kind of falsifying. To insinuate that one has done it, when you have not the slightest proof that he has, is an unkind, unjust, and cowardly thing to do. Mr. Wilkinson insinuates that if he had the books, and if he were sufficiently well acquainted with them, he could show that I have misrepresented them. But if he is able to show it, why does he talk about a committee? Why don't he show it to this audience himself? All, but he does specify one case: he positively affirms that I have misrepresented Mr. Stuart. He says that Stuart gave dip, plunge, immerse, as the classic meaning of *baptizo*, but not as the meaning in the Bible. We will take this as a test case, and see who is guilty of falsehood in perverting the meaning of an author. When I introduced Stuart's testimony into the debate, *if*

was to show the classic meaning of baptizo. When Mr. Wilkinson admitted that in the classics it meant to "dip, immerse," etc., I said, No wonder he admits this; and then quoted Dr. Stuart to show that "all lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this." But as my opponent plainly intimates that Stuart agrees with him as to the Bible meaning, you shall hear the great Presbyterian on that phase of the question. I read from *Stuart on Baptism.*, p. 153 (Nashville edition). He says: "We have collected facts enough to authorize us now to come to the following general conclusion respecting the practice of the Christian Church in general, with regard to the mode of baptism, viz., that from the earliest ages of which we have any account, subsequent to the apostolic age, and downward for several centuries, the Churches did generally practice baptism by immersion; perhaps *by immersion of the whole person*; and that the only exceptions to this mode which were usually allowed were in cases of urgent *sickness*, or other cases of immediate and imminent danger, where immersion could not be practiced." He says that *affusion* and *aspersio*n were *gradually* introduced, and then on the same page adds:

"In what manner, then, did the Churches of Christ, from a very early period, to say the least, understand the word *baptizo* in the New Testament? Plainly, they construed it as meaning immersion. They sometimes even went so far as to forbid any other method of administering the ordinance, cases of necessity and mercy only excepted."

On the next page he gives his own opinion thus: "For myself, then, I cheerfully admit that *baptizo* in the New Testament, when applied to the rite of baptism, does in all probability involve the idea that this rite was usually performed by immersion, but not always. I say *usually*, and *not always*, for to say more than this, the tenor of some of the narrations particularly in Acts 10: 47, 48; 16: 32, 33, and 2: 41, seem to me to forbid. I cannot read these examples without the distinct conviction that *immersion* was not practiced on these occasions, but *washing* or *affusion*."

Mr. Stuart here cheerfully testifies that from the days of the apostles, down through several centuries, immersion was the general practice; that aspersion and affusion were gradually introduced; that the Churches in those days understood *baptizo* in the New Testament to mean immersion; and, finally, he freely admits that he himself believes that in all probability it does generally involve the idea of immersion in the New Testament

My friends, I leave it to you to decide who is in danger of failing

"to be an honest man," "to tell the truth," and "to go from here with a good reputation."

While my opponent was talking about the covenants—about my position that Jewish Christians should still practice circumcision—he asked me if I would also baptize Jews? Certainly I would. Christ was circumcised, and afterwards baptized; so were the apostles; so were the three thousand on the day of Pentecost; all believers were to be baptized, according to the commission, regardless of whether they had been circumcised or not. Then, on the other hand, Timothy was circumcised after he had been baptized; then, as late as A.D. 60, that is, about 27 years after the beginning of the Christian dispensation, Paul, James, the leaders of the Jerusalem Church, and the "many thousands of Jews that believed," regarded it as disorderly for Jewish Christians to neglect circumcision and the customs. (See Acts 21: 17-25.) There is not an intimation in the New Testament that Jews were to give up circumcision. On the contrary, the circumcised were baptized, and the baptized circumcised. Of course the one did not come in the room of the other. Mr. Wilkinson has argued that the covenant we are now under is the old Jewish covenant of circumcision; that under the Mosaic dispensation circumcision was its seal; that while the covenant is the same under the Christian dispensation, we have another seal, baptism, which, he claims, has taken the place of circumcision. But all this we have seen to be incorrect; we are under a "new covenant;" circumcision has not been done away; baptism has not taken its place; each has its own place to this day. So the only argument upon which my friend has placed any stress since we began to discuss this proposition is worthless, absolutely worthless.

In order to show that circumcision has been done away, Mr. Wilkinson quotes Gal. 3: 28, 29: "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." The point which he wishes to make from this is that when a Jew becomes a Christian he ceases to be a Jew, and hence must give up all the Jewish customs and peculiarities. What superlative nonsense! for then a Greek must cease to be a Greek; a servant must cease to be a servant; a woman must cease to be a woman, and must give up all of the customs and peculiarities of women; and so of the men. The passage simply teaches that there are no partialities with God; people that are equally good he treats with equal favor, whether they are of Jewish or Greek extraction, whether they are bond or free, male or female. In this connection I

will read 1 Cor. 7: 17-21: "But as God hath distributed to every man, as the Lord hath called every one, so let him walk. And so ordain I in all the churches.

"Is any man called being circumcised? let him not become uncircumcised. Is any called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised.

"Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God.

"Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called.

"Art thou called being a servant? care not for it, but if thou mayest be made, free, use it rather."

Remember that "the circumcision" is the Jew; "the uncircumcision," the Gentile; and then the meaning of the passage is plain. If a man is called being a Jew, let him not cease to be a Jew, but let him be a Jewish Christian; let the Gentile be a Gentile Christian; the servant, a Christian servant. There is nothing in circumcision, nor in baptism either, but everything in keeping the commandments of God. God gave circumcision to the Jew as an "everlasting covenant," therefore let him observe it; he did not give it to the Gentile, therefore he must not observe it. Every one must abide in the calling wherein he is called. Paul, who so readily agreed to circumcise Timothy, would never allow that Titus should be circumcised. The one was a Jew, the other a Greek; to the one circumcision had been given, but not to the other. There is everything in doing just what God requires—no more, no less; and all who do this equally well, stand equally high in His favor. For as Peter says (Acts 10: 34, 35), "God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness, is accepted with Him."

Mr. WILKINSON—Are the females all "one man" in that sense?

Mr. HARDING—Yes, all who are in Christ are one, constituting one Church, regardless of sex, nationality, or condition in life.

Don't forget, my friends, that Neander says, "We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution;" Mosheim says that they were immersed "after they had repeated what they called the creed;" Schaff says, "The apostolic origin of infant baptism is denied, not only by the Baptists, but also by many Paedo-baptist divines;" Meyer says, "The baptism of the children of Christians, of which no trace is found in the New Testament, is not to be held as an apostolic ordinance;" and then, to cap the climax, the learned George Edward Steitz, though a Lutheran, testifies that, "Among

scientific exegeses it is regarded as an established conclusion that not a trace of infant baptism can be discovered in the New Testament." And we know that this conclusion is correct, too, for Mr. McKay has summed up for us all the cases of baptism mentioned in the New Testament, and we have examined them carefully, and have found not a vestige of the practice.

And then, when our unfortunate friend Mr. Wilkinson turns desperately to the covenant of circumcision, his great brother Dr. Ditzler says, "The covenants of the Old Testament have nothing to do with infant baptism." This was more than he could patiently stand, so he claimed that Ditzler had been misrepresented, and his sentiments distorted all through the book. I then turned to the first of the book and found a note signed by both Graves and Ditzler, saying that they had read and corrected the whole work, and that it is a faithful transcript of what they said in the discussion at Carrollton. I learned, moreover, from the introduction, that Mr. Ditzler had been paid \$500 to do his part of the work. Neither does Ditzler now claim that his own speeches were in anywise tampered with; though he does charge, in his work on baptism since published, that Mr. Graves had added to his speeches, and made many changes in them. But if Ditzler had never said so, we have seen there is nothing in that old covenant argument; for after Christian baptism was instituted, circumcision was still practiced. As Dr. Stuart says, in speaking about arguing from circumcision, "Numberless difficulties present themselves in our way as soon as we begin to argue in such a manner as this." *Com. 0. T.*, chap. 22.

There is a circumcision of the heart mentioned in the Bible, both in the Old Testament and the New, to which I wish to call your attention. "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiff necked." Deut. 10:16. "And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live." Deut. 30: 6. "Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskins of your heart, ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem: lest My fury come forth like fire, and burn that none can quench it, because of the evil of your doings." Jer. 4:4. "For he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God." Rom. 2: 28, 29. "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of 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." Col. 2:11, 12.

To circumcise the heart is to produce in it a loving, trustful faith in God. As we have seen from these readings, to have a circumcised heart is the opposite of being "stiff-necked." But this faith which purifies the heart is produced by the "Word of God, the sword of the Spirit (see Rom. 10: 17); that is, as the foreskin of the flesh is cut away with a knife, so the foreskin of the heart (its stubbornness against God) is cut away with this weapon that "is sharper than any two-edged sword." This circumcision is not baptism, for it is "made without hands." "When a man preaches the Gospel to a sinner, and the faith that loves and obeys Jesus is thus produced in his heart, he has a circumcised heart; then, in apostolic times, he was "buried in baptism:" the one was without hands; the other with hands. The apostle John says (1 John 5: 1), "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God;" it is evident that he who is born of God has a circumcised heart; and hence it follows that to believe is to circumcise the heart. Mr. Wilkinson is much mistaken in saying that circumcision was a type of baptism. It never was a type of baptism.

Mr. WILKINSON— I never said it was.

Mr. HARDING— Did you not say that baptism came in the room of circumcision?

Mr. WILKINSON— What did outward circumcision mean?

Mr. HARDING— Is baptism in the room of circumcision?

Mr. WILKINSON— Yes.

Mr. HARDING— So I might believe, were it not for the facts. But unfortunately for Mr. Wilkinson's theory, and the doctrine of infant baptism, the facts in the case are all against him: the two rites are alike in no respect scarcely; and if the one came in the room of the other, the apostles never found it out, for they practiced both right along.

"What did circumcision mean?" inquires my friend. Well, it did not "*mean*" what baptism does; for after Timothy was baptized, he was then circumcised. What did circumcision "*mean*" there?

Mr. WILKINSON— They all knew his father was a Greek.

Mr. HARDING— They all knew his mother was a Jewess; he had Jewish blood in his veins, and therefore had a right to circumcision. But if baptism had taken its place, Paul would simply have said so, and that would have ended the matter.

FIFTH DAY—AFTERNOON.

MR. WILKINSON'S FOURTH SPEECH.

I shall endeavor as hurriedly as possible, in my first address, to run over a few of the points dealt with last night by my opponent, and in my second address I will endeavor more fully to illustrate the question under discussion. I will pass by, for the time, any objections which may be advanced by my opponent in his next speech, and deal with the historical aspect of the question. If anything remains to be said on that phase of the subject, I will deal with it in my first address this evening.

My opponent again referred last evening to our Discipline, and quoted certain parts of it relating to the baptism of infants, and was very emphatic with regard to some particulars. But without spending any more time over that matter, I want to say, once for all, that I have been a Methodist preacher longer than he has, and have baptized more infants than he has ever done, or ever will do, unless I convert him in this debate (which I can scarcely expect to do), and I never baptized an infant in my life (and I would appeal to other ministers present, who baptize under our Discipline, or that of other Churches, if the same is not true concerning them) with the thought of any change being effected in its present condition, but recognizing an infant as a human being newly launched upon the great sea of life, with a variety of experiences to pass through, subject to many evil influences common to our nature, our prayers are designed to apply to its whole life. That is the way in which they are to be interpreted. I make this remark to explain that any man who attempts to confine our prayers, either written or oral, to the present condition of the child, will put into our mouths sentiments which we do not entertain, and which we emphatically disclaim. But suppose it were all true, that Methodists believe and teach a lot of blasphemous and unscriptural things, what connection has that fact with the merits of the question whether infants are to be baptized or not? The question is not whether we utter orthodox sentiments in our prayers, with respect to the moral state of infants, but whether it is right and proper that infants should be baptized; and I hope my opponent will bear in mind that it is my proposition, and not the Methodist Discipline, that we are met here to discuss. If, however, he is anxious to abandon the

real issue and raise some other where he thinks he will have a better chance of maintaining his ground, he had better say so and have the programme changed. But while my proposition is the recognized ground of debate, I trust he will stick to the point.

With respect to Timothy's circumcision, it has been quoted again and again to prove that under the Christian dispensation the Jews had a right to circumcision. Acts 16:3 says, "Him would Paul have to go forth with him; and took and circumcised him because of the Jews which were in those quarters, for they knew all that his father was a Greek." Timothy, therefore, had never been circumcised. This was an objection to the Jews, especially when he was going to preach the Gospel to them, and seek to convert them to Christianity. They were not Christian Jews, but unconverted Jews, as yet, and their prejudice on account of his not being circumcised would be so strong that his influence among them would be destroyed. Hence, to overcome this objection, and as a matter of expediency, having no religious significance whatever, Paul took Timothy and circumcised him, not because he was a Jew, but because he was a Greek, the lineage of a child being reckoned from his father, and not from his mother. If anything could be made out of this case, therefore, it proves that if circumcision is to be still practiced, it is to be practiced, not on the Jews, but on the Gentiles. But an effort was made to prove that it did not apply to Gentiles, but still applied to Jews I challenge my opponent to prove from all his histories and encyclopaedias that circumcision, as an historical fact, was practiced in the early age of the Christian Church upon Jewish converts, or that it was ever insisted upon by the Church after the introduction of Christianity, save when the people were passing over from one dispensation into the other. Paul says in Gal. 5: 2, "Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing." Such Jews, then, as trusted in circumcision were profited nothing by Christ. He "is become of no effect unto you," says the apostle; "whosoever of you are justified by the law, ye are fallen from grace." This shows that circumcision was an appeal to the ceremonial law as a means of justification, though that law was abrogated. "For we," says Paul (and he was a Jew, and as he uses the first personal pronoun, he includes himself with others), "through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith. For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." If, therefore, in Christ Jesus, neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, circum-

cision is not to be regarded as entitling us to be called Abraham's seed. My opponent's argument on that point entirely falls to the ground. In Romans 2: 25 we read, "For circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision." That is to say, if you have fulfilled God's law so perfectly that there is no other demand upon you, having met all its requirements, then circumcision might profit you something, but not otherwise, for if there be a breach of the law, then circumcision has become uncircumcision; and a state of uncircumcision is, in the Scriptures, equivalent to a state of sin, or condemnation. Therefore Paul says in the 26th verse, "If the uncircumcision keep the righteousness of the law, shall not his uncircumcision be counted for circumcision" (or justification)? That is to say, those who are not circumcised at all would be counted as circumcised if they kept the law, and those who were circumcised would be counted as uncircumcised if they broke the law. He continues, "for he is not a Jew which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh. But he is a Jew which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men but of God." In Phil. 3: 3 we read, "For *we* are the circumcision *which worship God in the spirit, and rejoice in Christ Jesus, and have no confidence in the flesh.*" By the term "flesh" the apostle evidently means fleshly rites as a means of justification. If the Jew has confidence in fleshly rites, then he is not circumcised, and is not a Jew, and all those who put their trust in fleshly rites for the regenerating of their hearts are excluded by this passage from being of the circumcision. These are ruled out of the covenant, and if my opponent and his friends put their confidence in fleshly rites to remove sin from their souls, this passage rules them out of the covenant. In 1 Cor. 7: 19, Paul says, "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God." Gal. 5:11, "And I, brethren, if I yet preach circumcision, why do I yet suffer persecution?" Did Paul preach circumcision then? It is said he did, because he circumcised Timothy. If so, why did he yet suffer persecution? "Then is the offence of the cross ceased." Now, according to the inspired teachings of Paul, the Jews can never be saved if they keep on everlastingly being circumcised. You put them out of the covenant, and Christ can profit them nothing. The Jew being circumcised, and having confidence in the flesh, is not, in a Christian sense, a Jew at all, therefore he is not in Christ, therefore he is not of Abraham's seed, therefore he is not an

heir of the covenant, and therefore he is not saved at all. My opponent's interpretation sends the Jews to hell as well as little children: that is, logically. I do not think he believes it, but he cannot put his creed and the legitimate consequences of it together and make them harmonize without becoming a preacher of Jewish damnation all through. Besides, I would like to ask why the word circumcision is, in the Scriptures, so frequently applied to the regeneration of the heart, as quoted by my opponent in his last speech, if it possesses no spiritual significance? He tells us that it simply sealed the land of Canaan to the Jews. If so, there was nothing spiritual in its meaning. Why, then, should it be so frequently used to describe a spiritual operation? Where is the analogy? I hope he will tell us.

And now I want to show that my opponent's doctrine, interpreted in the light of the Gospel, sends his own soul to the bad place too. Paul says they are of the circumcision who have no confidence in the flesh, or in fleshly rites. My opponent distinctly said last night that baptism regenerated. It is well known that this is the doctrine of his persuasion, viz., that it is by baptism that the soul is regenerated, that without it it cannot be regenerated; and I am told he taught the people last summer that it was under the water that the soul came in contact with the blood of Christ, and was cleansed from sin. Therefore he has confidence in fleshly rites as a means of purification. If he has confidence in the flesh, then Christ profiteth him nothing; he is not of the circumcision; he belongs to the uncircumcision, and consequently he cannot be saved; he must be with the Jews and little children in limbo or some other place outside the sphere of happiness and bliss.

With respect to little children, my opponent says they are not *saved*, but *safe*. Of course I know where he got that. He got it from the "office editor" of the *Standard*.

Mr. HARDING—We both got it from the same source, the Bible.

Mr. WILKINSON—That is exactly the way the "office editor" put it. He says the children are *safe*, not *saved*. If not saved, they are not Christ's, for Christ's people are such as He has redeemed, and only those. I read in Ephesians 5: 25, 26, "Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church, and gave Himself for it, that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word; that He might present it unto Himself a glorious Church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." No children in Christ's Church, according to my opponent, for He has not given Himself for them, nor sanctified and cleansed them. "For we are

members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones." The Church is His body. He is the head over all things to that body, and if the children are not in that body, they do not belong to Christ. My opponent distinctly puts them out of that body; and if they are not Christ's, they are not Abraham's seed, and if they are not Abraham's seed, they are not his heirs according to the covenant, hence they are left to perish. That is where Alexander Campbell and Mr. Harding put the babies. My opponent says their bodies will be raised through Christ's redemption, but it has nothing to do with their souls. He died for their bodies, but not for their souls. Yet their bodies die because Adam sinned, and in dying for their bodies it was to redeem them from the effects of Adam's sin, but that sin did not affect their souls, nor did Christ die for their souls, though as soon as they are old enough to sin then He died for their souls too. What a convenient theory! And it is the soul that is saved! Strange doctrine! Will my opponent tell us how Adam's sin could affect the body and cause its death without affecting the soul and causing its death? And how Christ could redeem the body by His death without redeeming the soul at the same time? Remember Christ redeemed us, and cleanses us with His blood. He sprinkles the heart from an evil conscience with His blood. In Peter 1:18, "Forasmuch as ye know ye were redeemed, not with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation, received by tradition from your fathers, but with the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot." Let us take a peep into heaven, and see if there are any children there. In Rev. 7: 9 we read, "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 when John asked the angel whence came they, the angel answered, "These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." There was not a single baby among them, according to my opponent's theory, for the whole multitude in heaven had been washed in the blood of the Lamb, and He does not wash infants in His blood. In fact, he cannot get a baby into heaven on that theory; it is not broad enough; he leaves them to perish in the quagmire of human depravity. They are outside the covenant, outside the Church, outside the Gospel, and outside salvation: and he cannot get them into heaven until he gives up his present theory, according to which there are no children before the

throne. In Rev. 5: 12, they are "saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory and blessing." In v. 9 they say, "Thou hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests." But there are no children, says my opponent, to join in that song, because they were never redeemed and never washed in the blood of the Lamb, but simply by reason of their belonging to the old Adam, I suppose, they are taken to heaven without an atonement; they are not saved by an atonement! This doctrine which ignores original sin, ignores the necessity of an atonement, except for adult sinners. Though men are born in Adam they, as children, are able to get to heaven without an atonement. According to this theory, we are placed at no disadvantage, spiritually, by reason of Adam's sin. It is generally supposed that Adam was created able to stand, yet free to fall. If not, he could not help sinning. And what a man cannot help doing is not sin. Now, if all men are born as free from sin as Adam was, without an atonement, and all as able to stand, how is it that nobody does stand, but all men fall, and that, too, as soon as they get old enough to know better? If not able to stand, but fall in spite of themselves, it cannot be sin, hence we are at a loss to know why they need an atonement. I admit, with my opponent, that children are born pure, but they are pure because Christ has redeemed and saved them from hereditary pollution. He says they are pure by birth, and go to the Father because they have never sinned. But in point of fact, "No man," says Christ, "can come unto the Father but by Me." If a soul gets to heaven, it has to get there through the blood of the Lamb. That is the only way I ever heard of until I heard these people preach. Some of them may be astonished that they hold a heresy, an old superstition that inevitably and logically (I admit they do not believe it) excludes little children from the kingdom of heaven. Unless they can get these barriers out of the way, let them cease their sneers at infant sprinkling. I want to show you that there is such a close relation between men, under the moral government of God, that the parent cannot sin without affecting the child. In Rom. 5:18, 19, we are shown the connection between the parent and child in regard to the moral nature. I cannot explain the philosophy of it. I do not suppose anyone can. I take it that Paul is a better authority than Mr. Harding, even with all his authorities and basswood brains, and Paul says, "Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the

free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." My opponent has admitted that all are dead morally, and in Christ we are all made alive, and we are born into the world redeemed from what Adam's sin brought upon us, viz., "Judgment to condemnation," "For, as by one man's disobedience, many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." I claim that just as many as Adam's transgression brought judgment and condemnation upon, just that many, and no more, Christ's righteousness and obedience brought life to. Therefore I am an ardent believer in universal salvation, and here, and now, I announce myself as a pronounced believer in the doctrine of universal salvation, in the sense that Christ has redeemed and saved all from hereditary or imputed sin. Christ has reconciled *the world* unto God. "God so loved *the world*" of which infants form a part—and every man belonged to that class in the beginning of his existence—"that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life." All men are justified from Adam's sin, and if they are ever damned it will be for their own. If they trust in Christ He will anchor them safely in the heavenly harbor, beyond the storms of life and the rough waves and dangerous quicksands of life's tempestuous sea. Coining into the world under the scheme of Divine redemption, all are alike entitled to the benefits of Christ's sacrifice. My opponent will say that refers to men. Well, suppose it does, is it any more equitable, under the Divine government, to damn a man than an infant for Adam's sin? Are men any more responsible for Adam's misdeeds than infants are? If so, on what principle can it be? What does he gain by such an alternative? In Psalm 51 we read, "Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." In Eph. 2nd chapter, "And you hath He quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins; wherein in time past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience: among whom also we all had our conversation in times past in the lusts of our flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind; and were *by nature the children of wrath, even as others.*" And now let my opponent take up the Methodist Discipline and howl as much as he pleases about our praying to the Lord to deliver little children from His wrath. "We were," says Paul, "*by nature the children of wrath, even as others.*" There is no getting out of that by either the front or the side door.

My opponent asks, why not give the Lord's Supper to children after

they are baptized? He said they did give them the Passover after they were circumcised, and thinks to be consistent we should give them the Lord's Supper. Mr. McDiarmid, four years ago, took the same position. He said that undoubtedly they gave the Passover to little children. Then I said, You must suppose that babies eight days old were able to eat meat? He said he did not know how they gave it to them, but he thought they might possibly have made soup and given them the soup. That would be a soupy business, and the argument itself is rather thin. We do not give the Lord's Supper to little children for the same reason that the Jews did not give the Passover to little children. At twelve a Jewish child was recognized as belonging to the Church. It was in the covenant visibly at eight days old; but at twelve the child was recognized as a member of the congregation, and permitted to receive the ordinances of the Church in connection with the existing dispensation of things. Therefore the child did not get the Passover until it was twelve years old, and we will give the Lord's Supper to twelve-year-old children who have sense enough to know what they are doing.

My opponent has put forth a herculean effort to extricate himself from the charge of garbling the authorities, and has quoted a number of extracts to prove that he quoted Dr. Stuart correctly. And in order the more effectually to shirk the responsibility of misrepresenting the attitude of Paedo-baptist writers he tries to transfer the charge of falsification to me, and insinuates that I have been guilty of unkindness, injustice, cowardice and meanness besides. If all this were true, he has an easy and speedy way of establishing his charges and ridding himself of all suspicion. Why not at once accept my challenge to appoint a committee of scholars representing both sides to examine the books and report? I am willing to abide the consequences, but he does not seem to be. But he seems terribly exasperated by the proposal, which makes me think he has been hit where it is sore. Surely there has been some proud flesh touched, or he would not writhe so over the proposition.

I did not insinuate that if I had the books, and were sufficiently well acquainted with them, I could show that my opponent had misrepresented them. That statement was invented by Mr. Harding, and lacks the first essential of a reliable statement.

As to the case of Dr. Stuart, though Mr. Harding states that he gave dip, plunge, immerse, as the classical meaning of *baptizo*, but not the Bible meaning, I emphatically deny the statement, and assert that he quoted it in direct proof of his proposition that

"Christian baptism is immersion," etc., without the remotest hint that he was quoting Dr. Stuart's definition of both *bapto* and *baptizo* in their classical sense, and not *baptizo* alone, in the Bible sense. He proceeds on the presumption that these two senses are synonymous, but I deny it, and nearly, if not quite, every Paedo-baptist authority he has quoted, or can quote, denies it, and furnishes proof in support of his denial. I maintain, therefore, that it is not honest for any man to quote a Paedo-baptist's classical definition of these words as their Bible definition, and no amount of contortions in movement or distortions in statement will suffice to justify such a perversion of facts.

My opponent has given a number of quotations from Dr. Stuart to neutralize or outweigh the quotations I made from him. But, as a matter of fact, the only thing of any importance that Dr. Stuart says in those quotations, to which I have not already assented, is that "*baptizo* in the New Testament, when applied to the rite of baptism, does in all probability involve the idea that this rite was usually performed by immersion," but even this is a mere conjecture, based on a "probability," unsupported by and incapable of any direct proof. And Dr. Stuart distinctly testifies on page 313 of his book that "there is no absolute certainty from usage, that *baptizo*, when applied to the rite of baptism, means to immerse or plunge," and on page 388, that according to his belief we "*do obey* the command to baptize when we do it by affusion or sprinkling." And in the very language quoted by my opponent, the Professor says it "does not *always*" involve the idea of immersion in the Bible, though my opponent's proposition says it *does always* involve it. So it will be seen that Prof. Stuart does not sustain my opponent's position any more than he does mine, nor as much.

My opponent says that the point which I wish to make is that when a Jew becomes a Christian he ceases to be a Jew, a Gentile ceases to be a Gentile, a woman a woman, a man a man, etc., and for this he imputes to me "superlative nonsense." Yes, it is superlative nonsense, no doubt, but he himself is the author of it, for I didn't wish to make any such point. I simply wished to make the point that all these classes stood in precisely the same relation to Christ spiritually, and possessed neither superiority nor inferiority as Christians, but occupied common ground, and were subject to common conditions in the matter of salvation. It is a comparatively easy thing to construe another man's meaning into superlative nonsense when it suits our purpose and our cause requires it. But I prefer that my opponent should father his own folly. If he does, I have no doubt his family will be sufficiently large.

He still insists that Paul circumcised Timothy because his mother was a Jewess, but, as I have frequently pointed out, Luke says, Acts 16:3, that it was because his father was a Greek. My opponent's interpretation agrees with his theory, and has one quality to commend it, viz., it is new. Mine agrees with the Word of God, and needs no other commendation. You can choose between Mr. Harding and the Bible. Perhaps he knows better than an inspired apostle, and perhaps he doesn't. Whatever he lacks, it isn't cheek.

My opponent repeats the statement that Dr. Ditzler said in his debate with Dr. Graves that they had agreed not to discuss the covenants, also that Dr. Ditzler did not complain of his speeches having been tampered with. Now, I must say, in justice to myself, that I never intimated that Dr. Ditzler's speeches had been tampered with. I simply quoted Dr. Ditzler's own statement that Dr. Graves had been guilty of making "hosts" of statements which were not true in re-writing his speeches, and that this accounted for their "not sending him a single proof-sheet after his sixteenth speech on the First Proposition, though he requested it, and gave them his address." Now, what are the facts? Simply these, that in the introduction to his book, pages 8-10, Dr. Ditzler distinctly testifies that *after they had subscribed their names to the report as an accurate one*, and after Dr. Graves had professedly published his speeches on Mode, he re-wrote all of his own speeches, "adding as many as six, eight, ten, and even twelve pages of new matter at a time in single speeches, not a line of which was used during debate, and leaving out what he did say wherever exposed." Dr. Ditzler also declares that "whatever he says of covenants is just the reverse of the facts *in toto*." Moreover, he testifies that "not a page after my seventeenth speech in the book was proofed by me." He says, "I wrote for the proofs of our speeches, but neither his nor mine were ever sent to me."

[NOTE.—It is but fair to say, that as I did not recall these statements at the time, and admitted at the close of the session, as the only apparent way of harmonizing Dr. Ditzler's testimony in his book with his endorsement of the debate, that he must have meant that Dr. Graves' proof-sheets had not been sent him, I was taunted by my opponent with not being able to understand my own authorities. But it now appears that I did understand my authorities, though my opponent was quoting from a work of deception. And this is the kind of testimony that is generally employed to buttress up the anti-Paedobaptist theory.—T. L. W.]

[Time expired.]

MR. HARDING'S FOURTH REPLY.

Infant baptism came into the world to save infants from the sin of Adam, to take away "the pollution of our birth." As I have stated, Origen (A.D. 210) is the second writer of the world to *mention* the custom, the first one to *favor* it; and he expressly states that "Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins." When asked, "Of what sins?" he replied, "None is free from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one day upon the earth: and it is for that reason, because by the sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away, that infants are baptized." *Wall's Hist. Inf. Bap.*, Vol 1, p. 65. The idea prevailed that they would be damned if they were not baptized. In proof of this I read from Zell's Encyclopedia (*Art. Baptism*) as follows:

"In the first centuries of the Christian era, when, generally speaking, adults only joined the new sect, the converted (catechumens) were diligently instructed; the power of this sacrament to procure perfect remission of sins was taught, and while some converts delayed their baptism from a feeling of sinfulness not yet removed, others did the same from the wish to gratify corrupt desires a little longer, and to have their sins forgiven all at once. But the doctrine of St. Augustine, that the unbaptized were irrevocably damned, changed this delay into haste, and made the baptism of children general."

The Methodist Discipline, the book which Mr. Wilkinson has said that he believes, and which he has pledged himself to defend, teaches that all men are totally depraved by nature; so did Mr. Wesley teach; *and he claimed that, "in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved unless this be washed away by baptism."* *Doct. Tracts*, p. 251. On page 73 of the Discipline, among the questions asked of local preachers are these:

"Do you sincerely and fully believe the doctrines of Methodism as contained in our Articles of Religion, and as taught by Mr. Wesley in his Notes on the New Testament and volumes of Sermons?—especially the following leading ones: a Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Godhead; the total depravity of all men by nature in consequence of Adam's fall; the Atonement made by Christ for the sins of all the human race," etc. Mr. Wesley teaches that infants are "guilty of original sin" (*Doct. Tracts*, p. 251); the Discipline teaches "the total depravity of all men by nature," while Mr. Wilkinson says men are born pure—pure as angels. How can you say of a being as pure as

an angel, that it is totally depraved, guilty of original sin? It seems to me that my opponent no more believes this doctrine than he does that other one of his Church, namely, that Rom. 6: 4 refers to baptism by immersion.

Mr. WILKINSON—The Church does not believe it.

Mr. HARDING—You could not become a local preacher without *saying* that you believed it. In the light of what has now been presented, my friends, you cannot fail to understand the baptismal service used at the baptism of infants. You remember the minister reminds the people that "all men are conceived and born in sin," and that our Saviour Christ saith, "except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the kingdom of God;" he asks them to pray that the child "being baptized with water, may also be baptized with the Holy Ghost, be received into Christ's holy Church, and become a lively member of the same;" the minister himself then prays for the child that the Father may "wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost;" that he, being delivered from the wrath of God, may finally come to the land of everlasting life; he prays that the old Adam may be buried in the child, and the new man raised up; "that all carnal affections may die in him, and that all things belonging to the Spirit may live and grow in him."

Now, as Mr. Wesley and the framers of this prayer of the Discipline believed the child to be depraved by nature, and that baptism is for the forgiveness of sins, it is clear that the ground of infant baptism, according to this service of the Discipline, is the pollution of the child, and "the mystical washing away of sin" by water, as the Book of Common Prayer puts it. True, neither Mr. Wilkinson nor the Methodist people of to-day believe these doctrines; but they hold on to the practice; they have given up the ground of it, but continue to cling to the thing itself. Nor is this the worst of it; it causes them to distort and pervert the plain meaning of words in the endeavor to make their Discipline teach that which they believe. Observe the following statements, which I read from the Discipline. Of an applicant for membership this question is asked:

"Question. Will you cheerfully be governed by the rules of the Methodist Church of Canada, hold sacred the ordinances of God, and endeavor as much as in you lies to promote the welfare of your brethren and the advancement of the Redeemer's kingdom?

"Answer. I will." (*Page 177.*)

As we have seen, the applicant for the ministry is required to state that he sincerely and fully believes the doctrines of Methodism

as taught in the Articles, Wesley's Notes, and his volumes of Sermons. On page 73 it is taught that he must "believe and preach all our doctrines;" that he must duly observe the Discipline. On page 74 he is asked, "Will you endeavor fully and faithfully to preach these doctrines?" And now, to add to the ugliness of the case which I am making out against Mr. Wilkinson, the following statement from page 113 is added:

"If a member of our Church shall be tried and convicted of endeavoring to sow dissensions in any of our Societies, by inveighing against either our doctrines or Discipline, such person so offending shall be first reprov'd by the Superintendent of his Circuit, and, if he persist in such pernicious practices, he shall be expelled from the Church."

He has been inveighing against the doctrines of his Church ever since this debate began, since it is one of the doctrines of the Church that Rom. 6: 4 refers to baptism by immersion. Not only so, but the doctrines of his Church logically involve infant damnation, that is, of infants that die unbaptized. But he had to *say* that he accepted them before he could become a preacher in the Church. On page 87, it is said, "A Methodist preacher is to mind every point, great and small, in the Methodist Discipline." But Mr. Wilkinson seemed to "swing around" to the doctrine of his creed on the question of infant depravity in his last speech. He talks about my leaving the little ones "to perish in the quagmire of human depravity," because I do not understand that they wash their robes and make them white in the blood of the Lamb: I don't think their robes need any washing; he does; he thinks they are in "the quagmire of human depravity," I suppose. He boldly announces himself a believer in the doctrine of original sin, and in that connection talks about "*adult sinners*;" from all of which it appears that he now believes that *babies* are sinners. He charges me with admitting that all—infants as well as adults—are morally dead; and he talks about men—infants and all—being justified from Adam's sin. No man was ever justified from Adam's sin, except Adam himself, nor will any other man ever be. We have inherited some of the consequences of Adam's sin, but none of the guilt of it. We die the natural death in consequence of Adam's sin (seeing that by it we were separated from the tree of life, of which, if we could eat, we would live forever); but the moral death comes from our own sins. No man is "a child of wrath" until he commits sin, Eph. 2: 1, 2. (*Revised Version*) reads: "And you did He quicken, when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins, wherein aforetime ye walked," etc. The Ephesians had been dead, and then were quickened; but

observe that they were dead through *their trespasses and sins (plural)*, not through Adam's sin. This miserably false doctrine of infantile depravity has been the fruitful mother of a wretched brood of false teachings and improper practices in the Churches.

Mr. Wilkinson said, "My opponent distinctly said last night that baptism regenerated." His opponent said no such thing, neither distinctly nor indistinctly. Nor does he believe any such thing. I said baptism was for the remission of sins. I invite him to deny it. If his Church will endorse him we will debate that.

In talking about the circumcision of Timothy, Mr. Wilkinson challenged me to show, from my encyclopaedias and histories, that it was the custom of the Apostolic Church to circumcise Jews. Very good. I will do it by one of the very best and most reliable of Church historians, Luke, the writer of Acts of Apostles. In the 15th chapter of this book he gives us an account of occurrences which took place about eighteen or twenty years after the resurrection of Jesus. The first verse of the chapter reads thus: "And certain men which came down from Judea taught the brethren and said, 'Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved.'" The city of Antioch, to which these Jewish brethren had come, and where they thus taught, was headquarters for the evangelistic forces that operated in the Gentile world, as Jerusalem was for the laborers among the Jews. These Jewish brethren, who were members of a Church that had been presided over by the holy apostles of our Lord, Peter, James and John, and the others, for nearly twenty years, understood, not only that the Jews should continue to observe the rite, but they insisted that the Gentiles also should be circumcised after the manner of Moses, or they could not be saved. This shows conclusively that for at least eighteen years after the beginning of the Christian dispensation circumcision was still practiced by the Jewish Christians; for had their leaders, the apostles, been teaching them through all these years that circumcision was done away, and that baptism had taken its place, they would not have said that the believers among the Gentiles would be lost unless they observed it; of course, if the Jews had given up the practice they would not have insisted that the Gentiles should take it up.

Paul and Barnabas stoutly opposed these brethren from Judea, denying that the Gentiles should be circumcised. Listen while I read to you the account of the matter as it is recorded in this chapter:

"When, therefore, Paul and Barnabas had no small dissension and disputation with them, they determined that Paul and Barnabas and

certain other of them should go up to Jerusalem unto the apostles and elders about this question.

"And being brought on their way by the Church, they passed through Phenice and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles: and they caused great joy unto all the brethren.

"And when they were come to Jerusalem they were received of the Church, and of the apostles and elders, and they declared all things that God had done with them.

"But there rose up certain of the sect of the Pharisees which believed, saying, That it was needful to circumcise them and to command them to keep the law of Moses."

Mr. WILKINSON—Read right on.

Mr. HARDING—I shall when I get ready and not till then.

Mr. WILKINSON—You dare not read on.

Mr. HARDING—I intend to read every word of it. That is a mean pretence, a cowardly dodge. There is not a greater coward on earth than this man behind me. He knows well enough that there is not a word in this whole connection that I need be afraid to read—not a word that militates against my position. He only wishes to divert your attention from facts that are crushingly against his theory that baptism has taken the place of circumcision, and hence he insinuates that I would keep back some truth that, if known, would spoil my doctrine.

Mr. HUNT—Mr. Chairman, I call the gentleman to order.

Mr. HARDING—YOU do? Well, you can just call on. How does it happen that you never call Mr. Wilkinson to order?

Mr. HUNT—That is the duty of your moderator.

Mr. HARDING—It is the duty of the moderators to keep order, as far as is in their power. I should think that you, sir, would be even more solicitous that Mr. Wilkinson should deport himself in a fair and honorable manner than that I should do so. Are we not here to seek for truth? I have requested my moderator not to call Mr. Wilkinson to order at any time, and I am glad that he has not done it. He is an honorable man and a gentleman.

Mr. Wilkinson intimates to you, my friends, that I am purposely holding back some truth from you that you ought to know. Why, let me show you what sort of a man this T. L. Wilkinson is. On the 13th page of his Discipline the doctrines of his Church are summed up, and among them are "those taught by the Rev. John Wesley, M. A., in his Notes on the New Testament." But Wesley, in these Notes, says that at Rom. 6: 4 Paul alludes to "the ancient manner of bap-

tizing by immersion;" hence this is one of the doctrines of the Church. On page 73 of the Discipline we find the questions which candidates for the ministry are required to answer affirmatively; among them are these:

"Do you sincerely and fully believe the doctrines of Methodism as contained in our Articles of Religion, and as taught by Mr. Wesley in his Notes on the New Testament and Volumes of Sermons?"

"Will you endeavor to fully and faithfully preach these doctrines?"

Just think, my friends! Mr. Wilkinson said "Yes" to all these questions.

Mr. WILKINSON—Well, what of it?

Mr. HARDING—What of it? You said you believed the doctrines of the Methodist Church, Wesley's Notes and all, when you believed no such thing. You made a statement as true, when you knew at the time you were making it that it was false. That is all there is of it. That may not be much for you, but it would be a good deal for me.

Mr. HUNT—Mr. Chairman, I protest against this gentleman's course. He insinuates that Mr. Wilkinson is a liar. He does not say so, but he would make that impression.

Mr. HARDING—Certainly I do not call him a liar. There is no need that I should; these people are not fools.

Mr. HUNT—A gentleman will not call a man a liar.

Mr. HARDING—Christ was a gentleman, yet he called men liars, for they were; and so did Paul. The wrong is in being a liar, not in being called one. But I have not called Mr. Wilkinson a liar, nor do I intend to; I will simply give you the facts. You have eyes and ears, and can see and hear for yourselves. Hut, ladies and gentlemen, this is the man who would have you believe that I misrepresent the authorities, that I hold back the truth. It is all right for him to "insinuate," but, forsooth, it is very wrong and unkind for me to do so. The dreadful fact of it is I don't insinuate; I *prove*.

A number of you were here last evening and heard Mr. Wilkinson's first speech. From the beginning of it to the end he sought to leave the impression that I was a falsifier. I had been told in the afternoon that an effort would be made in the evening to break up the discussion, and I was warned to be on my guard and keep cool. I said, "He may call me anything under heaven to-night and I will not interrupt him, but woe be to him when my time comes." This man has indulged in insinuation and innuendo, in sneers and scoffs, from the beginning of the debate, but he has never shown me to be incorrect in a single statement; whereas he has made blunder after blunder,

has misrepresented authors, and has been compelled to take back his incorrect statements.

Don't forget that Wesley, in his Notes, says that the burial in baptism refers to immersion; that Mr. Wilkinson has been ridiculing and sneering at this interpretation from the beginning of the debate; that he was required to say he believed the doctrines of these Notes before he could become a Methodist preacher; and that when I called his attention to these facts he merely said, "*What of it?*"

With respect to interruptions: He has interrupted me ten times as often as I have him, and he began it. His brethren, as you know, have interrupted me from the floor, and not unfrequently not less than a half-dozen Paedo-baptist ministers have been on their feet on this platform at one time breaking into my speeches. [There were numbers of these interruptions of which the reporter kept no record. J. A. H.] There never was a more unjust, a more unrighteous set of preachers congregated on a platform than those who have been here on his side of the question.

Mr. HUNT—I protest against such language.

Mr. HARDING—Do you think because you outnumber us three or four to one that you can domineer over us? You were never more mistaken in your lives. For, standing as I do for the defence of God's eternal truth, I feel myself more than a match for all of you together. My brethren in the audience and upon the platform have been quiet and serene, as only those who are confident in the strength of their position can be. My preaching brethren are gentlemen, and they have acted as such from the beginning.

Let us return now to the 15th chapter of Acts, which Mr. Wilkinson was so afraid I would not read. I begin where I left off, that is, with the 6th verse: "And the apostles and elders came together for to consider of this matter." That is, to consider whether or not they should require Gentile converts to be circumcised. Remember, this was about twenty years after Jesus came from the grave. Could this question concerning the circumcision of the Gentiles have ever arisen if the Jews themselves had already given up the practice? If they had ceased for twenty years to circumcise themselves and their children, would they have insisted that the Gentiles should take up the practice at this late date, and that they could not be saved without it? Common sense will answer this question. My opponent, in order to sustain his position that baptism came in the room of circumcision, claims that the Jews who embraced Christianity ceased to practice this latter rite. Well, this one thing is certain: About

twenty years after Christ, many of them were insisting that the Gentile Christians, who had already been baptized, could not be saved unless they were also circumcised; and that was the question before this council at Jerusalem. I read on:

"And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe.

"And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as He did unto us;

"And put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith.

"Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?

"But we believe that through the grace of the Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved, even as they."

After this address, Paul and Barnabas declared what wonders and miracles God had wrought among the Gentiles by them; then James made a speech and gave the decision, which was acquiesced in by all the apostles and elders, in these words:

"Wherefore my sentence is that we trouble not them, who from among the Gentiles are turned unto God.

"But that we write unto them, that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood.

"For Moses of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath day."

That this decision was for the Gentiles and not for the Jews is evident from two facts: 1. About one year after this (*see next chapter*) Paul circumcised Timothy. 2. About eight years after this, Paul returned to Jerusalem: on the next day, he went in to James and the elders, and after he had saluted them, he declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry. "When they heard it, they glorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest, brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law: and they are informed of thee, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs.

"What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come. Do therefore this that we say unto thee: We have four men which have a vow on them; them take,

and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things whereof they were informed concerning thee are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law.

"As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication." Acts 21: 20—25. This was in A.D. 60, about thirty years after Christ died. Here we have the elders and James, the very ones who made the decision recorded in the 15th chapter, explaining that by it they meant only that the Gentiles should not observe circumcision and the customs; that they would consider it disorderly for the Jews to neglect these matters; and Paul evidently agreed with them heartily in the whole matter. It 'was to Gentiles that Paul was writing when he said, "If ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing." Do you suppose he would have circumcised Timothy if he had known that in so doing he would cause him to be damned? It was after he wrote this sentence that he took pains at Jerusalem to show that he had not taught the Jews to neglect circumcision. If Paul had circumcised the Gentiles it would have been will-worship; it would have been like sprinkling for baptism—something that God had never authorized to be done. If Timothy had been a Gentile, without any Jewish blood in his veins, Paul would not have circumcised him. He would not circumcise Titus. Why? Because of the Gentiles it is true, "If ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing." But did not Paul say, "Circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God?" Yes, and his saying is true? the commandment of God is the important thing. When we do in the worship of God that which He has not commanded, we are guilty of "will-worship, of observing the commandments of men; all such worship, Jesus says, is vain; and those who do such things worship in vain. Circumcision was a commandment to the Jew; it was not to the Gentile. Therefore when a Jew was circumcised he obtained a blessing; but when a Gentile was circumcised, he presumptuously did that which he had never been authorized to do, was guilty of will-worship, and received a curse instead of a blessing.

Let me call your attention to a singularity in Mr. Wilkinson's position. He tells us at one time that infants are born pure; and then he says that they are regenerated, redeemed, that their souls are washed and made white in the blood of the Lamb. When are their

souls washed? After birth? How could that be, seeing that they are born pure? But he claims that by virtue of being thus washed they go to heaven; if, then, one should die before the washing it would be lost; but if the washing takes place after birth, and the child should die in birth, it would be lost. According to Mr. Wilkinson's theory, *the infant must be regenerated (that is, born again) before it is born the first time, before it is born into the world*; and that places the second birth before the first, and reminds me of the way the Irishman wanted to take his music lessons—the last one first. Then, to increase the muddle, comes the doctrine of the Discipline, that infants are totally depraved; and the Discipline holds it just as Wesley did, that they are born sinners, born vile. But Mr. Wilkinson, I suppose, thinks they are totally depraved before they are born, regenerated before they are born, and hence, born pure as angels. But we have to do with people that have been born—people that are in the world. And I don't hesitate to affirm that whoever is as innocent as an angel, and at the same time incapable of sinning, is safe; such an one does not need baptism, nor the Lord's Supper, nor the Church. If such an one dies he will go to heaven; for nothing but sin separates man from his God.

But what are we debating about? My opponent is insisting that infants should be baptized; I am most earnestly opposing him; and he charges that my doctrine logically sends them to hell; does not that look as though he baptizes them to save them. That is what Origen baptized them for: no other reason for their baptism was known for hundreds of years. But Mr. Wilkinson says they are born innocent. Then they are in no danger of hell till they are old enough to sin.

Mr. "Wilkinson has repeatedly charged me with perverting the authors that I have quoted. I have denied being guilty of this mean kind of lying, and have affirmed that he could not find the slightest support of the charge. If he fails to maintain the charge, he must publicly acknowledge that he has falsely accused me, or else he will stand convicted of the mean crime that he would have you believe I am guilty of. So far he has made but one specification (that I remember), namely, that I misrepresented Moses Stuart. I quoted Mr. Stuart thus: "*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, plunge, or immerge into anything liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this." *Stuart on Baptism*, p. 51. (Nashville Edition). Mr. Wilkinson does not deny that the quotation is strictly correct, but he affirms that I used it unfairly. He says I sought to make the

impression that Stuart gave these as New Testament meanings, whereas he gave them as classical meanings. Mr. Wilkinson's charge is false. I made the quotation to show the classical meaning. My exact words are these: "My opponent agrees that in the classics it means to immerse. No wonder he agrees to that. Dr. Moses Stuart, professor of sacred literature in Andover Theological Seminary, one of the most learned and distinguished Presbyterians America ever produced, says in his work on Baptism (page 51): "*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into anything liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this." [NOTE.—The reader can see how I used Stuart by turning back to pages 55 and 56 of this printed debate.—J. A. H.]. After making this quotation from Stuart, I quoted from Donnegan, *whose lexicon I had already informed the audience was a classical lexicon.*

Moreover, on pages 153 and 154 of his work on Baptism, Stuart distinctly teaches (1) "that from the earliest ages of which we have any account, subsequent to the apostolic: age, and downward for several centuries, the Churches did generally practice baptism by immersion;" (2) "that *aspersio* and *affusio*, which had in particular cases been now and then practiced in primitive times, were *gradually* introduced;" (3) that "the Churches of Christ, from a very early period, to say the least, understood the word *baptizo* in the New Testament as meaning immersion;" (4) he himself cheerfully admits "that *baptizo* in the New Testament, when applied to the rite of baptism, does in all probability involve the idea that this rite was usually performed by immersion;" (5) he specifies but three cases in which he thinks immersion was not practiced, namely, that of Cornelius and his friends, Acts 10: 47, 48; the jailer, Acts 16: 32, 33; and the three thousand, Acts 2:41. Stuart did not think that immersion could have been performed in these cases, but the discussion of them which has taken place since his time has clearly shown that it could have been done; (6) on pages 65 and 66, speaking of the use of *bapto* and *baptizo* in the Old Testament, Stuart says: "The verb *bapto* signifies to plunge, immerse, dip in;" and after giving a number of examples illustrative of this meaning, adds: "In like manner *baptizo* takes the same signification." He claims that *bapto* in the Old Testament sometimes means to bedew, to moisten; but he does not claim to find any such use of *baptizo*, which is the word our Saviour used to indicate the rite of Christian baptism. Now, my friends, I leave you to decide which of us has deviated from the path of rectitude and truth in this matter concerning Stuart; for one of us has

sinned sadly about the matter, and I don't think it will take a Solomon to decide which has done it.

As to the Graves Ditzler debate, I would only remind you that Mr. Ditzler himself, over his own signature, in a note prefixed to the debate, testifies that he and Mr. Graves read and corrected the whole work, and that it is a faithful transcript of what was said in the discussion. Mr. Wilkinson says that he claims, in another book, since published, that they never did send him the proof-sheets of many of his own speeches. Why, then, did he sign that endorsement of the book? Why did he take the \$500? I would hate to stand in the position in which Mr. Wilkinson leaves his distinguished brother. Seeing Mr. Ditzler is not to be trusted, in any event, I prefer to believe the Baptist Publication Society.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKINSON'S FIFTH SPEECH.

My opponent is lavish of strange statements, and affects to be wise above that which is written. He stated in his last speech that Origen was the first man to favor infant baptism. I would like him to tell us how he found that out. Origen himself, in his Eighth Homily on Leviticus, chapter 12, says: "According to the usage of the Church baptism is given to infants." How it could have become "the usage of the Church" if nobody favored it, is somewhat mysterious. He also says in his Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, book 5: "For this cause it was that the Church received an order from the Apostles to give baptism even to infants." Now, this testimony is either true or false. If true, my opponent's testimony must be false. If false, it must be either because Origen was an untruthful witness or an incompetent one. No one will charge Origen with untruthfulness in the matter, for two reasons. First, because he had no motive for telling a lie about it, and secondly, because the irreproachableness of his character forbids it. As to his competency as a witness, surely he would be as likely to know as my opponent. He was born only eighty-five years after John died, and had access to all the writings of the age, most of which have since been destroyed, and was doubtless contemporary with men who lived in the days of the last of the

apostles. He *must have known*, therefore, and on the supposition that he was a man of integrity, his testimony is unimpeachable. Can my opponent claim to be a more competent witness? If not, then how dare he make such an unauthorized statement, that Origen was the first man to favor infant baptism?

Besides, it will be shown that both Justin Martyr and Irenaeus speak of the existence of infant baptism in their day, and the former was born within about five years of John's death, and the latter about the same time, if not still earlier. Hence it is a piece of inexcusable recklessness for a Christian minister to stand before you and make such absolutely unfounded statements.

My opponent would have you to believe that infant baptism originated in the belief that infants would be damned if they were not baptized. I have only to say that saving efficacy was ascribed to adult baptism just as far back as to infant baptism, hence it was to save the big folks from being damned as truly as the little folks. Moreover, the quotation from Zell's Encyclopaedia in support of this statement ascribes this doctrine of infant damnation to Augustine, who lived nearly 200 years after Origen, and about 250 after the testimony of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus was given. Moreover, he cannot find an instance where an early father, prior to Augustine, taught the doctrine in question. Therefore this statement, like the one just examined, is utterly without foundation. And this is the kind of evidence on which we are asked to reject infant baptism. But we would prefer something a little more authentic.

My opponent cannot seem to understand how a child can inherit original sin and yet be born pure, and he tries very hard to convict me of inconsistency for holding such doctrines. Perhaps he will tell us how a person guilty of personal sin can become pure. If he will, I will tell him how a person unclean by nature can be made pure at birth. If he says, by faith, I deny it. Faith is the condition of purity, not the agency, and surely it is as easy for God to cleanse a child without faith, as an adult sinner by faith. I think my opponent is trying to create difficulties where none exist. But if he will deal with the difficulties and inconsistencies of his own theory, he will have a task sufficient to tax all his energies.

Again, my opponent squarely denies the doctrine of original sin, and says "no man was ever justified from Adam's sin, nor ever will be." I desire again to cite him to Rom. 5:18, 19, where the apostle says: "As by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon

all men to justification of life," etc. Now, I leave him to settle the matter with Paul and his Master. It is needless for me to spend time with a Christian minister who ignores the teachings of the Bible. Such men, if they were not ministers, would be called infidels. You can call them what you like. And remember he has not yet attempted to explain this passage in any other light than that in which I have presented it. He simply denies and ignores its plain teachings altogether. I therefore call upon him to tell us what this "justification of life" means. If not justification from Adam's sin, it must be justification from personal sin; and if all men are justified from personal sin, then all men will be saved. Does he believe this? If so, let him proclaim it. And then let him tell us in what way "judgment to condemnation" came upon "all men by the offence of one," or how "through one man's disobedience many were made sinners." Till he does this I must just leave him pinned to the wall by the javelin of divine truth, and let him writhe. No doubt it will be painful, but I cannot relieve him.

He referred to Eph. 2:1, 2, but did not quote the whole passage. If he had, he would have found that we are all "*by nature* the children of wrath even as others." But this fact was slurred over and concealed by an *et cetera*—another convenient way of dodging an unwelcome truth. It is evident that my opponent manufactures his own gospel and then patches up the Bible to make it correspond. Of course he can upset everybody's creed on that principle and prove anything he pleases. But most people will demand "a more excellent way."

He seems very keen to debate some other question besides the one under discussion, and I don't wonder at that. No doubt a temporary respite from his present unpleasant situation would be a great relief. But, as the old lady said, he must comfort himself with the passage which says, "You must just grin and bear it." When he gets done with this subject it will be time enough to prepare for another. But he probably won't be so keen by that time. He had better not get too many jobs on hand at once, or he will get mixed worse than ever, which is needless.

In response to my challenge, my opponent makes a flourish of proving that the apostolic Church practiced circumcision. But my challenge related to the early Christian Church, and not to the apostolic Church at all. And I challenged him to prove it from his Church histories and encyclopaedias, but he tries to prove it from the Bible. It is so much easier to prove something that is not disputed

than something that is. I am aware that Paul circumcised Timothy, and that the Jews clung to the ceremonial law after the days of Christ; but I want him to prove that in post-apostolic days Christians held or taught that Jews ought still to be circumcised. And he cannot do it.

My opponent has labored very hard to prove me a liar on the ground of my having agreed to the doctrines of Methodism as taught in Wesley's Sermons and Notes on the New Testament. It is a very sublime spectacle, no doubt, for one Christian minister to appear before a public audience to prove another a liar. But the employment of such tactics can only recoil on the unworthy head of the man who employs them. They are beneath contempt, and I only condescend a reply to such vile and unchristian innuendo lest it might have some little weight with the thoughtless. In the first place, it would not prove me a liar if it could be shown that I had at one time endorsed Wesley's Notes and Sermons and afterwards rejected them. It would only prove that my religious belief had undergone a change. And surely a man may change his creed without being branded as a liar. But, in the next place, I never promised to accept Wesley's Notes and Sermons as the exponents of my belief, not having been ordained in the Canada Methodist Church, but having come into it by a union of Churches; and, in the third place, my present teachings are not at variance with "the doctrines of Methodism as contained in our Articles of Religion and taught by Wesley in his Notes and Sermons." The mode of baptism is not one of our "articles of religion," and if it were, it is declared to be "sprinkling or pouring" (see Discipline, p. 34), and not immersion; so all my opponent's ammunition and effort on that point are thrown away. Besides, a mere conjecture indulged in by Wesley, that Rom. 6: 4 contained "an *allusion* to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion" can hardly be exalted into a *doctrine* of his, especially when he himself, in another place, declares that "*nothing* can be inferred from such a figurative expression. Nay," he says, "if it held exactly, it would make as much for sprinkling as for plunging; since, in burying, the body is not plunged through the substance of the earth, but rather earth is poured or sprinkled upon it." So I am quite as much in accord with Wesley as my opponent is, and his hue and cry on this point is just to raise a dust. While men have arguments to advance they do not need to resort to twaddle. One cannon is worth a cart-load of such fire-crackers. The twaddle indulged in by my opponent about the attempt to be made this evening to break up the discussion, I have

no doubt, is the thinnest kind of moonshine. I have not patience to deal with such unworthy tricks to excite the prejudice of the community against myself and my people. I know not how anything short of the most desperate extremities could induce a man to resort to such tactics. Drowning men catch at straws.

But I cannot spend any more time over my opponent's reply. I want to adduce a few more arguments in support of my proposition. The proposition which I am here to affirm is that infant baptism has existed in the Christian Church from apostolic times. It occurred to me that if I had a little chronological chart extending from Christ down through a few centuries, including the period that would be covered by this debate, it would greatly aid friends on both sides of the question in apprehending the period when each individual lived, and consequently the value of his testimony as a competent witness because of his proximity to the days of the apostles. I have therefore prepared this chart (see accompanying chart). The perpendicular lines mark the centuries, and the broad horizontal lines the witnesses I propose to examine. The name of each is printed in large letters, which I trust all will be able to see, just over the line representing the relative length of his life. The proportion of each century covered by these lines indicates exactly the proportion of such century during which the individual lived. My chart shows that John was born in the early part of the first century, and died about A.D. 100. Polycarp was born about 80 A.D., and died in the second century about 169. He was contemporary with John for about 20 years. Justin Martyr was contemporary with Polycarp, being born about the close of the first century or beginning of the second. His birth is generally put down at about 105 A.D. He died between 165 and 170. Irenaeus was for more than half his life contemporary with Polycarp. Polycarp was acquainted with John and heard him describe our Lord and His miracles; therefore these men must have known what the usage of the Church was in the days of the apostles. Their evidence will accordingly be valuable on this point. Tertullian comes in as the alleged opponent of infant baptism. He was born about the middle of the second century, and lived, you will observe, till near the middle of the third. I propose to give you the testimony of some others of the early fathers, but I propose to begin down the line and work up to the time of the apostles. I will begin with Pelagius, who, so far as my present knowledge of Church history goes, was the first prominent individual to deny the doctrine of original sin. He believed, just as my opponent believes, that children came into this world without

CHRONOLOGICAL CHART,

Showing the proximity to the days of the Apostles of those early fathers of the church who testify to the existence of Infant Baptism during the early post-apostolic age, and whose testimony is quoted in this debate.

	A. D. 100.	A. D. 200.	A. D. 300.	A. D. 400.	A. D. 500.	A. D. 600.
ST. JOHN. _____ 100	JUSTIN About _____ 100 to 105	TERTULLIAN. _____ 150 to 160	COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE. _____ 253	PELAGIUS. _____ 354	CHRYSOStOM. _____ 354	AUGUSTINE. _____ 354
IRENÆUS. _____ 115 to 120	CYPRIAN. _____ 190 to 202	POLYCARP. _____ 69	ORIGEN. _____ 185	_____ 420	_____ 407	_____ 430
_____ 33	_____ 258	_____ 254	_____ 418	SECOND COUNCIL OF CARTHAGE.		

any sin. In using that expression I may define it. We recognize sin in two aspects. It is true that personal sin is an actual personal transgression of the law; but there has always been recognized in the world the doctrine of natural depravity, or hereditary taint, by whatever name you choose to call it, and for want of a better name people have been in the habit of speaking of it as original sin. No one who understands the belief of the Methodist, Presbyterian, or almost any orthodox Christian Church, will understand by the phrase original sin such sin as the individual alone is guilty of. We understand that in a moral sense there was a corruption of the stream that flowed from the original Adamic fountain, in consequence of the corruption of the fountain; that the effect is on our souls as well as on our bodies; that when Adam fell the corruption descended to everyone that descended from him, and that man in his physical, intellectual and moral nature is impaired because of his descent from Adam. Pelagius denied this doctrine of original sin. He said that children were born into the world perfectly pure, without need of an atonement. A great discussion arose over his teachings on that point. He was opposed by his contemporaries, Augustine, Chrysostom and others. They pressed him on that point most strongly, and in connection with this very question of infant baptism especially. At that time the doctrine that regenerating influence or power was communicated in baptism had become very general in the Church. The opponents of Pelagius pressed him hard in this way: "Why do you baptize infants if they are perfectly pure, if they have no taint of original sin?" My opponent has truly said that some of the early fathers believed that infants were saved from sin by being baptized. The Church then was full of superstition and error. Pelagius lived only 300 years after the death of John, and was acquainted with the writings of the early fathers as we cannot be acquainted with them. He must have known whether infant baptism was introduced after the days of the apostles or whether it was continued from their days. Because of his peculiar belief and doctrinal attitude, and because of the straits into which he was driven by his antagonists, we claim it would have been policy on his part and that of his associates, if they could have done so, to have denied *in toto* that we had any right to baptize infants, that there was no ground on which it could be upheld, and therefore infant baptism should not be practiced. Did he do that? I will read a quotation from Pelagius on the subject.

In a letter to Innocent, bishop of Rome, he complains of his opponents, and says:—

"Men do slander me as if I denied the sacrament of baptism to infants," etc.

He further declares:—

"That he never heard even an impious heretic who would affirm this concerning infants" (viz., that they were not to be baptized), and continues:—

"For who is so ignorant of the reading of the evangelists, as to attempt (not to say to establish this [doctrine,] but) to speak of it heedlessly, or even have such a thought? In fine, who can be so impious as to hinder infants from being baptized, and born again in Christ, and thus cause them to miss the kingdom of heaven; since our Saviour has said, that none can enter into the kingdom of heaven that is not born again of water and the Holy Spirit? Who is there so impious as to refuse to an infant, of what age soever, the common redemption of mankind, and to hinder him that is born to an uncertain life from being born again to an everlasting and certain one?"

Celestius, an Irishman, a companion of Pelagius, in travel, toil, and faith, and a fellow leader in the Pelagian heresy, in his confession of faith, quoted by St Austin, says:—

"But we acknowledge infants ought to be baptized for the remission of sins, ACCORDING TO THE RULES OF THE UNIVERSAL CHURCH, and ACCORDING TO THE SENTENCE OF THE GOSPEL, because our Lord has ordained that the kingdom of heaven shall be bestowed upon no person except he be baptized; which, as men do not receive it by nature, it is necessary to confer by the power [or liberty] of grace."

Both Pelagius and Celestius confess that they never heard of any sect or person who denied infant baptism.

Dr. Wall, whom my opponent has so highly extolled, says—
 "If there had been any such church of anti-Paedo-baptists in the world, these men could not have missed an opportunity of hearing of them, being so great travelers as they were. For they were born and bred, the one in Britain, the other in Ireland. They lived the prime of their ago (a very long time, as St. Austin testifies) at Rome—a place to which all the people of the world had then a resort. They were both for some time at Carthage, in Africa. Then the one [Pelagius] settled at Jerusalem, and the other [Celestius] traveled through all the noted Greek and Eastern churches, in Europe and Asia. It is impossible there should have been any church that had any singular practice in this matter but they must have heard of it. So that one may fairly conclude that there was not at this time, nor in the memory of the men of this time, any Christian society that

denied baptism to infants. This cuts off at once all the pretences which some anti-Paedo-baptists would raise from certain probabilities, that the Novatians, or Donatists, or the British Church of those times, or any other whom Pelagius must needs have known, did deny it." (*Quoted from Hibbard, p. 219.*)

There was a Council held at Carthage about this time, A.D. 418, composed of 214 bishops. At this Council they considered the Pelagian error concerning infant Baptism, and also the question as to whether they might be baptized before they were eight days old; which, it seems, some doubted. The violence of the Pelagian controversy was well calculated to elicit definite statements; and we have them. The Council decreed as follows:—

"Also we determine that whosoever does deny that infants may be baptized when they come recently from their mother's womb; or does say that they are indeed baptized for forgiveness of sins; and yet that they derive no original sin from Adam, (from whence it would follow that the form of baptism for forgiveness of sins is in them not true, but false), let him be anathema."

As we have already intimated, Irenaeus testifies in favor of infant baptism, yet this same Irenaeus wrote a history of all the sects and heresies that had arisen up in the Church before his time, from the time of Simon Magus, mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles. He wrote his treatise about 77 years after the death of the apostle John. He was intimately acquainted with Polycarp, John's companion and friend. After residing in Smyrna during the earlier part of his life, Irenaeus was appointed Bishop of Lyons, in France. Thus he became conversant with the churches both in Asia and Europe, by actual residence and intercourse among them, as well as by his general learning and his office. He mentions with particularity all the sects that had sprung up, but he mentions none that held any doctrine contrary to the general Church touching infant baptism—that is, he mentions none that denied it.

Augustine was a high authority among the early fathers. I will read an extract from a letter from him:—

"And if any one do ask for authority in this matter, though that which the universal Church practices, which has not been instituted by councils, but has always been observed, is most justly believed to be nothing else than a tiling delivered, (or handed down) by the authority of the apostles; yet we may, besides, take a true estimate how much the sacrament of baptism does avail infants, by the circumcision which God's former people received."

In A.D. 253 a Council, composed of 66 bishops, was held in Carthage. Fidus, a country bishop, sent a letter inquiring, among other matters, whether, in case of necessity, an infant might be baptized before it was eight days old. To this they returned the following answer:—

"Cyprian, and the rest of the bishops who were present at the Council, in number 66, to Fidus, our brother, greeting:—

"We read your letter, most esteemed brother, in which you wrote of one Victor, a priest," etc. "But to the case of infants: Whereas you judge 'that they must not be baptized within two or three days after they are born, and that the rule of circumcision is to be observed, so that none should be baptized and sanctified before the eighth day after he is born;' WE WERE ALL, IN OUR ASSEMBLY, OF A CONTRARY OPINION. For, as for what you thought fitting to be done, there was not one that was of your mind, but all of us, on the contrary, judged that the grace and mercy of God is to be denied to no person that is born. For, whereas our Lord, in His Gospel, says, 'The Son of Man came not to destroy men's souls (lives), but to save them,' as far as lies in us, no soul, if possible, is to be lost. ... So that we judge that no person is to be hindered from obtaining the grace by the law that is now appointed, and that the spiritual circumcision [that is, *the grace of baptism*] ought not to be impeded by the circumcision that was according to the flesh, [that is, Jewish circumcision], but that all are to be admitted to the grace of Christ, since Peter, speaking in the Acts of the Apostles, says, 'The Lord has shown me that no person is to be called common or unclean.'

"If anything could be an obstacle to persons against obtaining the grace, the adult, and grown, and aged, would be rather hindered by their more grievous sins. If, then, the greatest offenders, and those that have grievously sinned against God before, have, when they afterward come to believe, forgiveness of their sins, and no person is prohibited from baptism and grace; how much less reason is there to refuse an infant, who, being newly born, has no sin, save that being descended from Adam according to the flesh, he has from his very birth contracted the contagion of the death anciently threatened; who comes for this reason more easily to receive forgiveness of sins, because they are not his own but others' sins that are forgiven him.

"This, therefore, most esteemed brother, was our opinion in the assembly, that it is not for us to hinder any person from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and kind, and affectionate to all. Which rule, as it is to govern universally, so we think it more espe-

cially to be observed in reference to infants and persons newly born, to whom our help and the divine mercy is rather to be granted, because by their weeping and wailing at their first entrance into the world, they do intimate nothing so much as that they implore compassion."

Another of the early fathers who have left on record their testimony on this subject is Origen. He is one of the most illustrious of the early fathers, and lived, as you will observe from the chart, in close proximity to the apostles. He was born but 85 years after the death of John, and was contemporary with Cyprian and Tertullian. His knowledge of the subject must have extended back to apostolic times and included apostolic practices, and is certainly more reliable than that of any man living in our day. My opponent maintains that there is no mention of infant baptism before the days of Tertullian, and infers that therefore it had no previous existence. Now, Origen had as good a chance of knowing as my opponent, and he says it was handed down from the apostles. The following is his testimony: Speaking of the evidence of original sin he says:—

"Besides all this, let it considered what is the reason that whereas the baptism of the Church is given for forgiveness of sins, *infants* also, according to the usage of the Church, are baptized; when, if there were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be superfluous to them."

Again:—"Infants are baptized for the remission of sins. Of what sins? or when have they sinned? Or how can any reason of the laver hold good, but according to that sense we mentioned even now, (*viz.*) 'None is free from pollution, though his life be but of the length of a single day upon the earth.' And because by the sacrament of baptism our native pollution is taken away, therefore infants may be baptized."

Again, speaking of original sin, and of its affecting infants, he says, "For this [cause] the Church received from the apostles a tradition [an order] even to give baptism to infants. For they to whom the divine mysteries are given know that there is in all persons the natural pollution of sin, which must be done away with by water and the Spirit."

My next witness is Tertullian, who, according to my opponent, was the first person who ever mentioned infant baptism, and he mentioned it to oppose it.] will give you his testimony and you will see that it is not in opposition to the baptism of infants as an unscriptural innovation, but owing to his peculiar belief that sin was washed away

by baptism, and that no sin committed after baptism could be forgiven, and he recommended the delay of the ordinance in their case and that of some other classes, to a later period of life. He says:

" But they whose duty it is to administer baptism are to know that it must not be given rashly. 'Give to every one that asketh thee,' has its proper subject, and relates to alms-giving: but that command rather is to be here considered, 'Give not that which is holy unto dogs, neither cast your pearls before swine.' And that [command] also, 'Lay hands suddenly on no man, neither be partakers of other men's faults.' Therefore, according to every one's condition and disposition, and also their age, the delaying of baptism is more profitable, especially in the case of little children. For what need is there that the godfathers should be brought into danger? because they may either fail of their promise by death, or they may be mistaken by a child's proving of wicked disposition. Our Lord says, indeed, 'Do not forbid them to come to Me.' Therefore let them come when they are grown up: let them come when they understand: when they are instructed whither it is that they come: let them be made Christians when they can know Christ. What need their guiltless age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins? Men will proceed very warily in worldly things; and he that should not have earthly goods committed to him, yet may he have heavenly. Let them know how to desire this salvation, that you may appear to have given to one that asketh."

Justin Martyr, A.D. 133, says: "We also who by Him have had access to God, have not received this carnal circumcision, but the spiritual circumcision which Enoch and those like him observed. And we have received it by baptism, by the mercy of God, because we were sinners: and it is enjoined upon all persons to receive it in the same way." Again, "We are circumcised by baptism with Christ's circumcision." Again, "Many persons among us, of sixty or seventy years old, of both sexes, who were disciplined to Christ in their childhood do continue uncorrupted." That testimony brings us to the door of the apostolic Church, and shows that this father identifies baptism and circumcision as one and the same thing.

[Time expired.]

MR. HARDING'S FIFTH REPLY.

This chart exhibited by my friend is, doubtless, in many of its details as correct as any one could draw it.

Mr. WILKINSON—I measured it out with mathematical exactness.

Mr. HARDING—You did? Well, I am very glad to hear that; I will endeavor to make good use of it.

Justin Martyr wrote about A. D. 140; Irenaeus, about A.D. 167; Tertullian, about A.D. 200; Origen, about A.D. 210; Cyprian, about A.D. 250; Augustine, about A.D. 388; Pelagius, about A.D. 400; and the Council of Carthage was held A.D. 416. These are the dates as given by Dr. Wall in his History of Infant Baptism, and are as correct as it is possible to give them.

Polycarp was born, it is supposed, about A.D. 80, and became a teacher in the Church A.D. 110.

In order to find infant baptism my friend started with Pelagius and Augustine, that is to say, about 400 years after the beginning of the Christian era. By that time a great many changes had taken place, a great many corruptions had crept into the Church, and a great many false doctrines were taught. Four hundred years is a long time; why, it has only been 392 years since this continent of America was discovered by Columbus. My opponent, therefore, in tracing the historical chain by which he hopes to connect infant baptism with the apostolic age, begins his speech away down the stream of time, further from the beginning of the Christian era than is this present day from the date of the discovery of America. He found infant baptism there, and it is not at all strange that he did. There is not a vestige of it to be found in the first century, not the slightest trace in the second; not till the beginning of the third is there a word to be found concerning it in all the records of time. We hand down statements concerning changes in politics and religion with ease to posterity in these days, because we have books, papers, and printing presses, and everybody nearly can read. Not so in those days; there were no printing presses, books were written by hand, and there were no newspapers nor telegraph lines. News crept out slowly, and the doctrine of the Bible was circulated for the most part from mouth to mouth. Any one who knows how hard it is for most men to repeat what they hear just as they have heard it, can readily understand that many false doctrines would certainly be

circulated in the world in the course of a few hundred years, and that many improper practices would naturally arise out of them.

My friend began with the Council of Carthage, A.D. 416. Infant baptism very generally prevailed in the Church by that time. As Mr. Wilkinson's quotations show, they baptized infants to wash away the stain of sin that they might be saved; for they believed that if they should die unbaptized they would "*miss the kingdom, of heaven.*" At this council Pelagius was tried for heresy, because he claimed that infants are born as pure as Adam was before the fall. The "orthodox" of that day thought this was a horrible doctrine; they could not imagine why he baptized infants "if they have no taint of original sin." So, we see, first came the false doctrine that infants are sinners, and then the practice of baptizing them to save them from sin, and to give them a place in heaven.

Mr. Wilkinson says Augustine was the first who taught that infants would be damned if not baptized. His own quotations show that both Cyprian and Origen taught that infants were baptized to cleanse them from the sin of Adam; both taught that they were baptized for the forgiveness of sins, to wash away the pollution of their birth. Could a polluted, sin-stained thing go to heaven? They believed that the sin-stains were washed away in baptism; and they did not believe that the unforgiven could enter heaven.

My friend might have saved himself much trouble in tracing this practice of infant baptism, for I admit that it was known in the days of Pelagius, Augustine, Cyprian, Origen, and that it was spoken of by Tertullian, A.D. 200. He is the first man to make any reference to it. This was two hundred years after the beginning of the Christian era, and one hundred years after the death of John, the last apostle. Let my opponent find a mention of infant baptism by any writer before Tertullian and I will promptly give up the debate. There, now, is a square issue. There is a chance for him to close this debate right speedily, with honor to himself and glory to his cause, *if only he can find the passage.*

But suppose the practice had been mentioned within two years, or one year, after John's death? It would have been just that much too late. Aye, if it had been mentioned in the apostolic age, unless it had been taught by an inspired man, it would not have been of divine authority; for Paul said, as early as A.D. 54, "The mystery of iniquity doth already work;" and John said, about A.D. 90, "Even now are there many antichrists." Thus we see that even in the apostolic age false teachers were in the Church, and their doctrines

were stealing upon the people. Therefore, I repeat, if it could be shown that some writer even in the days of John mentioned infant baptism, if he were not an inspired apostle it would not establish the practice. But no such thing can be found. Christ lived on earth for thirty-three years, and died without ever having said a word about infant baptism; Matthew and Mark and Luke and John wrote biographical sketches about Him, telling about His works and doctrines, and not one of them ever said a word about infant baptism; Luke, in Acts of the Apostles, gives a brief account of the rise and progress of the Church through a period of about thirty years, but not one word does he say about infant baptism; in the New Testament there are fourteen letters written by Paul, three by John, two by Peter, one by James, and one by Jude, but in not one of these, written though they were to direct the Christian in all the duties of life, can any mention be found of infant baptism; the apostolic age has passed away, John has died, and still the world is silent on the subject of infant baptism; ten years are added to the first century, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty, ninety, and still in all the literature of the world not a reference can be found to infant baptism. The second century passes away, A.D. 200 dawns upon the world, and then, for the first time in all the history of the ages, do we find any reference to the practice. Tertullian is earnestly contending against it, and hotly inquiring, "What need their guiltless age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins?" Ten years later Origen is arguing in favor of it, and he says, "It is for that reason, because by the sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away, that infants are baptized."

There now, my friends, you have the beginning of this rite; it arose one hundred years after the days of inspiration, and began to be practiced in order that the infant might be "washed," "sanctified," "delivered from the wrath of God," and "received into the ark of Christ's Church;" that the "old Adam" might be gotten out of him, and the "new man" raised up in him.

My opponent said that "Irenaeus testifies in favor of infant baptism." He did not. There is not a word of truth in that statement. Mr. Wilkinson is mistaken. Here again is a square issue. I know what Irenaeus said. There is not a single mention of infant baptism in all his writings. He wrote about thirty-three years before Tertullian. Dr. Meyer says, speaking of infant baptism, it was "not certainly attested before Tertullian, and by him still decidedly opposed." *Com. on Acts 10:15*, p. 312. Dr. Bledsoe, the learned, powerful and

candid editor of the *Southern Review* (Methodist), says: "Tertullian is the first writer in the Church who makes any express mention of the custom of infant baptism. .Before, his time, A.D. 200, there is not an allusion to the custom from which its existence may be fairly inferred!" *The Southern Review*, vol. xiv. p. 339.

As we have seen, the first man to mention infant baptism opposes it *on the ground of the innocency of the little ones*; the first one to favor it does it *on the ground of their guilt*. And on this ground, viz., the pollution of the child, every orthodox advocate of the practice has contended for it from the days of Origen to the time of John Wesley. So far as I know, there has not been an exception to the rule. Even the unorthodox Pelagius, though he thought they were innocent at birth, believed they would "*miss heaven*" unless they were baptized. John Wesley thus testifies: "As to the grounds of it, if infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects for baptism; seeing in the ordinary way they cannot be saved unless this be washed away in baptism. It has been already proved that this original sin cleaves to every child of man, and that hereby they are children of wrath and liable to eternal damnation." *Doctrinal Tracts*, p. 251. This quotation is from the edition "Published by order of the General Conference," in New York, in 1850. In 1861, the tract on Baptism, from which this quotation is taken, was left out of the "Doctrinal Tracts," and another substituted in its place. Dr. Ditzler says Wesley is not the author of the tract; but it is probable that he is wrong in this, for the Tract Committee that published it called it "Mr. Wesley's Short Treatise on Baptism;" at any rate, it was published with the endorsement of the General Conference. The whole baptismal service, as it relates to infants, is built upon this idea, and as Mr. Wilkinson rejects the idea—as he holds that infants are born "pure as angels"—he can never explain the minister's petition that the "child being delivered from Thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Holy Church!"

But in his last speech Mr. Wilkinson seemed to switch around again. He says: "We understand that in a moral sense there was a corruption of the stream that flowed from the original Adamic fountain, in consequence of the corruption of the fountain; that the effect is on our souls as well as on our bodies; that when Adam fell the corruption descended to every one that descended from him, and that man in his physical, intellectual and moral nature is impaired because of his descent from Adam." In these words he clearly shows that he believes the souls of all men were corrupted by the fall of Adam—the

souls as well as the bodies. But no corrupt soul can enter heaven; hence he argues that infants had to be redeemed in order to be saved. When is the infant redeemed? If it needs redemption, and dies before it is redeemed, it will be lost. But Mr. Wilkinson must think it gets rid of this corruption before it is born, for he says it is born pure: that is, he has it redeemed, regenerated, "born again," *before it is born the first time*—the second birth before the first. What nonsense! In such foolishness as this do even intelligent men entangle themselves when they begin to advocate and defend false teachings.

This miserably false doctrine of original sin involves its advocates in an endless number of difficulties. Who can tell when a child becomes a living soul? It certainly does before its birth into this world. From the very beginning of one's existence as a living soul, they tell us, he is totally depraved and corrupted by the sin of Adam, and cut off from heaven unless regenerated. But one is a living soul before he is born; some die before they are born, hence the necessity of regeneration before birth, of regeneration at the very instant of becoming a living soul. If the child should exist for one moment before the sin of Adam is washed from it, it would be liable to everlasting destruction, for it might die in that moment; hence those who hold to the doctrine of original sin, are driven to the position that the moment of beginning to exist, and the moment of regeneration are the same, for it is nonsense to talk about the regeneration of a being that has not yet begun to exist, and, if a child exists before regeneration, it is liable to die in that time, and hence to be lost. How absurd to speak of a being that is pure, that has been pure from the very moment when it began to exist, as being guilty of original sin, polluted by the sin of Adam, totally depraved, and so on!

Mr. Wilkinson quotes, Rom. 5:18, 19, to prove his doctrine of original sin—that all men sinned in Adam. I read the passage from the revised version, as follows: "So then as through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; even so through one act of righteousness, the free gift came unto all men to justification of life. For, as through the one man's disobedience, the many were made sinners, even so through the obedience of the one shall the many be made righteous."

Through one trespass the judgment came unto all men to condemnation; that is Adam sinned, and, in consequence of that sin, all of us are born separated from the tree of life, and hence die the natural death; Christ did not sin, hence He came up from the grave, and hence all, good and bad, will come up from the grave. "As in Adam

all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive," says Paul—"shall be" evidently referring to the resurrection.

Again, from Adam's fall we all inherit enfeebled bodies, but through the body Satan tempts the soul; hence from the fall of Adam man is more easily approached by the devil, not because the spirit is corrupted by Adam's sin, but because the avenues of approach through the enfeebled body are better for his work; hence, from the sin of Adam many become sinners. But, mark you, they are not sinners till they sin, till they are old enough to understand and violate law. Paul tells the Colossians that they were dead in their sins—their own sins. His words are: "And you, being dead in your sins and in the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him, having forgiven all your trespasses," Col. 2:13. To the Ephesians he says: "And you did He quicken when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins," Eph. 2: 1, *Revised Version*. But does not Paul speak of these Ephesians as being children of wrath by nature? Yes, but that was when they "lived in the lusts of our flesh, doing the desires of the flesh and of the mind," Eph. 2: 3, *Revised Version*. Everybody knows that the flesh was affected by the fall of Adam, seeing that it was cut off from the youth-preserving, life-giving tree.

But we do not inherit our spirits from Adam at all: the Bible (Heb. 12: 9) speaks of "the fathers of our flesh," in contradistinction to "the Father of spirits;" and Zechariah (chapter 12, ver. 1) says, God "formeth the spirit of man within him;" Solomon (Eccl. 12: 7), in speaking of death, testifies thus "Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return to God who gave it." Our bodies, and the mere animal life that is in them, we inherit from Adam through our parents—"the fathers of our flesh;" our spirits are direct impartations from God, the "Father of spirits," who "formeth the spirit of man within him." Hence they are pure—pure as God the Giver is pure; nor is one of these spirits corrupted till of its own volition it violates the law of God. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." If it passes through the change that we call death before any violation of law, the pure spirit returns to heaven, because heaven is its native land, heaven is its home. It does not need baptism, nor the Lord's Supper, nor the Church; for all these are intended for those that have sinned: in heaven it will not be one of the redeemed, for it was never lost, and, of course, was never bought back. Jesus did not come into the world to save the sinless, but to call sinners to repentance. In heaven it will be as the angel Gabriel, one that was never lost.

The guilt of sin cannot be inherited; the effects of it may be. Let me illustrate this: the drunkard weakens his constitution, brings himself to poverty, and loses his soul, by the drinking habit: his child, born to him after his constitution has been broken down, inherits the physical debility and the poverty, but not the condemnation. The Lord speaking through Ezekiel, says: "The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." Ezek, 18: 20. In the fourth verse of the same chapter the Lord says: "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." This saying fully agrees with the statement that God is the Father of spirits; that we inherit our spirits from Him, and not from our earthly parents.

It is nonsense to talk about "the guilt of original sin." When Adam sinned he was driven away from the tree of life, lest he should eat of it and live for ever. (See Gen. 3: 22-24.) Hence all that have descended from him are separated from that tree, and, as a consequence, die the natural death. Had it not been for his sin, he and his posterity would have had access to the health-preserving fruit, and would have continued to live, all through their innocence, in the power and vigor of youth. But while it inherits this sad consequence, the little one inherits none of the guilt of Adam's sin. The soul does not die on account of Adam's sin. "The soul that sinneth it shall die." When the child becomes old enough to sin, and does sin, then for the first time it is lost; then it needs to be redeemed—to be bought back. How beautiful is the story of the prodigal son. At first he was in his father's house; then he wandered away; and then, when he repented and turned back to his father, he was promptly forgiven, and joyfully restored to his place. Every man is a prodigal. He is born in a state of innocence and purity; God is his father, and his pure spirit has not forfeited the right to a place in his father's house. But he grows in knowledge; he comes to understand law; he violates it; and thus he wanders from his Father's house; then he needs the preaching of the gospel, baptism, the Church, the Lord's Supper; in fine, he needs to be washed in the blood of Jesus, and thus cleansed from his sins and iniquities, that he may be restored to the innocence of his childhood. In harmony with this idea, Jesus said, "Except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Matthew

18:3. Little children are already fit for the kingdom of heaven, they are already in Christ, in the grace of God, and adults must become innocent as they are, if they would be saved. Jesus came into this world to save sinners: to call sinners, not the righteous, to repentance. Hence the Church, built upon the new covenant, of which Jeremiah prophesied, is for those who have sinned, and who come back by faith to Jesus Christ. The whole thing is a matter of faith, and hence infants have no part nor lot in it, as they are as incapable of believing as they are of sinning: they have, without this covenant, all that adults gain by it, that is, innocence; and after the judgment all the innocent enter the city of God.

Now that the Church is for believers, and believers only, I want to make clearer by reading from the third chapter of Galatians. As I read I will emphasize the words to which especial attention is called:

"O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you, that ye should not OBEY THE TRUTH, and before whose eyes Jesus Christ hath been evidently set forth, crucified among you? This only would I learn of you, Received ye the Spirit by the works of the law, or BY THE HEARING OF FAITH? Are ye so foolish? having begun in the Spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh? Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if it be yet in vain? He therefore that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by THE HEARING OF FAITH? Even as Abraham BELIEVED God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness. Know ye, therefore, that THEY WHICH ARE OF FAITH, the same are the children of Abraham."

Before reading further I pause to remark that Abraham was the father of two seeds—a natural seed, and a spiritual: the one was composed of his- fleshly descendants, the other were children of the promise: the one became his children by natural generation the other in the manner which will appear from the following reading:

"And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen THROUGH FAITH, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed. So then they WHICH BE OF FAITH are blessed with faithful Abraham. . . . Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; [this shows whom Christ *redeems*, namely, those who are under a curse for having violated law]; for it is written, Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree; that the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit THROUGH FAITH. . . . But the Scripture hath concluded all under

sin, that the promise BY FAITH of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe. But before faith came, we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed. Wherefore the law was. our schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, THAT WE MIGHT BE JUSTIFIED BY FAITH. But after that faith is come, we are no longer under a schoolmaster. 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. 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."

From this reading we learn that those who are under the "new covenant" receive the Spirit "by the hearing of faith:" that "they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham:" that Christ hath redeemed them "from the curse of the law:" that they were under the curse because they had not continued in "all things which are written in the book of the law to do them:" that they had become "children of God by faith in Christ Jesus;" and that if they were Christ's they were Abraham's seed. So, we see, under the new covenant it is all a matter of FAITH.

Jesus Christ, in giving this covenant, said: "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." Matt. 28: 19, 20. Teach them, baptize them, teach them; that is the divine order; they must be instructed before they are fit to be baptized. Mark records these instructions of the Lord in these words: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16: 15, 16. By comparing these we see that the teaching which comes before baptism is such preaching of the Gospel as will produce faith in Jesus. Without this faith none is a proper subject for baptism.

Those who were under the old covenant came under it by birth; by the natural birth, being children of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, they were children of the covenant; but to come under the new covenant, people must be "born again," "born from above," "born of God." Even to Nicodemus, a man born under the old covenant, circumcised the eighth day, a teacher in Israel, Jesus taught, Ye must be born again. He said, "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." Yet, my friends, Mr. Wilkinson

would have us believe that the old Jewish covenant of circumcision, under which this man had been living all his life, which he had entered at birth, is the Christian covenant, under which we now live! Nay, verily! This leader under that covenant could not enter this without the new birth. He was a child of Abraham by the birth of the flesh, but in order to be a child of Abraham according to the Spirit, in order to be of the spiritual seed, he must be born again by believing in Jesus Christ; for, saith the Apostle John, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God," or, as the Revised Version has it, "is begotten of God."

Again I say, it is impossible that infants should be in this covenant, for Jesus says, "Except a man (Greek, *tis*, anyone) be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." We have seen that they are incapable of being born again, seeing that they cannot believe that Jesus is the Christ, and hence they cannot enter the Church, the kingdom of God, otherwise called the new covenant.

Paul, at Heb. 8: 6, talking about Christ, says, "But now hath he obtained a more excellent ministry, by how much also he is the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises." To the Jew was promised the terrestrial Canaan; to the Christian, the celestial; to the Jew, the earthly Jerusalem; to the Christian, the heavenly Jerusalem, "a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God." The Jew was born with a title to these earthly possessions, but if he was not circumcised on the eighth day, he forfeited his title, and was cut off from his people. All men are born with a title to these celestial possessions, seeing that they derive their spirits from God—that God, the owner of them all, is their Father. But when one sins, he forfeits all these rights, and must be "born again," that he may be classed as a son of God, and have a place in the kingdom of God. Why are not infants received into the Church? Because they have a title to the celestial land without coming into it. They have not wandered from the Father's house, nor transgressed His laws, nor forfeited their rights. Jesus says, "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Both Mr. Wilkinson and I have been telling you that infants are born pure,—they are as pure in heart as the angels. Hence they do not need baptism nor anything else to fit them to see the Father—to enter His presence, and to enjoy Him.

If Christ had said, The infant that is not baptized shall be cut off from God's people, then I would have said, Baptize them; by all means baptize them; and do it quickly, lest they be lost. But will my opponent say they will be cut off if not baptized? No, indeed!

But I claim that his creed teaches it, when fairly and honestly interpreted; and it is certain that the advocates of the practice, from the day it began to be observed, and for hundreds of years, gave this as the reason for it, that the child might not "miss the kingdom of heaven," that it might not be separated from God's people. To those who held to this view there was some meaning in this rite, when applied to infants; in giving them baptism they gave them something. But what do the Paedo-baptists of to-day give to the little ones that immersionists do not? Nothing, absolutely nothing, but water, and precious little of that. Do they teach them? So do we. Do they strive to bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord? So do we. Do they endeavor to have them lead moral lives? So do we. They do not give them the Lord's Supper; nor do we. We do not think they will be damned if they die unbaptized; neither do they.

But what harm does it do to baptize them, do you ask? Before I would lift up my hand over a little babe and say, "By the authority of Jesus Christ I baptize you," when He has given me no such authority, I would suffer my arm to be torn from its socket, and my tongue from my mouth: for me to do such a thing would be the most horrible blasphemy.

"But," do you inquire, "is it possible that there is no authority for infant baptism?" Remember (I am determined you shall not forget it), the learned Lutheran, George Edward Steitz, says, "Among scientific exegetes it is regarded as an established conclusion that not a trace of infant baptism can be discovered in the New Testament.' Neander says, "We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution." Meyer says, "Of it no trace is found in the New Testament;" and he adds that it "gradually arose in post-apostolic times." Dr. Philip Schaff says, "The apostolic origin of *infant* baptism is denied not only by the Baptists, but also by many Paedo-baptist divines." In addition to these testimonials from men who rank among the very greatest in learning, talent, and scriptural research in the Paedo-baptist world, consider the following from the late Dr. A. T. Bledsoe, editor of the *Southern Review*, a quarterly published in the interests of one of the Methodist Churches of the United States. Dr. Bledsoe was distinguished for his learning, his great logical powers, and his calm, impartial spirit. He says:—

"With all our searching, we have been unable to find in the New Testament a single express declaration, or word, in favor of infant baptism. We justify the rite, therefore, solely on the ground of logical inference, and not on any express word of Christ or His apostles. This may, perhaps, be deemed by some of our readers a strange posi-

tion for a Paedo-baptist. It is by no means, however, a singular opinion. Hundreds of learned Paedo-baptists have come to the same conclusion; especially since the New Testament has been subjected to a closer, more conscientious, and more candid exegesis than was formerly practiced by controversialists." *Southern Review*, Vol. 14, p. 334.

There, now, my friends, what do you think of that? How can you expect me to find infant baptism in the Bible, when such men as these, who want to find it, and who search for it eagerly, thus testify? Some of these men plainly say that the rite, as applied to infants, is not of apostolic origin at all, that there is not a trace of it in the New Testament, that it is of post-apostolic origin; while others, as Drs. Bledsoe and Stuart, while declaring that there is "no express declaration, or word, in favor of infant baptism in the New Testament," nevertheless believe that there are principles set forth in the Bible from which, by a logical inference, the rite may be justified. But Jesus says, "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them, I will liken him unto a wise man," etc., and it is certain, from the testimony of "hundreds of learned Paedo-baptists," that He did never utter one word about it. It is mentioned in none of His sayings.

Now, concerning that creed affair: Mr. Wilkinson says he came into the Canada Methodist Church by a union of churches, and hence he never promised to accept Wesley's Notes, and his doctrine that Rom. 6: 4 refers to immersion. He slipped into this church, and under this creed, without obligating himself to believe and teach the doctrines, as those who are ordained in the regular way are compelled to do!

In order to bring about this union of churches it became necessary for the different churches to agree upon a creed; they did agree, it appears, to take that of the Canada Methodist Church; and every one thus accepting it is in honor bound to support it, or else to get out.

Mr. Wilkinson ought now to sneak out just as he sneaked in. For my part, I would not have a creed, and present it to the world for its acceptance, that I believed taught lies. Moreover, when I called attention to the fact that Wesley's Notes are a part of the doctrine of Mr. Wilkinson's Church, and that he had said he believed and would maintain them, knowing at the same time that he did not believe them, and that he did not intend to advocate them, he merely said, "What of it?" But after further reflection he feels the necessity of trying harder to save his honor. A poor out he makes at it. 'Tis a pity he cannot do better.

[*Time expired.*]

EVENING SESSION—FIFTH DAY.

MR. WILKINSON'S SIXTH SPEECH.

I was speaking upon the historical parts of my subject when my time expired. I was showing how Pelagius introduced the doctrine in his day that we were born into this world without any hereditary taint by reason of our descent from Adam, that we did not need any regeneration of our nature, and therefore he claimed in the case of infants that baptism was not for the remission of sins or the cleansing of their nature. His antagonists pressed him very hard as to why he baptized infants if they were not unclean; for it was generally believed by the Church in his day, and admitted by himself, that baptism was a means of grace by which sins were actually removed and the soul actually cleansed. In other words, they believed in baptismal regeneration, as my opponent does. They attached similar efficacy to the water as they did to the bread and wine which ended in the transubstantiation of the Roman Catholics. This question raised such a disturbance in the Church at the time that a great many rose up to oppose Pelagius. The Carthage Council was held in A.D. 418. It was composed of 254 bishops, and they all endorsed infant baptism, and that before the child was eight days old. Another Council was held at Carthage in 253 A.D., at which 66 bishops were present, and it decided in favor of infant baptism; and not only so, but they held that it might be administered before the child was eight days old, showing that they still recognized the old circumcisonal rule. They must have believed, therefore, that baptism took the place of circumcision. Cyprian, who presided over the Council, wrote to Fidus, a country bishop who had written about the matter and desired to get the sentiment of the Council, stating that all the bishops present were of one mind in the matter. I also quoted Origen, who was born only about eighty years after John died. No doubt there were men living who were between eighty and one hundred years old, with whom he could have conversed, and who must have been intimate with the apostles and others living in the apostolic age, and in this way he must have known the usage in the days of the apostles without either printing presses, newspapers, or telegraphs.

He says the Church received infant baptism as a tradition, or order, from the apostles. This is important testimony, coming from so illustrious a father of the Church as Origen, and one who possessed such unquestionable facilities for knowing all the facts. Surely no one living in our day can pretend to be as competent an authority. Tertullian, we are told by my opponent, was the first to oppose infant baptism. If he opposed it, it only serves to prove that it must have existed before the days of Tertullian and at the very door of the apostolic Church. But I deny that Tertullian opposed infant baptism. He only recommended its delay because he had, like my opponent, embraced the superstitious belief that as sins were blotted out by baptism no sins committed after baptism could be forgiven. And he recommended the delay of the ordinance in the case of other persons as well as infants. But he never once denied either the scripturalness or apostolic authority of this rite as applied to infants, as I explained in a former session. But, owing to his superstitious belief, he recommended the delay of baptism in the case of infants lest the godfathers should be brought into danger and be made responsible for the sins of the children committed after their baptism; and so he recommended delay also in the case of unmarried people and widows and those exposed to peculiar temptations, because there was danger of committing sin after baptism and thus rendering themselves liable to the consequences in the future world. I do not know how those who hold the doctrine of baptismal regeneration can escape from the logical dilemma into which Tertullian was brought. Yet, if he did not know whether infant baptism had existed from the days of the apostles, it is difficult to say who had a right to know; and he said, "It is more profitable," not, "It is inexpedient." But he is an important witness in this controversy from the fact that his recommending delay is a proof that infant baptism was the prevailing custom of the Church. It was so in the time of Tertullian, who wrote not more than one hundred years after the death of John, and was born only a little over fifty years thereafter.

My opponent is very fond of running away back to the birth of Christ, to make the distance appear as great as possible, but remember Christ did not begin his ministry until within three years of His death, or A.D. 30, and the apostles flourished after that. I claim that it would be no unusual thing for scores or hundreds of individuals to be living in the days of Tertullian who lived in the days of John. Therefore he *must have known* whether infants were baptized in the Church in the days of the apostles or not. I have here a little

clipping from the *Scientific American*. There is an enumeration in it of individuals who have attained great longevity, and in the 18th century no less than six are mentioned (and the paragraph was not written for my benefit) who lived to the age of 140 years. Suppose even in middle life Tertullian had met an individual a hundred years old it would have brought him back to the time of the death of John. Suppose he had met one 120 years old it would have brought him back to twenty years before the death of John. Would it not have been an easy matter for Tertullian to have conversed with people who had seen John before his death? My opponent said they had not printing presses and books in those days, and he would like to invalidate the testimony of these fathers on this ground, but they did not need them because they had only a small length of time to cover. My opponent says that Tertullian is the first man known to have mentioned infant baptism, and he mentioned it to oppose it. But in mentioning it to oppose it he testified that it existed. So we have his testimony that it existed at the time.

And just here I want to point out a little bit of inconsistency on the part of my opponent. He said in his last speech that "the false doctrine that infants were sinners" came first, "and then the practice of baptizing them to save them from sin, and give them a place in heaven." Yet he says Tertullian was the first to mention infant baptism, and he mentioned it to oppose it, though he believed that baptism was for the remission of sins, and that it actually remitted them. And this is the man, too, who said, "What need their *guiltless* age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins?" It is false, therefore, according to his own testimony, that the false doctrine that they were sinners came first, and then baptism afterwards. Out of his own mouth he stands condemned. Moreover, he made that statement purely on his own authority, for he neither has furnished nor can furnish one scrap of proof in support of it, and the reason is that it is not true. But he does not seem to consider it necessary to prove a statement. So long as any notion agrees with his theory, he feels at liberty to announce it with as much gusto and dogmatism as an oracle.

And now I hasten to give the testimony of Irenaeus. In order to get an idea of the competency of Irenaeus as a witness I will read a short extract from his writings. In his old age, speaking of Polycarp, who was a friend and companion of John before he died, Irenaeus said:

"I remember the things that were done then better than do I

those of later times, so that I could describe the place where he sat, and his going out, and coming in; his manner of life, his features, his discourse to the people concerning the conversations he had had with John (the apostle) and others that had seen our Lord; how he rehearsed their discourses, and what he had heard them that were eye-witnesses of the Word of Life, say of our Lord, and of His miracles and doctrine, all agreeable to the Scriptures." *Hibbard*, p. 188.

Now, this witness, who lived at the very door of the Apostolic Church, and conversed with a man who had heard the apostle John preach and bear testimony as an eye and ear witness of our Lord, testifies as follows:

"For He (Christ) came to save all persons by Himself; all, I say, who by Him are regenerated to God; infants, and little ones, and children, and youth, and elder persons."

Moreover, we contend that by "regenerated," in this passage, Irenaeus meant baptized. We claim this not only on the ground that this was a customary use of the term in the days of our Lord and His apostles, but also in the days of Irenaeus himself, who elsewhere undoubtedly uses the word in this sense. He says:

"When Christ gave to His apostles the commission of regenerating unto God, He said unto them, 'Go and teach all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'" *Hibbard*, p. 184.

This is an important witness, who knew a man who knew John and others living in the apostolic age, and heard their testimony that they had seen the Lord, heard Him preach, and witnessed His miracles. That is getting into the neighborhood of the origin of this matter. If infant baptism is a Popish superstition, how is it we find it in the time of Irenaeus, when the first pope was not elected until 606 A. D. My opponent does not believe that little children are regenerated, but he believes that adults are regenerated in baptism. Irenaeus believed that they were regenerated by the baptism of the Holy Ghost, and regenerated symbolically by water, which was a symbol of the invisible truth. With respect to the word *regenerate*, we claim it is used synonymously with baptize. I have proved that Irenaeus used the terms synonymously, hence no intelligent man can resist the proof that Irenaeus taught that infants were baptized unto God. My opponent, in the discussion of the previous proposition, admitted that the phrase referring to the "washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost" was baptism. He has never denied it; on the contrary, he has acknowledged it again and again. He himself accepts in

the writings of Paul the application of the phrase regeneration to baptism. Our Lord says, "Except ye be born again"—that is, regenerated—"of water and the Spirit ye cannot enter into the kingdom." Our Lord, then, applied this very phrase to baptism. Is it any wonder that those who followed our Lord in the next century used the same phrase for the same purpose? I will read an extract from Hibbard on this point. In his work on baptism, commenting on the application of this term to baptism, he says, concerning the latter:

"The change was great; it was complete and universal, and they called it '*the new birth,*' or *regeneration*. So says Maimonides, 'The Gentile that is made a proselyte . . . behold, he is like a child *new born.*' So the Christian fathers regarded a person *baptized* as being *newly born*; and this also is an appellation given to disciples in the New Testament. So Peter says, '*As new born babes,*' &c. It is easy then to perceive how the early Church came to use *regeneration* so as to include, by the term, water *baptism*" *Hibbard*, p. 183.

Justin Martyr, in his first Apology, describing the manner of making Christian disciples, says, concerning their baptism:—

"We bring them to some place where there is water, *and they are regenerated by the same way of regeneration by which we were regenerated*; for they are washed with water [that is baptized] in the name of God the Father and Lord of all things, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. For Christ says, 'Except ye be regenerated, you cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.' . . . And that we shall obtain forgiveness of the sins in which we have lived, *by or in water*, there is invoked over him that has a mind to be *regenerated* the name of God, the Father and Lord of all things

and this washing [or baptism] is called the enlightening," &c. Now, in the light of these evidences, let me again read the testimony of Irenaeus. He says, "When Christ gave to His apostles the commission of *regenerating* unto God (*regenerationis in Deum*), He said unto them, 'Go and teach all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.'"

That is Irenaeus' own definition of the word regeneration, and he said there were "infants and little ones, and children and youths, and elder persons," regenerated to God in his days; I maintain, therefore, that according to this father regeneration means baptism, and that baptism was applied to infants. Justin Martyr, also, as we have shown, distinctly calls baptism regeneration, and it seems to have been the custom of those times to do so.

If this testimony does not teach that those fathers believed baptism

to be regeneration, I confess I am not capable of interpreting or understanding language. I have shown, therefore, that infant baptism is referred to by Irenaeus and Justin Martyr, That is as certain as that heaven is above us. Unless it can be proved that they did not use the term in this sense, but in some other, then I have proved that infant baptism has come down to us from the apostolic age. I leave the question with you, ladies and gentlemen. I submit the case to you as to a jury. If you were sitting in a jury box and a case supported by evidence as strong as this was placed before you, and *not one scrap of proof was produced on the other side*, in what way would your verdict be given? Yet my opponent has the hardihood to stand before you and declare that Tertullian, A.D. 200, was "the first man to make any reference to it," and says, "Let my opponent find a mention of infant baptism before Tertullian and I will promptly give up the debate." And he emphasizes his statement by adding, "There, now, is a square issue. There is a chance for him to close this debate right speedily, with honor to himself and glory to his cause, *if only he can find the passage*." Now, ladies and gentlemen, I have found the passage. There is nothing more certain than that Irenaeus refers to infant baptism in the passage I have quoted, and no man would dream of denying it, only to bolster up a shaky, tottering cause. If he repudiates this testimony, I trust he will give us something more authoritative than his own unsupported *ipse dixit* for doing so, otherwise he is bound "promptly to give up the debate," for I have accepted his challenge, and met the issue.

I do not, however, depend exclusively on this evidence, strong and undeniable as it is, nor indeed does it form the chief ground on which we rest. I have also shown you that God made a covenant with Abraham nearly 2000 years before the Christian era; that it included his seed, the infants and children, and that a token or seal was attached to that covenant which implied justification or regeneration. That seal was applied to the children of Abraham when they were eight days old, and when a Gentile became a proselyte he must receive the seal, which included spiritual blessing, for in Romans 4:17 Paul quotes from that covenant to prove that the blessing promised in it to Abraham was the same as that which was bestowed on the Gentiles, of which baptism became the outward symbol and seal. We have established on the most incontrovertible evidence the principle of receiving children into the covenant and sealing them with the seal. It is the old principle that applied to Abraham and his seed and has never been revoked. And when God removes the seal then He will

revoke His covenant with the rest of the world. So surely as that covenant was the covenant of redemption, and so surely as little children were taken in and recognized by sealing, so surely must they remain there till God puts them out, and so long must they receive the seal. Consequently we find, in harmony with this argument, away back at the very door of the Apostolic Church, that this practice of infant baptism is recognized and unquestioned, and remained unquestioned for eleven hundred years or more. Tertullian never opposed infant baptism as an innovation of man. He merely recommended its delay for reasons I have explained, and this very circumstance proves it to have been the custom of the Church at that early day.

My opponent says, if this practice had been mentioned within one or two years of John's death, or even in the apostolic age, by any but an inspired man it would not have answered my purpose. Now, I maintain that this is misleading. I undertake to prove, in accordance with my proposition, that it has been practiced in the Christian Church from apostolic times; yet he would rule out the testimony of every man unless inspired. But I was not aware that there was any inspired authority to be found later than the days of the apostles. And if not, how can anything be proved to have existed since the days of the apostles, except by uninspired testimony? Yet he is reduced to such straits that he is obliged to repudiate all historical evidence since the days of the apostles. Suppose I had applied the same principle to his proposition and rejected the testimony of all but inspired men, where would it have landed him? I guess he would very soon have run aground. But very small quibbles often have to do service when arguments fail. Shipwrecked men frequently try to get ashore by means of very small fragments of the wreck.

In my opponent's last speech (as rewritten) he enters into an elaborate argument in support of the old exploded notion that man's spirit nature is not propagated but created. I need not spend much time in replying to that nonsense, for few will be found so foolish as to be led away by it. Perhaps, however, he will be kind enough to tell his readers how it is, if God creates each soul apart from the body, and independently of any natural process, that there are so many idiots in the world. Does God make some people wise and others foolish, by an arbitrary creative act, from mere choice? And how is it that children generally have such a striking resemblance to their parents, mentally, as well as physically? And how is it, if children are created immaculate, that they often display such woful depravity and violent tempers even before they can walk or talk?

It is generally supposed, too, that an atonement was not needed for Adam until he had sinned, and his moral nature was depraved; that he was created in a holy state, bearing the image of his God, and that he possessed the power to withstand temptation and preserve his integrity. Now, if all men, in their moral natures, are the direct product of divinely creative power, and equally pure by nature, as my opponent maintains, then how is it that no one of all the millions of earth's population has ever maintained his or her integrity beyond the period of accountability? And how is it that God provided an atonement for all others, except Adam, before they committed personal sin and how is it that no one born into the world has any chance of getting to heaven except through Christ, by faith? And how is it that God has assumed the responsibility of supplying a pure, spotless, immortal spirit to every offspring of mankind, whether in wedlock or out of it, whether to Christian or heathen parents, whether to be brought up in His "nurture and admonition," or trained in the school of the devil? I am amazed that my opponent should commit himself to a theory so inexpressibly silly and absurd. And this is only necessary in order to escape from the pitiable dilemma into which his false theory about original sin has betrayed him.

My opponent says that when Adam sinned he was driven away from the tree of life, lest he should eat and live forever. Let me ask him why his posterity should be also driven away from it before they had sinned?

The story of the prodigal son is just as beautiful to illustrate my theory as my opponent's. I claim, as well as he, that every man is born in the Father's house, and I can understand why every man turns out a prodigal. It is because of native depravity. But he denies native depravity, therefore I cannot see how he can account for it. Unless men are born with a natural bias to sin, I cannot understand why they should all drift in the same direction, no matter how favorable their chances in the right direction.

My opponent makes another tremendous effort to prove that nobody can be saved except by faith. He might have saved himself much time and a deal of effort, for evidently the Bible was written to and for those who could understand it, and not for babies. And all who can understand it are supposed to be personal sinners, and as faith is the condition of pardon for personal sin, no one can be pardoned but those who believe. But my contention is that all men are born into the world under an economy of redemption, and consequently saved from what is popularly called original sin unconditionally. I have

never disputed the necessity of faith for adults, therefore the ammunition fired at the man of straw has all been wasted. And now, will my opponent furnish one scrap of proof apart from his own unsupported *ipse dixit* that "all men" are not saved from "judgment to condemnation" by Christ's righteousness, independently of personal faith or repentance. If he will, he will be doing something for his country and his cause.

He admits that "all men are born with a title to celestial possessions," and "when one sins he forfeits his right" to them, and "must be born again that he may be classed as a son of God, and have a place in the kingdom of God." Yes, and this is where faith comes in as a condition of recovery. And the reason this condition is not required of children is, that they have not sinned, and therefore have not forfeited their rights. He is beginning to see men as trees walking.

As for the two seeds of Abraham, the natural and the spiritual, my opponent admits that the spiritual seed were believers and those entitled to spiritual blessings. Yet he denies that circumcision was the seal of the covenant conveying those blessings. Will he tell us, then, why Abraham was circumcised "that he might be the (spiritual) father of all them that believe" (a spiritual seed)? Rom. 5: 11. It seems strange that he should receive the seal of a covenant including natural seed only, in order that he might be the father of a spiritual seed. Perhaps he will solve this mystery before throwing any more dust. Moreover, my opponent has failed to explain to you why circumcision was "a seal of righteousness" to Abraham, and a seal of the land of Canaan to Isaac. Is there so much as a whisper by any inspired writer that it meant one thing to Abraham and another to his seed? But he will not tell us. He finds it easier to raise quibbles and throw dust than to answer objections. But no doubt he is wise in steering clear of rocks.

My opponent admits that the Church is the kingdom of God, and says no one can enter into it but Abraham's spiritual seed, or such as are born again. But Christ says (Luke 18: 16), concerning little children, "of *such* is the kingdom of God;" I therefore infer from my opponent's own premises that little children belong to the Church, are born again, and therefore Abraham's spiritual seed. Will he extricate himself from this dilemma?

My opponent's quotations from authorities may seem very formidable upon a superficial examination, but in point of fact they prove little or nothing against my position, since, for the most part, they utter my sentiments. Neander is quoted as saying, "We have all

reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution." Certainly; and that is my position exactly, hence I have not argued for it as an "apostolic" institution. So, Neander is right, nor does his testimony affect my position.

Dr. Schaff is also quoted as saying that "the apostolic origin of infant baptism is denied not only by Baptists but also by many Paedo-baptist divines." Evidently the intention is to impress the audience that Dr. Schaff is opposed to infant baptism. But he gives an elaborate argument in favor of it in his encyclopaedia, and the quotation from him proves nothing that I do not cordially admit. I do not claim that infant baptism is of apostolic origin. Dr. Bledsoe's testimony also agrees exactly with my own position. I "justify the rite solely on the ground of logical inference, and not on any express words of Christ or his apostles." Meyer does not oppose infant baptism, but expresses himself somewhat doubtfully about the ground on which it can be justified. And surely all men are not compelled to think with the brains of the Lutheran Steitz!

But the effort to persuade a congregation that because a man admits that infant baptism is not a New Testament institution that therefore he has difficulty in finding it in the Bible is a dishonest trick, unworthy of a Christian man, since Paedo-baptists the world over, almost with one consent, hold and teach that infants are baptized because they are included in the covenant God made with Abraham that in his seed (Christ) all the families of the earth should be blessed.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. HARDING'S SIXTH REPLY.

Just before closing my last speech I opened up a matter that I want to finish now, lest I should forget it, viz., the testimony of Dr. A. T. Bledsoe. I doubt if there was ever a more learned, or a more candid man among the Methodists of the United States than Dr. Bledsoe. His "Theodicy" is the clearest, the most profound, and the most powerful refutation of Calvinism that I have ever seen. At the time of his death, which occurred a few years ago, he was the editor of the quarterly magazine published in the interests of his

Church, *The Southern Review*. In this *Review* he published an article on infant baptism, which led to the discussion of the question in a number of articles by himself and Mr. C. W. Miller, a brother in his Church. The following quotations are taken from Dr. Bledsoe's articles. He says:

"With all our searching, we have been unable to find in the New Testament a single express declaration, or word, in favor of infant baptism." (*Southern Review*, vol. 14, p. 334.)

He then quotes from Dr. Jacob, of the Church of England, as follows:

"However reasonably we may be convinced that we find in the Christian Scriptures the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterward developed, and by which it may now be justified, *it ought to be distinctly acknowledged that it is not an apostolic ordinance.*" (*Southern Review*, vol. 14, pp. 334-5.)

On page 335 Dr. Bledsoe continues:

"Neander concedes the point that infant baptism is not an apostolic ordinance. We might, if necessary, adduce the admission of many other profoundly learned Paedo-baptists, that the doctrine is not found in the New Testament, either in express terms, or by implication from any portion of its language."

On page 336 he says: "Before the time of Tertullian (A.D. 200) the practice of infant baptism is nowhere distinctly mentioned by any writer of the Church."

On page 339 he adds: "However strange it may seem, the fact is that the first father, or writer, by whom the practice is noticed, condemns it as having no foundation either in reason or revelation."

On page 169 of vol. 15 he says: "We should, if possible, be glad to find this custom mentioned by all the early writers of the Church—by Hermias, by Justin Martyr, by Irenaeus, and all the rest. But after the most careful and conscientious investigation, we have been able to find no such corroboration of the views we hold, nor do we need it."

In vol. 16, p. 226, the Doctor gives his reason for practicing infant baptism. He says:

"We here reach at last the great moral ground for infant baptism, which is clearly deducible from the Scriptures—namely, that our little children have been redeemed by the precious blood of the Lamb; that they are therefore the children of God, and as such are entitled to the seal of the everlasting covenant of the promise."

He does not claim any express command for it, nor an example of

it, in the Bible; he says in the most positive way that no such authority can be found. He says that in this position Knapp, Jacob, Neander, Watson, Wesley, and "hundreds of learned Paedo-baptists" agree with him. He then says that as infants have been redeemed by the blood of Jesus, they are children of God, and, as such, are entitled to baptism.

What an unfortunate position Paedo-baptist ministers occupy! Although the learned Steitz. says, "Among scientific exeges it is regarded as an established conclusion that not a trace of infant baptism can be discovered in the New Testament;" although Neander says, "Baptism was administered at first only to adults. . . . We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution:" although the great Meyer says, "Of it no trace is found in the New Testament; . . .

but it is an institution of the Church which gradually arose in post-apostolic times;" although Stuart says, "Commands, or plain and certain examples in the New Testament relative to it I do not find;" although Dr. "Bledsoe says, "But yet. with all our searching, we have been unable to find in the New Testament a single express declaration, or word, in favor of infant baptism;" and adds, "Hundreds of learned Paedo-baptists have come to the same conclusion;" although Dr. Schaff says, "The apostolic origin of infant baptism is denied not only by the Baptists, but also by many Paedo-baptist divines:" although these learned and profound Bible students thus testify, Paedo-baptist ministers must raise their hands to heaven, and baptize infants in the name of Christ, claiming to do it by His authority, when He never uttered one word about it nor performed a single such baptism in His life. It is a fearful thing to do!

Mr. Wilkinson thinks that if this case were given to a jury, it would be constrained to decide in his favor. Let us see about that. He is here to show that Jesus Christ requires infant baptism, and that it has been practiced from the days of His apostles till now. Did Christ say anything about infant baptism? No. Did He ever practice infant baptism? No; there is no proof that He ever did. Did any of His apostles ever say anything about it? No. Did they ever practice it? No, indeed; there is not an iota of evidence to show that they did. Did it begin to be practiced within ten years after the last apostle died? No. Within twenty? No. Within thirty, forty, fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty, ninety years after the last one died? No. When, then, was the practice first mentioned? Not until one hundred years after the last apostle died. But who says

there is to be found no mention of it for one hundred years after John died? Many of the greatest and most learned Paedo-baptists that ever lived, some of whom have just been quoted in your hearing. Moreover, neither Mr. Wilkinson here, nor any other man, has ever been able to *produce*, and *present to the people*, an earlier mention of it than that of Tertullian.

Suppose, my friends, you were a jury, and that I were to endeavor to prove to you that any great teacher of the past, Socrates for instance, had taught a certain doctrine: you would inquire of me, "Is this doctrine mentioned in his writings?" "No," I reply, "it is not." "He had many personal followers," you would say, "who sat at his feet and learned of him; did any of them mention the doctrine?" "In so far as I know they never did." "But these pupils of Socrates also had pupils of their own; did any of them ever mention this doctrine?" "Not that I ever heard of." "Well, sir," you would inquire, "who was the first man to mention your doctrine?" Suppose I should be constrained to say, "The first clear and unmistakable mention of my doctrine, that any one has ever been able to find, is made by a man who wrote one hundred years after the last pupil of Socrates had died;" would you be able to decide from this testimony that I had made out my case? that I had proven that Socrates taught the doctrine, and that his followers practiced it?

Now that is Mr. Wilkinson's case exactly: he wants to show that Christ taught infant baptism, and that the apostles practiced it; but he cannot find a mention of it by Christ, nor by His apostles, nor by any one else, until one hundred years after the death of the last apostle.

Almost every passage of Scripture that is relied upon to prove infant baptism, when carefully examined, clearly shows that the practice was unknown at the time it was written. Consider this one, which is so often quoted in favor of the practice; "Then were 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. 19: 13-15. I can easily imagine the feeling that moved these mothers to press through the crowd, bringing their little ones for a blessing. When General Jackson passed through my town, many years ago, before I was born, several mothers pressed through the surging throngs to the great man, that he might caress their children. But here was a greater than General Jackson: a mighty prophet of

the Lord, a marvelous worker of miracles, a man who spake as man never spake before, stood in their midst; this man had power with God as none other had ever had. No wonder these women bring their darlings to Him for a blessing! But what blessing do they want? and how much? They want every blessing that the Master will give—all that He will give. But the disciples of Jesus interpose, and forbid them to come. Then the Master cries, Forbid them not: let them come: for of such is the kingdom of heaven. He laid His hands on them, and prayed, and then departed. Why did He not baptize them? If there had been a blessing in baptism for the children, would He not have given it to them? How did it happen that the apostles opposed the coming of the children? If they had been accustomed to see Jesus baptize infants would they not have urged the mothers to bring them along? Here are two facts that are evident to my mind: (1) If there had been a blessing in baptism for infants, Jesus would have baptized these; (2) If His followers had been accustomed to see Him baptize infants, they would not have opposed the bringing forward of these. Suppose Jesus were to return to the earth to-day, would He practice infant baptism? Who can believe that He would, seeing that He did not do it when He was here? That episode forever settles the question as to whether infant baptism had been taught by Christ. He blessed the children, and that is what He would do if He were here now.

A gentleman, in passing out from the meeting this afternoon, I was told, said that if Tertullian (A.D. 200) mentioned infant baptism (and all agree that he did), it must have been practiced in his day. But this conclusion does not necessarily follow, as the following illustration very clearly shows: Nearly every Church in the land has been more or less troubled by the instrumental music question. "Shall we use the organ in the public worship or not?" is a question that has divided many a congregation. Was an organ ever introduced into the worship of a congregation without any discussion, any mention at all? Never. I say, an innovation is always mentioned before it is adopted. A church will not bring in a new practice without any consideration, or discussion of it. In some sections of the country a discussion for a year or two has taken place, and the congregation has been appealed to more than once before the instrument has been allowed to come in. In one town that I know it was placed in the Sunday-school room about five years ago and the question as to whether it shall be used in the public worship has been agitated more or less ever since; it has not been admitted yet, but probably will be.

In the very nature of things, all innovations are mentioned before they are used. Tertullian does not say that infant baptism was practiced in his time. He is inquiring indignantly what they want to baptize them for. He says, "What need their guiltless age make such haste to the forgiveness of sins?" and he explains, "Let them come when they are grown up; let them come when they understand; when they are instructed whither it is that they come; let them be made Christians when they can know Christ." *Wall's His. Inf. Bap.*, vol. 1, p. 58. He talks like one who is opposing an innovation that has been suggested, and that he thinks would be foolish and hurtful. Ten years later Origen mentions it as "a thing that causes frequent inquiries among the brethren." And he explains that "infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins." He says, "By the sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away." *Walls His. Inf. Bap.*, vol. 1, p. 65. But, as Meyer and others have explained in your hearing, the practice did not become general till the time of Augustine (A.D. 400); and then only through the mighty influence of his doctrine that "the unbaptized are irrevocably damned."

But I would remind you again that if infant baptism had been first mentioned fifty years after John's death, or five years, or five days,—if it had been first mentioned even so much as one day after his death, it would have been just that much too late. If it had been first mentioned during the life of John, that would have been early enough; but it would have been necessary then to show that it was mentioned approvingly *by a proper man*, that is by an apostle of the Lord Jesus; for even during the time of the apostles, Paul teaches that the "mystery of iniquity" was already working in the Churches. (See 2 Thess. 2:7.) True, the first pope was not appointed till the seventh century (if my memory is correct), but the false teaching which culminated in his appointment began in apostolic times, as the Scriptures clearly show.

But, argues my opponent, Tertullian may have known Irenaeus, and Irenaeus knew Polycarp, and Polycarp knew John. Just so; and John did not favor infant baptism, nor did Polycarp, nor did Irenaeus, nor did Tertullian: only one of them, as we have seen, the last one of them, even so much as mentions it; and he opposed it in such a way as to leave it doubtful whether it had ever been practiced at all, or only suggested for adoption. These fathers were Latins; it is necessary to go to a later date, and to another tongue, that is to the Greek, to find the first favorable mention of the practice. Origen wrote in Greek. Here we have quite a gap between John and the

first advocate of infant baptism. George Washington died within less than a hundred years ago; I was born thirty-six years ago; the English is the language of both, and our homes are not very far apart; yet I have never seen any one who had seen Washington; so far as I know, I have never seen any one who had seen any one who had seen Washington. But I know that the people of the United States generally labor under very erroneous notions about him; for they have the idea that he was a wonderfully peaceful, gentle, pious general; whereas, as I have recently learned on good authority, when in a bad humor—and he was very high-tempered—he would swear like a trooper.

I call your attention to another illustration which shows how universally and how quickly an innovation may gain ground in a Church: within less than half a century, in England, the habit of dipping was changed to sprinkling almost universally. Let me read to you from Dr. Gale, who lived about 170 years ago, on this point. He says:

"You are not to imagine this practice [that is, Infant Baptism] was established altogether, and at once, in as great a latitude as it is at present. It began, doubtless, at first, as all other innovations do, with only some little variations in opinions, and then passed to as little in practice; and so, by very short steps, at length attained unobserved the great reputation it has now indeed for a long time enjoyed. And all this might be done in a very short time, as I have often observed to you it happened in the manner of administering this sacrament here in England; for dipping was wholly laid aside, and sprinkling used in its stead, in less than half a century (even as our adversaries themselves still confess), though directly contrary to Christ's direction, to a decree of a synod under Kenwolfe, the express words of the Service book, and without any allowance, etc., and surely no alteration can be more bold than this is." *Gale's Reflections on Wall's Hist. of Inf. Bap.*, vol. 2, page 347. A hundred years is a very long time; a great many innovations can come into the services of a Church in that time. John was about one hundred years old when he died; he must have been superannuated for at least twenty-five years; after this, one hundred years pass, and infant baptism is first spoken of; then ten years more pass, and it is first favorably spoken of; then three hundred years passed away before the practice became general. So testify Meyer, and other most learned Paedo-baptists.

Now my notes on Mr. Wilkinson's speech bring me again to the case of Irenaeus. He tried hard to show that this writer *refers* to, if

he docs not distinctly mention, infant baptism. Irenaeus says: "For He came to save all persons by Himself; all, I mean, who by Him are regenerated unto God; infants and little ones, and children and youths, and elder persons."

Mr. Wilkinson claims that by the word "*regenerated*" Irenaeus means *baptized*. According to that interpretation Irenaeus is made to teach that Jesus came to save only the baptized—that unbaptized infants would be lost; but that doctrine did not prevail till later; Tertullian, writing about thirty years after Irenaeus, talks about the "innocent age" of infancy. Hear the great Methodist, Dr. Bledsoe, on this passage, and on the common Paedo-baptist argument from it: He says: "This inference is bad, for, in order to make the testimony of Irenaeus conclusive, it must be shown, not that he *commonly*, but that he *always*, calls baptism by the name of regeneration. Nay, it must be moreover shown, on the other hand, that he never used the word 'regeneration' without meaning baptism. For if, in his vocabulary, the term 'regeneration' is sometimes applied to other things as well as baptism, how do we know but it is so applied in the passage under consideration? The argument proceeds on the supposition, or the assumption, that, in the language of Irenaeus, baptism means regeneration, and regeneration means baptism. But this assumption is purely gratuitous; it is not proved; and, besides, it is false." *Southern Review*, vol. 11, page 338. On the next page he adds, "Before his (Tertullian's) time, A.I. 200, there is not an allusion to the custom from which its existence may be fairly inferred."

Irenaeus calls Christ's commission to His apostles to teach and baptize, "the commission of regenerating unto God;" and he quotes it thus: "Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." With him, evidently, in the process of regeneration, when baptism came in at all it came after teaching. To be regenerated is to be born again born of water and of Spirit: but, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God," (1 John 5::1, revised version). Now, as the begetting is the first step in the process of birth, in regeneration the very first thing is *faith*, a heartfelt conviction that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.

But Mr. Wilkinson thinks that if we reject infant baptism because Tertullian opposed it, we must also reject the baptism of widows. I don't reject it because Tertullian opposed it; I reject it because there is not one word in the Word of God about it; on the contrary, Christ's instructions in the commission are *to teach* and then to baptize those

who believe. So when I have taught, I am ready to baptize all who want to obey the Lord.

Mr. Wilkinson argues that as Tertullian may have known Irenaeus, who knew Polycarp, who knew John, and as Tertullian mentions infant baptism, it must have come down from the apostles. Tertullian, and the people of his time, he thinks, were so closely linked with the apostolic age that they *could not* be mistaken about this matter. Well, how did it happen, then, that Tertullian was opposing infant baptism? He did oppose it as being unnecessary and foolish, as being without foundation in reason or revelation. Now, if infant baptism is an apostolic institution, it is clear that, in spite of his proximity to the apostolic age, he had imbibed false doctrines, else he would not have so earnestly opposed an apostolic institution. Why, my friends, there were many false doctrines and improper practices current then, notwithstanding only a hundred years had passed since John died. Some believed that if a man was not baptized he would be lost. That was generally believed. But Mr. Wilkinson will not receive it because Tertullian held to it.

Mr. WILKINSON—Was not that doctrine right?

Mr. HARDING— Do you believe it?

Mr. WILKINSON—Do you believe it?

Mr. HARDING—Is he under the impression that if infants are not baptized they will be damned? Perhaps we will be compelled to conclude yet that he baptizes babies to save them from hell, as Origen, who lived in those days, and whose writings are ranked only ten years later than Tertullian's, claimed that they must be baptized "for the forgiveness of sins," that the pollution of their birth might be taken away! Why, there were people in the days of Tertullian who doubted whether any of the apostles would be saved, except Paul, because, they argued, it did not appear that any of the others had been baptized. They believed there was some magical influence in the water. Do I believe that? Certainly not. Water cannot wash away sin; I never thought so: I never said so; nor do my brethren believe that it can. No, no; as a servant of the Lord and a lover of the truth, I affirm water cannot wash away sin. Christ washes away sin. Christ saves all who obey Him. "Being made perfect, He became the author of eternal salvation to all them that obey Him," says Paul at Hebrews 5: 9. Unless baptism springs out of a loving trustfulness in Christ, out of a heart changed by faith, it is worthless; if it is not an expression of faith, it is nothing; it is the *obedience*, not the *water*, that reaches the blessing.

But those who introduced infant baptism (Origen and those, of his day, for, though Tertullian mentioned it, he opposed it) thought that by it human depravity—original sin was washed away. According to their notions, water, without faith, love, hope, knowledge, obedience, or anything else, reached the blessing. Even John Wesley thought that by, or in, baptism the infant's pollution was washed away. And to this day Methodists, in baptizing babies, pray God to wash them, sanctify them, that, being delivered from His wrath, they may be received into the ark of Christ's Church. They are a nice set of people to find fault with anybody for believing in the power of water!

Yes, the ancients argued, infants are born sinners, and as they cannot believe, nor love, nor obey, nor even eat the Lord's Supper, we will baptize them, and *wash away* their sins. And then the little wafers were invented for this purpose, I presume, that as soon as possible the little ones might partake of the Supper.

Mr. Wilkinson wound up his address by another appeal to the covenant of circumcision. Ditzler says this covenant has nothing to do with infant baptism; Stuart says the man is "unwary" who endeavors to make an argument from it in favor of the rite; but it is Mr. Wilkinson's chief staff, and a broken reed it is. Figures, figures that will not lie, show clearly that the covenant made with Abraham, which was fulfilled in Christ, was not the covenant of circumcision. At Galatians 3: 17, Paul teaches that the covenant which was confirmed in Christ was given 430 years before the giving of the law at Sinai; but the covenant of circumcision (Genesis 17) was given 406 years before the law; therefore it cannot be the one confirmed in Christ—the one under which we live. It was made when Abraham was 99 years old. If you go back to the time that Abram was 75 years old (Genesis 12), you find God making a covenant with him; this was just 430 years before the giving of the law, and 24 years before the giving of the covenant of circumcision. Look at the chronology as given in your Bibles when you go home, and you will see this.

From the time of the calling of Abraham out of Haran to the going down into Egypt was 215 years; the sojourn in Egypt was 215 years; the whole period from the departure from Haran (when this covenant found at Genesis 12 was given) to the departure from Egypt (when the law was given), is thus shown to be 430 years. And these facts would forever cut out the covenant of circumcision as the Christian covenant, if nothing else did.

I believe I have now answered pretty fully every matter of much consequence in Mr. Wilkinson's speech, but there are several little things that deserve a few words.

1. He said that I, like Tertullian, have "embraced the superstitious belief that as sins were blotted out by baptism, no sins committed after baptism could be forgiven." I hold to no such belief. The statement is false. Sins are blotted out by Jesus Christ, not by baptism; when one sins after baptism— if he repents and prays—God will forgive him: I, as well as all of my brethren, so teach, and if Mr. Wilkinson does not know it, he is even a greater ignoramus than I take him to be.

2. He says, "My opponent has the hardihood to stand before you and declare that Tertullian, A.D. 200, was the first man to make any reference to infant baptism." Yes, I have that hardihood. So had Meyer, the greatest of all the New Testament commentators that ever lived; and so had Bledsoe. Neither one of them could find any passage in Justin Martyr, or Irenaeus, or in any other writer before Tertullian, from which the practice could be fairly or reasonably deduced. After considering the passages upon which Mr. Wilkinson relies, they frankly state that they do not teach the practice, that its existence cannot be inferred from them. But you, my friends, have heard the extracts from these fathers as they have been read by Mr. Wilkinson and myself, and, if you have paid attention, you have seen for yourselves that they make no mention of infant baptism. I repeat, if Mr. Wilkinson can find any mention of infant baptism by any writer before Tertullian, I will promptly give up the debate. Nor shall the matter be settled by my "unsupported *ipse dixit*;" if he can find such a passage that will be received by his own brethren, it will satisfy me. But while the greatest and best of Paedo-baptists cannot see infant baptism in a passage, he cannot reasonably expect me to see it there,

3. I claim that Mr. Wilkinson's proposition requires him not only to trace this practice back to the very days of inspiration, but that he is required by it also to show that it was mentioned approvingly by an inspired man. This claim, he says, "is misleading." I don't see how it is. How can he show that it is of "Divine authority," unless he can show that some inspired man mentioned it favorably? I deny that there is anything "*misleading*" in demanding inspired testimony to show that anything is of Divine authority.

4. Mr. Wilkinson wants to know, if men are not totally depraved by nature (the Discipline says they are), how it happens that some are idiots and some wise; how it happens that infants often display

such woful depravity and violent tempers even before they can walk or talk? A strange question for him to ask me! I should think that if they are all totally depraved they would not differ in meanness at all, they would be all mean alike. The man is so tangled up that his mind seems to be somewhat addled.

But how are the differences that we find in the mental powers and dispositions of children to be accounted for? Easily enough, thus: The physical nature of man was somewhat enfeebled by the fall; this feebleness was transmitted; each individual adds to this weakness, more or less, by his own sins; thus, in the course of time, an almost infinite number of differences arise in the bodily powers of men: but the members of the body are the instruments by which the mind expresses itself; in ways that are inexplicable by man, the mind is affected by making the blood impure, by injuring the nervous system, by impairing the spinal cord, etc. The unsolved problem among metaphysicians is this mysterious connection between mind and matter, and the strange influences which each exerts upon the other; but it is a well established fact that the mind is much affected in its operations by the condition of the body. Thus I account for the great differences in temper, etc., in young children. A child's body is impaired, its nervous system all out of fix, its stomach in an unhealthful condition, and, of course, it suffers and is cross; and some people who ought to know better call that "original sin;" as well accuse a man of sinning when he groans with the toothache. As long as the Divine definition stands that "sin is the transgression of the law," just so long will it be evident that they who cannot understand law are sinless.

5. Mr. Wilkinson is exceedingly anxious to make it appear that the authorities I quote agree with him; and no wonder, for they are among the mightiest Paedo-baptists the world ever saw. He quotes a part of Neander's testimony thus: "We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution." Then he adds: "Certainly; and that is my position exactly, hence I have not argued for it as an apostolic institution. So Neander is right, nor does his testimony affect my position." Mr. Wilkinson is the last man who ought to charge another with misrepresenting authorities. I would not so misrepresent an author, as those words misrepresent Neander, for the whole town of Meaford. Mr. Wilkinson's position, as you know, is this: The basis for infant baptism is found in the covenants of the Old Testament; that at the beginning of the Christian dispensation baptism took the place of circumcision; that infant baptism

was practiced all along, but was not mentioned because it was not necessary, for, he argues, the apostles would be sure to baptize them, seeing they had been accustomed to circumcise them. That is not Neander's position at all. This is his testimony: "Baptism was administered at first only to adults, as men were accustomed to conceive baptism and faith as strictly connected. We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution, and the recognition of it which followed somewhat later, as an apostolical tradition, serves to confirm this hypothesis." *Neander's Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church*, Vol. I, p. 311. On the next page (312) Neander argues that in the time of Tertullian, one hundred years after John died, "the practice had not as yet come to be regarded as an apostolical institution." So, you see, Neander, like Meyer, holds that it is of post-apostolic origin; that is, that it began to be practiced after the days of inspiration. If Mr. Wilkinson holds to that position, he has been converted since this debate began.

But does the gentleman know what the word "apostolic" means, when he so readily agrees that baptism is not "an apostolic institution / I doubt it. The word means, "Relating to, or taught by, the apostles; according to the apostles." Does he mean to say that infant baptism had no relation to the apostles, that it was not taught by them, that it is not according to the teaching of the apostles? If so, he might as well give up this debate.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKINSON'S SEVENTH SPEECH.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,- I will first reply to my opponent's remarks relative to the covenant. I showed in a former address that Paul in Rom. 4 quotes the very language of the covenant made with Abraham, of which circumcision was the token, to prove that that covenant was a covenant of spiritual blessings procured by faith in Christ. This is the covenant recorded in the 17th chapter of Genesis. It would be of enormous value to my opponent if he could prove that the covenant of which circumcision is the seal, as set forth in that chapter, was not the Christian covenant, and that Paul quoted the language of a covenant not found in the 17th of Genesis. But

the two are linked together so unmistakably that no man can dissolve the link. My argument is not that there were 430 years between the 17th of Genesis and the giving of the law. That period of 430 years is to be reckoned from the time God called Abram out of Ur of the Chaldees and promised to give him the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession. Twenty-four years afterwards Abraham entered Canaan, and God repeated, amplified and ratified the same covenant with him. The covenant mentioned in the 17th of Genesis is therefore only a repetition and confirmation of the covenant mentioned in the 12th chapter. If my opponent will disprove this I will give up the debate on this proposition. I quoted from Galatians 3: 8 to prove that the same apostle quotes from Genesis 12th chapter, evidently for the purpose of showing that the covenant there recorded is the Christian covenant, hence there are not two covenants, but one. You never read about "covenants made with Abraham," but the "covenant." The same blessings are promised in both, but the seal was not given until he got to the promised land. God did not propose to attach the seal to the covenant while Abraham remained among his heathen ancestors, illustrating the truth that the seal of God's spiritual covenant is to be applied to no one until he will leave his evil associations and pursuits, and go out by faith in pursuit of the inheritance promised him, as Abraham did. When individuals are brought into the spiritual inheritance of the saints then we put the seal upon them. Get this truth, and the identity of the covenants in Genesis 12 and 17 clearly before your minds, and the doctrine of infant baptism will appear as clear as the noonday sun. You can then understand the bearing of the passages I have read upon the subject of infant baptism, and the reason why no command to baptize them was given in the New Testament. There was a very good reason, because God had put the children in the covenant in the days of Abraham, and commanded that the seal should be applied to them. He had kept them in the covenant and applied the seal during the old dispensation; He had said that this should be an "everlasting covenant;" therefore the children must remain in the covenant and receive the seal. My opponent applies the everlasting covenant to the land of Canaan. But according to my Bible "the things which are seen are temporal," and must pass away. This evidently applies to the things that are seen in Canada, the United States, and even in Kentucky, and I presume it includes the land of Canaan also, hence the land of Canaan as an "everlasting possession" can only be intended in the sense of a type and pledge of a spiritual and heavenly inheritance. In harmony with

this the apostle says, "the things which are *not* seen are eternal." And in Hebrews 11th chapter, that the fathers who lived in the land of Canaan "all died in faith, not having received (realized) the promises, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and embraced them, and confessed that they were pilgrims and strangers on the earth." They "desired a better country, that is, an heavenly." With all this agrees the testimony of Peter that "the elements shall melt with fervent heat, and the heavens and earth shall pass away." But God has "begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead to an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, *reserved in heaven*" etc. And our Lord, when He left the world and went to the Father, said, "I go to prepare a place for you." Now, if He intended His people to stay here forever, it is strange that He should "go away" somewhere else to "prepare a place" for them. I have shown from Romans 4:11 that the seal of the covenant as applied to Abraham was the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had before he was circumcised. This same "token" of the covenant, therefore, which is recorded in Genesis 17th chapter, and sealed to Abraham the promise of earthly inheritance, was also a "token," or "sign" and "seal" of spiritual blessing which prepared him for his spiritual inheritance in heaven. But if Abraham is to inherit an eternal home in heaven, I don't know what value an eternal home on earth would be, hence I infer that the earthly was given merely as an earnest, or type and pledge of the heavenly. Then observe that the same sign and seal that was applied to Abraham was also applied to Isaac as an infant, and must have sealed the same blessing. It sealed justification to the former, therefore it sealed justification to the latter. And that infants are regarded as in the same moral state as adult believers is evident from Romans 5: 18, which declares that "by the righteousness of one (Christ) the free gift came upon *all men* unto justification of life." If this be true, then infants, through the atonement, inherit justification, of which circumcision is the seal, and it was to seal this blessing to them that they were circumcised. Besides, our Lord distinctly declares that "Except ye (adults) be converted and become *as little children* ye can in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 18: 3.) We have thus to come back to the same moral condition as infants in order to enter the kingdom of heaven. We must be *born again* and *become as little children*, and thus the child-character is made the basis of admission into the kingdom. The children, through the atonement, are justified in the sight of God and

stand acquitted before Him. There need be no dispute on the subject of original sin, for, according to Paul, in the eyes of the law all men are condemned. According to Christ, however, all children stand before the court acquitted of all guilt and sin, being justified because Christ died for them. My opponent is full of quotations from the works of uninspired men, but one page of inspired truth is worth more than a car-load of such testimony.

With respect to the commission, my opponent referred to it to show that if, when the mothers brought the children to Christ, infant baptism had been practiced, Christ would have given the children His blessing in that form. But he is evidently mistaken in this, for we are told that "Jesus baptized not, but His disciples." It was no part of His mission to administer the ordinances of the Church beyond appointing them, but, as a matter of fact, Christian baptism was not, at that time, appointed. He, therefore, just took them in His arms and blessed them, and thereby showed that infants were capable of receiving the Divine blessing. John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb, and surely Christ could put the Holy Ghost into the hearts of the children; and if He did not give them the Divine Spirit, will my opponent tell us what He did give them? And if they are capable of enjoying the spiritual reality, surely they are entitled to the outward shadow, or symbol.

My opponent quoted me as saying that circumcision and baptism were for the same thing. What I said was this: that circumcision and baptism were for the same thing so far as the *spiritual import* of the two was concerned. I never have denied, on the contrary I have affirmed, that circumcision in one sense was peculiar to the Jews, but in its spiritual significance, viz., as an outward sign of regeneration, it is applicable to all who are in Christ. I do not say that those who received it, except little children, were all in a condition to receive it; but the children always were.

My opponent says that I said that infants were born pure as the angels. If I did, what of it? I say so now. They come into this world under an economy of redemption that was provided for them before they were born. I cannot tell you in what way or to what extent little children are blessed, but I know that when they are born and die in the same day, and even in the same hour, they are saved in heaven because Christ died for them. I believe the provisions of redemption take away the imputed curse. Adam was placed under law. The penalty was death, and all who were born of Adam were under the penalty of the law until an economy of grace was established, and

no man, woman, or child would ever have been saved unless God had provided an economy of grace for them and met the demands of their spiritual condition. Now we can sing, so far as our connection with Adam is concerned, "Free from the law." We are "not under the law, but under grace." When my opponent says that I am responsible for having children re-born before they are born, he talks nonsense. Every individual born into the world is born under a dispensation of grace. They were made sinners in the eye of the law, they are made righteous by the provisions of grace.

My opponent's quotation from Acts 15 is a little too long to read, but I want to say that it distinctly establishes my position. One verse shows that the elders of the Church in Jerusalem decided that the yoke of bondage which had been imposed on their fathers before the Christian dispensation was now removed, and that yoke of bondage involved circumcision. The question before the council was as to whether Gentile converts should be circumcised or not: it was not a question about Jews. Peter said to those who wanted the Gentiles circumcised, "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Now, if it was a yoke which neither these Jews nor their fathers were able to bear, how is it that they are still bearing it, by divine appointment, and are to bear it to the end of time? Will my opponent please tell us? Besides, Peter expressly declares in verse 9, that God "put no difference between us (Jews) and them (the Gentiles)," yet my opponent would persuade you that Peter was mistaken. Paul says in Col. 2: 14 that God had blotted out "the hand-writing of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross." He also asks, "If I have preached circumcision why do I yet suffer persecution, because then is the offence of the cross ceased."

With respect to the circumcision of the heart: my opponent says that it is made without hands; that if baptism is in place of circumcision how is it that circumcision is made without hands and baptism made with hands? I am sorry for his sake that he made this statement. It betrays a disposition to mislead. Ritual circumcision is made with hands, and ritual baptism is made with hands; circumcision of the heart is without hands, and the baptism of the Holy Spirit is without hands.. Why does he compare the spiritual condition in one case with the ceremonial condition in the other? This is calculated to convey a very erroneous impression with respect to this religious truth, and proves either that he wanted to mislead you or is unable to distinguish between things that differ.

My opponent has been claiming in this debate that the burial in baptism mentioned in Romans and Colossians was ritual baptism. Listen to what Paul says: "We are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands." That is the one made with the sword of the Spirit, according to my opponent's own teachings. Now this circumcision which is made with the sword of the Spirit, is made, according to Paul, because we were buried with Him in baptism. The passage in the Revised Version reads, "In whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ; having been buried with him in baptism," etc. I have claimed all through that the burial baptism was a spiritual baptism by which we were brought into fellowship with Christ. We are circumcised with spiritual circumcision, *having been baptized with spiritual baptism*. Therefore spiritual circumcision and spiritual baptism are the same operation, described under two forms. I hope he will take hold of these points without gloves and deal with them like a man. He will find plenty to do without reading authorities. I have not time to read over the whole Methodist Discipline and haggle over what my opponent thinks it and Wesley taught. Perhaps he is a competent and impartial authority on the subject, and perhaps he is not. I am conscious of having taught the doctrines of the Methodist Church for twenty-two years, or have tried to teach them, and I have never been accused by my brethren with teaching anything contrary to them, but I have never taught the doctrines imputed to Methodism by my opponent. Moreover, ours are the doctrines, to a large extent, of all the great evangelical Churches of the day, especially on the subject of baptism and original sin. Nor am I going to enter into any farther defence of what is contained in the notes of John Wesley and in the Methodist "Discipline, for this would take me away from the subject under discussion to the gratification of my opponent. That is a question to be settled elsewhere and in another way.

As regards the quotation made from *Dr. Moses Stuart*, I say my opponent conveyed a wrong impression, and if he wishes to vindicate his character for honesty and consistency he should show that my quotation is not correct.

MR. HARDING—What quotation?

MR. WILKINSON—With respect to the mode of baptism. I quoted what *Moses Stuart* said to show that my opponent's quotation from him did not express the real sentiments of the writer, and unless he can extricate himself from the dilemma, he is convicted of an attempt,

either through ignorance or dishonesty, to mislead this congregation. Now, I hope he will not neglect this point again.

My opponent denies that infants are redeemed by Christ, yet he admits that they will be raised from the dead by Him, which I hold to be inconsistent, since death is the result of sin, and the resurrection is one of the results of redemption. If, therefore, Christ did not die for them, how can they be made alive in any sense through Him? The Bible says we die in Adam physically. I claim, and have long claimed, that on the day Adam sinned he also died spiritually. I am aware that he lived in the flesh for 430 years afterwards. But in a spiritual sense Adam died on that day and was consequently cut off from God. And how can his descendants get back unless they are restored by Christ? And this applies to the body as well as the soul. My opponent says that babies are not among the redeemed in heaven. Yet Christ is to bring back (redeem) their bodies from the grave. But he says they are dead only because Adam was driven away from the tree of life. But this of itself was a figure of the separation of the soul from the favor of God (which is life), therefore both physical and spiritual death were involved, not only upon himself, but both were entailed upon his posterity, and Christ came to redeem us from both. My opponent admits the one concerning infants and denies the other. I would be glad if he would explain how the bodies of infants are redeemed by Christ and not their souls. He says they suffer the physical consequences but not the guilt of sin. If a little child dies physically because Adam sinned, is it any more unreasonable to suppose that they die spiritually? The apostle says that "as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death hath passed upon all men for that all have sinned." Thus death affects the body because of sin, and I claim it is no more unreasonable to suppose that, in some way, though inexplicable to us, it also affects the soul.

And now, with regard to my opponent's elaborate quotations from Dr. Bledsoe. What has he proved? That this most "learned" and "candid" of all the Methodists of the United States, while admitting, as I have done, that there is no "express declaration" concerning infant baptism apart from adult baptism in the New Testament, yet is "reasonably convinced that we find in the Christian Scriptures the fundamental idea from which infant baptism was afterward developed, and by which it may now be justified," and discovers "the moral ground for infant baptism, which is *clearly deducible from the Scriptures,*" No wonder that he claims "hundreds of learned Paedobaptists" as in agreement with him, for this is substantially the

position of all "learned Paedo-baptists," hence the parade on this point is something like the pig-shearing exploit, "much cry, but little wool." In fact, nearly every authority he has quoted is in accord with my position. They simply affirm that the ground of infant baptism is not to be sought chiefly, if at all, in the New Testament, but they nearly all claim it as of divine authority. A man's resources must be getting pretty well played out when he has to make such an effort to extract moonbeams of comfort from cucumbers."

My opponent says I am here "to show that Jesus Christ requires infant baptism." He knows better. He knows I undertook to establish the "divine authority" of the rite from any part of the inspired record, hence he is attempting willfully to alter my position. All these petty quibbles serve to show either his desperation or his dishonesty, or both. And when he repeats the shameful untruth that infant baptism was not practiced within a hundred years after the last apostle died, in face of the testimony I have adduced from men living at the time, and especially in face of the testimony of Origen that it was received as a tradition or order from the apostles, he deserves to forfeit the respect of all right-minded men. And on whose authority fies he make such reckless statements? On no less authority, forsooth, than that of the great, and wise, and immaculate Elder J. A. Harding, the Kentucky evangelist! Tell it not in Gath!

And what analogy, let me ask, is there between Jesus Christ and Socrates? Did Socrates exist in spirit thousands of years before he was incarnated, and reveal his mind to the world through the medium of others? If so, and we are allowed to embrace these ante-incarnate utterances of the philosopher, as well as those spoken by him during his earthly life, then the analogy will hold good; otherwise it is unadulterated deception. And this, again, reveals the hopelessness of the cause that requires such support.

My opponent's organ illustration is about of a piece with his Socratic one. Suppose that some writer were to recommend delay in the use of the organ in churches until near the close of each service, would not the plain inference be that organs, in his church, were now used at the commencement of the service? If not, why recommend delay? Will my opponent please tell? But, as I have shown, Tertullian advised delay in the baptism of "widows" and "unmarried persons" in general, and for the same reason that he recommended delay in the case of infants. Therefore, if Tertullian's testimony proves that infants were not baptized before his time, it equally proves that widows and unmarried persons were not previously baptized.

And if it proves that he was opposed to infant baptism as an unscriptural innovation, it also and equally proves that he was opposed to the baptism of these other classes as an unscriptural innovation. This is where my opponent's own logic lands him. I wonder if he is willing to abide by the consequences!

My opponent says my interpretation of the word "regenerated," as used by Irenaeus, would imply that Christ came only to save baptized persons, and consequently that little children not baptized would be lost. Now, Irenaeus teaches that Christ "came to save all who by Him are regenerated to God, infants, and little children," etc.; but my opponent denies that any infants are regenerated; therefore, according to his teachings, they will be lost. The question is, Did Irenaeus use the term regeneration with respect to baptism at all, either spiritual or ritual? If so, then, according to his belief, infants were baptized in whatever sense he used the term. If he meant spiritually, they were baptized spiritually, and if they were baptized spiritually they were entitled to be baptized ritually. And if he meant ritually, then his testimony is decisive that the practice existed in his day. And I contend, and have proved, that both Irenaeus and Justin Martyr, as well as our Lord and the apostle Paul, used the word regeneration with reference to baptism, and the only counter testimony we have received so far is a pretended quotation from Dr. Bledsoe. But if Dr. Bledsoe repudiates the testimony of Irenaeus, he stands alone in it, so far as I know, among Paedo-baptist authorities. Certainly Dr. Wall, whose learning and candor have been equally extolled by my opponent, and who made this subject a special study, claims the testimony of this father for the Paulo-baptist cause. And so of the whole Paedo-baptist world, almost without an exception. Surely the testimony of one man is not to override that of the thousands. But my opponent would like to destroy the testimony of Irenaeus by making it appear that when he spoke of the "commission of regenerating" he did not mean baptizing, but teaching. But I deny that Christ gave His disciples any commission to teach before baptizing, and if He had, I deny that to teach is to regenerate, but to baptize is; therefore He meant the commission to baptize, and not to teach.

He says Tertullian opposed infant baptism "as being without foundation in reason or revelation." I simply deny the statement, and call upon him for the proof.

My opponent says I impute to him the superstition that "as sins were blotted out by baptism, no sins committed after baptism could

be forgiven." This he blankly denies. What I impute to him is the belief that sins are blotted out in baptism, which he cannot deny. The whole sentence expresses Tertullian's belief. My opponent, I said, had embraced the former part, and I could not see how he could consistently repudiate the latter. Let him deny the real issue and not a manufactured one.

Again, he repeats the claim that Tertullian was the first man to mention infant baptism, and after quoting something to the same effect which he imputes to Meyer and Bledsoe, he says, if I can find a passage in the early fathers to the contrary that will be accepted by my own brethren, he will promptly give up the debate. Yet he knows right well that Dr. Wall, Hibbard, Wardlaw, and nearly every Paedo-baptist writer extant, claim the testimony of Irenaeus and Justin Martyr as favoring infant baptism. If Meyer and Bledsoe testify to the contrary they stand almost, if not quite, alone among Paedo-baptists in the position they hold. Nor has he been able to quote any other scholars on my side who reject their testimony; and if they do they certainly never gave the matter proper consideration. If he will accept a thousand to one of my brethren who agree that Justin and Irenaeus do mention infant baptism, then he must give up this debate. But I suppose Meyer and Bledsoe must outweigh the thousands in this matter; though when they chance to differ from him he can pitch them overboard quite easily.

I repeat that his claim is misleading when he demands inspired authority for infant baptism under that part of my proposition which says it has been practiced *from* apostolic times. This clause only calls for historic proof. The former clause demands inspired authority, and I have given it to you in abundance. But I repeat that he has no right to claim inspired authority under both clauses, though this is what he is trying to do.

My opponent has not studied Methodist theology very attentively or he would understand the meaning of total depravity better than he does. We do not mean by that term that a man is as bad as the devil, but that he is depraved in every part, body, soul, and spirit. We recognize degrees in depravity, however; hence all men are not "mean alike." But if God creates every spirit separately, and makes them all immaculate, will he tell us why all men are not *good* alike? His theory about the "spinal cord" or enfeebled body affecting the moral character is a lamentable failure, for we find some very good characters coupled with very poor spinal columns, and *vice versa*. The bed is too short for him and the covering too narrow. He had better try again.

His attempt to show that I misrepresented Neander is another failure. In the passage I quoted from Neander he expresses my sentiments. I never supposed or affirmed that we agreed in all things; hence if he should find a sentence in Neander differing from some things I hold, he has no cause to crow. Nor does it follow that Neander is necessarily right and I wrong, for millions of scholars agree with me and differ from him.

Yes, I know what "apostolic" means, and I mean to say that infant baptism did not originate with the apostles.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. HARDING'S SEVENTH REPLY.

My opponent has again referred to the covenants. He agrees that 430 years take you from the giving of the law back to the twelfth chapter of Genesis, when Abram was seventy-five years old; twenty-four years before the covenant of circumcision was given. Bearing this in mind, consider the following reading from the third chapter of Galatians: "Brethren, I speak after the manner of men; Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth, or addeth thereto. Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many, but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ, And this I say, that the covenant which 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." Gal 3: 15-17. Now we have it. Raul says that if a covenant (contract) is confirmed it cannot be added to, nor disannulled. To this Mr. Wilkinson agrees. Paul also says that the law was given 430 years after the covenant was confirmed in Christ. Mr. Wilkinson and I agree that this period of 430 years reaches back to the time when Abram was 75 years old, when the covenant in the twelfth chapter of Genesis was given. Thus the covenant found in Gen. 12 is identified as the one confirmed in Christ. Mr. Wilkinson and I agree that circumcision and the promise of the land of Canaan were given twenty-four years after this time, after the covenant confirmed in Christ was given. He claims that they were added to the covenant. But according to the apostolic saying this cannot be true; for, "Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed no man

disannulleth, or addeth thereto." God made the proposition to Abram to bless him, to make his name great, and to make him a blessing. He promised to bless those that blessed Abram, and to curse the one who cursed him. To this He added: "And in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed: *"but all this was upon the condition that Ah ram should leave his country and kindred, and go into the land which the Lord would show him.* With the promptness and trustfulness that always characterized him, he arose at once and did what God told him to do. Now, can any of you believe, my friends, that after God had made this covenant with him, after it had been confirmed, and after he had fulfilled his part of the contract lovingly and faithfully, that God would add the bloody and painful rite of circumcision to the conditions upon which He would give the blessing? Why, even a man would not do as mean a thing as that, if he had about him a particle of honesty. Any man who would so change his contracts would be considered a mean, dishonest character.

When a covenant has been con tinned and sealed, it is not right to tamper with the seal, nor to change any of its provisions. But, according to Mr. Wilkinson, change after change has been made in this covenant. In the first place, he tells us circumcision was the seal of it: now baptism is the seal. According to him the seal has been changed. Then the seal was applied only to males, now to males and females alike; then, if a man bought a male servant the seal was applied to him, but not so now. Our Methodist friends in the United States, in the days of slavery, bought many servants, but they did not immediately baptize them. Why did they not do it? They said then, as many of them do now, "Baptism has come in the room of circumcision, and therefore we ought to baptize our children." Why did they not say with equal force: "Baptism has come in the room of circumcision, and therefore we ought to baptize our servants as soon as we buy them?" If the one practice is correct, the other would have been equally so. The fact is, these people have been tampering with the Word of God, adding to it, taking from it, and changing it to suit their own foolish fancies. They tell us that God began the work of changing by adding the promise of the laud of Canaan, and by affixing the seal of circumcision; now, they themselves, without one word of warrant from the Word of God, tear this seal off and put in the place of it baptism—a thing which God has appointed for a different purpose: then, without the slightest intimation that it is God's will, they give the baptism (or what they call baptism) to the female as well as the male infants; then, with as little warrant, they

cut off those bought with their money. It is a serious thing, my friends, thus to trifle with the Word of God, and to change His appointments at every shifting of the foolish fancies of silly men.

Arguments cannot set aside facts. A man may argue as long as he pleases, but the facts remain. I might present to you a most plausible argument to show that Canada had been annexed to the United States; but it is not so. During our civil war I heard men demonstrate (?) to the perfect satisfaction of their ardent listeners that the Confederacy must—that in the very nature of things it was bound to—

succeed, but it did not. It has been proven (?) to the satisfaction of the whole world that the sun moves around the earth every twenty-four hours; but it does not. Mr. Wilkinson argued most earnestly to show that in the fifteenth chapter of Acts, Paul, James, Peter, with the other apostles, and all the elders at Jerusalem decided that circumcision had been done away, and that it should be practiced no more, neither by Jews nor Gentiles; he would have us believe that baptism had taken its place, and that these apostles and elders were aware of the fact; but, unfortunately for his argument, the FACT remains—it is recorded in the very next chapter—that Paul did, after this council, circumcise Timothy, and that too after he had been baptized. It is also a FACT that about eight years after this council the "many thousands of Jews" which believed still practiced circumcision, still thought it was lawful for them so to do, and still held it to be disorderly for any man (even though it were Paul himself) to teach Jews to neglect to circumcise their children, though they were agreed that the Gentiles should observe no such thing; and, finally, it is a FACT that Paul took steps to show that he perfectly agreed with James, and the "many thousands of Jews that believed," in these things. I repeat it, Mr. Wilkinson may argue till his head grows white to show that circumcision passed out of God's covenant at the beginning of the Christian dispensation, and that baptism took its place, but the FACT remains that both circumcision and baptism continued to be practiced even to the close of the days of inspiration: nor did any apostle ever intimate that it ought not so to be, that the one had taken the place of the other, though it would have been the most natural thing in the world to have said, had it been the fact. When those Judaizing teachers were clamoring that the Gentile converts should be circumcised, what a quietus it would have put upon them if the apostles could have said, "Baptism has taken the place of circumcision, you know it well; you yourselves have ceased to circumcise your children: these Gentiles have been baptized, and that is

enough." What sane man can doubt but that the apostles would have made such statements as these, *had they been true*?

"But," my opponent will say, "Timothy's father was a Greek." What if he was? Paul would never have circumcised him had not his mother been a Jewess. Such a case was settled in the person of Titus, whom he would not circumcise—he stubbornly refused to do it—because he was in no wise connected with Abraham according to the flesh.

Before we leave this case of Timothy, I want to show you by another argument that, it seems to me, is so simple and satisfactory that it ought to satisfy any reasonable man, that circumcision continued to be practiced by the apostles, and hence that it was not supplanted by baptism. Suppose, my friends, that Mr. Wilkinson could turn to his New Testament and read from it that Paul came down to Lystra, where he found a certain pious woman named Eunice; and suppose he could read, a little further on, that Paul took the infant child of this excellent lady and baptized it; suppose he could show that this took place about seventeen years after the beginning of the Christian dispensation; would you not exclaim, That settles the question: we have here apostolic example for infant baptism? Ah, you say, but no such thing can be shown. True enough; but I have shown that Paul took Timothy, the son of the excellent and amiable Eunice, and circumcised him, about seventeen years after the ascension of Christ; does not that show that this rite continued to be observed by divine authority? If this proof would be abundantly sufficient to establish infant baptism, why is it not sufficient to establish the continuance of circumcision? Possibly it is because some people want to believe the one, whereas they do not want to believe the other.

When you remember that I have shown you not simply one such case, but thousands of them, and not simply the *examples*, but also the *teaching* of James and the elders at Jerusalem, in which Paul heartily concurred, (see Acts 21: 17-2G) it seems to me that even an unreasonable man ought to be convinced. He who understands this does not need to change the seal, nor to tamper with the covenant; for circumcision has its own place, and baptism has another.

I asked Mr. Wilkinson why Christ did not baptize those infants that the mothers brought to Him, when He said, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me," etc. He replies Jesus did not baptize but His disciples. True enough; Jesus baptized through His disciples as agents; why then did He not tell His disciples to baptize them? To this Mr. Wilkinson replies: "As a matter of fact, Christian baptism

was not, at that time, appointed. He, therefore, just took them in His arms and blessed them, and thereby showed that infants were capable of receiving the divine blessing." If I understand my opponent, then, he admits that infants were not baptized during the life of Christ unto the baptism of John. He says Jesus did not baptize them, for as a matter of fact Christian baptism was not yet appointed. We are to understand then, I suppose, that John's baptism did not come in the room of circumcision; but that Christian baptism does. If these things are so, my friends, does it not appear strange to you that God did not make known by some plain revelation that the one was not in the room of circumcision, but that the other is?

As Mr. Wilkinson limits the baptism of infants to the Christian dispensation, let us come down to the institution of Christian baptism, and see how the matter stands. After Jesus came up from the grave He became the ruler; His dispensation opened; and He said, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and in earth, 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. 28:19, 20. The same thoughts are expressed in Mark's account thus: "And He said unto them, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not, shall be damned.'" Mark 16:15, 16. As Matthew expresses it, they were to teach the nations and baptize them; or, as Mark has it, they were to preach the Gospel to every creature, and baptize those who believed it. This, now, is the place to which Mr. Wilkinson goes to find the beginning of infant baptism; and when we look at the passages we find it plainly written that Christ instructed His followers to teach the people, and then to baptize those who received and believed the teaching. This commission furnishes all the authority that any man has for baptizing anybody, and its order is (1) teaching (or the preaching of the Gospel), (2) faith (the faith that includes repentance), (3) and then baptism. Thus we come into the new covenant; and hence it is that all in it "know the Lord, from the least to the greatest." As we have seen, Christ did not baptize infants; nor did the apostles; nor is it strange that they did not, seeing that they labored under this commission; nor did any of the immediate followers of the apostles ever so much as mention it; nor is this strange, for they were accustomed to see the apostles first teach, and then baptize the taught; nor, so far as we know, did any

man that had ever soon a man that had soon an apostle ever even so much as mention the rite; Irenaeus knew the aged Polycarp; and Polycarp, when he was a youth, knew John; but neither Irenaeus nor Polycarp ever spake a word about infant baptism. When Christ ascended to the skies, infant baptism had not been mentioned; when the last apostle died, infant baptism had not been mentioned; when the last man who had ever known an apostle died, infant baptism had never been mentioned; not until one hundred years after the last apostle died do we find a mention of infant baptism, and then it is by a man who opposes it.

But Mr. Wilkinson teaches that water baptism is "an outward sign of an inward grace," that when the inner man has been baptized with the Holy Ghost, the body should be baptized with water as a sign of it; with him water baptism is a sign of regeneration; according to him, the unregenerate are under the "imputed curse;" and as he will not agree that the little ones are regenerated—born again—before they are born the first time, I suppose we must conclude that, according to his theory, they are "born again" at the same time that they are born the first time; seeing that he will have them born pure. But the whole theory is most ridiculously nonsensical, without any basis in reason or revelation. He baptizes people with water *because* they have been baptized with the Holy Ghost, he tells us; whereas the apostles taught the people to be baptized in water that they might receive the Holy Ghost. It was Peter who stood up, a few days after the ascension of Jesus, and preached the first discourse of the Christian dispensation, the first one under the great commission under which we now live and labor. As he preached, many of those who listened became convinced that the Jesus whom they had killed fifty days before was indeed the Son of God, that the grave had not been able to hold Him, and that He was then seated at the right hand of God, King of kings and Lord of lords. They were pricked in their heart, and they cried out to Peter, and to the rest of the apostles, saying, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter replied, "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." Here the order is (1) Repentance, (2) Baptism, (3) Remission of sins, and (4) The gift of the Holy Ghost. Since Christ came up from the grave the Holy Spirit has, in every case, without a single exception, been given after faith; and in every case, but one exceptional and miraculous one—that of Cornelius—it has been given after baptism. The Gospel rule, to which there is this one exception only, is

faith (including repentance), baptism in water, and then the gift of the Holy Spirit. Baptism was for the remission of sins that the recipients of it might receive the Spirit; it was not for innocents, on the ground that they had received it. Hence, in the New Testament, we find it stated time and again that "believers" were baptized, that "men and women" were baptized, but never that infants were.

Remember that Mr. McKay, in the little book that Mr. Wilkinson has here, sums up for us all the baptisms of the New Testament. As he was a Presbyterian, writing on baptism, of course he did the best he could for his side. He finds ten cases. We went over them, you remember, carefully, and in every case but one we found proof positive that no infants were among them; in the one exceptional case, while it is true we found no express proof that would clearly show she had no infant, it is also true that there is nothing indicating that she was married, or that she had any children at all; every intimation of the text seems to indicate that she was single. What a miserable condition these advocates of infant baptism are in!

Not only is it true that the commission justifies the baptism of believers only, but it is also true that every figure that shows our connection with Jesus as the Saviour of sinners, predicates that connection upon faith. If the figure of a birth is contemplated, it is said, "Of His own will begat He us with the word of truth;" and again, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is begotten of God;" if the figure of turning from darkness to light is used, it is said, "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul;" if the sinner is represented as dead, the quickening to a new life is ascribed to the word in these words, "Thy word hath quickened me;" if the new covenant is presented, all under it know the Lord, and have His laws written in their minds and hearts; and so of the figure of the olive tree to which Mr. Wilkinson referred, and which is often appealed to in support of infant baptism. The record concerning it is found in the letter to the Romans from which I now read.

"For if the first fruit be holy, the lamp is also holy: and if the root be holy so are the branches. And if some of the branches be broken off, and thou being a wild olive tree wert grafted in amongst them, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree: boast not against the branches: but if thou boast, thou bearest not the root, but the root thee. Thou wilt say then, The branches were broken off, that I might be grafted in. Well; because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded but fear. . . . And they also, if they abide not still in

unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God is able to graff them in." Rom. 11: 16-23. Here it is expressly said that those that were broken off were broken off on account of unbelief; those that stood, stood by faith; and if those that were broken off remained not in unbelief they would be grafted in again. So you see it is all a matter of faith. Just so when the relation of sonship is considered. In writing to the churches of Galatia, in speaking to the many members of these churches, Paul says, "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. . . . And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3: 26-29. Thus in speaking of all the Christians of the regions of Galatia, Paul said that all of them were children of God by faith in Christ. No infant members in that country. This perfectly harmonizes with the statement of John that, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God." Observe, too, that Paul teaches that those who are thus the children of God are the seed of Abraham, and heirs according to the promise. Thus we see that the covenant with Abraham that was fulfilled in Christ involves only those who become children of God by faith.

The Lord says, teach the people and then baptize them; preach the Gospel and baptize them that believe it. This is the commission that I am working under. Put Mr. Wilkinson says baptize the babies first, and teach them afterwards. Is that working under the commission? When Tertullian made that first mention of infant baptism, he said, "Let them come when they are grown up; let them come when they understand; when they are instructed whither it is that they come; let them be made Christians when they can know Christ;" and in saying that he expressed the correct idea; Christ explains (John 6: 44, 45) that God draws the people to Himself by teaching them. So, I say to you mothers, if you want to bless your children the way to do it is to teach them. "Oh," says my friend, "surely there is a blessing for the children." Certainly there is. Christ took the little children, and put His hands on them, and prayed. I am glad when a true man of God prays for my children: I believe in praying for God's blessing to rest upon them: I do it myself, and I ask others to do it, because that is what Christ did. If He had baptized them, I would have wanted mine baptized; but as He prayed for them, I will do likewise; I want to follow Him. If you follow Christ you will pray for the children, and teach them; and then, when they understand and believe the Gospel, you will baptize them. That is the way

Christ did; that is the way His apostles did. But you ask, "Is there not a blessing in baptism for the child?" No; there is not. What spiritual blessing is there in water—nothing but water? Our Methodist friends of to-day admit that they give the little ones nothing but a few drops of water; the child neither believes, nor repents, nor obeys; nor does it receive any thing—neither forgiveness nor the Holy Spirit—in its baptism: formerly it was supposed to bring pardon and the Holy Spirit to the infant, and to deliver it from hell; but now it is an empty, meaningless rite. One of the worst features of it is that the minister professes to do by the authority of Christ that which the Lord never gave any mortal the authority to do. It is horrible! It is a fearful thing for them to say, "By the authority of Christ we do this," when He has given them no such authority; when they grant that He did not baptize infants, and when they admit that all of us derive all the authority that we have for baptizing from the commission. I would rather lose my right arm than to make such a declaration.

"But," you inquire, "what harm can be done to the child by sprinkling a few drops of water on it?" No trouble can come from simply sprinkling a few drops of water; but to do this as an institution of Christ is awful blasphemy; for it is an established fact that Christ has given no man authority so to do. But to practice infant baptism as a divine institution does harm in other ways. If this doctrine were to prevail, it would not be long till every man, woman, and child in the world would be in the Church (that is, in whatever Church this rite would bring them); and thus all the distinctions between the world and the Church would be broken down; just to the extent that the doctrine does prevail does this miserable result follow; and just to this extent is Christ's appointment—believer's baptism—set aside.

Now, my friends, consider another tangle in which these believers in infant baptism find themselves. "Infant baptism is for everybody," say the Methodists, "for all infants;" "Not so," reply the Presbyterians, "the father or the mother must be a believer; there must be at least one believing parent." Mr. Wilkinson will baptize any infant; but his friend, Mr. Paterson who sits here by his side, and is so zealous in helping him, will not administer the ordinance unless one of the parents is a believer. Why, my friends, the advocates of infant baptism are in a perfect muddle from the beginning to the end. They do not agree about any passage that is quoted to maintain the rite; some say the passage teaches the doctrine, while

others of them deny that it refers to the matter in any way at all; they do not agree about any argument that is found to sustain it; some think the argument is sufficient, while the others positively affirm that it is not: they do not agree about what infants should be baptized; some say that all may be, while the others say there must be a believing parent: who, my friends, can believe that God is the originator of such a miserable lot of tangles!

Before Mr. Wilkinson endeavors to convert the rest of us, he would better try his hand on his friend, Mr. Paterson; and if he succeeds with him, they can go on with their work; then, if they could accomplish their desires, in the next generation there would be in their Church the world and the flesh, to the great delight of the devil.

Mr. Wilkinson is exceedingly anxious to find a mention of infant baptism before the time of Tertullian; and it is not strange that he is. The prophets say nothing about it, nor does Jesus, nor do the apostles; it is not mentioned in the Old Testament, nor in the New; hence it is not strange that those who practice it should be anxious to find as early a mention of it as possible after the days of the apostles. Mr. Wilkinson claims that Justin Martyr and Irenaeus mention the practice. They do not. I know there is one sentence in the writings of each of these fathers that is relied upon as *favoring* infant baptism *by some*. But no one of candor and intelligence claims that these writers clearly and expressly *mention* it. But, my friends, consider the sentences and judge for yourselves. Thus reads the one from

JUSTIN MARTYR.

"Several persons among us of sixty and seventy years old, of both sexes, who were discipled to Christ in their childhood, do continue uncorrupted."

Of this sentence it is enough to say that the word rendered "childhood" is the exact equivalent of our word "youth." They became Christians in childhood, in youth. Does that have any bearing on infant baptism? I was baptized in childhood myself, and I have baptized hundreds of children, but not one infant (*brephos*), which Justin would have used instead of *pais* (youth) had he desired to express the idea of infancy. Thus reads the testimony from Justin Martyr. Now, my friends, do you not agree with Bledsoe and Meyer that he does not mention infant baptism?

And now you shall have the sentence from

IRENAEUS.

"For He came to save all persons by Himself; all, I mean, who by Him are regenerated unto God; infants and little ones, and children and youths, and elder persons. Therefore He went through the several ages; for infants being made an infant, sanctifying infants; to little ones He was made a little one, sanctifying those of that age," etc.

Irenaeus not only tells us that Christ came to "regenerate," "save," all by Himself; but he explains how he understood that the Lord did it, viz., *by passing through the several ages, He thus sanctified the persons of that age.* Not a word is said about baptism. Moreover, Irenaeus wrote 67 years after the death of John. Thirty-three years after that time—one hundred years after the death of John—we find the first unmistakable allusion to the practice; and it is made by one who opposes it *as though it were an innovation suggested, but not yet adopted.* Ten years later we find the practice in the Church; but it still "causes frequent inquiries," says Origen, who is the first writer to favor it. It is a characteristic of innovations that they cause "frequent inquiries." Now, my friends, if you can have your babies baptized on such testimony as that, you are easily convinced; that is all I have to say about it.

Mr. Wilkinson denies that he misrepresented Neander. He says: "In the passage I quoted from Neander he expresses my sentiments." This is not true; Neander does not express his sentiments. Had Mr. Wilkinson quoted the entire sentence, and the one just preceding it, instead of a part of one sentence, it would have appeared that Neander's sentiments were exactly the opposite of his own. Mr. Wilkinson holds that infant baptism is not an apostolic institution, because it began before the days of the apostles; and so he quotes Neander thus: "We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution." Then he (Mr. Wilkinson) adds: "Certainly; that is my position exactly; hence I have not argued for it as an apostolic institution; so Neander is right, nor does his testimony affect my position."

Now, my friends, Neander's position is that infant baptism is not an apostolic institution *because it began after the days of the apostles.* He takes my ground exactly on this point, and had Mr. Wilkinson quoted two sentences, instead of a part of one, this fact would have clearly appeared. The sentences read thus:

"Baptism was administered at first only to adults, as men were

accustomed to conceive baptism and faith as strictly connected. "We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution, and the recognition of it which followed somewhat later, as an apostolical tradition, serves to confirm this hypothesis." *Neander's History*, Vol. 1, p. 311.

It is no pleasure to me to show you that Mr. Wilkinson is guilty of perverting and misrepresenting this great historian; but he did it knowingly, as the circumstances clearly show, and it is due to the truth that it should be shown. I say again, he is one of the last men in the world who ought to accuse others of misrepresenting authorities.

[*Time expired.*]

SIXTH DAY—AFTERNOON.

MR. WILKINSON'S EIGHTH SPEECH.

My opponent last night endeavored to make the impression that the covenant of circumcision recorded in Gen. 17, was a covenant merely to give Abraham and each of his boys a farm in Judea forever and forever, it being an everlasting covenant, and it was sealed with a seal to the boys only, thus leaving the girls, according to his theory, without a patrimony. But Peter said Acts 7: 5, that God "gave Abraham none inheritance in that land, no not so much as to set his foot on," and when Sarah died he had to buy a hole in the ground to bury her in. And Paul declares that he "sojourned in that land by faith, as in a strange country, dwelling in tabernacles with Isaac and with Jacob, the heirs with him of the same promise, and he looked for a city which hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God. Through faith also Sarah herself received strength to conceive seed, and was delivered of a child when she was past age because she judged Him to be faithful that promised. Therefore sprang there even of one and him as good as dead so many as the stars of the sky in multitude, and as the sand which is by the sea shore, innumerable. These all died in faith, *not having received the promises*, but having seen them afar off, and were persuaded of them, and confessed that they were strangers and pilgrims on the earth. For they that say such things declare plainly that they seek a country. And truly if they had been mindful of that country from whence they came out they might have had opportunity to have returned, but now they desire a better country, that is a heavenly, wherefore God is not ashamed to be called their God for He hath prepared for them a city," even the heavenly Jerusalem. In 1 Peter 1:3 the apostle says, "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ which according to His abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead, unto an inheritance incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away—reserved in heaven," etc. Now, according to my opponent, Abraham's sons were circumcised to seal the earthly inheritance to them. We are begotten again, or born again, unto a lively hope of an inheritance reserved in heaven. This new

birth is effected by spiritual baptism, the symbol of which is baptism by water. And in this spiritual baptism we are not only buried with Christ, but raised with Him to walk in newness of life, or as the same apostle elsewhere describes it, "raised up together (as believers), and made to sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus." Our inheritance is not earthly but heavenly—hence said Christ to His Jewish disciples, "In my Father's house are many mansions; if it were not so I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you; and if I go and prepare a place for you I will come again and receive you unto myself," etc. John 14: 1-3. Where did He go? He went to the Father—to heaven, and He said in addressing the Father, in chap. 17: 24, "I will that they also whom Thou hast given Me be with Me, where I am," etc. Heaven, then, is to be the future eternal inheritance of all believers, and Christ has undertaken by His cross to "break down the middle wall of partition between Jews and Gentiles, 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, and that He might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby. And came and preached peace unto you who were afar off and to them that were nigh, for through Him we both have access by one Spirit to the Father. Now, therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners (as they were under the old dispensation), but fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God, and are built upon the foundation of the apostles and of the prophets," etc.

I call your attention to Rom. 4: for I want to show what the blessing was that was promised to Abraham. We read from v. 6 as follows:—

"Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works,

"Saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered.

"Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin."

He is talking about the blessing of justification and a man is pronounced blessed who receives that blessing. The blessing received by Abraham was the blessing of justification, a better blessing than Canaan, Egypt, or all the rest of the world. It was the blessing of salvation. "What profiteth it a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" After this blessing came circumcision, which was a seal to Abraham of the same blessing. He was not circumcised and justified afterwards as my opponent is trying to show, but he was

justified first and circumcised afterwards "For," said the apostle, "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 to 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 uncircumcised.

"For the promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not to Abraham, or to his seed, through the law, but through the righteousness of faith.

"For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect.

"Because the law worketh wrath for where no law is, there is no transgression.

"Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all,

("As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations .")

You will see from this testimony that circumcision referred to and sealed justification to Abraham himself, but it sealed it to him as the father of all believers, who are Abraham's spiritual seed. Now it is passing strange, if circumcision had no reference to anything but an earthly inheritance for Abraham's natural seed, that it should be applied to him that he might be the father of a spiritual seed. Perhaps my opponent will tell us how a seal of temporal blessings only could constitute a man the father of a spiritual posterity

It is clear, moreover, that baptism was given with reference to the same blessing, viz, justification On the day of Pentecost, the great inauguration day of the new dispensation, Peter, addressing a congregation of Jews, said, Acts 2 38, "Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins," and what was remission of sins but justification? Men were circumcised then to seal justification to them, and now they are to be baptized to seal the same blessing. Besides, Peter knew that those Jews to whom he was speaking were accustomed to have the seal of justification applied to their infants at eight days old, and that the covenant made with Abraham distinctly included such. He also knew that when he mentioned the fact of their children being included in the covenant they would understand it to refer to their infant children, yet he

exhorts them to be baptized for (or with reference to) justification, or the remission of sins, *because* the promise (covenant) was to them and *their children*, v. 39. Baptism, then, relates to the same blessing that circumcision did, and is administered because of the covenant made with Abraham, of which circumcision was the seal, therefore, I argue, without a divine prohibition it must still be given to the same classes of subjects,—infant children and believing adults. I have shown that Peter distinctly mentions the children, hence when he adds, "and to all that are afar off (Gentiles), even as many as the Lord our God shall call," we know by parity of reasoning that he must have meant their infant children also. Consequently, by the unquestionable authority of this inspired apostle on this great occasion, we have Jews and their infant children, and Gentiles and their infant children included in the covenant made with Abraham, of which circumcision was the seal, and Peter calls upon his Jewish auditors to be baptized on account of this, therefore baptism must have been involved in the covenant with Abraham, the covenant which included the Jews "and their children." But as a matter of fact there was no *mention* of baptism in that covenant, hence it will be necessary to inquire in what way it was involved in it. I have shown that circumcision was the seal of that covenant, and all who were admitted to its provisions must receive the seal. But under the present dispensation baptism signifies the same thing (regeneration) and occupies the same place, hence, says Peter, "repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus (the promised seed), for (or because) the promise (which involved baptism by another name) is unto you and your children," etc., hence baptism is the New Testament seal of the same covenant, and must be applied to infants as circumcision was under the old dispensation. My opponent thinks infants are not included in the covenant under this dispensation until they get old enough to commit sin, but I think they are taken in as soon as they are born, and unless he can prove that they are incapable of receiving justification and the gift of the Holy Ghost, he cannot prove that they are excluded from the covenant of redemption. To establish these points he will need to prove that circumcision sealed a different blessing to Isaac from what it did to Abraham. We know it sealed justification to Abraham as an adult, and we know it was applied to Isaac as an infant, and I claim it was for the same purpose in both cases. And there is not a word in the Bible to the contrary. If it meant two different things in these two cases, why did God give us no intimation to that effect in His word? I hope my opponent will tell us.

But, as a matter of fact, the covenant with Abraham not only involved justification or pardon, but the gift of the Holy Ghost. The renewal of the nature which is symbolized by circumcision, as I have clearly shown, is effected by the agency of the Holy Ghost, and as Abraham received the former he must have received the latter, hence it is an important part of "the blessing of Abraham," as intimated by Paul in Gal. 3: 14, where he says Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law "that the blessing of Abraham (the blessing promised to and enjoyed by Abraham) might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." It is evident, then, that the gift of the Holy Ghost as well as righteousness, or regeneration, was involved in the Abrahamic covenant, and no doubt this was intended by the phrase "I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee," hence, Peter, on condition of repentance and baptism, promised his auditors the Holy Ghost, and assigns as a reason for this that "the promise" or covenant to bestow the Spirit, "is unto you (Jews) and your children," etc.

And just here let me ask why, if circumcision was understood by the Jews to seal to them the land of Canaan only, that they were not only so ready to receive Gentile proselytes into the covenant with them before Christ, but that they *insisted*, as a condition of their being saved, that they should be circumcised and keep the law of Moses? And why was it that "no uncircumcised person" was allowed to eat the Passover, the acknowledged symbol of atonement⁷ It is evident, from these considerations, that circumcision was distinctly connected not only by its divine author, but also in the Jewish mind, with religious truth and human salvation, yet my opponent and his co-religionists would degrade it to a mere secular use. Evidently they have not the mind of the Spirit.

On the ground of infants being cut off who were not circumcised, Mr. Harding asked, last evening, if I would say that they were cut off under this dispensation because they are not baptized. I answered emphatically, *Yes*, in a visible sense. And that is the only sense in which any one was ever cut off because he was not circumcised. Neither baptism, circumcision, or any other outward rite can bring any person into God's covenant any farther than to visibly or ritually recognize the relationship. It makes a spiritual state or relationship apparent by a visible rite or operation, and the person who is not visibly recognized as belonging to God is ceremonially, or apparently cut off from Him. The visible Church is Christ's visible body, and

those who are not visibly inducted into it are visibly outside of it. They are not recognized as belonging to the Church, not having received the badge of Christian discipleship, and that is what I understand by their being cut off from it. And this is what happened to an uncircumcised male child under the old dispensation. He was not sent to hell because his parents did not circumcise him, but he was cut off from the religious assemblies of God's people, and was not recognized as in the outward dispensation of the covenant. Circumcision of the heart, or justification, saved the soul, and those who were not justified were lost. Circumcision of the flesh illustrated the nature and necessity of this spiritual state, for as uncircumcision of the heart cut the individual off from God in fact, so uncircumcision of the flesh cut him off in figure.

My opponent has said that infants are not *saved* but are *safe*. How can they be *safe* when they come to die and not be *saved* while they are alive? Will he tell us?

Scholars were quoted to prove that there is no command for infant baptism. In the quotation made from Dr. Bledsoe he is represented as saying that hundreds of Paedo-baptists deny that infant baptism is taught in the Bible, yet he says, in the same quotation, that "It is clearly deducible from the New Testament." And this is what they all claim. I have read hundreds of Paedo-baptist authorities and I know exactly how they explain the matter. They say there is no express command in the New Testament on the subject because an express command was not called for; and I hope to be able to show you why. If God put infants in the covenant of redemption away back 1900 years before the new dispensation began, no express command was required to put them in again at the beginning of the new dispensation, since without a command to put them out they were recognized as still being there. It is not necessary to re-enact a law before it is first abrogated. God had never abrogated this law. My opponent cannot produce a single proof that the law which put the children into the covenant in infancy was ever abrogated. I might illustrate this point by relating a little incident I recently heard. Two men who were neighbors were very fond of disputing on this point. One said, "You have no right to do anything for which there is no command in the Bible." The other opposed him, by maintaining that there were many plain duties for which there is no express command or injunction in the Bible. One day this man who insisted on commands so strongly happened to fall into a well and could not get out. He sent his little boy to tell the neighbor with whom he had so oft

disputed to come and help him out of the well. He did not come for a long time, and when he did come he was rebuked for his tardiness. He replied, "You know you have been telling me that I should not *do* anything except there is a command for it in the Bible. I have been studying the Bible to see if there was any command for pulling you out of the well. I read the command that if an ox or an ass fall *into* a pit, you are *to haul it out*; *but you are neither an ox nor an ass*. *At length I found the passage, 'Do good to all men, especially to those who are of the household of faith,'* and I thought I might come and take you out under that command." This question under discussion occupies very nearly the same position. We are constantly beset with a demand for some command to baptize infants. *We* reply that this is not necessary, because it is woven into the very warp and woof of the whole scheme of human redemption, and the scholars of Christendom through all ages—with few exceptions in latter days—have agreed, and the more so the more fully the Divine arrangement has been examined and understood, that God Himself put the children into the covenant of redemption and put His seal on them at eight days old, and until He puts them out they must stay there and receive that seal. Who is man, then, that he should ask for another command for this?

My opponent stated that there is no mention of infant baptism during the life of Christ or the apostles nor for the first 200 years. In point of fact there was no opposition to it for the first 200 years, and then by a man who believed no sins committed after baptism could be remitted. Now, if you believe it possible for such an innovation to have been brought into the Church without opposition, then you must believe that human nature has changed, when an organ cannot be introduced now without raising such a dust. But the fact is that there was no opposition except Tertullian for the first 1300 years. I have proved that it existed all this time, and my opponent has failed to produce one tittle of proof to the contrary except this plea that no one mentioned it before Tertullian, which I have shown you is not true, for Irenaeus distinctly mentioned it under the name of regeneration. And until he can give us some modicum of evidence to the contrary I can afford to let his assumptions pass for what they are worth, which is but very little. But suppose his statement were true. Would that prove the practice did not exist? Suppose a man was arraigned in court on a charge of theft. And suppose you could produce ten thousand witnesses who would testify that they never saw him steal. Would not one reliable witness testifying that he did see

him steal outweigh them all? Undoubtedly so. So in the present case. Irenaeus says it was there, Tertullian says it was there, Origen says it was an order from the apostles, others living near the time say the same thing, and no one was ever silly enough to deny it for upwards of a thousand years after the days of the apostles, yet my opponent wants to overturn all this positive evidence by a mere negation—"nobody mentions it before Tertullian,"—and even this negation is a mere assumption in opposition to the facts before us. But his whole line of defence, for the most part, consists of just such unsupported assumptions, which he, no doubt, finds a very convenient method of whiffing away arguments against which he has nothing more substantial to advance. However, it pleases him, I presume, without materially injuring me, so let him fiddle away on that line. I now call attention to the fact that my proposition does not call for historical proof any farther back than John's death. The proposition is that infant baptism has been practiced in the Christian Church *from* apostolic times. I did not undertake to prove from history that it was practiced *in* the apostolic age. I knew what I was doing. A party who was present when I framed the proposition asked, "What do you mean by the phrase 'from apostolic times?'" I said, "I mean just what it says." And now I ask, have I not traced it back to the apostolic age? Has my opponent made out a better case for immersion in the early Church than I have for infant baptism? Yet he claims to have established the point that the early Church immersed, a point I have not denied. If he proved the one I have proved the other. He says Irenaeus' reference to the commission was to regeneration by teaching, for in the commission Christ says, "Go teach and baptize them." I say Christ gave no such command. He simply said, if He spoke Greek, "Go *matheteusate*." Turn to the Greek lexicon and see what that means. Every scholar knows that in the New Testament sense it means "Go make disciples." And what is a disciple? A pupil or learner. Then it means "Go get the nations into my school by baptizing them, and then let them come and learn of me." The Christian Church is Christ's school where He is teaching them by His word and Spirit. First, make disciples of them, then baptize them, and then teach them. Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you. That is the Divine order and arrangement, hence Irenaeus must have meant by regeneration, baptism and not teaching.

My opponent said we had to make wafers in order to give children the Lord's Supper. The "office editor," Mr. McDiarmid, said they

had to make soup in order to give the children the Passover. I do not know but a wafer is as sensible as soup. But I don't consent to be held responsible either for the errors of the Roman Catholics or Campbellites. I neither administer wafers nor soup.

My opponent is still greatly exercised about the change of the covenant which to his mind is involved in the addition of the seal. I have explained that no change in the covenant was involved, but he cannot see it, apparently. I still maintain, however, that God was supreme, and it was His prerogative to affix the seal whenever He pleased, whether at the time the covenant was first given or at any time thereafter, and the addition of the seal twenty-four years afterwards no more involved a change of the terms of the covenant than the addition at the time the covenant was made. This is all the change, I claim, that was made (though my opponent represents otherwise), and this, as I have shown, was not a change in the terms of the contract, but only a ratification of its provisions. By the addition of the seal, therefore, I again insist, God neither disannulled the covenant nor added to it. Besides, I want to ask my opponent how covenants are "confirmed." I always thought it was by signing and sealing. If so, will he tell us when the covenant God made with Abraham as recorded in Gen. 12 was ever "confirmed," and what was the seal, unless the covenant in Gen. 12 and 17 are the same and circumcision the seal⁷ The fact is he cannot do it.

My opponent struggles heroically against the testimony of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, because he knows it is corroborative of my position and destructive of his. As to there being no mention of infant baptism, by either of these writers, he seems to forget that Justin distinctly identifies circumcision and baptism as the same thing when he says, "We are circumcised by baptism with Christ's circumcision." And again when he says, "We also, who by Him have had access to God, have not received this carnal circumcision, but the spiritual circumcision, which Enoch and those like him observed. And we have received it by baptism, by the mercy of God, because we were sinners: *And it is enjoined upon all persons to receive it in the same way*" viz., by baptism. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that Justin Martyr *must have believed in infant baptism*, because he knew circumcision was a rite peculiar to the infant age, and he declares that it is "enjoined upon all persons to receive circumcision by baptism."

Now what does it matter if no mention of infant baptism, as distinct from the baptism of adults, could be found prior to the time of Tertullian, so long as it can be so unmistakably proven that these

early fathers identified these two rites as one and the same thing under different forms? Does it not follow with all the force of moral demonstration, that when they identified these rites as the same, they must have identified the subjects as the same? It seems childish to call this in question.

Besides, the very fact that whole households were uniformly baptized during the apostolic age goes far to sustain the position I have taken. True, my opponent fails to find any babies in those households, but I suspect he is not a good hand to search for them. He shuts his eyes, puts stoppers in his ears, feels in the wrong place, and then swears there is not a baby in all that region. But a good many wise men think they see children, even infant children, in these households; and in favor of this view much may be said.

1. The term *oikos*, used in two of the cases referred to, manifestly include all the inmates of a house, or home, whether great or small. Therefore the language is just such as we would expect on the supposition that there were children in these houses. If the word circumcise had been used in each of these instances, instead of the word baptize, no one would ever have questioned that infants were present.

2. The universal desire among Jewish women to be the mothers of the promised seed, and the feeling that barrenness was a reproach to them, constitute a strong presumption that these households were composed of something more than strangers.

3. The Syriac version, the oldest and most literal version in the world, in the case of Lydia reads, "Lydia and her children."

4. Nor is it any valid objection to my position that it is recorded concerning the Philippian jailer that Paul "spake the word of the Lord to all that were in his house;" and concerning the household of Stephanas that they "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints." Such general expressions are common, both in conversation and writing. As Dr. Wardlaw expresses it, "When we ascribe to a *family* anything of which infants are universally understood to be incapable, we never think of making a formal exception of them. The man who from my saying, 'I spoke to the whole family—to all in the house,' or, 'They are a very benevolent family—they lay themselves out for doing good,' should conclude that L was certainly speaking of a family in which there were no *infant children*,— I should be apt to regard either as in jest, or as a hypercritical fool. When Joshua says, 'As for me *and my house*, we will *serve the Lord*,' does any one ever think of inferring that his family could not contain any infants be-

cause infants were incapable of serving the Lord? Yet the inference would be as legitimate in this case as in either of the others; and it may not be amiss for our Baptist brethren to make it the subject of a little self-examination, by what principle it is that they are led to such a conclusion in the one case, when they never think of it in the other. What is the precise difference in the state of their minds, when they read the 15th verse of the 24th chapter of Joshua, and when they read the 34th verse of the 16th chapter of the Acts, or the 16th verse of the 16th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians.

"Let us only consider for a moment into what ridiculous absurdities we should be led by the adoption of such a principle of criticism. The children of Israel were commanded, in preparing the Passover, 'to take a lamb for *a house* according to the *number of souls*. Are we to infer from this that they numbered the mouths of sucking infants? or that there were no such infants at that time in the families of Israel? They were enjoined to eat it 'with their loins girt, and their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand.' Children could not do this, therefore we conclude again that there must have been none; and the conclusion is irresistibly confirmed by the testimony of the Psalmist respecting the passage of the Red Sea, for 'they went through the flood,' he says, 'on foot,' which infants, none will dispute, were incapable of doing. When the paralytic Eneas was cured by Peter, it is said "all that dwelt at Lydda and Saron saw him and turned to the Lord;" from which, amongst other inferences, it will follow that these places presented the singular anomaly of a population without infants! Paul writes to the Thessalonians that 'if any would not work neither should he eat:' were the babes of Thessalonica, then, to be left to starve because they were incapable of earning, or of being willing to earn, their daily bread? Let no Baptist say indignantly, 'This is ridiculous; it is making a joke of the matter.' I grant it is. It is fit for nothing else. But let him recollect that the materials of the joke are furnished by his own friends. Let the *argument* (if it must have a name to which it has no title) be withdrawn, and there will be no room left for *the joke*. I am only ashamed, indeed, of being obliged to argue it at all. It is not worth the ammunition."

Thus the unspeakable absurdity of my opponent's plea that there could have been no infants in the house of the jailer because Paul and Silas "spake the word of the Lord to all that were in his house," and none in the household of Stephanus because they had "addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints," is glaringly exposed—and the exposure might be carried to much greater length; hence I claim

the baptism of these households as invincible proof of infant baptism. I trust he will supply us with something more cogent in the way of objections, if he has anything at hand.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. HARDING'S EIGHTH REPLY.

I will begin my review of Mr. Wilkinson's speech by calling your attention for a moment to his remarks concerning the authorities. Dr. Bledsoe says that although there is no express mention of infant baptism in the New Testament, the rite may be justified on the ground of logical inference; and Mr. Wilkinson says that all the Paedo-baptist authorities that I have been quoting agree with him in this; that is, that all of them teach that infant baptism is taught in the Bible by a logical inference. Let us see about that. Dr. Bledsoe says:

"We might, if necessary, adduce the admission of many other profoundly learned Paedo-baptists, that their doctrine is not found in the New Testament, *either in express terms, or by implication from any portion of its language,*"—*Southern Review*, Vol. 14, p. 335.

This aged and powerful Methodist editor here says that "many profoundly learned Paedo-baptists" deny that infant baptism is taught in the New Testament at all, "either in express terms" (that is, by command or example), "or by implication" (that is, by logical inference). My opponent is mistaken, then, in saying that all of them agree that it is clearly deducible from the New Testament. If a doctrine is taught neither by express terms, nor by implication, it is not taught at all. Many Paedo-baptist authorities say it is not of apostolic origin.

Mr. WILKINSON—I say that.

Mr. HARDING—They say it is of *post-apostolic origin*. Do you say that? Mr. Wilkinson would have us believe that he agrees with Neander, Meyer, and the many Paedo-baptists who deny the apostolic origin of this rite; but does he? He claims that it is of *divine* origin, and he goes back to the Old Testament to find the beginning of it in circumcision; do they so claim? Hear them testify, my friends, and know for yourself. Neander says, (see his *Church History*, Vol. 1, p. 311) "Baptism was administered at first only to adults, as men were accustomed to conceive baptism and faith as strictly connected.

We have all reason for not deriving infant baptism from apostolic institution, and the recognition of it which followed somewhat later, as an apostolic tradition, serves to confirm this hypothesis." This greatest of Church historians here testifies (1) that "baptism was administered at first only to adults;" (2) that "men (including the inspired apostles and evangelists, of course, as they did most of the baptizing 'at first') were accustomed to conceive of baptism and faith as strictly connected;" and (3) that it was recognized somewhat later than the apostolic age, "as an apostolic tradition." But some one may inquire, "Is there not much force in its having been received as an apostolic tradition?" No; for they called infant communion also "an apostolical tradition." Says Dr. Knapp (Paedo-baptist), Augustine calls infant baptism *apostolica traditio*; and we should unquestionably attach some importance to this testimony, if he had not also called infant communion *apostolica traditio*; we know he was mistaken in this case. Why not then in the other?"—*Southern Review*, Vol. 14, p. 344.

Dr. Bledsoe adds to this testimony of Knapp's that "When the Fathers were called upon to defend any custom of the Church, they seldom, if ever, failed to plead an apostolical tradition in its favor." Meyer says it is "an institution of the Church which gradually arose in post-apostolic times;" and yet Mr. Wilkinson would have you believe that all these great authorities agree with him, and that I very much misrepresent them. Does he think that infant baptism arose in post-apostolic times? that it cannot be found in the New Testament in "express terms," or "by implication from any portion of its language?" Certainly he does not; then he does not agree with these authorities.

Mr. Wilkinson still insists that Irenaeus referred to infant baptism, when he said, speaking of Christ, "He came to save all persons by Himself; all who by Him are regenerated unto God; infants and little ones, and children and youths, and elder persons." Irenaeus then explains that "He went through the several ages, for infants being made an infant, sanctifying infants; to little ones He was made a little one, sanctifying those of that age," etc. By "regenerated," he means "baptized," says Mr. Wilkinson. He meant no such thing: nor would any one have been silly enough to say so, had it not been for the sad necessities of this argument for infant baptism. Drowning men will catch at straws. I am willing to leave this case of Irenaeus with you, with simply reminding you that Dr. Bledsoe says "Before the time of Tertullian, A.D. 200, there is not an allusion to

the custom from which its existence may be fairly inferred; "and with reminding you, moreover, that Dr. Meyer says, "It is not certainly attested before Tertullian, and by him still decidedly opposed, and, although already defended by Cyprian, only becoming general after the time of Augustine [A.D. 400] in virtue of that connection." While Meyer and Bledsoe agree with me about a matter of this kind, I shall not trouble myself as to whether Mr. Wilkinson does or not.

He thinks that Tertullian did not oppose it on the ground that it was not of Divine origin, but on the ground that he did not believe that sins committed after baptism could be forgiven. This is not so; as Bledsoe truly says, he condemns it "as having no foundation either in reason or revelation." Neander says Tertullian was "an unconditional opponent of infant baptism;" and he claims that his opposition to it grew out of "the great importance which he attached to its spiritual conditions." (Vol. 1. pp. 231,2.) Moreover Tertullian does make a clear argument from the words of Jesus: he says, "*Do not forbid them to come to me.*" Therefore let them come when they are grown up; let them come when they can understand; when they are instructed whither it is that they come; let them be made Christians when they can know Christ."

Dr. Watson is an authority of a different class. He believes that infant baptism can be deduced from the Bible, though he admits that he can find no express mention of it in the New Testament. He says, "Though there is no expressed example in the New Testament of Christ or the apostles baptizing children, yet there is no proof that they were excluded." If they were never excluded from baptism, it is because they had never been admitted to it. As we will see by and by, when we come to that part of Mr. Wilkinson's speech, when Christ authorized His apostles to baptize, He limited them to the baptism of believers.

My friends, it is a thing made out that there is not the slightest reference whatever, of any kind, in the New Testament to infant baptism. Bledsoe, Neander, Meyer, Schaff, Watson, Mosheim, and hundreds of other Paedo-baptists have searched diligently for it, but have not been able to find a single clear case or express mention of it; they cannot find a single reference to it from Matthew to Revelation; and some of the greatest of them frankly admit that it did not begin to be practiced for many years after John died: some of them, however, as Watson and Schaff, like Mr. Wilkinson, go back to the Old Testament, and try to draw an inference in favor of the prac-

tice from the rite of circumcision. Is it not strange that if it is taught anywhere in the Bible, the greatest of Biblical critics, Meyer, failed to find it there? that if it was practiced from apostolic times, the greatest of Church historians, Neander, did not discover the fact? that if Irenaeus mentions it, Meyer and Bledsoe can not so understand him? Indeed, my friends, as Dr. George E. Steitz says, "among scientific exegetes it is regarded as an established conclusion that not a trace of infant baptism can be discovered in the New Testament." Is it not singular that men practice "by the authority of Jesus Christ" that about which Christ and His apostles are as silent as the grave? Is it not singular that the Lord should expect us to baptize infants "by His authority" when neither He nor His apostles ever said a word about, or gave us a single example of it? There are frequent references in the New Testament to the baptism of men, of women, and of believers, but not one to the baptism of babies.

My opponent has rested his case almost entirely upon the claim that as circumcision was formerly the seal of the covenant of redemption, baptism is now. The covenant is the same, he argues, but baptism is now the seal, whereas circumcision formerly was. Observe, my friends, and you will see that he goes to the wall on this point, as emphatically as any one ever did since the world began. He gives baptism the place that God has given to His Holy Spirit. At Eph. 1:13 we read, "In whom ye also trusted, after that you heard the word of truth, the Gospel of your salvation; in whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." From this we learn that the Holy Spirit, not baptism, is the seal. Again at Eph. 4: 30, we read, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God whereby we are sealed unto the day of redemption." Also at 2 Cor. 1: 22 it is said, "Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts."

My opponent has occasionally hinted that we lay too much stress upon the efficacy of water; but we have never put water in the place of the Holy Spirit of God. Baptism is never called the seal of the new covenant, never; not a word was ever spoken by an inspired man that intimates that it has any such place; on the contrary, we are said to be baptized into Christ, baptized for the remission of sins, and as we are not sealed as Christ's till we are in Him, the gift of the Holy Spirit, which, according to the gospel rule, follows baptism, is appropriately called by the apostle the seal; and hence the Bible doctrine (Gal. 4: 6), "Because ye are sons God hath sent forth the Spirit of His son into your hearts, crying Abba, Father." Truth is

consistent, error is not, hence Mr. Wilkinson's position is forever leading him to contradict and pervert the Word of God.

When my friend began to read from the fourth chapter of Romans, I thought within myself, surely he is hard pressed indeed to go there; for if one wants to show that infant baptism is not found in the Bible, but that under the new covenant (which is with Abraham's spiritual seed), believers are baptized, not infants, he should take this chapter to begin with. Abraham has two seeds: (1) those who sprang from his loins according to the law of natural generation, and (2) those who became his sons by being "born again" through his great son Jesus Christ; as saith the Scripture, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Remembering that Abraham has two seeds, and that the new covenant is with the spiritual seed, just as the covenant of circumcision is with the natural, let us read from this fourth chapter of Romans. The apostle quotes David (ver. 7), "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin." Then he says of Abraham (ver. 11), "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 to them also." This verse shows that his spiritual seed are *all them, that believe*, whether circumcised or not; and this agrees exactly with the saying of the apostle John, "whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God:" all those born of God are Christ's, and hence are Abraham's seed according to the promise. But infants, never having sinned, not being dead in sin, do not need to be born again; as a matter of fact they *cannot* be born again, seeing they cannot believe that Jesus is the Christ. It is said (ver. 12) that Abraham is "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 uncircumcised." This verse teaches that Abraham is the father of those who "walk in the steps" of his faith. No infants in that. At verse sixteen it is said, speaking of imputed righteousness, "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that only which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all." Abraham is not the spiritual father of everybody who is born into this world, as Mr. Wilkinson seems to believe, seeing that he would have all baptized, but as these verses clearly

show, he is the father of all that believe that Jesus is the Christ, of all who walk in the steps of his faith. These, and these only, should be baptized, for Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." If we turn to Galatians we find the same doctrine. Paul there says (Gal. 3: 7), "Know ye therefore that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." But it is hard to get Mr. Wilkinson to know this; he goes blundering around with his eyes shut, claiming that every body that is born into this world is of the seed of Abraham, and that they should all receive the seal of the covenant that God made with his spiritual seed; then he adds the blunder of supposing that baptism is the seal. By the way, if infants must be regenerated in order to be saved, if, in point of fact, they are all regenerated (born again) even at their birth, is not that being born again without faith, repentance, prayer, understanding, or anything else"? And then when they believe that Jesus is the Christ, with a trusting obedient faith, are they not born again the third time? How many new births does Mr. "Wilkinson believe in, anyhow? I am sure I don't know, and I don't believe he does himself; but the Bible doctrine is, "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus," and, "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed." Gal. 3: 2G, 29.

Mr. Wilkinson thinks that if I can prove "that infants are incapable of receiving justification," I can show that they are not in the covenant of redemption. Certainly, that is so. To justify is to pardon, to forgive. How can God forgive one who has never sinned? how can He justify one who has done no wrong? Remember, John says, "Sin is the transgression of the law" (1 John 3:4); and Paul says (Eph. 2:1, Revised Version), "Ye were dead through your trespasses and sins;" and God says (Ezek. 18:4), "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." So infants are not sinners, seeing they have transgressed no law; they are not dead, seeing we die through sinning, through our trespasses and sins; and hence it follows that they cannot be justified, seeing that justification includes the forgiveness of sins.

Mr. Wilkinson says Abraham never possessed the land of Canaan. Well, what of it? God did not promise it to him for himself, but for his seed. What has that to do with our question?

I understood him to deny that God promised the land of Canaan to him and his seed for an everlasting possession. Read and see: "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession." Gen. 17:8. Had not the Jews broken the covenant of the Lord they would have been dwelling in that land to this day; and if they turn

to the Lord, doubtless, they will have it restored to them. At any rate this one thing is certain, *viz.*, the very last time an inspired man makes any reference to the practice of circumcision among the Jews, he teaches that they were still circumcising their children and that it would be disorderly for any one to instruct them to do otherwise. About this there is no room for doubt.

Of the two circumcisions, that of the flesh and that of the heart, the one belonged to the natural seed of Abraham, and was connected with the earthly inheritance; the other, to the spiritual seed, is connected with the celestial inheritance; the one was made by a knife cutting the foreskin of the flesh; the other with the sword of the Spirit cutting the heart. When Peter spake to the people, using the sword of the Spirit with such tremendous power (Acts, 2nd chapter), it is said, "Now when they heard this, they were pricked in their heart;" observe, this sword that is "sharper than any two-edged sword" pierced to their hearts, cut off" their stubbornness, and made them anxious to do the will of God; thus were they circumcised in heart. In the one case a material knife cuts a material body, and this cutting is the token of a material inheritance; in the other, a spiritual knife cuts the spiritual or "inner man," and this cutting leads to an eternal inheritance. This sword of the Spirit pierces to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, joints and marrow, and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. By using this sword Peter so pierced the hearts of the people that many men and women cried out in their anguish, "Men and brethren, what shall we *do?*" He replied, "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. 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 2: 37-39. Mr. Wilkinson thinks that as the promise (the gift of the Holy Spirit) was to them and their children, they would naturally conclude that their infants should be baptized. He told them "to repent," and to be baptized "for the remission of sins;" as infants cannot repent, and as they have no sins to be forgiven—and never did have—I infer they would not expect their infants to be baptized; and as the promise was to all whom the Lord should call, and as He came not to call the righteous but sinners—those who are weary and heavy laden—it is clear infants are not among those who are to receive this promise. They do not need it. The word rendered "children" means "offspring," without any reference to age.

My opponent wants to know something about the time when the

seal is applied. As he needs information on that subject very badly indeed, it gives me pleasure to furnish it. We have it as a fixed fact—a matter settled by the very words of God—that we are sealed by the Holy Spirit. When does one receive Him? At John 7:37-39 we read, "In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified)." In this place Jesus plainly foretells that believers will be sealed by the Spirit. Paul, as we have seen, in writing to the Ephesians tells them that they were sealed by the Spirit "after that they believed." (Eph. 1: 13). And as they are baptized with water in token that they have received the Spirit, according to the Methodistic theory, baptism in water must follow faith; unless they can show that one is born again of the Spirit twice, once in infancy, and again when he believes; a thing that all who know anything about the Bible teaching on this subject, know cannot be done.

My opponent spoke about the Gentiles being fellow-heirs with the Jews under this new dispensation. Yes, they are. How did they get in? In that allegory of the olive tree, so often referred to, Paul says to the Gentiles that the natural branches (the Jews, who were connected by natural generation with Christ) were broken off "because of unbelief;" and that the Gentiles stood "by faith;" he added that if the Jews continued not in unbelief they would be grafted in again, and that if the Gentiles should forsake their faith they would not be spared. So we see the Gentiles came in by faith. It is all a matter of faith.

Mr. Wilkinson wants to know, if babies are not *saved* while they live, how they can be *safe* when they come to die. Infants are born innocent, we agree, and hence are *safe* when they are born; during their infancy they cannot sin, and hence remain *safe* through that period; if they die in infancy, being sinless, they die safe. Will Mr. Wilkinson tell us how one can be *saved* from that from which he is already absolutely and unconditionally *safe*? To talk about infants being *saved* is to intimate that at some period in their infancy they are in danger of hell fire—are lost—than which nothing is more unscriptural and nonsensical.

Mr. Wilkinson does not approve of the doctrine of the disciples that one should have a "thus saith the Lord" for all that he does in

the service of God. And no wonder; a Methodist could never be very strongly attached to that doctrine. But the illustration by which he blunderingly tries to ridicule the doctrine does not serve him well. In his illustration, you remember, the man who argued for the "thus saith the Lord," fell into a well; and the other man searched the Scriptures to find a command for taking him out; *and he found one*; if he had not been an ignoramus he would have thought of it without searching; he was a very ignorant man, indeed, not to have thought of the golden rule. I venture to say, and will undertake to maintain the statement, that there is absolutely no good thing that a man can do, that is not taught, directly or indirectly, in the Bible.

Mr. WILKINSON—Hear, hear.

Mr. HARDING—And heed what you hear. Infant baptism is not taught in the Bible, in any way, and hence it is not a good thing. A great many of the most earnest and faithful men have been constrained to say it is not to be found in the book, although strongly prejudiced in its favor. Such a one is Neander, and such the great Meyer, who tells us not only that there is not a trace of it to be found in the New Testament, but that it is of post apostolic origin, an institution of the Church that arose after the days of the apostles.

And that brings me to this red line on my friend's chronological chart (A.D. 100.) He says his proposition requires him to trace infant baptism just to that point, to the death of John, as he is only to show that it has been practiced *from* the apostolic age. He is mistaken.

Mr. WILKINSON—I said the latter part of my proposition only called for this.

Mr. HARDING—In arranging for the debate he wrote, "Infant baptism is of divine authority, and has been practiced by the Christian Church from apostolic times." I said, "I deny that," and promptly signed my name as taking the negative of it. Just then one of my brethren, now present, looking at it said, "'From apostolic times,' that only requires him to trace it back to the edge of the apostolic age." I remarked, "'Divine authority' covers the ground: that takes him into the apostolic times." "But," said the brother. "I would rather have him say that it was practiced in apostolic times." This Mr. Wilkinson declined to say. I then said, "Very good; if Mr. Wilkinson wants to acknowledge that it was not practiced in apostolic times, I am willing; but how then will he get his 'divine authority.'" In his last speech he says, "I did not undertake to

prove from history that it was practiced in the apostolic age. I knew what I was doing." That is, I suppose, he knew it was not practiced in the apostolic age. I knew that, but I supposed that he was ignorant of the fact. That which has begun since the apostles has for it no divine authority.

He now asks if he has not traced it back to the apostolic age. No sir; you lack just one hundred years of it; there is just that much of a gap between the beginning of your practice and the death of the last apostle; so testify the most learned of Paedo-baptists.

Now to the commission: Mr. Wilkinson calls attention to the fact that the word rendered "teach," in Matthew's account of it. is *matheteuo*, which he properly rendered "to disciple," "to make disciples of;" then he paraphrased the passage thus: "Go get the nations into my school by baptizing them, and then let them come and learn of me." A gross perversion of the passage! The word *matheteuo* signifies to disciple *by teaching*; Greene defines it thus: "To be the disciple of, to follow as a disciple; *in N. T.*, to make a disciple of, to train in discipleship; *pass.*, to be trained, disciplined, instructed." Mark gives the same commission in these words: "Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16: 15, 16. Where Matthew says, "make disciples," Mark says, "preach the Gospel;" and the latter adds: "He that believeth and is baptized;" showing that to make disciples is to make believers by preaching, and that the baptizing comes after the believing: I take it that Mark is a very good commentator on Matthew.

This commission harmonizes perfectly with what Jeremiah says about the new covenant; for under it God writes His laws in the minds and hearts of the people, and all shall know Him from the least to the greatest.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKINSON'S NINTH SPEECH.

I am not going to haggle any more about authorities, but I will continue the argument in support of my proposition. My opponent says that Paedo-baptist authorities are with him. He quotes from one such authority who declares that infant baptism is of post-apostolic origin and has no foundation in the word of God; but there are thousands who hold differently, and for every scholar among the ranks of the Paedo-baptists who can be found on that side, a thousand can be found on this side. Besides, it is very strange, if the authorities he quotes are so certain about infant baptism not being taught in the Scriptures, that they are Paedo-baptists, yet I'll guarantee they all defend their practice from the Bible. It is also strange if Dr. Bledsoe declared at one time that "the doctrine is not found in the New Testament, either in express terms or by implication," and at another time that is "clearly deducible "from the Scripture. Still, you will observe, his remark, as quoted by my opponent in his last speech, relates to the New Testament, and not to the whole Bible. And so you will find in every case, almost without exception, there is some explanation of these men's utterances not found in the scraps quoted by their opponents, which if supplied would make their teachings consistent. I have never known an instance where this was not the case. Let this suffice about the authorities.

In my debates with these gentlemen I have been treated to a great many dishes of resurrection hash, but I think the last speech I listened to from my opponent contained the biggest dose I ever had to take. I think the audience is entitled to a dish of something fresh from him, and I hope they will get it unless he has exhausted the supply. He tried to create an erroneous impression with respect to my proposition. Let us look at the subject fairly. I say, first, that infant baptism is of Divine authority. That confines me to the Scriptures. But I do not stop there. I say, not only that it is of Divine appointment, but also that it has been practiced in the Christian Church from apostolic times. My proof under the first clause must necessarily be confined to the Scriptures. Under the latter clause I have simply to prove that it has existed from the close of the New Testament Canon to the present time in the Christian Church. There is no use in his attempting to take any advantage of me by trying to make the two parts of my proposition overlap each other, for it is net fair to do so. The dodge is quite transparent.

My opponent says there is not a case of conversion before baptism recorded in the Bible, except that of Cornelius, and that was a miracle. I shall be glad if he will toll us what he means by a miracle. Effects are produced chiefly in three ways: by natural law, by human agency, and by Divine power outside of natural law. It is a miracle when God exercises His power outside of natural law. In which of these ways are all conversions effected? Are they effected by natural law? This one conversion, my opponent says, was a miracle. What about other conversions? In what way does this conversion differ from the rest? God can exercise His saving power when He pleases? He is not confined to outward ordinances in order to save men. You are not required either to have a dip in the water or a lot of water poured over you in order that Christ may get into your heart. "But God is the author of those outward rites," says my opponent, "and must operate on men's hearts through their instrumentality." It would be a strange thing, however, if He put up a barrier between Himself and man's salvation so that it should by necessity depend on human instrumentality. God cannot convert a man, according to my opponent's theory, until He can get him, or some other Disciple priest, to come and dip the individual. Thus the Lord Jesus has got to send for Mr. Harding before He can convert a man! What do you think of such a doctrine as that? The Lord Jesus has bound His hands behind Him so that He cannot convert a man's soul, nor get into his heart by His Holy Spirit till He gets some one who believes in dipping to put the candidate under water so that He can get at him! It amuses me. This case of Cornelius was the first case of conversion after the introduction of the Gospel to the Gentiles. It was therefore a *representative* case. It showed the way in which Christ would receive the Gentiles as soon as they believed in Him, and Divine truth got into their hearts, water or no water. In ordinary cases God does not visibly *manifest* the pouring out of His Spirit. We do not therefore know when it takes place. We have to take a man's word for it, if he is an adult • if an infant we know he is all right, for God says so John was filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb, but surely it was not because of his faith! There is another "skeleton in the closet" for my opponent, and he is terribly afraid of it. Abraham was justified, regenerated, made a child of God, then the Divine seal was put upon him. The same thing took place in the case of Isaac at eight days old. Adults have first to be made new creatures by faith in Christ, and then visibly sealed. The seal is applied in the case of infants without any faith, proving that they are already in Christ.

This is another "skeleton in the closet." Isaac received the same seal as Abraham and enjoyed the same blessing. Will my opponent deny this? Did the seal mean one thing to Abraham and another thing to Isaac? I say it meant the same thing in both cases. It meant that both belonged to the Lord and that He had a right to put His mark upon them. Will Mr. Harding please tell us where there is a "thus saith the Lord" for teaching that the seal to Abraham meant one thing and the same seal to Isaac another"? He has given us nothing yet but the authority of his own illustrious opinion.

Now, with respect to the olive tree illustration. My opponent interprets the term "natural branches" as referring to the connection between the Jews and Christ "by natural generation." Yet he admits they were "broken off" from that connection by unbelief. That is, the connection resulting from natural generation ceased because of their unbelief! And the Gentiles were "grafted in" by faith in the place of the Jews and became our Lord's natural relatives, and if the Jews continue not in unbelief they will be restored again as our Lord's natural relatives! Well, well, I never knew before that faith and unbelief had anything to do with natural relationships. But my opponent's false theory of interpretation frequently lands him in just such absurdities. The fact is that the olive tree has nothing to do with natural generation, but is a figure of the Jewish Church of which all Jews in their infancy were considered members in a spiritual sense, and so continued until "broken off" by unbelief." This membership was recognized by the seal of circumcision. They knew no other. Now, when the Gentiles are grafted in and become branches of the same olive tree are they not to be sealed also? They were under the old dispensation. All Gentile proselytes to the Jewish Church were sealed with circumcision. Are they not to be sealed under the new dispensation also? If so, with what seal? My opponent admits that Gentiles are not to be circumcised. But he says the Spirit is the seal under this dispensation. Very good. And the gift of the Spirit is called baptism. Water baptism simply makes this visible, hence as the Spirit's baptism is the spiritual seal, so ritual baptism is the symbolic seal. This being the case, baptism answers precisely the same end now that circumcision formerly did. I do not believe that circumcision sealed righteousness to Abraham in its spiritual essence, but only in ceremonial figure. This outward seal was the sign and pledge of it. I believe as much as my opponent does that the Holy Spirit seals us "to the day of redemption;" therefore I do not believe it is done in ritual baptism. I believe baptism is the outward visible

illustration of it. As circumcision was the outward seal and pledge of justification under the old dispensation, so baptism is the outward pledge and seal of justification under the new dispensation, and the outward seal is not the seal itself, it is only the sign of it (see Rom. 4:11). It was not the circumcision of Abraham's flesh, therefore, that regenerated his heart; nor was circumcision a spiritual seal. The real sealing was effected under the old dispensation as well as this by the Holy Spirit. Nor does baptism regenerate the heart; baptism with water only makes the Spirit's operations visible. I hope my opponent will remember to draw a distinction between things that differ; the spiritual reality and the outward shadow of that reality are two things, yet he has put the substance in place of the shadow and the shadow in place of the substance. I pointed this out last night and I hope he will bear it in mind.

He says we give no blessing to children in baptism, except a few drops of water. He has sought to leave the impression on your mind that because he prays for children he is a prayer ahead of us. But we pray for children, too, therefore we give a few drops of water more than he does. And we symbolize the safe condition of the child, and religiously recognize that it is neither a heathen nor a child of the devil. There is no such distinction, as far as their religious condition is concerned, in the case of my opponent's children. They are in the same condition in the eyes of the world as are the children of barbarians and heathens. What does he confer in baptism that we do not, except a good wetting, a burial in water in imitation of a funeral, and often a bad cold and not unfrequently a shroud and coffin. I have just received a letter from a Presbyterian minister in the county of Simcoe who said he had an interview with a gentleman near Ottawa within the last few days who told him that a daughter of one of his neighbors was recently baptized by immersion, took cold and died. I have a book in my possession giving a number of such instances. That is what my opponent gives more than I give, because no one ever heard of any one taking cold from being baptized by sprinkling.

He admits that our doctrine would put every man, woman and child into the Church in a short time. Well, I cannot say as much for his, for it puts every infant and invalid and all, however sincere, who cannot accept this immersion-superstition-dogma, outside the Church, and keeps them there, relegating their souls to the limbo of the un-circumcised.

As for the assumption that infants go to heaven without the mediation of Christ, it is a bald, baseless assumption of his own, without the

first scrap of reason, or Scripture, or common sense to recommend it. Until he gives us something besides his own unsupported *ipse dixit* to support it, it isn't worth a rush. And the very idea of a man's requiring people in a debate to accept his own solitary opinion as evidence is rather cool even for winter weather. He cannot find a child in heaven if he or she has not come there by the blood of the Lamb; he cannot find a scrap of Scripture evidence that any child or human being goes to heaven except through the death of Christ. "No man can come to the Father except by Me." My opponent has prated much about faith, faith, faith. We attach as much importance to faith as he does. He says the Lord does not enjoin any condition on children. They are not capable of complying with conditions. What is faith? It is resting on Christ for the forgiveness of sins, and infants do not require to do so, for they have no sins to forgive. My opponent quotes from Romans, 4th chapter, to show that Abraham was the father of all that believe. True, and circumcision sealed their faith. Yet he says it was a seal of an earthly land property—a huge pile of dirt. He says it did not refer to spiritual blessings at all, it meant nothing but a pile of dirt in Judea. He says the covenant of circumcision was not the one fulfilled in Christ. Then Paul must have been much mistaken. (Compare Rom. 4: 16 with Gen. 17:5.) Either Paul is wrong or Mr. Harding is wrong, and you can pin your faith to which ever of those gentleman you think is best deserving of your belief. It does not matter to me, it matters to you.

You would think, to hear my opponent talk, that it is impossible to admit children into a covenant along with adults except on the same conditions. Or if the conditions should be different, this fact must always be specified when any reference is made to the matter. Yet we have a covenant made with Abraham involving faith as a condition on his part before receiving the seal, and we know that his infant offspring were included and the same seal applied to them and nothing said about conditions of any kind. So, if there is any incongruity about the matter, God is the author of it. And the very same thing may be said about baptism. We know it is the symbol of the same blessing as circumcision, namely, righteousness. "We know that adults are required to believe before receiving it, and we see no greater incongruity about applying it unconditionally to infants than in the case of circumcision. Adults must believe, as I have shown, in order to be justified. Infants are already in a justified state before God and have no need of faith, hence it is not required of them.

He imputes to me the statement that the covenant of circumcision

was not an everlasting covenant. I never uttered such a word. I never dreamed of making such a statement. My argument is based on the fact that it *is* an everlasting covenant and therefore cannot be confined to the land of Judea, because the land of Judea is not everlasting, and the New Testament points us to an "inheritance, incorruptible, undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven." Nothing could be more false than to impute to me the statement that the covenant was not everlasting.

With respect to the word *matheteusate*. He says it means to instruct. Certainly. But when I say, *matheteusate*, go make disciples of, I am simply telling you to go and bring the people into the school where they may be instructed. The law was our instructor or "school master" until Christ came, but when He came we had no need of such a school master any longer. Christ became our teacher according to Divine prophecy concerning the Christian Church, which says that "all her children should be taught of the Lord." Therefore, says Christ, "Take My yoke upon you and *learn of Me*." Bring the nations to Christ and let them learn of Him, is the meaning of the commission. It is not a command confined merely to instruction; it is to bring in the people that they may receive instruction; bring them in by baptism; then "teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." That is the Divine command. Is this to put Mark against Matthew? If he consults the revised Testament—no doubt he knew it—he will find that the passage in Mark, from verse eight to the end, is set off from the rest of the chapter, and constitutes a separate paragraph. He will also find in the margin the statement that all the verses of the chapter after verse eight do not appear in the two oldest Greek MSS. and some other authorities, and that some other authorities have a different ending to the Gospel. Yet my opponent placed the passage which is to be found among these verses against an authority which was never questioned.

He insists on faith, faith, faith. But Mark says, "He that believeth not shall be damned." A baby believes not, and therefore in every sense, according to his own doctrine, he logically damns the babies. They cannot believe, therefore they must go under.

I want to show that the Church of God which was begun in the days of Abraham and sealed with the seal of circumcision is the same to-day as it was then. It is not another institution, but the same institution. It is too often assumed that there is nothing in common between these two dispensations, that everything under the former had been swept away and everything started anew. You would scarcely

suppose that God's people under these two dispensations were as nearly related as forty-second cousins.

With respect to the olive tree: Paul says, "And if some of the branches be broken off and thou being a wild olive tree wert grafted in among them and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree, boast not against the branches. But if thou boast thou barest not the root, but the root thee." That is a perfectly clear illustration of the fact that the Gentile Church is not some new institution, but a continuation of the old Church, grafted on the original stock, Christ being the administrator of this dispensation, Moses and his successors in the Levitical priesthood the administrators of that dispensation. The new covenant was with the House of Israel and the House of Judah. The very same fact is more fully stated in Ephesians 2: 11, 12, "Wherefore remember that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world." But Gentiles and Jews were made one by the blood of Christ, and He hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us. It is needless to multiply proof although I have plenty at hand. It is the same God that established all things from the beginning, the same Christ, "who is over all, God blessed forever," and yet not the same Church? the same Saviour under the old dispensation as under the new, yet not the same Gospel salvation? the same Spirit under the old as under the new, the same doctrines precisely under the old as under the new; the same moral law under the old as under the new; the same design, viz., the regeneration of the heart, preparing man for heaven, under the old as under the new; the same result, the cleansing of the soul, under the old as under the new; the same end, taking man to heaven when he shall die, under the old as under the new; the same heaven promised and believed in and hoped for; the same salvation—all the same, but illustrated to the world in different ways. Yet my opponent would have you believe there is nothing in common between those two institutions. It is the same thing, but under different manifestations. But you see it is the same. So, if I show you the Church of Christ in its infancy and in the bud under the former dispensation, and show you the same Church under the new dispensation in its full bloom, in its manhood and strength, it is the same institution. Because the dispensation is changed and the Divine plan concerning human redemption is more fully unfolded, is it

not, therefore, the same? Is it not the same Divine stream of truth running down through and permeating the whole? and is not that fact illustrated in the prophetic river of Ezekiel that flowed out from under the threshold of the temple? First, the waters were up to the ankles; second, to the knees; third, to the loins; fourth, a river to swim in; fifth, an ocean, spreading out and taking in the whole wide world, "Go into all the world and preach the Gospel to every creature." Not two rivers. The same in its Divine expansiveness, in its all-comprehensiveness. Those who have but feeble intelligence to comprehend, and so but imperfectly understand the Divine purposes, cannot see it in its comprehensiveness. Let me recommend my opponent to come up into the Divine mount with Moses and look out over the promised land, if he cannot enter it, and get a little glimpse of the all-comprehensiveness and harmony and glory and beauty and magnitude of the Divine plan as it is unfolded before all the nations in all its magnificence. Let him behold the Divine superstructure rise like the temple of Solomon without even the sound of any human instrument upon its stones and pillars, a lovely temple of the living God. It seems to me if there is anything under the whole canopy of heaven calculated to impress the unbelieving or skeptical mind with the Divine origin or authenticity of the Christian religion, whatever evil spirit may be manifested by its adherents, it is this great fact that because of the unity, harmony, and superabounding glory of the whole it is manifest that one all-pervading, superintending, infinite mind must have originated, must have supervised the erection of the superstructure, and will do so until the last stone is brought on with shoutings of grace, grace unto it. My opponent's theory, on the other hand, by denying the unity of the plan, destroys the harmony, and detracts from the magnificence of the superstructure, making it fragmentary and to a large extent earthly in its nature and design. Thus instead of spiritualizing the covenant and raising men's thoughts to God, he materializes it and points them to the earth. For my part I prefer the former.

And now let me give a passing glance at a few of my opponent's positions before I resume my seat.

1. He is fond of quoting the fifteenth chapter of Acts to prove that it was the Gentiles only who were exempted from circumcision by the action of "the apostles and elders" in their council at Jerusalem. I want to remind the congregation that at that council Peter distinctly testified that "God put no difference" between the Gentiles and the Jews, "purifying their hearts by faith." "Now, therefore,"

said he, "why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear." Yet my opponent expects to convince you that the Jews are still bearing that yoke, by Divine authority, and must continue to bear it while the world stands; and all this because Paul, to allay the prejudices of certain Jews, on one occasion circumcised a young man who was, by descent, a Greek, and not a Jew; and on another occasion he shaved his head and purified himself, ceremonially, to satisfy the Jews that he was not striving to overthrow circumcision and the law of Moses. (See Acts 21: 20, etc.) Now, if this proves that Paul was still advocating circumcision among the Jews, it equally proves that he was still advocating the Mosaic law, for these two things are coupled together in the account. But the facts are, not that Paul sanctioned the continuance of either, but simply showed to the Jews that he was not seeking to undermine either. His aim was simply to show that the provisions of the Gospel fully met the demands of both. But the blinded minds of those bigoted Jews were not to be enlightened in a day, nor by a single apostolic lesson; therefore, until he could gradually undermine and remove their prejudices, he deemed it better to convince them that he was not an enemy of these old institutions, as they had been told. Now, whenever, in future, my opponent quotes this circumstance in support of circumcision, let him bear in mind that it equally supports the ceremonial law, which he himself will not deny has been abrogated. I hope, therefore, to hear no more nonsense on this subject.

2. Regarding the case of Timothy, my opponent persists in affirming that Paul would not have circumcised him if his mother had not been a Jewess. How does he know? Does Meyer, "the greatest of biblical exegetes," say so? Does Neander, "the prince of Church historians," say so? Does Bledsoe, "the most able, learned, and candid of all the Methodists of the United States," say so?" Where are all the scholars gone in this emergency? And what can my opponent do without the scholars? He can vociferate, only vociferate his empty assertions. It is enough for sensible people that the inspired penman says it was because his father was a Greek. There I rest my cause. The case of Titus was not a parallel case at all. The demand for his circumcision was "because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out Paul's liberty, that they might bring him into bondage. To whom he gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour." (See Gal. 2: 3, etc.) Yet my opponent persistently tries to convey the impression that it was

because there was no Jewish blood in his veins that Paul refused to circumcise him, which is false. But what say the scholars, Bledsoe, Meyer, and Neander? We know what Paul says, and with all intelligent and unprejudiced persons that will suffice.

3. But my friend supposes a case, viz., that if I could find a case of infant baptism seventeen years after the beginning of the Christian dispensation, would not that settle the question? Now, let *me* suppose a case. Suppose baptism had been the seal of the covenant under the old dispensation, and circumcision had been appointed under the new; and suppose the Jews had been so much wedded to baptism as a distinguishing sign that they were very reluctant to relinquish it. And suppose Paul, to allay Jewish prejudice toward a fellow-laborer, had baptized him some seventeen years after the beginning of the Christian dispensation, while at the same time declaring to his countrymen that "if any man is called out of baptism let him not be baptized; that baptism is nothing, and the absence of baptism is nothing, but the keeping of the commandments of God"—that "in Jesus Christ neither baptism availeth anything, nor the want of baptism, but faith, which worketh by love"—that "as many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh they constrain you to be baptized; only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ"—that "I, if I yet preach baptism, why do I yet suffer persecution? then is the offence of the cross ceased;" that "in Christ ye are baptized with the baptism made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the baptism of Christ; having been circumcised with him," etc., would this single case of baptism, under these circumstances, prove that the Jews were to continue to baptize their children through all time, especially if the new rite (circumcision) was transparently for the same purpose, a symbol of the same truth? Surely no one will so argue. Yet this is a parallel case, and my opponent's supposed case doesn't come within forty gun-shots of being parallel. In fact, judging from his efforts thus far, he seems incapable of drawing a parallel. I guess he uses a crooked ruler.

5. With regard to John's baptism not coming in the place of circumcision, I reply that John's baptism, like all ceremonial purifications, belonged to the same dispensation that circumcision did, and, hence, could not be its substitute; while Christian baptism belongs to another dispensation, under which circumcision, as I have shown, is abolished. Hence the difference. But I am ashamed to have to meet such objections.

6. Children, we are told, cannot believe, therefore they cannot be

baptized under the commission. My opponent haggles most persistently over this point. Let me, however, remind him that they cannot confess their sins any more than they can believe. Yet we are told, in Matt. 3: 5, 6, that there "went out to John Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, and were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." Now, on my opponent's principle of reasoning, it is evident either that there were no infants in those parts, else that they "went out" to John, and "were baptized of him in Jordan, confessing their sins." He can impale himself on whichever horn of this dilemma he thinks will be most comfortable. One thing is certain, viz., there is no exception made of children. So, also, of the commission as found in Mark, of which my opponent is so passionately fond; it says, "Go ye into all the world (surely there are infants somewhere in the world), and preach the gospel to *every creature*" (surely infants are creatures, and there is no exception made of them); hence, on the same principle of reasoning, the gospel is to be preached to them. Does my opponent say that this is "silly?" I admit it. But it is exactly of a piece with his own reasoning when he says infants cannot believe, therefore infants cannot be baptized under the commission. Nobody misunderstands such general expressions but those who have an interest in doing so. For a further illustration of the folly of such reasoning I refer my opponent again to the extract from Dr. Wardlaw, given in another speech.

7. The same remarks are pertinent in the case of the covenant referred to by Jeremiah, in which all are to know the Lord, "from the least of them unto the greatest of them." Of course this does not apply to children any more than the passages I have just quoted; nor does that prove, by any means, that children are excluded. But such passages afford a convenient pretext to a forlorn cause to indulge in petty quibbling.

8. My opponent is very much exercised about the diversity of belief between my friend Paterson and myself; but if he will address himself to the reconciliation of the diversities between the different schools of immersionists, he will have his hands full. If diversity on my side proves infant baptism unscriptural, diversity on his side proves immersion unscriptural. But this seems to show on what a small hook he can hang a big quibble.

9. My friend says that Abraham is the father of all who walk in the steps of his faith. Let me remind him that Paul says he is *the father of circumcision to all such*, which means that they, being chil-

dren of the father of circumcision, are themselves accounted as circumcised—"their uncircumcision is counted for circumcision." Rom. 2: 26. This being the case, all who walk in Abraham's steps are entitled to the inheritance of which circumcision was the seal. My opponent says this was the land of Canaan. I say it was righteousness. If he is right, then the only inheritance believers can claim is a few square inches of ground in Judea, for, considering the number of the "heirs," there will be but little for each. But if I am right, then all believers, including their father Abraham, will inherit a heavenly inheritance, of which the land of Canaan was but the imperfect type and pledge. I will let the people judge.

10. Mr. Harding says that to justify is to pardon, to forgive. I admit that when used with reference to sinners it involves this; but in the proper sense of the term it signifies to pronounce just, or innocent in the eyes of the law. We are told in Matt. 11:19 that "wisdom is justified of her children." In Luke 7: 29, that "all the people and the publicans justified God." In 1 Tim. 5: 16, that "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit," etc. But in these, as in other cases, it cannot mean pardoned, but only vindicated, or pronounced just. Hence my opponent cannot prove that infants are incapable of justification, and therefore he cannot prove them incapable of baptism.

11. In one of his speeches he says that God did not promise the land of Canaan to Abraham for himself, but for his seed. In the very next breath he quotes the passage in Gen. 17: 8, where God says, "I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession." So, out of his own mouth he is not justified. God promised Abraham that land just as much as He did his seed, and Abraham did not forfeit it through unbelief, but, with many others of the patriarchs, he "died in faith, not having received the promises;" for God "gave him none inheritance in that land, no, not so much as to set his foot on." (Hob. 11: 13; Acts 7:5.) I argue, therefore, that the land of Canaan was only the visible type and pledge of the inheritance God intended for His people, else His promise to them has failed. Now, my opponent can take whichever side of this question that suits him best. Neither one will relieve his difficulty.

12. I don't know why my opponent persists in representing me as teaching that infants are born again. I teach no such thing. I teach that they are, by virtue of the atonement, in the same moral and spiritual condition, without either faith or repentance, as adult believers are brought into by faith. But I, as fully as he, believe in

the necessity of regeneration in the case of every human being who is a moral agent; but I do not believe it can take place in any soul until it is conscious of the motions of evil in itself and capable of exercising a personal trust in Christ. Moral agents are dealt with on a different principle, under the divine economy, from unconscious infants. The atonement is imputed unconditionally to the latter—conditionally to the former. Hence, when an infant attains to accountability it ceases to enjoy the benefits of the atonement without its personal acceptance of the same. Prior to this it is justified, or guiltless (not pardoned), in the eyes of the law, and this is what I mean by its being justified and pure. Nor can any infant, born under the economy of grace, be in danger of hell-fire. Now let us hear no more twaddle on this point.

13. My opponent is right, no doubt, that there is no good thing that a man can do that is not taught, directly, or indirectly, in the Bible. Hence the man who pulled his neighbor out of the well found an *indirect* command for it. On the same principle, precisely, we baptize infants. But our opponents are not satisfied with the inferential command, and so demand a direct one. According to their own principle, however, they must justify female communion, the change of the Sabbath, family prayer, and a great many other good things, by inference.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. HARDING'S NINTH REPLY.

Mr. Wilkinson says he is "not going to haggle any more about the authorities." Well, if he could find one inspired author who makes a favorable mention of infant baptism, that would be enough. But it is a fact—and the fact is ruinous to his cause—that he cannot find any mention of it at all, by an inspired man, either favorable or unfavorable. And just here I have not one, but hundreds, of the most learned of Paedo-baptists agreeing with me; that is, learned Paedo-baptists generally grant that no express mention of infant baptism can be found in the Bible: they agree that there is no command to baptize infants, and that there is no example of an infant's being baptized in the entire Bible. I think a religious ordinance is in a

bad way when its most learned supporters freely grant that it does not appear that any inspired man ever commanded it, or ever gave an example of it by practicing it himself. If infant baptism was commanded or practiced in the days of inspiration, it does not appear—it is not shown by the divine records.

But just here these learned Paedo-baptists begin to divide: some of them say that while the rite is not taught by command, nor by example, in the Scriptures, it can be deduced from them by a logical inference, and that it was doubtless practiced in New Testament times; while others of them boldly affirm that it is of post-apostolic origin, an institution of the Church that arose after the days of inspiration. Not one man, as Mr. Wilkinson would intimate, but many, with Neander and Meyer heading the list, belong to this latter class; some of whom, it is proper to remark, are affected with the Roman Catholic idea that the Church has the right to make or change ordinances as she needs them.

Of the former class—that is, of those who hold that the rite can be drawn from the Scriptures by a necessary inference—it can be truly said that they are in the most inextricable confusion; there is not a single argument, or passage, upon which they agree as teaching their practice. Some of them, like Mr. Wilkinson, appeal to the argument from circumcision; others of them say this has nothing to do with infant baptism; and others still, Dr. Stuart for instance, say, "The covenant of circumcision furnishes no ground for infant baptism," that men are "unwary" who so argue from it, and that "numberless difficulties" present themselves in their way as soon as they begin to do it. Some depend upon the commission, while others say there is nothing in this document in favor of the practice; some depend upon the households, while others shake their heads sadly and turn away from them; and so on to the end; they agree about not one single passage; one man shouts, "Here is the passage that teaches infant baptism by a necessary inference;" his brethren rush about him, look eagerly at the place, and then mournfully say, "We cannot see it." Why is all this? Why cannot these men, who want to sustain this ceremony, agree about a passage upon which to depend? Simply because it is not taught anywhere in the Bible; for, if it were, they could all see it and agree.

In order that you may see the unfortunate plight in which these Paedo-baptists are, my friends, I ask you to consider the following supposition: Suppose immersionists were divided into two parties, one holding that immersion is of post apostolic origin, an institution of

the Church; the other, that it is of Divine institution; suppose this latter party should very generally grant that there is neither command nor example for immersion in the Bible, but that it is taught by inference only; suppose the party should be very much divided in itself so that it could not agree upon any one passage, or argument, as teaching the rite; and suppose, finally, it could be shown that the first mention of immersion for baptism was made one hundred years after the death of the last apostle, by a man who opposed it; do you not think that we immersionists would be in a bad way, under such circumstances? Well, Paedo-baptists are exactly in that case with their infant baptism.

Mr. Wilkinson talks a good deal about the "two parts" of his proposition; he is to show (1) that infant baptism is of Divine authority, and (2) that it has been practiced from apostolic times. Well, I don't care anything about the second part of his proposition; it matters not to me whether it has been practiced from apostolic times or not; if it is of Divine authority it ought to be practiced now; if it is not, it ought to be given up now, even though it had been observed from the times of the apostles. Does God require it? Did Christ and the apostles observe it? If God did require it, *He did it without mentioning it; and not a trace, of it can be found in the sayings of Christ, or in the writings of the apostles.* Let Mr. Wilkinson show that the rite was given to us by the Lord, and I will freely grant the second part of his proposition. But as long as he can not find any reference to it whatever, by the Lord or by anyone else, till the time of Tertullian, I will be constrained to believe that it began to be practiced about that time, and that the Lord was no more the author of it than He was of infant communion, which began about the same time.

Mr. Wilkinson switches off the track again and discusses the question of the Spirit's work in conversion—a matter that he no more understands than he does the Bible doctrine concerning baptism. He represents me as saying, "There is not a case of conversion before baptism recorded in the Bible, except that of Cornelius, and that was a miracle." I said no such thing. No man who knows what conversion is could say such a thing. What I did say, and what is true, is this: Since Christ ascended on high there has not been a case in which the Spirit was received before baptism, except one—that of Cornelius and his friends—who received a miraculous outpouring of the Spirit, by which they were enabled to speak with tongues, as did the apostles at the beginning. The gospel rule is, that the Spirit is

received after baptism; and to this rule the case at the house of Cornelius is the only exception. Conversion consists (1) in believing with the heart that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, (2) in repenting of one's sins, (3) and in being baptized upon a confession of this faith of the heart into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Then God forgives and imparts His Holy Spirit. Pardon and the gift of the Spirit are not parts of conversion at all; they are consequents that immediately follow it. In this connection I want to introduce two statements bearing upon this point, which were made by Peter at different times and to different audiences to which he had just preached. The first is this; "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ unto the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts 2: 38, Revised Version.) Here we have: (1) Repentance; (2) Baptism; (3) Pardon; (4) The gift of the Spirit. The connection shows these people were already believers.

The second passage is this: "Repent ye, therefore, and turn again, that your sins may be blotted out, that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord." (Acts 3: 19.) Here the order is: (1) Repentance; (2) Turning; (3) The blotting out of sins; (4) The seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord. After the repentance comes the baptism (turning), and then the gift of the Spirit (the seasons of refreshing). This is the great gospel rule, to which, as I have said, there is but the one exception. Mr. Wilkinson teaches that the Holy Spirit operates immediately upon the sinner's heart in his conversion. I deny it. We will continue this debate for two or three days longer and discuss that proposition, if he says so. I challenge him to meet me here on Monday to debate that proposition. Moreover, I agree to the conditions which he specified the other day—to every one of them.* I will debate with him whether any Church will endorse him or not • and not one will do it, for his brethren have already said in your hearing that their Churches do not feel the need of engaging in debates; that they think such debates do no good, or words to that effect. And they are right, too, in one sense; they do *their cause* no good. I have now accepted his conditions. (*Addressing*

* NOTE.—On the clay alluded to, Mr. Wilkinson had publicly said that he would not debate with Mr. Harding again, unless it should be agreed that the books used by each party should be open to the inspection of the other during the intermissions; that rules of order and decorum should be agreed upon; and that personalities should be avoided. To these conditions Mr. Harding at once agreed.

Mr. Wilkinson): Will you meet me on Monday and debate that proposition for two or three days?

Mr. WILKINSON—No bravado in that?

Mr. HARDING—NO; I mean business.

Mr. WILKINSON—I thought you agreed to drop bravado.

Mr. HARDING—I thought you came here to debate for two weeks, or three, or for three months, if necessary, (so you said in your first speech.) He twists and squirms, you see, my friends. I told you that you would see who would be the readiest for this discussion to go on. He does not want it to go on, and he knows well that his friends do not.

Mr. Wilkinson thinks it is terrible that conversion is invariably brought about through human agency. Well, it is a fact, no matter how dreadful it may seem to him. "The Lord Jesus has got to send for Mr. Harding before He can convert a man," he exclaims. Yes, it is true that the Lord does always use a preacher when He wants to convert anybody. When He wanted to convert the eunuch, He sent Philip to him; when He wanted to convert Lydia, He sent Paul to her; when He wanted to convert Cornelius, He sent Peter to him. Paul said (2 Cor. 5:18), God "hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation." Was there ever a conversion without faith? Was there over faith without a preacher? Hear Paul's answer: "How then shall they call on Him in whom they have not believed? and how shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher?" (Horn. 10:14.) Then in the 17th verse he says: "So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." So, we see, there was never a conversion without faith, and never faith without a preacher.

Mr. Wilkinson has been telling us all the time that baptism is the seal of the covenant, and that as infants are in the covenant they should receive the seal. Put when I showed him that the gift of the Spirit is the seal of the covenant, that we are sealed by the Spirit, he promptly informs us that the Holy Spirit is the inward, spiritual seal, while baptism is the outward, visible manifestation of it. Now, anybody who has even a very slight knowledge of the New Testament ought to know that is not so; for, under the Christian dispensation, the Spirit is invariably given *after baptism*, with but the one exception mentioned. See the case of Jesus (Matt. 3: 1(5)); of the apostles (Acts 2: *i*), of the three thousand (Acts 2: 38); of the Samaritans (Acts 8 . 14 17); of the twelve men of Ephesus (Acts 19:1-7); and so on. Of course baptism could not be "an outward sign of an

inward grace," when the "inward grace" did not yet exist—when the Spirit had not yet been given.

Again, the Spirit, without a single exception, was given to believers. Now, if baptism is the outward sign of the indwelling Spirit, it, too, must be given to believers only. Consider the following passages:

"If any man thirst, let him come to Me and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive." (John 7: 37-39.)

Paul says to the Ephesians: "In whom ye trusted, after that ye heard the word of truth, the gospel of your salvation; in whom also after that ye believed ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise." (Eph. 1: 13).

So you see they received the Spirit—were sealed by it—after they believed. And, of course, if baptism is the outward sign of that inward work, it, too, must take place after faith. Mr. Wilkinson, in striving to get out of one tangle, has gotten into another equally as bad—"out of the frying-pan into the tire."

But did not the angel prophesy that John would be tilled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb? Yes; but had that been true of children in general, he would no more have prophesied it of John than he would that he was to have ten fingers and two ears. The fact is, John was the greatest of all the prophets; he was marvelously and miraculously endowed from his mother's womb, and that is what Gabriel foretold.

Just here Mr. Wilkinson left the subject again to tell us that he has a letter from a Presbyterian minister, who said he had an interview with a gentleman, who said he had a neighbor, who had a daughter, who was immersed recently, and took cold, and died. Just so; I have heard just such yarns as that before. Somebody said, that somebody told him, that somebody had heard, that somebody was killed by being immersed; but I have never yet been able to come to the exact place where it happened. (Though I have been at the exact place where a Methodist preacher's wife died just after "shouting.") Perhaps the lady was baptized—very likely—perhaps she died; but that her death was a result of the baptism I do not believe; and it would take a little more direct and specific testimony than has been given to convince me. But suppose it were true, what then? Did you never hear of people dying, in ancient times, for Christ? If Jesus tells us to do anything, must we not do it, even if it kills us? In such

a case, to die is gain. But I don't believe the statement is true—not a word of it. But if it were true, it would not in the least affect the case; for if Jesus commands us to be immersed (and I have shown you that He does), we must be, even if it kills us,

Mr. Wilkinson intimates that, as circumcision was given to Abraham as "a seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had, yet being uncircumcised," whereas it was given to Isaac while yet an infant, that it was designed to be an outward sign of the inward work of the Spirit, a work which he tells us is wrought in the heart of the adult *only when he believes*, but one which is wrought in all infants: then he adds that baptism has now taken the place of circumcision, and hence should be so applied (that is, to adult believers and to all infants). The heart of his theory—the very sum and substance of it—is this: circumcision was given as a sign of inward purity; but baptism has taken its place, and therefore it should be given to the pure. This argument is false in both premises: circumcision was not a sign of inward purity to the descendants of Abraham; baptism has not taken its place. Abraham was circumcised; so was Ishmael, his thirteen-year old boy; so were all the males that had been born in his house, or that had been bought with his money, in the self-same day. (See Gen. 17: 23.) And from that time on adults were circumcised, whether believers or unbelievers, whether good or bad, if born in the house or bought with the money of a Jew. Mr. Wilkinson's argument would be excellent were it not that both premises, and the conclusion, are false.

Now, concerning that olive tree argument for the perpetuity of the Church. Mr. Wilkinson claims that the Church of Christ began in the days of Abraham, and has been continued till now. He so concludes from the allegory of the olive tree. Here again facts, unmistakable facts, flatly contradict this theory. Nicodemus was "a ruler of the Jews," "a master of Israel," a leader in the Jewish commonwealth, circumcised according to the Mosaic law; nevertheless, Jesus said to him, "Ye must be born again." He told him plainly, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John 3:5.) That is, one of the most eminent in the Jewish Church was told that he must be born again in order to enter the Church of Christ. He had gotten into the one by a natural birth, but it required a spiritual birth to bring him into the other. Hence we find, all through the Christian dispensation, that the Gospel was preached to the Jew first as it was to the Gentile, and the two parties were received into the Church in precisely the same way.

Paul says (Gal. 3:24, R. V.), "The law hath been our tutor to bring us unto Christ." The Jews were in a preparatory school; but when Christ came they were invited to leave that school, and, with the Gentiles, to enter the school of the great Master, the Church of God. Some Jews, and many Gentiles, did enter the school by being "born again," by becoming new creatures.

Mr. Wilkinson says I impute to him the statement, "that the covenant of circumcision was not an everlasting covenant." I did no such thing. He is mistaken. But I did understand him to deny that God promised to Abraham the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession. He argued that the land would be destroyed, and hence it could not be an everlasting possession. As usual, Mr. Wilkinson's argument is a direct contradiction of the Word of God. God says, "I will give unto thee, and thy seed after thee, the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God." (Gen. 17:8.) It is a statement of the Lord against one of Mr. Wilkinson; weigh them in the balance, and take your choice, my friends. The Jews are not now dwelling upon their land, because they broke the contract, and God dispersed them. When they turn to the Lord, no doubt they will be restored to their place.

Mr. Wilkinson conies to the commission as recorded by Matthew. He comments on the word *matheteuo* (which means to teach, to make disciples of) thus: "When I say, *matheteusate*, go make disciples of, I am simply telling you to go and bring the people into the school where they may be instructed "Just so; but what did Christ mean when He said it? That is what we are concerned about; not about Mr. Wilkinson's meaning when he says it. By *matheteusate*, Jesus meant to preach the Gospel and make believers; so Mark understood Him. Where Matthew says, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them," etc., Mark says, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," etc. According to Mark's understanding of the matter, to make a disciple of one is to produce faith in him by preaching to him. I take him to be a much better authority than Mr. Wilkinson. I don't put Mark against Matthew, as my opponent expresses it, but Mark against Mr. Wilkinson. The fundamental idea in *matheteuo* is to teach; and Mark explains that that teaching is done by preaching the Gospel.

Mr. Wilkinson feels the force of all this; he knows that if Mark's testimony remains unimpeached, preaching and faith come before baptism, that they are implied in the command, "Go, make disciples."

Hence he attacks that passage from Mark. True, there was a doubt in the mind of the revisers about it, *but the doubt had reference to its authorship, not to its inspiration*. I will bring here to-night the *Companion to the Revised Version*, a work gotten out by one of the revisers, to prove this statement. They doubted whether Mark wrote the last few verses of his gospel, or whether they were written by some other inspired man; but they did not doubt their inspiration. The Christian scholarship of the world is divided as to who wrote the letter to the Hebrews, but they are united as to its inspiration. It is a well-known fact that Moses did not write the latter part of Deuteronomy, since the last chapter gives an account of his death, and of the mourning for him; but none deny the right of that chapter to a place in the inspired canon of Scripture.

But the very best proof in the world that the commission as given by Mark is correct is this: *The work of the apostles and evangelists in establishing the Church was in perfect accordance with it*. The commands of the commission, as Mark gives them, are these: (1) Go; (2) Preach the gospel; (3) Baptize the believers. On the day of Pentecost the apostles preached; 3,000 gladly received the word and were baptized; Philip *went* to Samaria, *preached* Christ unto them, and, when they *believed* the preaching, he baptized them, both men and women; Peter *went* to Cornelius, *preached* Christ to him, and, when he *believed*, *baptized* him; Philip *went* to the eunuch, *preached* Christ to him, and, when he *believed*, *baptized* him. So the practice of these first preachers demonstrates Mark's record of the commission to be correct.

But Mr. Wilkinson argues that as Mark says, "He that believeth not shall be damned," according to my doctrine, infants are logically damned. Not so; according to my doctrine the commission has nothing to do with infants. It is for those who can hear, understand, believe and obey; who are sinners that need to be saved. But as Mr. Wilkinson claims that infants are under the commission, his doctrine logically damns them, without doubt. Certainly all who come under the commission are damned if they believe not.

Mr. Wilkinson grants that his doctrine of infant baptism, if it should prevail, would soon bring every man, woman, and child in the world into his Church. And a nice (?) Church it would be, with all the murderers, whoremongers, liars and thieves in the world in it! Think of the millions of Greek infants that are immersed, of the millions of Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Presbyterian and Methodist babies that are sprinkled. Think how few of these prove to be God-

fearing men and women. What a mass of corrupt flesh they have in their Churches!

Did Christ ever institute such a miserable rite? Never. Did the apostles ever practice such a one? No. It is an outgrowth of superstition and ignorance, which began to be adopted to save the little ones from hell; it has resulted in evil, and only evil; and it can only be defended by perversion of the word of God, and distortion of the facts of history. I have known a man to argue that infants are believers in order to show that they ought to be baptized.

[*Time expired.*]

ADDENDA.

In preparing our speeches for the book, I saw Mr. Wilkinson's Ninth Speech *in printed proof sheets*, and then corrected and sent in my Ninth Reply. After my reply had been thus prepared and sent in to the printer, Mr. Wilkinson added about four and a half pages to his address. Beginning on page 334 with the words, "And now let me give a passing glance," etc., all from that to the end was added after my reply was given to the printer. To the thirteen paragraphs added I desire to make as brief a reply as possible here.

1. In this first added paragraph Mr. Wilkinson grants that Paul did practice circumcision after the beginning of the Christian dispensation, and did convince the Jews that he was not an enemy to the practice. But he wants us to believe that Paul and James knew all the time that it was wrong—that baptism had taken the place of circumcision—but that they pretended that it was right, and practiced it, merely to gratify blinded Jewish bigots. That is, he has Paul and James teaching and practicing a lie, until they can educate the people up to receive the truth. Mr. Wilkinson, with his regard for the truth, may believe that; I cannot. Paul did right in circumcising Timothy; he did right in convincing those Jews that it was proper for Jewish Christians to circumcise their children; he did right in purifying himself with those four men, in shaving his head, and in entering into the temple with them. When we find the teaching and practice of one apostle approved by another and condemned by none, surely we must receive it. If Mr. Wilkinson could establish his

position that Paul and James were here teaching and acting a lie, he would go far towards overthrowing all faith in the Bible; for what could we then believe? Little did I imagine when I started out to discuss infant baptism, that it would be necessary for me to defend the sincerity and truthfulness of two apostles of the Lord against the attack of Mr. Wilkinson. But the necessities of his cause force him to make the attack; for if Paul and James were sincere and true, then circumcision continued to be practiced by the will of the Lord; baptism did not take its place; and hence Mr. Wilkinson's chief argument is worthless.

2. Now just a word in reply to the second paragraph, concerning the cases of Timothy and Titus. Timothy's mother was a Jewess; his father was a Greek. Titus was a Greek. (See Gal. 2: 3.) The Jews demanded the circumcision of these two men. (See Acts 16: 1-3, and Gal. 2: 1-5.) Paul granted their wishes concerning him in whom was Jewish blood; he circumcised Timothy; but he resolutely refused to allow the Greek Titus to be circumcised. Intelligent people will have no trouble in drawing a conclusion from these facts. Concerning the circumcision of Timothy, Mr. Wilkinson says that "The inspired penman says it was because his father was a Greek." The inspired penman says no such thing. The statement is untrue. The passage in Acts just referred to (Acts 16: 1-3) shows exactly what he did say.

3. The passage "If ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing," (Gal. 5: 2,) and all such like ones, were addressed to Gentiles, it is certain Paul would not have circumcised Timothy had he known that in so doing he was cutting him off from Christ.

A question for Mr. Wilkinson: "I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law," says Paul. Mr. Wilkinson says that baptism has taken the place of circumcision, that it is "for the same purpose, a symbol of the same truth." Why, then, is not he that is baptized a debtor to do the whole law? By circumcision Gentiles would have been obligated to keep the whole law, but Mr. Wilkinson tells us that baptism has taken its place, and is for the same purpose.

5. (4, it should have been.) In this paragraph Mr. Wilkinson admits that John's baptism did not come in the room of circumcision, but that his baptism and circumcision belonged to the same dispensation, and were practiced concurrently. So Mr. Wilkinson admits that infant baptism was not practiced during the time of Christ at all; that both circumcision and baptism were given to the same individuals during the life of Christ on earth. Certainly we are

narrowing the ground down considerably. Is it not reasonable to suppose that if the apostles had thought that Christian baptism came in the room of any rite of the old dispensation, they would naturally have concluded that it came in the stead of John's baptism rather than of circumcision? A moment's reflection will convince any unprejudiced man that they would.

If John's baptism, by which Jesus and the twelve apostles were baptized, and by which they baptized thousands during the life of Christ, did not come in the room of circumcision, and Christian baptism did, is it not strange that some statement, clear and distinct, was not made by which they and we might know the fact? No such statement has been made; as we have shown you, some of Mr. Wilkinson's most distinguished brethren do not believe that the one is in the room of the other at all.

6 and 7. If there is any sense in these paragraphs I have not been able to discover it.

8. If it were true that immersionists do not agree about any passage, any argument, nor any fact of history, as sustaining their practice, then I would freely grant that their practice is in a bad way. But such is not the case: they agree that *baptizo* means to immerse; that it does not mean to sprinkle; that the facts that in the New Testament baptisms were performed in rivers, where there was much water; that they went down into the water, and came up out of the water; that they were buried in baptism, and had their bodies washed with pure water, all unmistakably indicate immersion.

But those who favor infant baptism agree about nothing; there is not a passage, nor an argument, nor a fact of history, that some rely on, that others do not deem insufficient and unsatisfactory. The difference between Messrs. Paterson and Wilkinson is an illustration of this; both argue from the covenant of circumcision, but the one will baptize (*rantize*) a child only when it has a believing parent; whereas the other will administer the rite to any infant. If the argument from circumcision is so clear, as they would have us think, it is strange they cannot see it alike. Paterson says: Baptism is in the room of circumcision; therefore children of believing parents should be baptized. Wilkinson says: Baptism is in the room of circumcision; therefore all children should be baptized, whether they have believing parents or not. While Stuart, a much greater Paedobaptist than either one of them, says: "The covenant of circumcision furnishes no ground for infant baptism." (Lecture on Galatians). And there is no doubt, in the minds of all intelligent, unprejudiced people who have looked into the matter, but that Stuart is right.

9. All who become children of Abraham by faith, and who hold out faithful unto death, will certainly have an inheritance in the city of God, which will come down out of heaven to earth, that God may dwell with men; and all infants that die in infancy shall have a place there. But all this has nothing whatever to do with our question.

10. Christian baptism is not for the just; it is "for the remission of sins."

11. This paragraph has nothing to do with the question under consideration.

12. In this paragraph Mr. Wilkinson says: "I don't know why my opponent persists in representing me as teaching that infants are born again. I teach no such thing." In his sixth speech, on page 271, near the bottom of the page, he says: "I therefore infer from my opponent's own premises that little children belong to the Church, are born again, and therefore Abraham's spiritual seed." Who can have any confidence in a man who will thus contradict himself? In one place he teaches that the little ones are members of the Church, are Abraham's spiritual seed, *are born again*; and then, a little further on, he flatly denies that he teaches that they are born again. What a miserable doctrine it must be that will thus force a man into such inconsistencies and contradictions! How much better it would be for him if he would just believe and teach the truth! I have never yet met a Paedo-baptist in a public discussion who was not forced into such contradictions and misrepresentations. The trouble is in their cause,

13. If Mr. Wilkinson could show that infant baptism is taught in the Bible, in any way, by command, or example, or necessary inference, I would gladly receive it. His opponents do not demand an express command, as he says; they will be content if he can find it taught in any way in the Bible. But he cannot even convince his own people that it is taught there.

J. A. H.

SIXTH DAY—EVENING.

MR. WILKINSON'S TENTH SPEECH.

I might spend considerable time in dwelling on the details of my opponent's reply, but as this subject is by this time well understood by this congregation, I will speak but briefly in reviewing his last speech. In fact, I find very little in it which I desire to review, and much of it had no bearing whatever on the question at issue.

As to the quotations from authorities with respect to the practice of immersion after the apostolic age, I have admitted the existence of the practice very soon after the days of the apostles, hence he has been frittering his time in constructing and demolishing another man of straw. No doubt it is very pleasant pastime for him in the absence of more profitable employment.

I never charged him with quoting Moses Stuart to misrepresent the case in regard to the post-apostolic practice; but what I did accuse him with doing was that of quoting Dr. Stuart's explanation of the classical meaning of *bapto* and *baptizo* as dip, plunge and immerse, but failing to tell you that Stuart, like all Paedo-baptist authorities, explained that it did not mean that in the New Testament, and that we *do* obey the word of God by baptizing people by affusion and sprinkling. That is the position of Moses Stuart, and Mr. Harding never touched that point, but left the impression that the definition he quoted from Stuart was that of Christian baptism.

My friend is very much exercised about the disagreement of Paedo-baptists, but if he will be so kind as to show the weakness of my arguments, and leave Paedo-baptists to reconcile their own differences, he will be doing much better service to his own cause. Besides, he knows full well, that with very rare exceptions Paedo-baptist scholars are a unit in believing and teaching, as I do, that baptism occupies the same place under the new dispensation that circumcision did under the old, being the New Testament seal of the covenant of grace, and that so sure as circumcision was administered to infants under the former dispensation, so sure must baptism be administered to them under this. Nor has he succeeded, with all his sophistry, in

overthrowing this position. The fact that, perhaps, one Paedo-baptist in a million thinks otherwise, by no means affects the validity of this position. A far greater proportion of Paedo-baptists imagine that immersion was the apostolic mode of baptism, but they are generally pitied by their brethren for their simplicity. Besides, the position of nearly all the early fathers of the Church is identical with my own. Justin Martyr, one of the oldest and most reliable of the Christian fathers, in speaking of baptism and circumcision unites them together as the same thing at the beginning of the post-apostolic age. Not only Justin Martyr, but St. Basil, who lived from 327 to 379 A. D., testifies to the same effect. Chrysostom testified to the same effect. We have also the testimony of Gregory, Origen and others, who, with one accord, recognized and acknowledged the doctrine which I have been teaching, viz., that baptism in the early post-apostolic Church was recognized everywhere as having come in the place of, and as a substitute for, the rite of circumcision. I am not aware that there was a single opponent of this view in the early post-apostolic Church. I think those early fathers who lived in the immediate neighborhood of the time of the apostles, and certainly knew what the sentiments of the Church were in those days, must have had a better understanding of that matter than we can possibly have after the lapse of 1800 years, and consequently must be better witnesses than we are, or can be in this day; and they with one accord recognized the fact I have stated.

With respect to the 16th chapter of Mark, I said the revisers stated that the latter part of the chapter was not to be found in some of the most ancient MSS. In reply my opponent said that he would bring an explanation by one of the revisers, and read it to-night. I will read to you, in anticipation of what may be read to-night on the other side, the note in the Revised Testament:

"The two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities, omit from verse 9 to the end. Some other authorities have a different ending to the gospel."

My opponent has therefore based his argument on a portion of Scripture not to be found in the oldest and best MSS.

Having made these brief references to his statements, I will now pass hurriedly on to give some of the reasons why the outward form of the seal was changed. I have shown that the seal itself was not changed—I claim that most distinctly—but the mere outward form of the seal was changed, because a change of dispensation had taken place and it was necessary that there should be a change in the outward

form of the seal in order to agree with the genius of the dispensation to which that seal belonged.

Why the seal was changed. I cannot enter too minutely into this question, but may assign some reasons that have been suggested to my own mind.

1. Circumcision was adapted to only one sex. We are not called upon to prove why God selected a rite of only partial application to designate membership among His ancient people,¹ but we know that such was the fact. Nor can we show on what ground, ritually, females claimed Church membership. There was certainly no initiatory ordinance, yet they certainly were recognized as Church members and enjoyed all the privileges of such. It is conjectured that ablutions and sacrifices served them instead of circumcision, and also "that they were considered as being completely represented in the man." This is a subject, however, on which I cannot enlarge in a promiscuous audience.

2. The present dispensation is pre-eminently the dispensation of the Spirit. Under the old dispensation spiritual influences were enjoyed, and circumcision denoted spiritual operations, even the purification of the heart through faith; yet this idea was not then so conspicuous in fact, therefore it was not made so conspicuous in the initiatory ordinance. But when the gift of the Spirit became the conspicuous and distinguishing feature of the divine administration, and pre-eminently the seal of the covenant whereby we are "sealed unto the day of redemption," circumcision as a seal became inappropriate, and some thing more distinctly and clearly symbolic of spiritual influences was required, hence the introduction of water baptism in palpable fulfillment of the prophecies: "So shall He sprinkle many nations," "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean;" "I will pour water upon him that is thirsty, and floods upon the dry ground," etc., which, although doubtless referring to the effusion of the Spirit under the similitude of water, evidently also allude to the symbol itself in the fact, as well as the mode, of its application.

3. Circumcision also denoted purity of heart, as intimated, but was certainly not so suggestive of this, nor so significant as the use of water. Besides, heart purity is the distinguishing object of the entire scheme of redemption. It was for this that Christ shed His blood, that He might "redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto Himself a peculiar people," etc. To this great fact multitudes of prophecies point, and this is the burden of the New Testament teachings, and the grand design of the giving of the Holy Ghost. It was meet, there-

fore, that a sign should be employed under this dispensation more distinctly indicative of the purifying influences of the blood of Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. No element in nature is better adapted to this end than water, as it is, pre-eminently, the uniform and universal element employed for purposes of cleansing. Hence the propriety of such a change in the ordinance as to substitute baptism for circumcision,

4. Another probable reason for a change in this rite was the severe and painful nature of the operation in connection with circumcision. It was appropriate under a dispensation where men must be constantly reminded that the putting away of sin could only be effected by suffering, and the shedding of blood, but since "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ," through the shedding of His blood once for all, such a rite would be inappropriate—such a seal would be an anomaly, hence the substitution of a milder and more appropriate seal, if we exclude the dipping-in-cold-weather process.

5. The Holy Ghost being "not yet given" under the old dispensation, and many never having heard that there was any Holy Ghost, and Jesus Christ not having come into the world, and people's views concerning Him being very vague, it would have been exceedingly unintelligible to administer religious ordinances in the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost, accordingly no such formula was used in connection with any religious observance under the old dispensation. But when the names of the Son and Holy Ghost became, and were intended to become, so common under the dispensation of the Gospel, and when the manifestation of the Divine character and personality was so clear and complete, it was fitting that the names of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost should be made prominent in connection with all religious teachings and observances. Accordingly, at the inauguration of the New Dispensation the Church's Divine Lord commissioned his ambassadors to baptize, or seal, all who entered into covenant with Himself, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

6. Still another ground of necessity for a change in the seal of the covenant was the fact that this seal had been so long in vogue among the Jews that they had erroneously come to regard it as a kind of badge of distinction, and gloried in it, calling themselves "the circumcision," by way of pre-eminence, and all others "The Uncircumcision;" and this, on the other hand, had begotten a prejudice to this so-called Jewish badge on the part of the Gentiles, who had no love either for Jews, or Jewish peculiarities. To remove a stumbling-

block, therefore, out of the way of the Gentiles, and afford no ground for Jewish arrogance, or seeming superiority, this national badge is taken away, and another, a badge, too, that had been applied to the Gentile proselytes to Judaism, is substituted for it. And, doubtless, one reason why so little was said about the identity of these two rites in the New Testament, was to avoid prejudice on the part of the Gentiles, and to prevent arrogance and pride on the part of the Jews. But,

7. The long association of circumcision with the ceremonial law had no doubt tended to identify it with the ceremonial observances in the Jewish mind, and now that that law was to be abolished, it was inexpedient that anything should be retained that would serve as an excuse for the Jews to cling to those observances. As the sequel proved, there was a very strong and almost insurmountable tendency on the part of the Jews to do this. It would therefore seem imperative that nothing should be associated with the Gospel rites that would justify or encourage this tendency. To this end circumcision must be swept away. Besides,

8. Circumcision had reference to the covenant in which a Messiah is promised, involving faith in the promise of His coming. When He had come, however, it became inappropriate, and must be succeeded by one involving a believing acceptance of the Saviour who had already appeared.

For these and other reasons it was manifestly expedient and highly proper that the seal of the New Covenant should differ from that of the Old, in form at least, as all must admit. But it was certainly not expedient that the New Covenant should have no initiatory seal, since this would be a strange anomaly in the Divine economy of redemption. Hence the substitution of a new seal when the dispensation of the covenant was changed. To all unprejudiced minds these reasons will, doubtless, be considered as ample to justify the change of seal for which I plead.

And now I will specify a few presumptions that infant baptism was practiced at the beginning of the Gospel dispensation.

1. It would, unquestionably, have been a great grievance to the Jews, who had long been taught to regard their children as heirs of covenant blessings, to have those children now excluded from the covenant. And I opine that it would have been a moral impossibility for any covenant that did not include their children to have been foisted upon that people without strenuous opposition and bitter murmurings. But, on the supposition that such was the case, viz.,

that infants were excluded from the covenant, is it not passing strange, nay altogether unaccountable, that not a murmur of dissatisfaction is ever heard from any Jew concerning the hardship of having his children left out of the provisions of this covenant, and no recognition of their rights and privileges given in the initiatory seal? Nor do we ever hear one word of explanation from any apostle, or from the Master himself, as to why children sustain any different relation to the covenant from what they did under the former economy, but the very reverse, as we shall presently show.

2. If it were intended that children should not be recognized under the new dispensation, as they were under the old, by any visible rite, certainly we have reason to suppose that some mention would be made of the fact. Such a change in the administration would be a vital one, and could not take place without some specific injunction to that effect, especially as the covenant remained unchanged in essence, as we have shown. Now, to illustrate. Suppose that before Confederation in this Dominion there had been a law in force in Upper Canada securing certain rights and privileges to the Indians of this Province, and suppose that in the Act of Confederation no mention had been made either of the Indians or of their rights, would any one suppose that the mere absence of any mention of them would disinherit them, or deprive them of those rights? Or would it not rather be supposed that in the absence of any mention of the Indians in the Act of Confederation, it was tacitly understood that they were to enjoy the same privileges as they did before Confederation, and that as no change was to be effected in regard to them it was considered unnecessary to make any stipulations? I leave it for this intelligent congregation to determine. And suppose that, instead of the Indians, it was the children of the natural born citizens to which certain rights and privileges were secured by some law of entail in the Statutes of Upper Canada; if nothing were expressly stipulated in the terms of Confederation canceling those rights, or repealing that law of entail, would not all natural born citizens of Upper Canada claim for their children the same rights and privileges under Confederation, by virtue of this law of entail? And no court of justice under heaven could deny them those rights, and no sane man would think of doing so. And would it not be a strange piece of legislation if our statesmen, at the time of Confederation, had enumerated the several laws that they did not intend to repeal, and written after each one, "No change to be made in this law?" And would it not be a stranger proceeding for any intelligent citizen to put

up the plea that all laws not so re-enacted were intended to be repealed? What would people say with reference to such a man's sanity? Would they not say that he was a little *non compos mentis*? Now, I maintain that the case under consideration is a precisely similar one in principle. God's covenant made with Abraham has never been repealed. It is still in full force and virtue, as much as ever. The form of administration is changed, but not the essential principles of the covenant. That covenant included Abraham's seed, not only his natural, but spiritual seed. Those who are Christ's are Abraham's seed, and distinctly said to be his heirs, having a claim to all the rights and privileges secured by that covenant. Infant children are unquestionably Christ's, therefore *they* are Abraham's seed. The token of that covenant was to be given to all the seed, and be "in their flesh for an everlasting covenant." Baptism, under the new form of administration, is unquestionably the token of that covenant, hence infant children have an inalienable and unquestionable right to that token, and to refuse it to them is virtually to ignore their saving relation to Jesus Christ. I hold, therefore, that unless it can be proved that the Abrahamic covenant has been repealed, no man has a right to stand between Christ and His "little ones" and say that they shall not be brought to Him to receive His mark, or the grand badge of distinction by which those who *are* His may be distinguished from those who *are not* His. With those who do so Jesus will undoubtedly be "much displeased;" hence, what becomes of all my opponent's noise about no command or mention of infant baptism by our Lord or the apostles? They had no need to give a special introduction to an institution as old and familiar as the covenant of redemption. It was sufficient that they recognized it by applying it to whole households, and in other appropriate ways.

This argument receives additional force if we consider it in the light of the New Testament teachings.

What says the New Testament? If I have correctly stated the case, then it would be absurd to expect any express re-enactment of each detail involved in the original charter to Abraham, at the commencement of the Gospel dispensation, but we may expect to find incidental allusions to such details implying that they are still regarded as being in full force and virtue. Now, what are the facts of the case? Do the New Testament Scriptures furnish any ground in support of infant baptism? We do not ask for an express command, for we not only admit that there is no re-enactment of the Old Testament Church charter as it specifically relates to children, but we claim that there

was no necessity for it. But are the necessary conditions, or grounds for infant baptism, to be found in the New Testament? I reply, they certainly are.

1. The moral condition of infants is such as to entitle them to baptism. We are told that faith is essential as a pre-requisite to baptism. But why necessary? What does faith do for us? If we are in the same moral condition before we believe that we are after, then why are we required to believe before we are baptized? Evidently because we are *justified* by faith, and it is anomalous and profane for any one to assume the badge of Christian discipleship who is not in a state of justification, or in other words, who is not reconciled to God. On this point, however, I need not enlarge. But I would simply remark that the Scriptures distinctly recognize the existence of this condition on the part of children. Christ says, "of such is the kingdom of heaven;" and when asked, "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" He "set a little child in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted and become as little children, ye shall not enter the kingdom of heaven. Whosoever, therefore, shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven." (Matt. 19:14, and 18: 2-4.) Moreover, I have already shown you that according to the statement of the apostle Paul in Rom. 5:18, "*As* by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." If, therefore, adults are baptized on the ground of their justification, surely children may be baptized on the same ground. In other words, if children possess the thing signified, we infer that they are entitled to the sign of that thing. Now, baptism is not a sign of faith, but a sign of purity, which on the part of the adult sinner can only be secured by faith, but on the part of the infant child is secured unconditionally through the atonement, and on the ground of its innocency it is entitled to the badge of innocency.

2. Children are capable of sustaining covenant relations to God, and of enjoying covenant blessings. I scarcely need do more on this point than merely to state the proposition, as it is well known that in nearly every case where God is represented as making covenants with man, especially where spiritual blessings are involved, He has included the children,—the little ones. It was so in the covenant with Noah after the deluge, (Gen. 9: 9, etc.) It was so with Abraham, (Gen. 15 and 17). It was so in the covenant with Moses, (Deut. 29: 10-12); and it has frequently been the case, thus proving that God regards

infants as suitable subjects for covenant relations, covenant rights and covenant blessings. In accordance with this fact our Lord Jesus Christ, as if forever to settle the question as to the relation they should sustain to the new covenant, called them unto Him, and said, "Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not; for of such is the kingdom of heaven." (Luke 18: 16). "And He took them up in His arms, puts His hands upon them, and blessed them." They were reckoned as believers the same as females were reckoned as circumcised. Now, what is this kingdom of heaven to which children belong but the New Testament Church? It is the whole body of believers, or those who have been born again of the Spirit. For, "Except a man be born again he cannot see the kingdom of God." Children, therefore, must be in a regenerate state, as they belong to that kingdom, and belonging to the kingdom they must be in covenant relations with God, and being in covenant relations with God they have a right to the token of the covenant, or the seal God puts upon his covenant people, which seal is baptism.

Mr. Hibbard, in his able work on this subject, says, "If infants, equally with their pious parents, are sharers in the bounteous provisions of the atonement, (which were the great blessings secured in the Abrahamic covenant), they obviously possess an equal right with their parents to the visible *mark*, or *token* of participation in such blessings. Under all civil governments children have rights; and it is a law of nature and a dictate of justice that these rights should be recognized and protected. The protection of the laws, the rights of citizenship and of property, are secured to them, not on the principle of their being of a certain age, or of their being competent to judge of the value of these blessings, but on the principle of their relation to their parents. . . . This, then, is the principle for which we contend. Children are as capable of sustaining covenant relations to God, so far as the question of natural fitness and propriety are concerned, as they are of sustaining any civil relations to government. They are as capable of possessing spiritual rights and immunities as civil rights; and as capable of being injured in respect of the former as the latter. Their spiritual rights are not founded on the circumstance of age or intellectual acquirements, but on the fact of their being human beings, included, equally with their parents, in the covenant of Abraham. It is in view of these facts that we may well repeat the caution, 'Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones.' "

3. The rights of infants to the seal of the covenant is plainly implied, if not specifically expressed, in the New Testament. Paul says, (Gal.

3: 29), "And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." Certainly, if this passage teaches anything it teaches that every genuine Christian, or true believer, sustains the same relation to Abraham, and to the Abrahamic covenant, as a pious Jew did before the time of Christ. To the same purport is verse 7 of the same chapter: "Know ye, therefore, that *they which are of faith* the same *are the children of Abraham.*"

Again, Horn. 2: 29, 30: "For he is not a Jew which is one outwardly, . . . but he is a Jew which is one inwardly," etc.

Now, the only question to be settled here is this, "*Are infant children Christ's?*" If so, they are Abraham's seed. Are infant children Jews inwardly? If so, they are Abraham's seed. They are the true spiritual circumcision. The blessing of Abraham, which is justification, has come on them. They are therefore in the covenant God made with Abraham, and as the seal was to be co-extensive with the covenant, so they are indisputably, according to inspired authority, entitled to the seal.

I really have not time to follow my opponent through all the random statements he sees fit to make outside the subject in hand, such as his analysis of the commission, the order of the Spirit's work, and a host of other absurdities, but will allow him to amuse himself and you by such exploits, if you are so easily amused, while I briefly glance at two or three remarks more directly connected with the subject in hand which he made during his last address.

He made a great display of bravery, or rather *bullying bravado*, during his last speech, in daring me to further debate. I now put it on record that the spirit manifested during this debate has been so intensely disgusting to myself and the good people of Meaford in general that I cannot be a party to imposing any more of it upon an innocent community without the expressed wish of the people among whom it would be held. Whenever the Paedo-baptists of Meaford deem it desirable to give Mr. Harding another opportunity of airing his notions, testing his lung power, smiting his fists like a representative of a backwoods prize-ring, and displaying his pugilistic propensities generally, in the name of the Lord, and invite me to champion their cause, I will duly consider the matter. But I cannot consent, merely for the sake of gratifying the ambitions of a conceited aspirant to polemical fame, or affording him an opportunity of further haranguing an already outraged community, to perpetuate such a farce as the people of Meaford have witnessed during the last six days. In fact, my opponent, failing in argument, seems determined to make the

battle one of physical endurance, and so accomplish by superior brute force what he has lacked the mental powers to accomplish. As a representative of the mere animal creation I cordially concede to him the palm. At the same time I cannot resist the conviction that all this bluster and banter are designed to disguise his consciousness of defeat,—a mere whistling to cheer his failing courage. It is not pleasant to make such remarks, but his persistent banter, after promising to indulge in no more of it, merits prompt and faithful rebuke.

My opponent strangely enlarges the scope of my remark about God's inability to convert a man without help, and then swings out into a lengthy disquisition on human agency in the work of human salvation. But he very well knows that my remark had exclusive reference to God's act by which the penitent believer obtains forgiveness and salvation. I have never denied the fact of human agency in leading sinners to Christ, hence there has been another serious waste of ammunition. The question is, Can God absolve a man without human agency, or aid? Let my friend deal with the real difficulty, and not fix up something pleasanter to handle.

His effort to prove that baptism with water is not the outward sign of the Spirit's baptism, exhibits him in a sorry light before the public. In the name of all that is sober in human reason, why are they both called by the same name if this correspondence does not exist between them? Of what use is a symbol at all if it has no corresponding spiritual reality? Will he tell us? Such unworthy quirks to extricate himself from the unpleasant consequences of a false theology are by no means creditable either to his candor or his intelligence.

My opponent is incredible, of course, about the young lady near Ottawa having died as a result of her immersion. Of course! Well, I would advise him to remain incredible, it will make him feel so much more comfortable. But to ask the congregation to share his incredulity in face of the evidence is unseasonably cool. And as for the Methodist preacher's wife who died from shouting, I have only to say it is quite likely (!), though evidently she was not as much accosted to it as my opponent, otherwise it must have been an unearthly shout to kill her. He ought to be warned of his own danger.

He seems to think that to die for Christ, and to die as the result of observing an institution of Christ's appointment, are quite analogous. Evidently he belongs to that class who lack the power to distinguish between things that differ. Well, be it so. Men are only responsible for what they possess.

I am quite willing for my opponent to draw the shades as dark as

they deserve to be in describing the various Paedo-baptist Churches, as I have no disposition to conceal or defend any improprieties in any of them; but when he has selected the worst of them, and drawn the shades at the darkest, I am quite willing that it shall sustain a fair comparison with his own. It is well known that laxity of teaching and discipline, and the immorality of the priesthood, have far more to do with the morality of a Church than the conditions of admission. Besides, if we cannot secure a high standard by taking the children into the Church and instructing them from their infancy in the fear of the Lord, I cannot see how we are to accomplish it by letting them grow up in the service of the devil and trust to a speedy dip in water to wash all the evil out of them. Such dips, as a matter of fact, too often leave them, like Simon Magus, in "the gall of bitterness and the bonds of iniquity." I prefer trusting to an early religious training. And then my opponent seems to overlook the fact that when persons within the Church become immoral they can be "cut off," or excommunicated. He can only see what serves his own purpose.

My opponent's denial that circumcision was a sign of inward purity, and that baptism takes its place, may comfort his poor sore heart a little, but doesn't fill the bill of demands on the part of this congregation. How could it be a seal of righteousness at all if it had no spiritual significance corresponding thereto? And how could a state of uncleanness be uniformly described by the word *un*-circumcision? And why did the Jews teach the Gentiles that unless they were circumcised they could not be saved? And why could no uncircumcised person eat the passover,—the symbol of the atonement,—and why was every uncircumcised person cut off from the religious assembly, if circumcision had no connection with moral purity? I blush to be obliged to argue a case that is so plain. The fact is that Abraham's natural seed were typical of his spiritual seed, and those born in his house or bought with his money were reckoned as belonging to Abraham's family and subject to the conditions of his religion,—servants of his God,—hence they ate the passover, which, my opponent has not denied and cannot deny, was symbolical and typical of the atonement. This accounts for their being circumcised. And if circumcision was the symbol and type of renewal, as the passover was of the atonement, then it follows, undeniably, that baptism takes its place, for it fills the same bill and answers the same end. It represents the "washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost."

Regarding the olive tree and Nicodemus, I want to say a word. You would think from my opponent's style of reasoning that no one

ever had to be born again until the gospel dispensation began. Did they go to heaven, then, without regeneration, or did they all go to hell? Does he not know that the language of our Lord to Nicodemus is just as applicable to every formalist and mere nominal Church member today, and all down through the ages, as they were to Nicodemus? It by no means follows because he was a master in Israel that therefore he was living up to all the spiritual requirements of the Jews' religion, though my opponent first assumes he was and then bases an argument on the assumption, and thus perpetrates a logical farce technically called *petitio principii*, or by common mortals a begging of the question. And this is the style of his reasoning throughout, as could be easily shown were there time to deal with it in detail.

[Time expired.]

ADDENDUM.

RESPECTED READER,—For the anomaly of this addendum, in what is professedly an oral debate, I disavow all responsibility. Fearing it would lead to an unseemly personal altercation, and so mar the book, I protested to the extent of my ability against the insertion of Mr. Harding's "Addenda" to his last speech. The publisher-in-chief wrote him, on the strength of my protest, strongly urging him to embody in his speeches any replies he desired to make to my additions, but he was invincible in his determination to have his reply appear under a separate heading. The reader may not be able to detect the design of this, though I surmise that I see men as trees walking. Probably the sequel will betray the plot. The pretext was that it would make his speech too long for a half-hour's speech, hence it must appear separately. The sincerity of this may be seen in the fact that his fifth reply, under the same proposition, contains just three lines more than his ninth speech, including the "Addenda," and his sixth reply just two lines less, and his fourth reply only twenty-three lines less, and other speeches are of but slightly smaller proportions, though he occupied some eight lines in the "Addenda" explaining to the reader about the additions I had made after he saw my speech in the proof-sheets. Had he loft this explanation out, his ninth speech, with the additions, would have been eleven lines shorter

than his fifth, six lines shorter than his sixth, and only fifteen lines longer than his fourth, though he does not seem to have considered these speeches too long for a half-hour. I fear it is another wolf and lamb story.

But to give the reader a still further illustration of the true inwardness of this business, let me say, that after making an exact estimate of the length of our respective speeches up to the close of the ninth under the second proposition, I find that his first twenty speeches occupy just seventeen pages and eighteen lines more than my corresponding twenty speeches; yet as soon as I entered a practical protest against such injustice by adding four and a half pages to one of my speeches, nothing would please the dear man but an exposure of my crime (1) in a separate paragraph to the reader. Hence the "Addenda." These facts will have all the more weight when it is remembered that I spoke with much greater rapidity than Mr. Harding, as the reporter frequently testified during the debate.

But it will probably be asked, "Why did you add the four and a half pages after your speech had gone to the printer, and the proof of it had been sent to Mr. Harding?" The time is now so long past that I cannot possibly remember the circumstances connected with each individual case, but suffice it to say that both parties had been in the habit of adding to their speeches from time to time, as they saw fit, after seeing their opponent's reply, even after the matter was made up into page-form in some cases; and I either made these additions to meet similar additions in my opponent's previous speeches, which I discovered after the copy of my ninth speech had been sent to the printer, else because I took advantage of an interval of leisure to reply to objections overlooked in times of hurry or absence from home. At all events, I have a distinct recollection that I noticed additions to Mr. Harding's speeches when the proof came to me in page-form. At what stage his additions were made I cannot say. I only know when I made the discovery. But no matter. I distinctly testify that he added to his seventh and other speeches after the proof-sheets were sent to me, hence he has no cause for complaint. And he was the man who began this business of garbling and enlarging the reporter's notes to suit his jealous caprices, though he is the first to show his teeth by exposing me. It is evident that no personal advantage was sought, or injustice intended in the matter on my part, or my proof-sheets might have been withheld from him, and it never entered my mind but that when he saw additions to my galley-proofs he would make corresponding additions to

his galley-proofs, as he had been in the habit of doing. But the fact is, he found the pages I had added put him in a very unpleasant dilemma, from which he saw no way of escape except under cover of a cloud of dust, hence he concocted a plan to prejudice the argument he could not answer. If any one imagines that this is mere empty banter, let him read carefully the last four and a half pages of my ninth speech, clause by clause, and after reading each clause let him read Mr. Harding's reply to it in the "Addenda," and see how it was met. If he is not satisfied by that time, let him glance over the sub-joined reply to the "Addenda." The experiment will well reward the trouble.

Let me call attention also to another fact. Mr. Harding admits that it was after he saw my ninth speech "in printed proof-sheets," that he "corrected and sent in" his "ninth reply." Now, I want to say that I could not wait till I saw his speeches "in printed proof-sheets" before I sent in my replies, unless I had assumed the responsibility of hindering the publication as he has done. In fact, I sometimes had to send two or three of my corrected speeches before I saw his reply in proof-sheets to the first of them. Hence, according to his own admission, he enjoyed an important advantage which I could only recover by making changes in mine after his proof-sheets came to hand. In this matter he has unconsciously borne witness against himself.

Another item worthy of note is the fact that Mr. Harding has positively rewritten and enlarged every one of his speeches from first to last. There is scarcely a paragraph, and comparatively few sentences, from the beginning to the end, except quotations from authorities, that has not been entirely remodeled. *His speeches as they appear in this book are not his speeches as delivered in Meaford, and I can prove it.* The reader has no guarantee that any thing printed here is what he said there, and in point of fact *very little* appears here *as he said it there.* While pursuing the same general *well-beaten, track*, from which it seemed almost impossible for him to get away, he has so entirely re-cast the argument that it would require a philosopher to discover even a remote degree of consanguinity, and in not a few instances he has actually left out of his rewritten speeches all reference to things he said, according to the reporter, thus making much that appears in my replies appear irrelevant. Instances of this can be given, if need be. On the other hand, with the exception of slight verbal corrections and additions to meet his *new* and revamped arguments and quotations, my speeches are published herein, almost

bodily, from first to last, as reported. Yet he is the man to make a noise and mar the book with "addenda" in order to expose me.

And now, as I have some fourteen or fifteen more pages of space at my command, before I get even with my opponent, I will indulge in a brief reply to his "Addenda."

REPLY.

1. He appears exceedingly anxious to convey the impression, either that I am wrong about Timothy's circumcision, or that the apostles acted a lie. Of course it is to his interest to put the matter as strongly as possible from his standpoint, but I think a moment's reflection will convince the reader that it is possible for me to be right without involving the apostles in either hypocrisy or falsehood. First, I do not claim that it was *wrong* for Paul to circumcise Timothy, under the circumstances, for I am not aware that there was any specific law against it. Besides, Paul recognized the law of expediency in the absence of express injunctions, and all I claim is that he was governed by this law in this particular matter. If my opponent repudiates this law, will he tell us on what principle the apostle could become "all things to all men, that he might by all means save some." 1 Cor. 9:22. He testifies that "unto the Jews he became as a Jew, that he might gain the Jews; to them that were under the law, as under the law, that he might gain them that were under the law; to them that were without law, as without law, . . . that he might gain them that were without law; and to the weak he became as weak, that he might gain the weak." Thus, so long as no moral wrong, or compromise of principle, was involved, he "pleased all men in all things, that they might be saved." 1 Cor. 10: 33. I presume it was on this principle that Paul "took and circumcised Timothy *because of the Jews which were in those quarters: for they knew all that his father was a Greek.*" Acts 10:3. All of which plainly implies that he would not have circumcised him *but for the Jews that were in those quarters*, nor even for this reason had they not known that his father was a Greek. But "being crafty," I suppose he endeavored to catch these Jews "with guile." And I presume his "purifying himself with those four men, and shaving his head and entering into the temple with them," may consistently be explained on precisely the same principle. So, if Paul acted a lie in these matters I will just leave him and Mr. Harding to tigh it out. It doesn't affect my position in the least.

But I am under the painful necessity of calling attention to a most unworthy quibble in my opponent's "Addenda." He quotes me as saying that "the inspired penman says that Timothy was circumcised because his father was a Greek," and then he vociferously denies it. He says, "The inspired penman says no such thing. The statement is untrue." Now, what does the inspired penman say? He says, as I have just quoted the words, that he "took and circumcised him because of the Jews which were in those quarters; *for* (and this means *because*) they knew all that his father was a Greek." It was, then, according to the inspired penman, first, "because of the Jews," and secondly, "because they knew that his father was a Greek." Did I toll a lie, then, when I said it was because his father was a Greek? I leave the reader to judge. In the meantime I repeat the statement, that the inspired penman says it was because his father was a Greek, and because the Jews knew it, that Paul circumcised Timothy. Now, let him deny this in his next "addenda." But my opponent says it was "because his mother was a Jewess." Will he tell us what inspired penman said that, and where it can be found? When he does he can, with a much better grace, flatly contradict my statements and make me out a false witness.

2. He would like to know why, if baptism has taken the place of circumcision, baptized persons are not, like circumcised persons, "debtors to do the whole law." I thought I had succeeded in making it plain that circumcision was the form of seal peculiar to the old dispensation, when the ceremonial law was in force, and that, therefore, persons receiving it (except on the ground of expediency, as in the case of Timothy) acknowledged the continued obligation of "the whole law;" but that baptism was the form of seal peculiar to the new dispensation, under which the ceremonial law was abolished, and that persons receiving baptism virtually recognized the fact of its abrogation. I trust this explanation will satisfy him.

3. My opponent cannot see any "sense" in some things I have said, and therefore declines a reply. This will, no doubt, occasion a great loss to the world's literature, but I presume if he had said he could see no "sense" in any possible reply he could make, he would have come much nearer the truth.

4. When he concedes that all infants who die in infancy will have a place in the city of God which is to come down out of heaven, he sadly gives away his whole contention. That city is the Church, called "The bride, the Lamb's wife" (see Rev. 21:9, 10). Now the Church is Christ's body, composed of His redeemed ones (see Acts

20: 28), and if children dying in infancy are to have a place in the Church, then they have been "purchased" with atoning blood, a truth that my friend has stubbornly denied. But now he virtually admits it. *That will do.* I think before the debate closes he will get a good many of these cobwebs of error out of his eyes, and then he will be able to see infant baptism in the Bible. I thank him very cordially for this admission. It concedes that little children are Christ's, and, therefore, Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise (covenant); hence, if he refuses them baptism, he must circumcise them, as Paul did Timothy, even though, like him, they are of Greek descent.

5. My friend thinks he convicts me of a serious slip because X said in my last speech that infants were not born again, though he finds I said in a former speech that "I infer from his premises" that they are. He thinks that this is a great "contradiction" and "inconsistency," and altogether destroys my title to the confidence of my fellow-men. I would simply remind him that I do not endorse every doctrine I deduce from his premises. If I did I should be as heterodox as he is, which I would greatly deprecate. By bearing this simple fact in mind, it will greatly relieve the distress he feels for me in consequence of my pitiable dilemma.

If he has any more "addenda" exposures or replies to make I hope he will send them along. He has sadly delayed the publication of this book by the months of time spent, according to his own public admission, in research and writing since the debate closed. What a pity he had not spent this time beforehand in preparing for the debate, it would have cost him so much less time afterwards, and he would have appeared to so much better advantage on the platform at Meaford.

And now we await the rising of the curtain for the next scene.

T. L. W.

MR. HARDING'S TENTH REPLY

With pleasure I rise to continue the discussion of this proposition. I realize that we are drawing near to the end of what has been to me a very profitable discussion; and I desire now, as earnestly and faithfully and kindly as I can, to continue the debate to the close,

Mr. Wilkinson still talks about my misrepresenting Moses Stuart. I am perfectly willing to leave that matter to the judgment of this audience—especially as this debate is to be published—for my quotations can then be carefully examined by any one interested in the matter. These facts will then appear:

1. That when I introduced Stuart *it was avowedly for the purpose of giving his classical definition of baptizo and baptizo.*

2. That Stuart is of the opinion that *baptizo* in the New Testament, when applied to the rite of baptism, does, as a rule, involve the idea of immersion.

3. That to this rule he thinks there are at least three exceptions.

4. That Mr. Wilkinson misrepresented Stuart when he stated in his last speech that he, "like all Paedo-baptist authorities," explained that it did not mean dip, plunge, immerse in the New Testament, With perfect serenity I submit this matter to you, that you may decide whether Mr. Wilkinson or I has been dishonest in dealing with this great author. It is certain that one of us has been.

Now we will turn our attention to the latter part of the sixteenth chapter of Mark. As you have been told, in the revised version a blank space is left between the eighth and ninth verses. Mr. Wilkinson thinks that the latter part of the chapter is of doubtful authority, and that therefore it was thus set off by the revisers. But you shall hear the testimony of one much more competent to speak on this question than Mr. Wilkinson. This volume [*holding up a book before the audience*] is the "*Companion to the Revised Version of the New Testament*" by Alexander Roberts, D. D. Mr. Roberts was a member of the revision committee—of the English New Testament company—and of course he knows whereof he testifies. The "*Companion*" was written by him to explain the reasons for the changes from the common version. Concerning these last verses of the book of Mark, he says (p. 6'5):

"On the whole, a fair survey of all the facts of the case seems to lead us to these conclusions: First, that the passage is not the imme-

diate production of St. Mark; and, secondly, that it is, nevertheless, possessed of full canonical authority. We cannot ascertain its author, but we are sure he must have been one who belonged to the circle of the apostles. And, in accordance with this view of the paragraph, it is marked off from the words with which, for some unknown reason, the Gospel of St. Mark ended; while, at the same time, it is inserted, without the least misgiving, as an appendix to that gospel in the Revised Version."

So, according to Dr. Roberts, the revisers had not the least doubt as to the inspiration of the passage: they only doubted as to whether Mark or some other man of the apostolic circle wrote it. As you were reminded, it is certain Moses did not write the last part of the Pentateuch, and it is doubtful who wrote the book of Hebrews, but their canonicity is undoubted by the Christian scholarship of the world; and so of these last verses of the book of Mark. While they are not found in two of the oldest MSS., it is a fact that they are found in translations older than any of them; moreover, as Dr. Roberts remarks, "Irenaeus quotes the passage, without the slightest misgivings, in the second century," and he antedates both of these MSS.

It is not strange that Mr. Wilkinson should be anxious to get rid of the fifteenth and sixteenth verses of the last chapter of Mark, for while they stand it must be evident to every unprejudiced observer that infant baptism is not only unscriptural, it is also antiscritural. For the command to "make disciples" (*matheteusate*), which precedes the command to baptize, in Matthew's account of the commission, is the exact equivalent of the preaching of the Gospel, and the faith, which precede the baptizing in Mark's account. While these verses stand, therefore, preaching and faith must precede scriptural baptism. And, as you have just heard from Dr. Roberts, the revisers did not doubt their inspiration. Nor should Mr. Wilkinson, for Irenaeus quoted the passage *long before infant baptism was ever heard of*. To use Mr. Wilkinson's own argument, How could Irenaeus have been mistaken about the passage, seeing that he knew Polycarp, who knew John? The fact that he quoted it without misgivings of any kind shows that, as early as sixty years after John died, the passage was received by the Church with the same confidence that any other part of the New Testament was. En order to maintain this silly, useless and unscriptural practice of infant baptism, you see, it has become necessary for my opponent to try to cast doubt upon a part of God's word.

In his last speech, which Mr. Wilkinson *read* in your hearing, he explained at great length why circumcision was changed to baptism! I take it that his speech would have had more effect if it had not already been shown pretty conclusively that circumcision was not changed to baptism. He has wasted his time in showing why that was changed which was never changed at all.

Does not a change of practice follow a change of law? Over in the United States we recently had a change in the postal law, so that two cents will now answer where three were formerly required. We all began at once to use the two-cent stamp instead of the three; there was a change of practice growing out of the change of law. If there had been a change of law with regard to circumcision, would there not also have been a change in practice? Was there a change in practice? No; Christ was circumcised and then baptized; so were the apostles; so were the three thousand; so were the Jews generally; while Timothy was baptized and then circumcised. Do you suppose that any man in the States was ever silly enough to use both a two-cent and a three-cent stamp on the same letter?

Not only did the Jewish converts to Christianity continue to practice circumcision, but many of them also insisted that the Gentiles who came into the Church should be required to submit to the rite, and they stoutly contended that they could not be saved without it. Why did not Peter, or James, or Paul, or some other one of the apostles arise and say, "Brethren, have you lost your wits? do you not know that baptism has taken the place of circumcision? these people have been baptized, and that is enough." Can any sane man doubt that some such speech would have been made, had it been true? Then Paul, instead of circumcising Timothy to please the Jews in those quarters, would simply have explained that his baptism was sufficient, seeing that the one had taken the place of the other. Then, too, when they at Jerusalem (see Acts, chap. 21) charged Paul with teaching the Jews which were among the Gentiles not to circumcise their children, he would simply have replied, "You know well enough that baptism has taken the place of circumcision; hence I teach them to practice baptism and to cease from circumcision." But as a matter of fact, Paul made no such reply; instead thereof he took steps to show that the charge was false. No, no; Paedo-baptists lean upon a broken reed when they depend on this circumcision argument; for there is no fact susceptible of a clearer and more satisfactory demonstration than that Jewish Christians continued to practice circumcision for many, many years after the ascension of Christ—after the beginning of the Chris-

tian dispensation. It is not worth while to argue against facts; no amount of argument can set aside a fact.

Mr. Wilkinson then proceeds to give us "a few presumptions" that infant baptism was practiced at the beginning of the gospel dispensation. What does he want to give us "presumptions" for? Does he expect us to receive the rite as a divine ordinance on the strength of a presumption? It is a significant fact, that at the end of a six-days' debate "a few presumptions" are the best things that can be offered to show that infant baptism was practiced in apostolic times. If the gentleman has any Bible teaching on the subject, it is about time to produce it; nobody is going to be very materially affected by his presumptions; an ounce of Scripture is worth many thousand pounds of presumption, and hence we want the Scripture.

But let us consider these presumptions.

The first one is this: he thinks the Jews would have been terribly grieved had their children been excluded from the covenant, and that they would have complained about it. As they made no complaint, he concludes the children were not excluded. Just so; that is exactly the fact in the case. The children were in the covenant of circumcision, and they remained in it; their parents continued to circumcise them, as we have seen. True, it was rumored that Paul was trying to get the little ones out by stopping the practice of circumcision among Jews, but the rumor was false, and he promptly took steps to stop the complainings by showing that it was false. They were never in the new covenant, which includes baptism, hence nothing was ever said in any way about their being baptized.

His second presumption is this: "If it were intended that children should not be recognized under the new dispensation, as they were under the old, by any visible rite, certainly we have reason to suppose that some mention would be made of the fact." It seems to me far more reasonable to presume thus: If God had wanted infants to be baptized, He would certainly have said so, seeing that when He wanted them to be circumcised He did say so. Moreover, I presume that pious, God-fearing Jews would have been very certain not to change circumcision to baptism without being expressly taught so to do, seeing that God had cautioned them very particularly not to add to, nor take from, nor change His laws. And let it be remembered, in this connection, that circumcision was practiced long before the giving, and long after the taking away, of the Mosaic law.

Mr. Wilkinson then supposed a case by way of illustration: If, before the confederation of the provinces of this Dominion, Upper

Canada had granted certain rights to the Indians (or children), and if these rights were not referred to at all in the Act of Confederation, would any one suppose that the mere absence of any mention of them, or of their rights, would deprive them of their just inheritance? I should say not; I should say that Upper Canada would be bound by every principle of justice to give to those Indians exactly what she had promised; and no contract which she might afterwards make with other provinces would free her from her obligations to the Indians. And now for the application. God gave the covenant of circumcision to Abraham and his seed for "an everlasting covenant;" about four hundred years afterwards He gave the law for temporary purposes; but this could not invalidate the covenant of circumcision, which continued to be observed; about fifteen hundred years later he took away the law; it had served its purpose; but circumcision continued to be observed; and so up to the very close of the days of inspiration there is not the slightest hint that the Jews ceased to hold to this "everlasting covenant," nor is there the least intimation that it was to be changed to something else.

After these "presumptions," which, as we have seen, do not amount to a row of pins in his favor, Mr. Wilkinson *reads* on to what he calls "the necessary conditions or grounds for infant baptism," which, he claims, are to be found in the New Testament. Infants are pure, hence they ought to be baptized, he says, as baptism is a sign of purity. Adults need faith before baptism, seeing that faith nukes them pure; but the infant is pure without faith, and hence has an equal right to baptism, he argues. Just here I have a question: How did it happen that, under the old dispensation, circumcision was given to adults regardless of faith or purity? Every male born among the descendants of Abraham, or bought with the money of his children, was to be circumcised, *regardless of any other conditions whatever*. There, now, is a nut for my friend to crack. If baptism is in the room of circumcision, how does it happen that the same rule does not hold good?

But, as a matter of fact, baptism is not for the pure; it is "for the remission of sins." John preached "the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins;" and the people were "baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." (See Mark 1: 4, 5.) Jesus said, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." Mark 16: 16. Peter said, "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 2: 38. Ananias said to

Paul, "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Acts 22: 1(5. And, finally, we are baptized into Christ (see Gal. 3: 27), and in Him we have forgiveness (see Eph. 1: 7). So it appears that infants have not the moral conditions that demand baptism; since, in order to be a proper subject for baptism, one must be a sinner, who trusts in Jesus, and who looks to Him for salvation.

Mr. Wilkinson next claims that children are capable of sustaining covenant relations to God; and in this connection quotes the saying of Jesus, "Suffer little children to come unto Me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." Did Jesus baptize these little ones? No. Did He baptize men and women who believed in Him? Yes; He did, through His agents, His disciples. Why this difference? Because infants are innocent; but adults have to "be born of water and of the Spirit" to become like them; hence the necessity for faith and baptism. But Mr. Wilkinson's practice is different from the Lord's; he baptizes (or rather *rantizes*) both babies and adults; and this difference in practice grows out of a difference in doctrine. Immersionists practice as the Saviour did; that is, we pray for the little ones, and we baptize the believing adults. Which is the more likely to be correct, my friends, the practice of the Lord Jesus, or something that differs from it? For my part, I am willing to follow Jesus, especially as He exhorts us so to do.

Mr. Wilkinson argues that infants are Christ's, therefore they are Abraham's seed, and therefore they ought to be baptized. He quotes from Galatians 3: 29: "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." But if he had read the entire chapter, and if he had been willing to receive what he read, without addition or subtraction, he would not have so argued; for in the seventh verse it is said, "Know ye, therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham." Mr. Wilkinson presumes to add to this statement. According to his theory, it should read thus: "Know ye, therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham, *and so are all infants.*" And then, to make his argument complete, it should have been added, "And all of Abraham's spiritual seed—infants and believers—ought to be baptized." It would take these two additions to make the argument good for infant baptism.

Had Mr. Wilkinson read the entire chapter, he would also have found these words: "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." So it appears from his own proof text that it takes both faith and baptism to bring adults back to the state of innocence that they had in their infancy; and, as in Christ "we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins," we have here a statement that perfectly harmonizes with the saying of Jesus, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved."

But here again the Paedo-baptists get into another tangle. The Presbyterians argue that baptism came in the room of circumcision; that circumcision belonged to God's people *and their children*; hence they claim that baptism should be given to Christians and their children. They will not baptize (*rantize*, sprinkle) any infant unless at least one of its parents is a believer. They understand that believers are children of Abraham, and that Abraham's children and their infants are entitled to baptism. You have seen that the Methodists view the matter very differently. It is singular, if the matter is so clear as they would have us believe, that Mr. Wilkinson and his Presbyterian brother, Mr. Paterson, who sits here so lovingly by his side, can not see it alike. Here is an infant that the one would baptize (*rantize*) while the other would not, for its parents are unbelievers. So you see, my friends, the Presbyterians can no more see any force in Mr. Wilkinson's "purity" argument than immersionists can; and no wonder, for (excepting the Lord Jesus Christ) there is not a particle of evidence that any pure person was ever baptized since the world began. Baptism, as we have seen, brings the believer into Christ, where he obtains purity; hence men and women were baptized, "confessing their sins," "for the remission of sins," to "wash away sins," and hence Jesus said, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved."

Again, if baptism is for the pure, why did not Jesus have His disciples baptize those infants that were brought to Him by their mothers? Who can tell?

It is true, moreover, and should be constantly borne in mind, that if we were to grant that infants are of Abraham's spiritual seed (which is not the fact), it would still be necessary to show that baptism has taken the place of circumcision, and that very many changes have been made as to the application of it. As you, who have listened with unprejudiced minds, know well enough, these things can never be shown, simply because they are not true.

And now a word to those of you who are fathers and mothers. What do you think of that which you have heard? Meyer, who is confessedly the greatest of New Testament commentators, has been

brought before you as a witness, and he freely testifies that not a trace of infant baptism can be found in the New Testament; that it is of post apostolic origin Neander, the prince of Church historians, has been called to the stand to testify, and he tells us that at first adults only were baptized, that infant baptism is not of apostolic origin, that it arose later with this the testimony of Mosheim, another great Church historian, fully agrees Schaff, another famous writer of Church history, tells us that the apostolic origin of infant baptism is denied not only by Baptists, but also by many Paedo baptist divines Steitz, a great Lutheran scholar, says, among scientific exegetes it is agreed that not a trace of infant baptism can be found in the New Testament Then comes forward Mr. McKay (I am glad he wrote that little book), who sums up for us all the cases of baptism mentioned in the New Testament, as he is a Presbyterian, of course he is not prejudiced in my favor, we examined the cases, one by one, and find not a trace of infant baptism in anyone of them Coming on down from New Testament times, Mr. Wilkinson talks about Polycarp, Justin Martyr, and Irenaeus, but Meyer and Bledsoe step forward and say these men do not teach the doctrine—that the first writer who makes any certain reference to it is Tertullian—that it cannot be fairly inferred from any utterance made by any previous writer But Mr. Wilkinson goes back beyond the New Testament, to the Old, to the covenant of circumcision, he says baptism has come in its room, we look at the facts to see about it, and we find that the statement is not true, moreover, Stuart, the great Presbyterian, promptly testifies that the covenant of circumcision furnishes no ground for infant baptism then, to add to the confusion and discomfiture of Mr. Wilkinson, the Presbyterian Church radically differs from him as to what children ought to be baptized. Then, to cap the climax of the ridiculous, and to make the whole thing unutterably nonsensical and absurd, when Mr. Wilkinson arises to sprinkle a baby, "because it is as pure as an angel," "because it has been redeemed by Jesus Christ," "because it has been cleansed from all the corruption and defilement of original sin by the Spirit of God," he prays to the Father thus "Look upon this child, wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost, that he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church," and then he prays that the old Adam may be buried in him, and the new man raised up. Moreover, John Wesley agrees with Origen, the first advocate of infant baptism, that in baptism original sin is washed away, he says "If infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper sub-

jects of baptism, seeing, in the ordinary way, they cannot be saved unless this be washed away by baptism. It has been already proved that this original stain cleaves to every child of man, and that hereby they are children of wrath, and liable to eternal damnation." *Doctrinal Tracts*, published in the year 1850. p. 251.

What think you of all this, my friends? For my part, I shall be content to do as Christ did; that is, I will pray for the babies, and baptize the believers. If you choose to baptize infants, just remember you will do that for which you have not a word of divine authority. There is not the slightest proof that any inspired man ever baptized a baby.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKINSON'S ELEVENTH SPEECH.

It is not necessary to say much with respect to the speech we have just heard; we have heard it so often, and I have answered it so often. It is very amusing to see a sheep trying to knock down a stone wall by butting his head against it. At first he fails. Then he backs up and tries it again. The action is not successful. Then he goes a little further back, and makes another tremendous effort, but the stone wall still stands. The sheep's head is not so fortunate—it suffers harm. So all efforts to demolish the structure of doctrinal truth that I have been endeavoring to rear in your presence from the Word of God seem to be as futile as the efforts of the sheep to knock down the stone wall. In fact, you might as well attempt to demolish an army with a pop-gun, as to try to overthrow this doctrine; hence I can afford to let my opponent amuse himself with his futile efforts without trying to follow him into every nook whither he seems inclined to run. But as this is my last speech in this hot and interesting debate, I will briefly reply to some of his main points, and then give a cursory review of the ground I have gone over, so that I may present my argument in its completeness at the close of my addresses,

1. I am accused of misrepresenting Professor Stuart by saying that he explained that *Baptizo* did not mean dip, plunge and immerse in the New Testament. Now, what Dr. Stuart said was, as I quoted in

a former speech, that "there is *no absolute certainty from usage* that the word *baptizo*, when applied to the rite of baptism, means to immerse or plunge," and that "we *do obey* the command to baptize when we do it by affusion or sprinkling." Also, that Stuart gives us as Old Testament meanings of *bap to* and *baptizo*, "to wash, to bedew, to moisten." Now, the audience can judge how far I misrepresented him by my remark. Certainly, whatever concession he makes, incidentally, to the immersionists, he does not believe that the word necessarily means immerse, or plunge, in the New Testament, But drowning men clutch at straws.

And now I take the liberty of denying emphatically (whatever complexion may be put upon the matter in his rewritten speeches for publication) that when my opponent first introduced Stuart's testimony in this debate, he said it was Stuart's classical definition of *bapto* and *baptizo*, instead of his New Testament meaning. The auditors or readers can accept whichever statement they please.

In regard to Mark 16:16, and the Companion to the revised edition of the New Testament by A. Roberts, I want to say a word. In the first place, I am not anxious to get rid of this passage, for it suits my case very well—much better than it does my opponent's. At the same time it is but fair to take an honest look at the facts pertaining to it. I told you that the revisers had separated the last twelve verses from the rest of the chapter, and stated in a marginal note that "the two oldest Greek manuscripts, and some other authorities," omit them from the text. Also, that "some other authorities have a different ending to the gospel." These facts alone were sufficient to cast doubt upon the genuineness of these verses, hence the revisers felt the necessity of offering a defence for inserting them at all. Dr. Roberts, therefore, on behalf of the revisers, has made that defence, during which he admits that "there is something peculiar about the paragraph"—that it "has no place in the two oldest manuscripts in our possession," and quotes the saying of Tregelles, that "Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, Victor of Antioch, Severus of Antioch, Jerome, as well as other writers, especially Greeks, testify that these verses were *not* written by Mark, or not found in the best copies." But after giving the various considerations, *pro* and *con*, he concludes by saying, as my opponent has told you, that "on the whole, a fair survey of all the facts of the case seems to lead us to these conclusions: first, that the passage is not the immediate production of St. Mark; and, secondly, that it is, nevertheless, possessed of full canonical authority. We cannot ascertain its author, but we are sure he must

have been one who belonged to the circle of the apostles." Observe, he says, "a fair survey of all the facts of the case *seems* to lead to these conclusions." That is not a very positive statement, I confess. No wonder, therefore, that he immediately adds, "In accordance with this view of the paragraph it is marked off from the words with which, for some unknown reason, the gospel of Mark ended, viz., the eighth verse." The setting of it off, as the revisers have done, in itself stamps the passage as doubtful, and the most that they claim for it is "an appendix to that gospel." In view of these facts I claim, that whatever veneration we may feel for this paragraph, it does not stand in the same undoubted position as the commission recorded in Matthew; hence, while it would be perfectly proper to appeal to Matthew for a clearer explanation of Mark, it is not proper to appeal to Mark as the expositor of Matthew. A well understood rule of interpretation among scholars is that the doubtful is always to be interpreted in the light of the undisputed. Hence, if my opponent really venerates the scholars as much as he pretends to do when they seem to agree with him, I hope he will cease to clamor for the passage in Mark as the exponent of the passage in Matthew.

My opponent coolly *assumes* that he has proved that baptism did not take the place of circumcision, and then expresses his astonishment that I should present reasons why it did. Well, the reason I did so was that his reasons were not very cogent, but exceedingly paltry, to me. There is a species of fallacy known to logicians called the *petitio principii*, or begging of the question, and he seems to be quite expert in its use. And then he wonders that I am not convinced by it. I may as well intimate to him just here, that it takes a stronger species of logic than that to convince me.

My friend says a change of law brings a change in practice, and wants to know why, if the law was changed in regard to circumcision, there was not a change in practice. I answer, there was a change in practice, and I am surprised to learn that he is ignorant of the fact. I would therefore take this opportunity of informing him that, though the Church always circumcised its members under the old dispensation, she has always baptized them under the new. Most people are aware of this. Oh! yes, my friend, there was a change in practice, undoubtedly. The unwisdom and prejudice of a few Jewish converts at the first doesn't affect the case an iota. It would have been exceedingly strange if they had accepted all the changes involved in the introduction of Christianity without showing any signs of undue attachment to their former usages. No sensible per-

son attaches any importance to the crotchets of those Jewish bigots. But the fact that they insisted so strongly that the Gentiles could not be saved without circumcision proves unmistakably that they attached peculiar spiritual significance to the rite, and did not regard it merely as a pledge of a small farm in Judea. Let my opponent note this fact.

He objects to my "presumptions," and wants to know why I give them. The reason is that one *pre*-sumption is worth fifty *as*-sumptions. I use the former, and leave him the monopoly of the latter. Still, if I had nothing but presumptions to offer, he might complain, unless they were very strong; but I have only thrown these in as extras after supplying an avalanche of indisputable arguments. But I don't wonder that he is annoyed with them, nor can I relieve his annoyance. His elaborate reply to my presumptions, while exhibiting the annoyance he feels, does not merit or require any further notice.

My friend also assumes that the circumcision of the "one born in thy house, or bought with thy money of any stranger," was "*regardless of any other conditions whatever.*" And this he calls a "nut" for me to "crack." I am glad it is not a "hard-shell." Let me say, then, that in the absence of any *expressed* conditions, it is to be presumed that the same conditions were recognized in such cases as in the circumcision of an Israelite. If the candidate were an infant it would be unconditional. If an adult, faith in Israel's God would be required. Let it be remembered that the apostle Paul says (Rom. 2; 25), "Circumcision verily profiteth if thou keep the law: but if thou be a breaker of the law thy circumcision is made uncircumcision." The obligation to keep the law of God, therefore, was laid upon all circumcised persons, whether they received the rite in infancy or age. The privilege of eating the passover, too, belonged to all circumcised persons, and it was enjoined upon them as a duty to do it; and surely no one will be bold enough to affirm that this was "regardless of any other conditions whatever," except to be "born in the house" of an Israelite, or "bought with his money." The passover was a type and pledge of atonement, and must have involved faith in the promised Messiah. The plain inference is, therefore, that Israelites were supposed to train all those born in their houses in the faith of Abraham, and to buy no servants who were unwilling to embrace it. The servants they bought must not be supposed to have been bought, like African slaves in the United States, as mere chattels, without their consent or approbation, (though my friend seems

to model his notions after this pattern), but such persons may rather be supposed to be persons willing to embrace the Jewish religion and become servants in Jewish families. And this idea harmonizes with the well-known fact that the Jews were expected to keep themselves separate from heathen, or idolatrous, associations. If these remarks be correct, then there is no foundation for my opponent's statement that in such cases circumcision was "regardless of any other conditions whatever" than to be born in the house or bought with the money of a *Jew*. I leave the congregation to judge whether the nut is cracked or not.

My friend says that "as a matter of fact, baptism is not for the pure, for it is for the remission of sins." Just so, having reference to the remission of sins, this is the meaning. And what is remission of sins if it does not involve purification? All I claim, or have claimed, either for baptism or circumcision, is that it is a symbol of purity, or purification, and that the inward purification is supposed to have taken place before the symbol is given. This was not so, I am aware, in the case of Simon Magus, and perhaps in millions of other cases, but it is the legitimate order. And this is virtually recognized, even by my opponent, else why does he require faith before baptism? Will he tell us in what way faith fits us for baptism, if not because God forgives us when we believe? This is a nut for him to crack, and I predict that he will find it a genuine "hard-shell."

My opponent, I fear, will never give over the use of that logical (or illogical) fallacy just now referred to, viz., the *petitio principii*. He begs the question when he assumes that our Lord's disciples baptized men and women, but not children; he begs the question when he assumes that faith and repentance are always requisite before baptism; he begs the question when he assumes that my practice is different from our Lord's; he begs the question when he assumes that I do not baptize, but rantize; he begs the question when he assumes that my doctrine differs from our Lord's; he begs the question when he assumes that immersionists practice just as the Saviour did; and, in fact, if you eliminate the assumptions from his speeches there would hardly be enough substance left for a decent bowl of gruel. But I cannot waste time in replying to assumptions. I prefer to deal with arguments, where I can find them.

I have replied so often to the assumption about no one being Abraham's seed except believers, that I am ashamed to refer to it again. Let me ask my opponent, once for all, if Isaac was Abraham's seed?

If so, was it faith that constituted him such? Or was he born so? Yet he received the very same recognition that his father did on the ground of his faith. Now, why may not an infant to-day receive the same recognition as its father on the ground of his faith? Will he tell us why? My explanation is this: Adults being sinners, they must believe in Christ before they are accepted in Him, and they cannot be baptized until they are accepted. When they believe, faith is imputed for righteousness, as in the case of Abraham; and they are justified when through Christ's mediation the guilt of their sin is no longer imputed to them. Will he tell us what people require, when they grow up to be sinners, before baptism? If he will do that he will give us something new in his next speech. To make this matter plain: he contends that faith is a prerequisite to baptism. I ask why it is such. There must be a reason unless God so appointed it arbitrarily, or without reason. This supposition would impeach the Almighty. If there is a reason we have a right to ask what it is. Suppose, *e.g.*, that we take two disconnected links of a chain, and call number one faith and number two baptism. Now we want to connect these two together by a third link which we will, for the present, call a reason. Will he give the proper name of that third link? My explanation is, that it is justification. We are justified by faith. And being justified we are entitled to baptism. Now, according to this explanation, faith is a prerequisite to justification, and justification a prerequisite to baptism. Adult sinners must believe, therefore, before they are baptized; but infants, as I have shown, are already in a justified state, regardless of faith, hence there is nothing between them and baptism. They possess the necessary qualification. Will he tell us why faith precedes baptism if not for the reason I have given?

I want to say also that it matters not a rush, so far as the issue of this debate is concerned, what Presbyterians or any other body of Christians believe. It is not the belief of Presbyterians, but my *arguments*, that he is expected to concern himself with. But when these get too strong for his digestive organs, he swings off and tells us what Presbyterians believe. I hope in future he will leave them to attend to their own theology, and spend his time and strength on my positions. This will be more to the point, and conduce much more to the edification of his hearers.

I don't know how you like the dish of re-hash that my opponent has served up to you for the fortieth time about "Meyer, the greatest of Biblical exegetes;" "Neander, the prince of Church historians;"

"Bledsoe, the most candid, able, and learned of all the Methodists of the United States;" "Schaff, the famous writer of Church history;" "Steitz, the great Lutheran scholar;" together with McKay, Moshheim, etc.; but it looks to me very much as though he had committed these high-sounding qualifications of these great men to memory, from some Baptist publication, and recites them in each speech, when he runs out of other matter, just to fill in the moments till time is called. No doubt it is convenient for him, and it must be supremely edifying to you, so I will say no more about it.

My opponent says that Paul never once mentions that baptism came for circumcision. I have quoted again and again what Paul plainly sets forth, that spiritual baptism is the same as spiritual circumcision. In the revised edition, Col. 2:11, 12, Paul says, "Ye were circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, having been buried in baptism." Thus he identified the two rites as equivalents of each other, hence he must have believed that the one was to be applied to the same class of subjects as the other. As I intimated in a former speech, it was a gracious act not to magnify this fact in the early ages of Christianity. Suppose you had all been Gentiles with strong anti-Jewish prejudices, and this had been the distinguishing feature between you and the Jews, and I came and preached the substitution of baptism in place of circumcision, it would have aroused your Gentile prejudices, and you would very naturally have said, "If this is. but another form of the same rite that has always distinguished the Jews from us, and made them boastful over us, we want nothing to do with it." And the Jews, on the other hand, would have continued to glory in it as their distinguishing badge, and have claimed that unless the Gentiles were baptized, and kept the law of Moses, they could not be saved, It was therefore expedient, no doubt, that little should be said on that subject in introducing it, so that it might produce as little friction as possible. This is the strongest evidence for so little being said on the subject in the New Testament.

We are told that there is no infant baptism in the Bible. Three million men, women and children were baptized in the cloud and in the sea. It is admitted that the deliverance of the children of Israel from Egypt, and their being brought under the administration of Moses, was typical of man's deliverance from a state of sin, and his entrance into the liberty of the sons of God. To set forth the former, men, women and children were baptized, and their baptism was typical; hence, under the administration of Christ, men, women and children should be baptized, and their baptism is antetypical.

And the antetype should agree with the type. If you destroy infant baptism in the Christian dispensation, you destroy the antetype.

No man knows whether Lydia had any children or not, says my opponent. Let us see what the scholars say. As explained in a former address, the Syriac version, the most ancient and literal, as well as one of the most reliable versions in the world, supposed to have been made in the first century after the Christian era, says. "Lydia and her children." So there is no "supposing" about it, for that version settles the matter.

Before entering upon my review, I want to remind you that my opponent has agreed to introduce no new matter in his final reply. But I do not know that it is necessary to use any safeguard, for he is not likely to do so. We have had scarcely anything new in any of his replies for the last two days, and I predict that we shall get nothing in his next speech but the same thing warmed over, so I pass hurriedly on to briefly review my entire argument.

I have referred to the fact that in our federal head, Adam, sin was brought into the world; that unless a dispensation of grace had been then introduced Adam must have suffered the extreme penalty of the Divine law, and been destroyed at the hand of God, and our race would have been blotted out. The human family would have been extinguished in its very germ. Accordingly, from the days of Abel to the present time there has been recognized on the part of man the necessity for an atonement between him and his God. And this recognition on the part of man is an evident result of the teaching of God on this subject. Away down in the days of Abraham God made an express covenant with him and his family in respect to this matter of the atonement. That covenant implied that God would be his God, and to be a man's God means to give Himself to man. The Godhead was to be placed at the disposal of the manhood; in other words, God was to employ all His Divine resources on behalf of man, and bless him in body and soul, for time and eternity. Anything less than this would have been to belittle and disparage the promises of God. He made this covenant with Abraham, that in his son Isaac all the nations of the earth should be blessed. Yet the word "seed," as explained by Paul, has special reference to Christ. Hence Isaac was a type of Christ, and represented the spiritual element in the covenant. That covenant was sealed with the seal of circumcision, hence circumcision was a seal of spiritual blessings. I have shown, moreover, that Paul quoted from the same covenant that was sealed with the seal of circumcision to prove that Abraham was to be the father of many nations; in that covenant

little children were included and sealed; that was an everlasting covenant and has never been abrogated, but is to-day in full force and effect. True, many of the natural branches were cut off" through unbelief, but the Gentiles were grafted in by faith, and when the natural branches give up their unbelief and believe in Christ they too will be grafted in again. But it is the same covenant including little children. Accordingly in the Psalms we read, "He hath remembered his covenant to a thousand generations." Under that covenant Christ when he came into the world took little children in His arms and blessed them, and said, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven." It is an insult to the Christian intelligence of this audience to seek to make out that the kingdom of heaven is too small a kingdom to include little children. It is also an insult to Christ, who came to establish on the earth a kingdom which was to include all for whom He died, even those who had committed personal transgression, when they received Him by faith, but especially those who had not personally transgressed. Christ said of the latter class, "Of such *is* the kingdom of heaven." I have shown that from the very days of the apostles down to the present time the rights of children in the covenant have been recognized. They were never denied until 1300 years after the beginning of the Christian dispensation. My opponent has failed to produce a case refuting this fact, and he cannot produce one. So, little children have always been regarded as in the covenant under the Christian dispensation, and received the seal of God, even the seal of righteousness. And this seal of righteousness is baptism, which the early fathers of the Church believed came in place of circumcision. Little children have thus been recognized as members of the Church of God and heirs of the eternal kingdom, ever since the days of Abraham, at least, and they will be crowned with glory in our Father's heavenly mansions. We become children of God by virtue of the atonement. But my opponent's argument cuts oil' little children altogether from the atonement: no atonement, he says, is made for them. There is no place in the fold of Christ for them, because they cannot commit personal sin; therefore, they are passed by, and stand in the same relation to God and His church and the covenant of redemption that your cat or dog might do. They have never committed any personal sin, therefore they have never been redeemed. They go to heaven, if they go at all, simply because they do not know any better, not because Christ died for them. They have no connection whatever with the atonement; it brings redemption only to humanity when humanity has begun to be personally sinful. But Romans 5: 18 and

19 completely sweeps this doctrine away. That is the skeleton in the closet which my opponent does not like to venture near. I could not get Mr. McDiarmid to venture near it, either, any more than if it had been a ghost. He threatened to tell what it meant, but took good care not to execute the threat. My opponent, also, said he would tell us what it meant. Well, that is just the thing I want him to do, but he does not do it; his offer was just made to throw dust in the eyes of this audience. There is the doctrine of original sin—some kind of taint in our nature which we cannot get over. If my opponent could get the 18th and 19th verses of 5th Romans out of the Bible, together with some other passages, his sailing might be comparatively clear; but with those passages there, he will run on a rock every time he tries to navigate these waters. I have shown you that according to his theory not only would it exclude the children from the Church of Christ, but also from the kingdom of heaven. My opponent's theory excludes the entire Jewish nation from the covenant of redemption, for Paul said distinctly, "If ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing." He says that Paul taught this doctrine of circumcision to his Jewish countrymen. I have shown you that he did no such thing. It is a libel on the teaching of Paul to say he taught or encouraged circumcision in his day. He was the great apostle to the Gentiles who discouraged it, and he distinctly taught that neither circumcision availeth anything nor un-circumcision, but a new creature. But if he taught circumcision he excluded himself and all other believers from the atonement of Christ and the kingdom of heaven. I have shown you that by my opponent's teaching, Christ has virtually tied His hands behind Him and cannot save a soul from hell, though it should fulfill every condition of His own appointment, unless he can get some Disciple preacher to come and put the individual under water. If my opponent says that Christ can work, but that he can work only in a certain way, that virtually amounts to the same thing. No matter how sincerely you repent and believe, you cannot get to heaven unless you can get a Disciple preacher to come and plump you under the water. Will my opponent be kind enough to deny that such is the case? I have shown you that the whole superstructure from my point of view is consistent and harmonious. God has all through the ages been building up a Church, not one under the old and another under the new dispensation, but one grand living temple under both dispensations; and He has built it on the foundation not only of the teachings of Christ and the apostles, but also of the teachings of the apostles and

prophets,—joining the teachings of the old with the teachings of the new—the great doctrinal foundation of which Jesus Christ is the chief corner stone, in whom all the building fitly framed together groweth unto an holy temple in the Lord. Solomon's temple was a grand type of the spiritual temple built on Christ, and when that temple was dedicated the glory of the Lord came down and filled it, and that was illustrative of the fact that His presence was to pervade the Church in all ages, though the glory was to be greater under the latter dispensation than under the former, for the Lord Himself would come to this latter temple, the spiritual temple, and fill it with His presence. He promised to be with it and in it when He gave His disciples the commission to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. He added the consoling promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even to the end of the world." Paul, addressing the believers at Corinth, said, "Ye are the temple of God, and the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." Thus by fitting each stone into the temple, by perfecting each stone in the temple, and by making alive each stone of the temple, Christ was building for Himself a glorious house, beautified, garnished, adorned, and purified even as a bride for her husband; and by and by the bridegroom is coming back to receive His bride. One fold, one Shepherd, one Lord, one faith, one baptism,—not a mere dipping in water, which would be a degradation to this great spiritual truth, but one spiritual purification—one Lord over all, one faith on the part of the whole, one baptism of the Holy Ghost, regenerating, quickening, anointing, and fitting the whole for the glorious temple above where we shall shine with infinite splendor throughout an eternal day, and make the temple of heaven resound with the praises of the redeemed gathered from all nations, peoples, tribes, and tongues, baptized with the Spirit of God, washed in the blood of the Lamb, and arrayed in white robes before the throne. This will be the consummation of our labors here on earth, this the consummation of our Redeemer's work, when He shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied. Go home and read the 7th chapter of Revelations. John, who saw the glorified company, thus records the elder's testimony concerning them: "These are they which came out of great tribulation." How many? "A company whom no man could number, of all nations and kindreds, and people and tongues." Are the parents in that company without their little ones? Mothers, are you not to meet your little ones that have gone before you in that blood-washed throng? Are you not to take them again to your

bosoms in that immortal land? Are they not to share with you the glories of heaven that Christ has bought for you and your seed forever? Are they to be gathered in some separate place set apart for babies and babies only? Christians are represented as one family in Christ—as, "one Church above, beneath, though now divided by the stream, the narrow stream of death." Thank God, Christ will gather all His loved ones home by and by. The ship is coming home, no matter how boisterous and stormy the voyage, no matter how great the trials and tribulations, how many the tears and sorrows. God will gather His family unbroken before His throne; He will wipe all tears from their eyes, and lead each one to living fountains of water. Is it possible that Christ will separate the older ones from the little ones? I am astonished that any people can believe such a doctrine. Nothing but a want of investigation, or strong prejudices that harden the heart so that it will not yield to truth and conviction, could lead anyone to cling to a superstition so deadly, so at variance with all our instincts concerning Christ and His government, His life and His redemption. O! mothers, will you bring your children to Christ, and put the seal of the everlasting covenant, the *visible seal*, on their bodies, and before high heaven and before men let it be known that as for you and your house you will serve the Lord. Then having recognized their right to Divine truth and to Divine grace, "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord."

Allow me, in closing, to thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your close attention. Many of you are present under circumstances of great personal discomfort, and in this hall, day after day, and night after night, I have admired your patience and your behavior. No people could have conducted themselves more orderly than you have done. And now, if either by word or act I have been rude or offensive to you, may God forgive me, and I trust you will forgive me too. In the heat of debate we sometimes give expression to sentiments unpremeditated, uttered on the spur of the moment, and from impulse, before we have time to consider what the effect is going to be. You cannot expect quite such strict and rigid propriety under such circumstances as if we were dispassionately considering the subject alone and uncontradicted. A certain spirit on one side provokes a similar spirit on the other side. I only regret that I allowed myself to be provoked by it. I again earnestly thank you. I am sure my introduction to the people of Meaford has not been attended by all unpleasantness. I am sure the recollection in the memory of some will be pleasant. I am sure some of the mist and fog has been blown away

by this little cyclone of theological debate, and you will all be able to see better in the clearer atmosphere. May God bless you, and if we meet no more on earth, may we meet, one and all, in our Father's kingdom. Amen.

[*Time expired.*]

ADDENDUM.

RESPECTED READER,—Having received the proof-sheets of Mr. Harding's eleventh speech, together with his second "Addenda," I am forced to the painful necessity of addressing myself to you again in this unusual and anomalous way. I deeply regret that this necessity has been forced upon me, but I suspected when he introduced the "Addenda" business at the close of his ninth speech, that he wanted to get a precedent established so as to make use of some pretext to put in a sting at the tail end of his last speech, when he knew I would have no chance of replying in the regular way; and my suspicions have proved correct, hence I claim the right of anticipating, in this place, some things he has added to his next speech. I would be glad if his "Addenda" were read before this.

1. He says, "About one-half of Mr. Wilkinson's eleventh speech has been altogether added, or very materially changed, since it was first sent to me in print." And suppose it has. Has not Mr. Wilkinson the same right to alter and enlarge speeches that Mr. Harding has? I have already pointed out, in a previous "Addendum," that Mr. Harding, though repudiating the report of his own speeches when "first sent to him in print," on the ground that he was not as fully reported as I was, yet up to the end of his twentieth speech had seventeen pages and eighteen lines in this book more than I had. Does he expect me to allow him to add to and alter his speeches all he pleases without making any additions or alterations in mine? If he does, he takes me for a greater simpleton than I am. Besides, I have been requested by the publisher to alter my speeches to meet the alterations in my opponents. This I have done to some extent, though I can prove that he has made half a dozen additions and alterations to my one. In fact he has entirely rewritten, recast and enlarged every one of

his speeches from first to last; yet, as soon as I take the same liberty I must be exposed in this odious manner. Had I suspected that the man was capable of such conduct I would never have consented to the publication of this debate at all.

When he says my speech was changed "since it was first sent to him in print," he evidently intends the reader to understand that this was done since it was put in print for this book. But his own "Addenda" unintentionally supply the correct solution. He admits that "the stenographer's manuscript was given to Mr. Wilkinson, and appeared in printed form first in his paper, *The Iconoclast*, My speeches," he says, "were clipped from his paper and were sent to me for correction." But he does not say that Mr. Wilkinson's eleventh speech was sent to him as it appeared in printed form in *The Iconoclast*, months before it was set up for this book, though this was evidently the case, for he admits having *The Iconoclast* of February 15th, 1885 (not clippings from it), hence I have no doubt that all the numbers containing the debate were sent to him also. This, it will be observed, puts quite a different complexion on the matter.

2. With regard to the question of veracity concerning Dr. Stuart, I admit that he has succeeded in putting the case in such a light as to make my position look somewhat doubtful. But when the whole truth is seen it will wear quite a different aspect, and he will be able to make use of all the flattering unctiousness at home that was intended for me in the sentences, "He who would succeed by misrepresentation and trickery needs a good memory," and "The way of transgressors is hard." Now, in order to make me out a false witness he quoted two brief sentences prior to the introduction of Dr. Stuart's definition, and from these two sentences alone, it would seem as if it was the classical definition he was trying to get at. But we will take in a little more of the context and see if this *seeming* intention is true. Here is the whole paragraph, *verbatim et literatim*, with the exception of some interruption notes which have no bearing on the point:

"It is agreed by Mr. Wilkinson that the word in the classics means to immerse. He says I might have saved myself the trouble of producing lexicons and books to prove that it means immerse in the classic use of it. He also admits that it does not mean to sprinkle, and that it does not mean to pour upon, and that it cannot in either case be so defined. Indeed, he has never yet agreed that the word means anything but immerse. Do you remember that I called upon him to answer this question, Tell us what *baptizo* means in the commission. He and I agree that a word in one place can have but one meaning. What is the meaning of *baptizo* in the commission? I

told you he would not give you the meaning. We do not want to know what it symbolizes, or represents. We want to know what the word means. Christ told the apostles to do something. 'Go disciple the nations, baptizing them.' Do something,—baptize them. What does it mean? He says it does not mean to purify or cleanse, but that it symbolizes that. He admits that in classic Greek it means to immerse, but he will not agree that it means anything else. I told you he would not answer that question in Jus last speech, and he did not. I prophesy that he will not answer it in his next speech or any speech—

"Mr. WILKINSON—Of course I won't.

"Mr. HARDING—I knew you wore a coward, and dare not do it.

"He is not going to answer that question because he dare not do it. I will tell you the meaning of the word because I know it. What does Christ tell His apostles to do? To baptize. My opponent does not say what it means. When you ask me the meaning of any word I am using, I will give it you as far as I know it. If I don't know it I will tell you so. My opponent agrees that in the classics it means to immerse. No wonder he agrees to that." (See also pages 54 and 55 of this book).

Now the reader can here see the scope of the context, including the two sentences quoted by Mr. Harding, and I ask all intelligent readers whether it is the classical or scriptural meaning which he was trying to drag out of me and proposing to define. He states, in the brief paragraph quoted, no less than four times, that I admit the word means immerse in the classics. He also calls upon me no less than five times, in the same paragraph, to tell what it means in the commission. He tells the audience no less than six times that I will not or dare not tell them what the word means in the commission, and in one case uses the word "coward." He also boasts that he *can* tell and *will* tell what I *won't* tell, and then immediately quotes from Stuart, Donnegan, Doddridge, Turretin, Casaubon, and Bishop Smith, of Kentucky, all in the same column, to develop the meaning that I was too big a coward to tell them! Surely a man of good sense would hardly take so much pains, and array so much scholarship, especially in a hotly contested debate, when every moment was precious, in order to prove what he repeatedly says I admitted! I could not give him credit for being so stupid. Yet he persists in shouldering the folly, and wants the reader to believe that I told a lie, and was guilty of "trickery and misrepresentation" when I tried to put a more charitable construction on the matter. But the candid reader will have no trouble in deciding the case. If I told a lie, then his course was supremely foolish, but if he acted wisely I told the truth. There is no force whatever in the fact that he used those two sentences im-

mediately before Dr. Stuart's definition, for he used them there, as I have shown, for the fourth time in the paragraph quoted. Besides, his proposition referred exclusively to Christian baptism, and not to classic baptism, hence I cannot conceive why he should want to quote authorities to prove the latter, especially when there was no dispute between us on that point. In view of all these considerations I again "emphatically deny that when my opponent first introduced Stuart's testimony in this debate, that he said it was Stuart's classical definition of *bapto* and *baptizo* instead of his New Testament meaning."

3. As to the charge of "adding to the Word of God," let the reader turn to and read my entire argument on the point in question, and not the garbled extracts given by Mr. Harding, and I am willing to be judged by the result.

4. Mr. Harding would convey the impression that the report of this debate, as supplied by Mr. Bradley, was a one-sided one. This is not true. Mr. Bradley received instructions to supply a full and correct report of the whole debate, and I testify that it was quite as fair to Mr. Harding as to myself. The Syndicate referred to in the Preface was not organized in the interest of either party.

5. He says that his speeches, as they appeared in my paper, wore "very much abbreviated, and most miserably distorted and perverted." I affirm that they were published exactly as reported by Mr. Bradley, with the exception that where a wrong word had been used by the reporter, the right one, as far as possible, was inserted; and I have challenged him and some of his satellites, who have repeated his insinuations, to appoint a committee to compare the published report with the reporter's MS., agreeing to publish the result of their findings in my paper. This they have failed to do. I again affirm that the insinuation is essentially false in every particular. Mr. Anderson, who has made the comparison, has publicly testified to the untruthfulness of this charge, and would do so under oath if necessary.

6. I also deny that I materially enlarged or altered my own speeches as they appeared in *The Iconoclast*. Nearly every alteration was made on the reporter's MS., and consisted almost entirely of mere verbal and grammatical corrections. Mr. Anderson will also bear me out in this.

7. Again, I deny that my speeches, as they appear in this book, have been altered as his have been. I have elsewhere stated the facts.

8. Besides, I don't complain of his changes, and never should have made any allusion to them in this book had he not commenced the trouble by exposing the additions I made to one of my speeches merely to meet the additions and alterations in his. I have acted merely in self-defence.

9. His efforts to prove that I taught the actual regeneration of infants in the debate are too puerile to require any notice. I shall, therefore, pass them by unnoticed.

10. I would like to remind Mr. Harding that the "horses and cattle, dogs and cats, pots and kettles, and other such things," were not baptized in passing through the Red Sea, unless they are included in the phrase "our fathers." (1 Cor. 10: 1, 2.) He can accept the relationship involved, if he wishes, but for my part I repudiate it. I accept the children as included in the phrase, because they afterwards became the "fathers," but not the horses and cattle, and dogs and cats. This is quite as bad as to talk of baptizing skunks. I am surprised to find such quibbles in a *rewritten* speech, over which so much time and study have been spent. It would have been disgraceful even in an extempore speech. And the same is true of a good deal of the banter interspersed throughout this book.

It is an unwelcome and unpleasant task to be compelled to make such exposures of a Christian minister, but he has stubbornly and persistently courted it.

T. L. W.

MR. HARDING'S ELEVENTH REPLY.

I rise to bring to a close the discussion to which you have listened so patiently, for so long a time; and I desire at this point, lest I should forget it at the close, to thank the people of this community for the great patience and kindness which they have manifested during the debate. For considering the crowded hall, and the excitement and disorder that has sometimes been displayed on the platform, we could hardly have expected such quietness and attention from the audiences. But I do not desire to weary you, and so will address myself at once to the subject before us.

Viewed even from the standpoints of its friends, the doctrine of infant baptism is in a most hopeless condition. The following different and conflicting statements are made concerning it by different advocates of the practice:

1. There is not a vestige of it in the New Testament. So say Meyer, Steitz, Neander and others.

2. It is taught in the New Testament by a logical inference. So say many.

3. The covenants of the Old Testament have nothing to do with infant baptism—furnish no ground for it. So say Stuart, Ditzler and others.

4. The covenants of the Old Testament justify infant baptism. So say Mr. Wilkinson and others.

5. Infant baptism is of post-apostolic origin. So say Meyer, Neander and others.

6. Infant baptism originated before the days of the apostles, teaches Mr. Wilkinson.

And now follows the most astonishing fact of all: The different churches that practice this rite base their practice upon different grounds altogether. The Methodists, as Mr. Wilkinson has been teaching you from the beginning, claim that infants are entitled to baptism because they are pure; and hence they are willing to baptize (*rantize*, rather) any infant. The Presbyterians, on the other hand, claim that infants have a right to baptism because their parents are the children of God; hence they will baptize (*rantize*, sprinkle) a child only when one, at least, of its parents is a believer. Hence we have two other conflicting statements to record, viz.:

7. The child is pure; therefore it ought to be baptized. So say Mr. Wilkinson and the Methodists.

8. Not so; the child must have a Christian parent, or it is not fit for baptism. So say Mr. Paterson and the Presbyterians.

9. Whereas, formerly, the doctrine of all Paedo-baptists was: The child is polluted with original sin, and this pollution is washed away in baptism; therefore it ought to be baptized.

Suppose a mother starting out with her infant to determine the question whether or no it shall be baptized. Her husband, though a pious Methodist, says there is no warrant for the practice in reason or revelation (as many such Methodists do), and he objects. She is seeking for information to use in overcoming his objections. She returns, and upon being questioned by him reports thus: Dr. A. said our child is totally depraved, stained by the sin of Adam, and therefore he ought to be baptized. Dr. B. said that he is pure as an angel, and as baptism is for the pure, therefore he ought to be baptized. Dr. C. said that infant baptism is not taught in the Old Testament at all, but that it is taught in the household baptisms, and in other places, in the New. Dr. D. said that it is not taught in the New Testament at all, but that it is taught in the covenants of the Old. Dr. E. said that it is not taught in the Bible at all; that it is of post-apostolic origin; but that it is a good thing, and that the Church had a right to institute the practice, which it did about one hundred years after John died. Dr. F. said if we are Christians, or if either of us is, our child should be baptized. Dr. G. said it matters not whether we are Christians or not, the child ought to be baptized.

What do you think, my friends, would be the state of that woman's mind? Every one of those statements can be obtained from learned Paedo-baptist divines this day. indeed I have here in my possession, and have quoted in your hearing, utterances from the most learned among them, justifying every one of those answers Truth is consistent; error is contradictory. Now if this father and mother should learn, in the course of their investigations, the fact that no mention of infant baptism can be found, in any form of words, by any writer, until one hundred years after the last inspired apostle died, would they not, if they were reasonable, conclude that their child could get along without it? So it seems to me.

Mr. Wilkinson tells us he is not anxious to get rid of Mark's account of the commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." Mark 16: 15, 16. It is well enough that he is not anxious to get rid of it, for it can not be done. Of the five most ancient manuscripts, it is contained in three;

all the most ancient versions—versions much older than any manuscript—contain it; then the passage is quoted by Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Augustine and others of the early fathers. When it is known that the oldest manuscript which omits this passage (Mark 16: 9-20) was written about A. D. 360, and that Irenaeus, who quotes it, wrote 175 years earlier, it will be understood that its failure to appear in the manuscript does not invalidate it as Scripture; for it is demonstrated that the passage was in the world nearly 200 years before the existence of that MS., and it was quoted as Scripture by one who knew Polycarp, who knew John. Would not Mr. Wilkinson be happy if he could link his infant baptism to the apostles in that way? That Syriac version that he relies upon to show that Lydia had children, contains the passage. It (the version) was made in the second century; or, as Mr. Wilkinson prefers to express it, "in the first century after the Christian." No wonder, therefore, the revisers (as Dr. Roberts tells us) did not doubt its full canonical authority, and hence inserted it without the least misgivings as to its being inspired. The book of Acts is an excellent commentary on this account of the commission; the apostles did just what Christ told them to do, as this account gives His instructions. They went to the people, they preached the gospel to them, they baptized those that believed their preaching, and they taught that those who would not believe would be damned. And as long as these verses (Mark 16: 15, 16) stand as inspired, just so long does Jesus limit us to the baptism of believers, and just so long does the "make disciples," which precedes the baptism in Matthew's account, equal the production of faith by preaching the gospel, which precedes the baptism in Mark's account; that is, to "make disciples" is to produce faith in the hearts of people by preaching to them. It is no light thing to change Christ's order, and put the baptism before the faith. If Mr. Wilkinson could produce one case in which a man, woman, or child was baptized by divine authority without faith, from the institution of Christian baptism to the death of John, I would give up the debate. But such a case can not be found.

Mr. Wilkinson seems to rely with great confidence on Colossians 2: 11, 12, to show that baptism came in the room of circumcision. Let us read the passage and see if it has this meaning. It reads thus:

"In whom ye were also circumcised with a circumcision not made with hands, in the putting off of the body of the flesh, in the circumcision of Christ: having been buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye were also raised with Him through faith in the working of

God, who raised **Him from** the dead." Of this circumcision, we learn from the text (1) that it was "not made with hands," and (2) that it consists "in the putting off of the body of the flesh;" we find here the idea of a cutting off, which properly belongs to the word circumcision; "the body of the flesh" which is cut off is equal to the "old man," "the body of sin," of Rom. 6: 6, where the matter is discussed in much the same way. Of the baptism here mentioned, we learn that in it they had been buried with Christ and raised with Him. The facts brought out in the text are these: (a) the Colossians had been circumcised without hands; (b) this circumcision consisted in the putting off of the "old man," "the body of sin," "the body of the flesh;" that is, in the pardon of their sins; (c) it is called "the circumcision of Christ," because it is in and through Christ that we obtain pardon; (d) this pardon takes place in baptism, that is, it is given by our Lord to those whose faith is made perfect by works. (See James 2:22-24.) Hence Peter and other inspired men direct people to be baptized "for the remission of sins." It is hardly necessary to add that almost every scholar of the world, of whatsoever faith he may be, understands the baptism of the passage to be water baptism, and that the apostle had the common practice of immersion in his mind. In denying that there is in the passage any reference to water baptism, or to immersion, Mr. Wilkinson has again (as is not unusual with him) the infelicity of running counter to common sense, and to the best scholarship of the world. I am perfectly willing to leave the question as to whether baptism came in the room of circumcision, and as to what bearing this passage has upon the matter, to this intelligent audience. When the Israelites crossed the Red Sea, they were baptized unto Moses "in the cloud and in the sea." Mr. Wilkinson reminds us that this baptism was typical of Christian baptism, and he argues that as there were infants in the one, there should be in the other: "the antetype should agree with the type," he says. Yes, but there were horses and cattle, dogs and cats, pots and kettles, and other such things, in that passage through the Red Sea; must we have these; things in the antetype? Must we baptize all of our live stock and household utensils, because such things were in the company when the "fathers" were baptized unto Moses? The fact is, Mr. Wilkinson was bent on finding a baby and a baptism in the same passage; and, as he could find no such passage in the New Testament, he went to the Old; as he could not find it in any case of Christian baptism, he went to this passage through the Red Sea. But after all his trouble he finds no comfort, for the passage shows just as conclusively that cattle should be baptized

as babies. As long as we are governed by our Lord's instructions, "Go ye, therefore, and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them," etc, we will have no trouble about the baptism of cattle or babies either. We will preach the gospel and baptize all who receive it gladly. (See Acts 2:41.)

Mr. Wilkinson tells us that in the Syriac version of the New Testament, which, he reminds us, is very ancient and very reliable, it is said that Lydia "and her children" were baptized; and he says, "That version settles the matter." It does, eh? Well, that version contains the last part of Mark's gospel, including the commission; does it settle that matter too? But what if Lydia did have children? I know a man who has three children, and the youngest one is not less than thirty-five years old. I have not either of the Syriac versions here, but I have the original Greek, and the very word which the man of God used; the word (which is properly rendered "household" in our common version) is *oikos*; it is rendered "household" also in the revised version. Its primary meaning is "house." In defining it, Greene, Groves, Bass and lexicographers generally use such words as house, dwelling-place, abode, city, citadel, temple, palace, court, apartment; and then, as secondary meanings, they give household, family, lineage. Mr. Wilkinson is welcome to all the comfort that he can get out of Lydia's household in favor of infant baptism.

"Will he tell us what people require when they grow up to be sinners before baptism?" asks Mr. Wilkinson. Certainly I will; they require faith; one must believe with the heart in the Lord Jesus Christ. The commission teaches this, so does Paul's course with the jailer, and so do many other passages of Scripture.

"Will he tell us in what way faith fits us for baptism?" he asks then. Certainly; baptism is an act of obedience. ("Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the sin of witchcraft, and stubbornness is as iniquity and idolatry." 1 Samuel 15:22, 23.) But without faith it is impossible to obey; without it, it is impossible to please God. (See Heb. 11: G.) Baptism is an expression of faith in the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ; and, as we have seen, no man was ever baptized by the authority of the Lord who did not have this faith in his heart. Unless it is the expression of such a faith, it is nothing but a mere empty, meaningless ceremony in which water, and nothing but water, is given.

Mr. Wilkinson dwelt at considerable length on the Church, the temple of God, in which, he correctly tells us, the Spirit of God

dwells. This temple is built up of living stones, each Christian being a stone. As the temple is the dwelling place for God's Spirit, when we learn who receive the Spirit we settle the question as to who are built as living stones into the building—or, in other words, who are members of Christ's Church on earth. The following passages clearly instruct us as to who receive the Spirit.

"In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and drink. He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture hath said, out of His belly shall flow rivers of living water. (But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive; for the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified)." John 7: 37-39.

This passage shows that the Spirit was not given, to dwell within men, till after the glorification of Christ; and that it was then given to believers.

"And we are His witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey Him." Acts 5: 32. This verse shows that God gave the Spirit to believers who obeyed Him.

"If a man love Me, he will keep My words; and My Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John 14:23. But God abides in us through the Spirit. (See Eph. 2: 22.) Hence this last verse shows that they who love and obey Jesus receive the Spirit.

"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 2:38. Here repentance (implying faith) and baptism are placed in natural and logical order before pardon and the reception of the Spirit.

Don't forget the gospel rule, which gives us this order: (1) Faith (including Repentance), (2) Baptism, (3) Pardon, and (4) The gift of the Spirit. To this rule there is one, and only one, apparent exception, viz., the peculiar case of Cornelius and his friends, in which there was a miraculous outpouring of the Spirit before baptism. In all other cases the order is as given here. I invited Mr. Wilkinson to discuss this question before you (that is, the question of the Spirit's work), but he wisely declined to accept the invitation. So, with the suggestions and Scriptural quotations already given, I shall leave the matter with you.

Mr. McDairmid must have made a very deep impression upon Mr. Wilkinson in the debate which they had at Acton. Mr. Wilkinson cannot forget him; he is continually telling us what the "office

editor" said and did. When I meet my old college friend again, I will toll him that the sting of his thrusts has not ceased in Mr. Wilkinson to this day, for he continues to sneer and snarl at every remembrance of him.

In conclusion, I desire to sum up a number of facts that have been brought before you during the progress of the discussion—facts that settle the question beyond the possibility of a reasonable doubt.

1. God prophesied through Jeremiah that He would make "a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah: that it should not be according to the covenant which He made with their fathers when He led them out of the land of Egypt;" that He would put His laws in their minds, and write them in their hearts; that all under this covenant would know Him, and hence would not teach one another, saying, Know the Lord; for all would know Him, "from the least to the greatest;" that He would be merciful to their unrighteousness, and that their sins and iniquities should be remembered no more. Paul quotes this prophecy (Heb. 8: 8-12), and applies it to the Church of Christ. The provisions of it absolutely exclude infants. With this covenant, as set forth by Jeremiah, Christ's commission to His apostles, under which they inaugurated the new institution, perfectly agrees; they were to instruct the people—put God's laws into their minds and hearts—and then, when they gladly received these laws into their hearts, they were to baptize them for the remission of their sins.

2. In the course of time John the Baptist came, baptizing. He taught the people, and they were then baptized "confessing their sins." It is admitted that he baptized no infants.

3. Then Jesus, after he had been baptized, began to teach the people, and to have His disciples baptize them. It is said that "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John." He first made disciples, and then baptized them. Even Mr. Wilkinson himself is constrained to admit that neither John nor Jesus baptized infants.

4. After the ascension of Jesus the apostles began to preach in His name and to baptize under the commission which he had given them; we are told that they baptized those that "gladly received" their words, that they baptized "believers," "men" and "women," but it is nowhere said that they baptized infants; we carefully went through all the cases of baptism given in the New Testament, as they are summed up by the Presbyterian McKay, in his little book, and we found no infants in any case: there is not an injunction to baptize infants, nor an example of infant baptism in the entire New Testament; or, as Meyer vigorously expresses it, there is *no trace* of it to be found in the New Testament.

5. The year A. D. 200 dawns upon the world; the apostle John, the last of the apostles, has been dead for one hundred years; all the people that ever knew him, or any other apostle, are dead; then it is for the first time that we find a mention of infant baptism in all the annals of time; Tertullian is saying that they should not be baptized—that they are innocent, and don't need to be. Ten years later the first man appears who writes in the defence of the practice.

Here now are five facts, and I defy any man living to show that they do not fairly and fully present the whole case, from the beginning to the days of Origen.

The discussion is now drawing to a close. I have enjoyed it very much, and I should like to have another one, for I am sure that they do great good. This one has done much good already. I am glad to know that it has. And it will do far more in the days to come; for, long after the heat of the discussion has passed away, the facts and arguments will remain in the minds of the people, and they will work like leaven.

I have, at times, been very much stirred up by the unfairness and injustice of my opponent and his supporters, and I have spoken some very plain words in a pretty hot way; but, gentlemen, I am happy to say, as I stand here before you, that I have not a word to take back. What I have said in that way is true; I meant it, and I do not take a word of it back. I am willing for it to go on record just as I spoke it, and to be tried by it.

Once, when some people were going out during one of my speeches, I said, "If it is uncomfortably warm in here for you, just pass out and cool off," or words to that effect. The chairman thought that I ought not to have made the remark, and I cheerfully granted, after a moment's reflection, that he was right. With that single exception, I do not think of anything that I have said or done that needs any sort of modification or apology.

I am glad that my friends have been so patient, and from my heart I thank them for their cordial, enthusiastic support. I like to be in Meaford, and to associate with Meaford people I like to be in this country. It is a grand country. If it were the will of God, I would be glad to have many debates with Methodists and Presbyterians all over it.

[Time expired.]

ADDENDA.

About one-half of Mr. Wilkinson's eleventh speech has been altogether added, or very materially changed, since it was first sent to me in print. I do not object to these additions and changes, as I have told the publisher that he may make any additions to his speeches he pleases, provided I am always allowed to reply. Among these additions there are a few matters only that need any attention from me. They are as follows:

I Mr. Wilkinson says, "I take the liberty of denying emphatically (whatever complexion may be put upon the matter in his re-written speeches for publication), that when my opponent first introduced Stuart's testimony in this debate, that he said it was Stuart's classical definition of *bapto* and *baptizo*, instead of his New Testament meaning. The auditors or readers can accept whichever statement they please."

I am glad that Mr. Wilkinson made this statement, for it enables me to bring out all the facts concerning the controversy over Stuart's definition. The debate had not advanced through many sessions before Mr. Wilkinson began to see that the testimonies of the learned and well-known Paedo-baptists whom I introduced were having a very considerable effect upon the audience; and he felt that it was necessary to break the force of the influence which I was thus obtaining. As he could not find that I had made the slightest inaccuracy in any quotation, he charged that I was misapplying the quotations by so using them as to convey ideas that they were never intended to express. But he knew that this charge would have no weight whatever, unless he could show one case at least in which I had thus perverted some one's testimony. He therefore charged that I had quoted Mr. Stuart's *classical* definition of *bapto* and *baptizo*, while giving the audience to understand that the definition was designed to express the meaning of the words as used in the New Testament. As the debate came through the press, it became evident to even the most careless reader of the "proofs" that this charge was false; for it appeared that I had introduced Stuart's testimony expressly for the purpose of showing the moaning of the words in the classics. So, into his last speech he inserts the charge that, however it may appear in my speeches as *re-written*, in the *oral* debate I was guilty of the perversion.

Now for the facts: (1) The stenographer employed by the Disciples took sick early in the debate, and died not a great while afterwards.

So we depended altogether for the report upon the gentleman employed by the other side. (2) The stenographer's manuscript was given to Mr. Wilkinson and appeared in printed form first in his paper, *The Iconoclast*. My speeches were clipped from his paper and were sent to me for correction. I have now before me *The Iconoclast* of February 15th, 1885, in which my fourth speech on the first proposition appears, as printed from the reporter's manuscript. This is the speech in which I introduced Stuart's definition. I quote from the paper, *verbatim et literatim*, as follows: "My opponent agrees that in the classics it means to immerse. No wonder he agrees to that. Dr. Stuart, a most distinguished Presbyterian, says, '*Bapto* and *baptiz*' mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into any thing liquid.' He gives many examples, and then says, 'A review of the preceding examples must lead any one, I think, to the conclusion that the predominant usage of the words *bapto* and *baptizo* is to designate the idea of dipping, plunging, or overwhelming, and (in the case of *bapto*) of tinging and dyeing.'"

So it appears that the stenographer's report, *as it appeared in Mr. Wilkinson's paper*, before I ever saw it, shows clearly that I introduced Stuart's classical definition *as a classical definition*, and hence Mr. Wilkinson's charge is utterly without foundation. Nor is it left to "the auditors or readers "to" accept whichever statement they please," as his own paper settles the matter against him. He who would succeed by misrepresentation and trickery needs a good memory. "The way of transgressors is hard."

2. God said to Abraham, "He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised." Gen. 17: 13. I argue that baptism did not come in the room of circumcision, for this reason (among many others), viz.: Circumcision was given to adults when they were bought with the money of a Jew, *regardless of their faith, or want of faith*. Mr. Wilkinson evidently feels the force of this objection. This is the way in which he endeavors to get rid of it: He says, "If the candidate were an infant, it (circumcision) would be unconditional. If an adult, faith in Israel's God would be required." He grants that faith is not expressed as a condition, that there is an "absence of any *expressed* conditions," but he does not hesitate to affirm that faith was required of adults. Any man who can thus add to the Word of God can easily justify himself in the practice of infant baptism. He can just *say* that, although it is not *expressed* anywhere in the Bible, it was practiced by the apostles.

But he who is determined to go by what is written would consider such a course exceedingly wicked.

3. Mr. Wilkinson represents me as saying that Bledsoe was "the most candid, able, and learned of all the Methodists of the United States." I have no recollection of saying that. He was *one of the most* candid, able, and learned of them all; but that he was above all, excelled all, I have never thought. But any man who will misrepresent, add to, and take from the words of God, will be sure to be unscrupulous in handling the words of men.

4. In his "first Addendum," in speaking of my speeches, Mr. Wilkinson says: "His speeches, as they appear in this book, are not his speeches as delivered in Meaford." Very true; and about this a word of explanation is necessary. As has been said, our stenographer (the one employed by the Disciples) took sick early in the debate; shortly afterwards he died; the report of the other stenographer was given to Mr. Wilkinson, and was published by him in his paper, *The Iconoclast*. My speeches, as they appeared in the paper, were very much abbreviated, and most miserably distorted and perverted. *Many of my half-hour speeches, as they appeared in his paper, could be read in a deliberate way within from six to ten minutes. And many paragraphs in them I would never have recognized as intended for parts of my speeches, had I not been told that they were.*

When the first of these speeches were sent to me for correction, I determined to have nothing to do with them, and so at once sent them back. I had agreed to correct the proofs of my speeches free of charge, provided the publishers would give their MSS. directly to the printer without allowing either Mr. Wilkinson or myself to tamper with them; I furthermore agreed to limit myself to verbal and grammatical corrections, promising that I would neither add to the speeches nor take from them a single idea, provided they would limit Mr. Wilkinson in the same way. As they had not accepted and complied with my conditions, I felt under no obligation to correct their proofs. Upon my returning the speeches uncorrected, Mr. Anderson (whom Mr. Wilkinson calls the publisher-in-chief) wrote me a kind letter, saying that the reporter had failed to make a full and correct report of the debate, and, as he was anxious to publish such an one, he requested me to correct the speeches, making them what they ought to be. He promised to print what I would write. Being moved, then, simply by a love of the truth, and a desire for a full and fair report of the debate, I undertook the work. In writing up the debate, I adopted for my guidance two rules, namely:

406 REPORT OF DEBATE ON THE MODE AND SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM.

1. I resolved to bring out in as clear and forcible a way as I could every idea presented in the stenographer's report of my speeches.

2. In the second place, I determined to reply to everything I might find in Mr. Wilkinson's speeches that seemed to me to need attention.

I told the publishers that I did not care how much Mr. Wilkinson might add to his speeches, provided they would allow me to reply to all he said; I was as willing to debate with him with the pen as with the tongue.

True, Mr. Wilkinson did not see my speeches "in proof-sheets" before he fixed up his replies, but he did see them in manuscript; they were sent to him by the printer before they were put in type. This I learned from the printer, into whose office I strolled one day while passing through Toronto.

True it is, my speeches, as they appear in the book, are not the speeches that were delivered at Meaford; and precisely the same statement can be made with equal truth of Mr. Wilkinson's speeches. And I presume the book is none the worse, but rather better, on that account. I presume that not a single argument of any weight, or fact of any importance, has been left out of the published debate that was given in the oral discussion.

To the items of Mr. Wilkinson's "first Addendum," I do not care to reply, except to the fifth. He still claims that he has not taught in this debate that infants are born again. On pages 192-3 he quotes the Discipline as follows: "Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized, but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth. He then adds, "That is what we teach." On page 267 he teaches that our Lord's phrase "born again" means "regenerated." On page 292 he teaches that "to baptize" is to "regenerate." On pages 306-7 he says, "The new birth is effected by spiritual baptism, the sign of which is water baptism." Then, in baptizing a child, he says, (see Discipline, p. 167) "Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Saviour, Christ, saith, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, I beseech you," etc. Then he turns around with great indignation (see p. 338), and exclaims: "I don't know why my opponent persists in representing me as teaching that infants are born again. I teach no such thing."

Poor man! he is in a bad way.