

THE

LOUISVILLE DEBATE:

A DISCUSSION OF THE QUESTION,

WHAT IS CHRISTIAN BAPTISM?

INCLUDING ITS PROPER SUBJECTS AND DESIGN,

BETWEEN

ELDER L. B. WILKES,

Of the Christian Church, Lexington, Ky.,

AND

REV. JACOB DITZLER,

Of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Louisville, Ky.

HELD IN "WEISIGER HALL," LOUISVILLE, KY.,

Beginning on the 13th and Closing on the 28d of December, 1870

REPORTED,

On the part of Mr. Wilkes, by Mr. BENN PITMAN, Cincinnati, O.,

Assisted by Miss FRANCES E. SPRAGUE, Cincinnati, O.,

And on the part of Mr. Ditzler, by MORRIS E. JONES, Louisville, Ky.

LEXINGTON, KY.:

J. D. TRAPP, OF THE "APOSTOLIC TIMES," PUBLISHER.

1871.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1871,

By L. B. WILKES and J. DITZLER,

In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

STEREOTYPED AT THE FRANKLIN TYPE FOUNDRY, CINCINNATI.

THE LOUISVILLE (KY.) DEBATE.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM: WHAT IS IT?

INCLUDING ITS PROPER SUBJECTS AND DESIGN.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LOUISVILLE, KY., April 8, 1870.

Elder L. B. Wilkes:

DEAR SIR:—From the papers published in our churches, we may infer our people are exceedingly pleased with the result of our debate. Your people must be pleased, if we are to credit the papers published in the interest of your church at Cincinnati, Lexington, etc. So with us. Our people—Methodist—express great regret that the debate was not “taken down” and published. I see, also, that the *Times*, of your church, proposes that an exhaustive discussion be held, though to be published in a leading paper of each of our churches. I propose, therefore, that we hold such discussion, “exhaustive,” on the leading differences between our churches; that it be held in Lexington or Louisville, Ky., as they are leading points in our State, and in the fall or early part of the coming winter, and *published in book form.*

Propositions can be arranged hereafter. I am willing that, as to “mode” or “action” of baptism, the Campbell and Rice debate proposition be taken; and, as to subjects, I will affirm the language of our article of religion on it, substituting “infant” for “young,” so as to make it perfectly unambiguous to all. I am satisfied for you to affirm the object of it, as in our recent debate, if you prefer, or as in Campbell and Rice’s debate, or the Brooks and Fitch debate. But these points, and all others, can be settled hereafter to the satisfaction of all, I suppose.

Of course there will be equal affirmatives on both sides.

I will be in Louisville, Ky., April 19th to 24th; at North Middletown, May 2d to 10th. I would suggest that the *Times* and one of our ablest papers (so far as I am concerned) could be allowed to publish at once the opening and closing address on each proposition, which usually embrace most of the leading points made. All this as you prefer.

If not convenient for you, any man indorsed by your leading papers as a representative man in learning and Christian courtesy, will be satisfactory. With kindest regards, yours in Christ,

J. DITZLER.

LEXINGTON, KY., April 18, 1870.

Elder J. Ditzler:

DEAR SIR:—Yours of 8th inst. is received. You say that your brethren are pleased with the results of our late discussion at Mt. Sterling. This may be so. You admit that my brethren appear to be well satisfied, also. This, I presume, is true.

You express the opinion that each party desires that there should be an exhaustive discussion of the principal points of difference between our churches, and that it be published in book form. I agree with you that this ought to be done, and will most certainly coöperate with you in bringing it to pass. You then name yourself as one of the debaters, and me as the other. Now, I suggest that it might be better for us and for the cause of truth, if we should call upon our brethren on each side to know whether they desire such a discussion, and if so, ask them to select the ones whom they wish to conduct it. This prudent preliminary step I hope you will think is wise and good. You may adopt your own mode of determining these questions; I will do the same.

I suppose, in case we are the selected speakers, that we ought to be able to represent a class of brethren, on each side, respectable in number and for their positions in their respective churches. Will you agree to this?

Our suggestion, made in the *Times*, was to have a written discussion. Much irrelevant matter would, in that case, be omitted, that would certainly appear in an oral debate. The parties, being calm, and writing at their leisure, would be able to present, in the same space, much more valuable matter and in better form than they could in an oral discussion. If we should be the selected parties, and it suits you to engage in an exhaustive written discussion, I shall be ready to proceed at once to settle all other preliminary questions.

As to propositions for discussion, I have a word to say. I am anxious on all questions where I am logically in the affirmative, to affirm, and I will affirm in no other case. The same is true in regard to the negative. I will not ask an advantage in the statement of a

question for debate, nor do I here intend to even insinuate that you would. I only wish, on this point, to be perfectly understood in this the very beginning of our correspondence. Let us, in the fewest and simplest words possible, put sharp, logical issues before the people, and each take the side of the question which accords with his convictions. If this be done, we may hope for the best results possible. You immerse, and so do I. On this we can, of course, form no logical issue. You sprinkle and call it baptism. I deny that it is so taught in the Scriptures. Do you affirm that sprinkling is Christian baptism and I will deny. In regard to the subjects of Christian baptism, you claim that infants ought to be baptized. I deny that the Scriptures so teach. Here, again, is a clear, logical issue. Do you affirm, on this subject, the Mt. Sterling proposition, and I will deny. I will affirm that "Baptism is for remission of sins." You deny this. On the questions about baptism we thus present three propositions, which, however, I have not attempted herein to fully and formally express in words. Thus far I have only one affirmation. I am perfectly willing to have two, or an equal number with yourself. What the other proposition shall be, and all other preliminaries, may be settled without trouble in due time. Let me hear from you soon.

Very truly, yours, L. B. WILKES.

NORTH MIDDLETOWN, KY., May 2, 1870.

Elder L. B. Wilkes:

DEAR SIR:—Yours of the 18th of April was received by me as I passed through Louisville, April 29th, on my way to this place, and I now hasten to reply.

As doubtless you know I have to travel almost constantly through four or five States, superintending in one or two of them the interests of our church, a *written* discussion, such as you speak of, if "exhaustive," would require at least eighteen months. At Mount Sterling we had three propositions; three days to each; four addresses by each a day. A half-hour's address would make a long article in a paper. The debate proposed would require, of course, four days to each of the old propositions and two days to the fourth one—fourteen days in all. Fourteen days, eight addresses each day, amounts to one hundred and twelve addresses or articles. That would require two years and two months to conduct the debate to a close, if an article appeared every

week. If from each of us one appeared—two every week—it would consume over a year. Often, doubtless, we would not have time to get our replies in the next number of the paper. Accidents would often delay and prolong the discussion. Such a long discussion would be very tedious, and not interesting to the people, I think. But with me it is impossible to hold a written discussion; for I can not stay at home a whole year or more, simply to write such articles when my duties compel me to travel; and of course, I would have to be where my library is if I wrote. You, I believe, live in Lexington, and would not be situated as myself.

I am ready and willing to leave it to our people and preachers who shall represent our side, though I speak of myself, and did in the other letter, because they unanimously, so far as I could learn, demanded that I conduct the debate. Hence I can not arrange for a *written* one, when it is impossible for me to be where I could write or promptly get your replies, etc.

I am not sure I understand the meaning of the sentence commencing, "I suppose in case we are the selected speakers," ending "Will you agree to this?" Hence I will await its explanation. I take it each represents his church—is selected by his church.

As to the advantages of writing over speaking, I am perfectly willing that *all* I say in debate shall go to press, we being allowed to act under the rules adopted by Campbell and Rice in their debate. As to propositions, it is certainly as logical for you to affirm exclusive immersion, which is your practice, as for me to affirm affusion. If I affirm affusion, that implies the *denial* of exclusive immersion. If you affirm exclusive immersion, you thereby *deny* affusion. You propose to deny affusion; *i. e.*, sprinkling and pouring as baptism. Well, do you not practice *exclusive* immersion? Affirm what you practice. If you do this, you affirm *all* you practice on this point. If we affirm, we are made to affirm only a *part* of our practice. As for logical affirmatives, it is more logical that you affirm *all* you practice, when it is so simple in terms, than for us to affirm a *part* of ours only. Your side has *always* unhesitatingly affirmed exclusive immersion, so far as I know, till very recently at Winchester and Mt. Sterling. I hope, therefore, you will do what all your people have done till so recently. You ask me to affirm the Mt. Sterling proposition on infant baptism. Surely you know that it was worded after the Presbyterian faith, not of ours, and that we all object to it. "Of a believing parent" is not in our Discipline. You agreed we ought to discuss "*the differences*

between" our churches. So far I have aimed to put the questions as they *ought* to be. But though I and my people regard them as unfair as arranged at Mt. Sterling, if you do not agree to affirm immersion exclusive, I propose the following: We will debate the Mt. Sterling propositions *verbatim*, as they stood, and affirm as there agreed and acted upon, and request, as all our people agree, that it be held in Lexington, Ky. We propose that the four adjacent presiding elders of the four districts around Lexington, with the traveling preachers in their districts—forty-five—select the Methodist debatable, your representative to be selected as you prefer, since you seem to request that the speakers be selected by their churches. If the debate is to come off, as I understand it is, at Cynthiana, and to be published in book form, it will remove the trouble as to any publication, or, if it please your people and Bro. Miller and his people, arrangements may be made to have the Lexington debate published instead of that one. That as you and they prefer. The fourth proposition you may draw up, on the operation of the Holy Spirit, and let me see it. If the one in Campbell and Rice's debate suits you, it does me, and have two days on it in debate. Of course we will have four days on mode, four on design of baptism, and four on subjects.

Several items I need not note now, in one of which you seemed not exactly to understand me. I write thus carefully, because, as said, I am going all the time—correspondence must be irregular. I will be in Louisville, May 17th—near Mount Sterling till then. Please send me the *Millennial Harbinger* commencing from December, 1869, at Louisville, Ky., and I will send you the money for it. By so doing, you will oblige. Yours, truly,

J. DITZLER.

ELDER L. B. WILKES, Lexington, Ky.

LEXINGTON, KY., May 10, 1870.

Elder J. Ditzler:

DEAR SIR: Yours of May 2d is received. You agree to the suggestions in my last letter that we should ask our brethren on each side—1. Whether they wish such a debate as you suggest; and 2. Whom they would select to hold it. Till these questions are answered by them in favor of the discussion, etc., our correspondence need not proceed further. When ready on your part, let me hear from

you. There will be a notice in our paper of this week in regard to the discussion. So soon as the information desired is obtained, I will inform you. Meantime, if you are in our city at any time and will let me know it, I will call and see you. I will affirm the following proposition on the Spirit question: "In the conversion of the sinner, the Holy Spirit operates through the truth." This is exactly what I believe. I affirm on this question nothing more. Also, I affirm that "The kingdom of Christ was set up subsequently to the birth of John the Baptist." Now, you may take either of these propositions, and then, so far as you and I are concerned, the *propositions* are all settled. Let me hear from you in due time.

Very respectfully, yours,

L. B. WILKES.

RULES AND STIPULATIONS OF THE DISCUSSION.

THE rules and stipulations of a discussion between L. B. Wilkes and Jacob Ditzler, to be held in the city of Louisville, and to commence on the 13th of December, 1870, are as follows:

1. The discussion shall commence on Tuesday, December 13, 1870.
2. It shall be held in Weisiger Hall, Louisville, Ky.
3. Dr. W. H. Hopson is selected as Moderator by Mr. Wilkes, and C. W. Miller is selected as Moderator by Mr. Ditzler, and it is agreed that these two shall select a President Moderator. The decision of a majority of these three shall be final on all questions of order that may arise.

4. In the opening of each new subject, the affirmant may occupy one hour, and the respondent the same time, and each thereafter one-half hour alternately to the close of the subject.

The debate shall commence each day at 10 A. M., and close at 12 M.; be resumed at 2, and close at 4 P. M., unless hereafter changed.

5. On the final negative no new matter shall be introduced.

6. The first question shall be discussed three days, the second three days, and the third four days, unless otherwise ordered by agreement between the debaters.

7. Each debater shall furnish a stenographer or phonographer, who shall pledge himself to make a verbatim report, as nearly as possible, of the speeches as they are delivered.

8. It is the privilege of the debaters to make any verbal or grammatical changes in the reports that shall not alter the state of the argument or change any fact.

9. It is agreed that the expenses of publishing the discussion shall be borne equally by the debaters, each giving his obligation to the publisher for one-half of the same, and receiving in return one-half of the books published.

10. The discussion shall be conducted in the presence of Elders I. B. Grubbs, W. C. Dawson, J. B. Briney, and J. C. Keith, on the part of Mr. Wilkes; and in the presence of Rev. R. C. Rivers, Prof. B. H. McCown, Eld. R. Hiner, and Rev. Dr. Stuart Robinson, on the part of Mr. Ditzler.

11. The debaters agree to adopt as "rules of decorum" those found in Hedge's Logic, p. 159, to-wit:

1. The terms in which the question in debate is expressed and the point at issue should be so clearly defined that there would be no misunderstanding respecting them.

2. The parties should mutually consider each other as standing on a footing of equality in respect to the subject in debate. Each should regard the other as possessing equal talents, knowledge, and a desire for truth with himself, and that it is possible, therefore, that he may be in the wrong and his opponent in the right.

3. All expressions which are unmeaning or without effect in regard to the subject in debate should be strictly avoided.

4. Personal reflections on an opponent should in no instance be indulged.

5. The consequences of any doctrine are not to be charged upon him who maintains it, unless he expressly avows them.

6. As truth and not victory is the professed object of controversy, whatever proofs may be advanced on either side should be examined with fairness and candor, and any attempt to answer an adversary by arts of sophistry, or to lessen the force of his reasoning by wit, caviling, or ridicule, is a violation of the rules of honorable controversy.

PROPOSITIONS FOR DISCUSSION.

The propositions for discussion are as follows :

I. Infant baptism is authorized by the Word of God. Mr. Ditzler affirms, Mr. Wilkes denies.

II. Baptism is for remission of sins. Mr. Wilkes affirms, Mr. Ditzler denies.

III. The sprinkling or pouring of water upon a proper subject, by a proper administrator, is Christian baptism. Mr. Ditzler affirms, Mr. Wilkes denies.

Subscribed by the undersigned, in the city of Lexington, this 30th day of October, 1870.

L. B. WILKES,

J. DITZLER.

PRELIMINARIES.

DR. W. H. HOPSON and REV. C. W. MILLER having selected Hon. J. T. Bush as President Moderator; the time for the discussion to begin having arrived, and the disputants, with their reporters, being present, Judge Bush arose, and called the assembly to order.

The Rev. G. W. Brush offered up a fervent and impressive prayer, whereupon the first proposition :

INFANT BAPTISM

IS AUTHORIZED BY THE WORD OF GOD,

having been announced, Mr. Ditzler was requested to proceed to open the discussion.

MR. DITZLER'S OPENING ARGUMENT.

TUESDAY, Dec. 13th, 10 A. M.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

WE appear in your presence this morning to discuss a question that necessarily involves the great and fundamental principles of religion—to determine the mode of baptism, a question that will come up for discussion hereafter, writers have reviewed the literature, profane and sacred, of two thousand years, and all for the purpose of trying to determine the meaning of one single word. To determine the meaning of a little particle of only three letters in Greek, the same broad field of literature has been examined by the most learned and thoroughly-qualified scholars of the different ages of the world. If, then, such simple questions as these demand such thorough investigation and examination into the laws of language and all kindred subjects, we may expect, also, that this question of the scripturalness of infant baptism should involve a great deal of thorough investigation.

To determine the force of the commission found in Matthew xxviii: 19, the only authority we have to baptize any body, we must place ourselves, mentally, as far as possible, where the apostles stood. We must try to enter into their feelings, ideas, sympathies, and shades of thought on principles to which they had been educated and with which they were thoroughly conversant. It is not sufficient to object to this by saying it imposes too heavy a task upon the parent; that it is an investigation they can never go through; and, therefore, they may be excused from baptizing their children. I might, by the same reasoning, respond that we ought not to be baptized at all, since we have to go through such labored investigation to determine the *action* of baptism. The infidel can offer infinitely superior objections to the whole plan of Christianity, for we are commanded to believe in the principles of the Christian religion; and how few can examine its evidences from a scientific and historic stand-point?

The merits of this whole question lie in the far more important question of *infant relation to the church of God*, and we shall, accordingly, address ourselves to the *greater*, which all acknowledge includes the *less*. We will proceed to show *what is the idea, design, and history of God's church, its origin, and what makes it*. We will see that it *originates in the nature and design of Religion; necessarily develops therefrom, and is, therefore, RESULTANT, consequent upon principles that give rise and EXISTENCE to it*; that it (the church) is *secondary in point of importance and time*, and that from its very design *infants are included in it*.

Before I proceed to such an investigation, it may be proper to read to you from what we call our Book of Discipline. It is language which many of you may not understand, for any book written at the time this ritual was is liable to be misunderstood. On page 142 we have the form of prayer used when we baptize infants

"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, 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. Amen."

Just before the minister baptizes the child, after this prayer, he says:

"In causing *this child* to be brought into the church of Christ, it is your duty to teach *him* to renounce the devil and all his works; the vain pomp and glory of the world, with all covetous desires of the same, and the carnal desires of the flesh, so that he may not follow or be led by them, to believe all the articles of the Christian faith, and to obediently keep God's holy will and commandments all the days of his life"

Now, you will remember that when they pray over the child just before the act of baptism, they use such language as this. "Be received into the church of Christ." By this they mean what we call the *external* or *visible* church of Christ as an *organization*. They had, therefore, this notion, whose truth we do not now propose to discuss,

that the *invisible* church of God represents all those who are in Christ Jesus, who sustain a saving relation to God through the cross of Christ Jesus; that this is the invisible kingdom, or invisible church of God. At the same time they believe that it was arranged for mutual good and the spread of the truths of the Bible among men. I will remark here that I do not suppose that my worthy and Christian opponent will take the position that what we call the visible church (that is, my people so call it), the united body of Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, etc., all together constitute the *entire body* of God's people. He doubtless perfectly understands what I wish to impress upon your minds. I mean that we believe and teach that any person who sustains a saving relation to God, through the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, will be received into the kingdom of heaven as a member of God's church, whether he has received the ordinances of the church or not. I mean by the term ordinances, circumcision, baptism, or any ordinance of the flesh. This is what we believe. The church of God, from its very nature, is coequal with and corresponds to the people or family of God, so that no person can be a member of one without being a member of the other. Much less do I believe my brother will take the position that some do take, though I do not say his church does. Will he say that his church is coextensive with the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ on earth, so that to be a member of his church is to be a member of Christ's church, in the New Testament sense of the word? And that to be a member of the New Testament church is necessarily to be a member of *his* church, so that you can not be one without being the other; and when you have counted all those who are in affiliation with his church you have counted all who belong to the New Testament spiritual family—all the members of the *church of God*. I do not suppose he will take that position, yet this is what I mean when I say the one is entirely coextensive with the other. These definitions will be of importance throughout this whole discussion, hence I wish to make them at the outset.

We shall now proceed to show that, as God is *unchangeable*, and human nature, as such, is the same through all ages, and needs the *same remedy*, religion is always the same, and the church the same in its *principles* and *design*; that it did not originate in ordinances of the flesh, but existed thousands of years before any carnal ordinance, such as baptism, or even circumcision, was introduced, and with the same *design* as now; that *infants* enjoyed membership and recognition in

this church; that their religious wants were seen to, and that the first ordinance ever introduced was administered to infants, the second administered to none—the lamb in Egypt—though it had infants as its beneficiaries, and was equally in their behalf, showing Heaven's legislation for their benefit, as well as the rest of mankind. We shall see that when we find this church in the clearest historical development, infants are recognized as members, entitled to its privileges and immunities. Hence we find the church in existence, having no ordinances of the flesh. We find the church receiving these ordinances afterward; but their introduction did not change the principles or design of it, nor destroy the immunities or privileges of its members. We can not doubt that God's design in the introduction of these carnal ordinances was a precaution against idolatry, or similar evils that militated against a pure spiritual worship of Almighty God; and the efficacy of the fleshly ordinances pertaining to the Mosaic economy had as their ultimate end this precaution, or aid to an understanding of spiritual religion. The whole design was a spiritual religion, and that you may see the force of all this I might remark further that our opponents have, in their opinion, their most plausible objection to infant baptism right here; and hence it will not be discourteous in me to state what are the leading arguments against infant baptism. We are told that it is contrary to the teaching of the Word, which says baptism is the answer of a good conscience; that it destroys the freedom of will, the right to choose. I do not know that my opponent will urge this, but some of his people do. But here is the leading objection to infant baptism, if I understand it rightly. They hold that infants were members of the Jewish Church, entitled to its ordinances, and received its ordinances; but they claim that these ordinances were not spiritual, but carnal ordinances—of the flesh; that the Mosaic institution was not a spiritual, life-giving institution; and that, therefore, infants, being members of that institution, received its ordinances, which were only of a temporal or fleshly nature; that on the day of Pentecost, or thereabouts, a spiritual institution was instituted, popularly called the church, community, or kingdom of heaven, and that now the conditions of membership were entirely changed; that with the new institution came a new constitution and "*new principles*," contemplating spiritual regeneration; that infants are not capable of regeneration and the graces spoken of, and, therefore, they are necessarily excluded from what we term the New Testament Church; that the Christian Church is *one* church, and the Jewish

Church, in its most spiritual day, was *another*; and, though it be admitted that infants were members of the Jewish Church, the spiritual design of the New Testament Church destroys that membership. This is their position, and in support of it they especially quote John i: 12, 13, and Hebrews viii: 8, 12. But this will come up at the proper time, and you will hear from my opponent before I discuss it. I simply name the points, that you may understand them.

Now, the merits of this whole question concentrate upon this point: *Was the Jewish Church a spiritual institution?* Was true religion, consisting of *purity of heart and excellency of character*, the real design of that institution? and were these its *fundamental* principles? We affirm that they were. My opponent, or at least the standards on his side, *unanimously* contend that they *were not*. They may admit that sin was "*laid over*," but not really pardoned. And Mr. Alexander Campbell, who is a standard with them, is decidedly plain on this. He says, in his "Christian Baptism," his most mature work: "The Jewish institution, and the people under it, were alike carnal. 'Carnal ordinances,' says Paul, 'were imposed on them until the time of reformation.' They had *letter* and *symbol*, but they had not the spirit nor the reality."—P. 105. Again on page 100 he says, "Hundreds of years passed away before any one thought of making baptism a substitute for infant circumcision." Again, on page 105 he says that religion signified a purifying of the flesh only. So in his debate with Rice he says, on page 309, that "*neither faith nor piety* was contemplated in the Jews' religion." I quote these as his words. On the same page he says, "No wonder that John the Baptist and the Messiah preached a *new religion*, a *new repentance*, a *new birth*, and that flesh must give place to faith, and blood to piety." I could read from "The Living Pulpit," a standard work of theirs, to the same effect. If the church of God ceased to exist in Christ's day, these inspired promises of Almighty God, all of which are indorsed and often quoted in the New Testament, were all false; and so the whole volume is untrue. Membership in it depended on the same principles that still are given to regulate the church. Our opponents admit no membership without baptism; therefore, if infants are members they are entitled to baptism. I will now read to you from Vattel's "Law of Nations," a quotation I always make—p. lxxv. preliminary idea and general principles, § 26 and note 9: "When a custom or usage is *generally* established . . . if that custom is in its own nature indifferent, and, much more, if it be useful and reasonable, it becomes ob-

ligatory on all the nations in question, who are considered as having given their consent to it, and are bound to observe it toward each other AS LONG AS THEY HAVE NOT EXPRESSLY declared their resolution of not observing it in future." In note 10: "There must be a reasonable notification . . . not to be bound by the customary law."—Martin's L. V. 356, and Fenning's V. Lord Granville, 1 Tauntin's Rep. 248, Chitty's Crim. Law, 29, 35, 92.

I now proceed to the main question, to show that *there was a spiritual religion; that it has always been the same, had the same God as its object of worship, the same human beings as its subjects, and the same heaven to attain; that it confers the same general benefit on mankind through purity of heart and excellency of character; that infants enjoyed membership in that church; that it was never destroyed, but has become more and more spiritualized, from age to age, and is still in existence—"the church of God."* It is not called the Christian Church in the New Testament, though we use that term. I will now define the term "*church*." There are two words for it which mean the same in Greek, Hebrew, and Chaldee. Ἐκκλησία (*ekklesia*) occurs only twice in the four Gospels, both times in Matthew, which was, doubtless, written in Hebrew, *i. e.*, Syriac. It means to "call out," "summon," "assemble," and it may be applied in classic Greek to any ordinary assembly, but in the New Testament it is generally applied to a religious body, and it is popularly rendered church or congregation. Then we have קהל, *kahal*—Hebrew—"to call together," "convoke," or "assemble." We can, therefore, only determine whether it is applied to a mob, an assembly, or a religious body, from the context—from the place where it occurs. Thus only can we learn what significance is attached to any word. If a religious or spiritual people are referred to, it means a church; if an irreligious people, it simply means an assembly or congregation of people. Buxtorff defines it *congregare*, to congregate, assemble.

Fürst says, קהל, *kēhāl concio*, coetus, an assembly, community, (*Concordantiæ, Heb., &c.*), "an assembly or convocation of the people." Gesenius says קהל, *congregatio, coetus (Thesaurus)*, congregation, assembly.

I remark that many of these lexicons are written in the Latin language, and as the debate is to be published, I give the original, that the public may have it. The root is קל, *köl*, קול, *kul*—the voice. Hence John x, 16, "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold; them, also, I must bring, and they shall hear my voice;

and there shall be one fold and one shepherd." There is another Hebrew word, with its corresponding Greek renderings, of "church," "assembly," "flock," etc. : עֲדָה, *aedhah*, "an assembly," "a church," "a witness" for God, etc. (Numbers xxvii : 17; xxxi : 16), עֲדַת יְהוָה, congregation of Jehovah, also, family. In the New Testament the word church occurs as a word well understood, as are many other like expressions.

Religion, therefore, originates from the very *nature* and *being* of God. It is determined in its principles by the nature, essence, or being of the Almighty, and by man's relation to that being. There is no such thing as a person being a member of the church of God in the true sense of that word, unless he is a child of God. Although we may receive him and administer unto him fleshly ordinances, he is not a member of the church of God unless he has been regenerated unto God; for it requires regeneration, as both my brother and myself teach, to bring a sinner into the family of God. Then it requires a man to be "in Christ Jesus," to be a member of the church of God; it requires that he should be justified by faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. Hence the church is represented as a "flock," "fold," as "sheep," "Mount Zion," "city of God," "brethren," "saints," or holy ones, "children," "house," or "household" (οἰκός), "Israel," "true circumcision," "branches," "followers," "body of Christ," "my people," etc.

Now, these terms occur constantly in the Old and New Testaments, and are applied to the people of God. Such a people existed ages before Christ's incarnation, which is sufficient for our purpose. In the course of time Abraham is told to separate himself from the wicked: "Come out from among them, my people!" After twenty-four or five years, "ordinances of the flesh" were introduced, and they had circumcision, a visible mark and recognition of what occurred. Now, this circumcision was administered also to his child thirteen years old, and when Isaac was born it was administered to him at eight days old, which sustains the point I made at the outset, that the first ordinance ever introduced was administered to an infant. It was a "sign and seal" of the *faith* of Abraham. After the Egyptian bondage and the ignorance attending it, it became necessary to introduce a great number of fleshly ordinances, to aid man to comprehend spiritual truths, for circumcision had fallen into disuse. *No new truth or principle was introduced*, but illustrations and modes of impressing them were, though they never changed the *facts* or *principles* they illus-

trated. From the beginning, then, the Holy Spirit was operative, preparing men for their relation to God, and establishing that "cloud of witnesses" which the Apostle Paul calls "the general assembly and church of the first-born which are written in heaven; and from this time on we find persons enjoying a spiritual religion designed to prepare the soul for heaven. In the course of time, after the days of the Egyptian bondage, the practice of ordinances of the flesh was instituted for the sake of enabling men to understand by this type or illustration the fundamental principles of a spiritual religion which had been revealed and enjoyed for thousands of years. These were designed to subserve those principles; and the introduction of these ordinances did not *change, modify, or in any way abridge* the truth or its end. They were designed as helps to the mind of man, to be used as illustrations to impress upon the mind the *truths* desired to be inculcated. As our Savior used parables, so God used these ordinances, their ulterior object being to enforce all those original truths which derived their being from the nature of God. And the *bringing of these things in* did not vitiate in any degree, or the *removal* of them *change or abrogate the religion* God had taught. These are my points. If I prove these points, I carry my proposition on *infant baptism*; for infant church membership necessarily implies infant baptism.

In Moses's day, which was some fourteen hundred years before Christ, we find God's people assembled and a written code given them, while a civil polity is given also—"An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of Jehovah." Here the mode of expression distinguishes between outside people and the church of Jehovah. Rules were laid down for the regulation of men's religious duties, and tests of fidelity and courts of judicature. Of course the two often came together, but in exile they are seen apart. It has been urged by our worthy opponents that the church and state were one, that it was simply a "commonwealth" in the political sense of that term. If that be so, their religious privileges were destroyed with their political rights. Now, this can be easily tested, for though their civil and political liberties were often destroyed for years, they enjoyed all their religious privileges. The Israelites were led into captivity, and though they were denied all political rights they were allowed more or less all of their religious privileges. Not only was this so in Babylon, but also in Jerusalem under the Romans. They were subject to the Romans, and had no power of the sword. Moreover, the Apostle Paul recognized this fact, for, though he held him-

self subject to the Roman governor as a citizen, he would have died before he would have recognized their right to interfere with his religion. Daniel and the Hebrew children recognized the political power of the Babylonish authorities, but they went into the den of lions and the fiery furnace before they would recognize the right of the king to interfere with their religion. But our opponents declare to the world that the political and religious institutions of this people were *one and the same*, and this they do in order to refute the doctrine of infant baptism. Not only this, but in Genesis xvii: 14, in reference to the uncircumcised, it is said, "That soul shall be cut off from my people." Now, I have heard distinguished men on my friend's side of this question declare that this meant to destroy in the sense of the annihilation of life; and I have heard others say that it meant to take their lives; but the Hebrew has no such meaning. It means simply that they shall be excommunicated. The word כרת (*karath*) means "to cut off, to root out, drive away, withdraw," etc., and is rendered in the Greek by a term which means to excommunicate. There were "sinners in Zion" in those days, and "all were not Israel who were of Israel." These are referred to in Galatians ii: 4; 2 Peter ii: 1; Ezra x: 8; v: 12, 13; 1 Kings ii: 26, 27; John ix: 22, 34, 35, and xvi: 2. It was then a regular excommunication, yet deprived no one of his political rights even when in captivity. They excommunicated persons for impiety and irreligion. Persons were regularly excommunicated in the Hebrew church on questions of a purely religious nature, yet it did not destroy their political rights as citizens of the commonwealth. On the contrary, they enjoyed all the rights and immunities of citizens, though deprived of their religious rights, when they became flagrant in their immorality. They had twenty-four distinct reasons for excommunication popularly known among them, and summed up in the Pentateuch. "Whosoever is excommunicated by the president of the Sanhedrim is cut off from the whole congregation (church) of Israel." But when cast out of the church שמת (*shammaeth*), *shammated*, which Buxtorff renders *separare ab ecclesia totaliter et finaliter*, it was followed with other evils; that is, they were conditionally suspended for certain things, and afterward reclaimed; but when the crime became exceedingly vicious, the offender was excommunicated totally and could not be brought back into the church without showing penitence sufficient to evidence his reformation. They clearly recognized the difference between the good and publicans and sinners, as you will find in the Jewish

writings. God's people were called out and commanded to separate themselves from the uncircumcised and the unclean, as we find it recorded in the fifty-second chapter of Isaiah. And this can not be too well understood, for when God called these people out of the darkness of Egyptian bondage, he first commended to them the *fundamental principles* of religion, the unity and purity of God, and the sinfulness of man; and all these things were done, too, *before any ordinances of the flesh were given at all.* He shall see in the course of our argument that in this church infants were incorporated as members, and that this church has never been destroyed or the rights of infants to membership therein repealed. Paul says the promises and covenant were "confirmed in Christ four hundred years before the law was given."—Gal. iii: 16–25. They were given more than four hundred years after the covenant of promise made to Abraham that had Christ embraced in it, with infants also, and all the world of mankind redeemed. Indeed, we shall see in due time that this covenant made with Abraham was the constitution of the church of the living God, and to this people he gave his most constant attention and care.

The New Testament also calls this Israel a "church," aside from its general teaching, which is far more important. "In the midst of the church—(ἐν μέσῳ ἐκκλησίας) *en mesō ekklesiās*—will I sing praise unto thee."—Heb. ii: 12. The other verses of the text show it is used in a *purely religious sense*, as Paul understood it. This is evident from Psalms xxii: 22, as its connection with *παῖδιά ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ θεός* (*paidia ha moi edoken ho theos*), "the children which thou hast given me"—the church—clearly shows. We find in the text faith and confidence expressed in a church *pure and spiritual*, though improper persons may have held a relation to it as they do now; though that would not vitiate the language that David used in reference to the church in which he would praise God. The language of Stephen in Acts vii: 38 also refers to this church: "This is he who was in the church in the wilderness with the angels which spake to him in the Mount Sinai." We see that both Paul and Stephen call this body a holy and excellent church. The question, then, arises, *Did the pious Jews have proper ideas of God, of redemption, depravity, sin? did they feel a need of atonement, seek and obtain remission of sins, experience a change of heart, repent, believe, seek God, love, serve, obey, trust his goodness, comprehend his providences, seek to save their fellow-men, distinguish between mere forms and cardinal ordinances, and the realities of a spiritual reli-*

gion? We see God's being, power, unity, wisdom, mercy, grace, and willingness to save us revealed as fully in the Old Testament as in the New. Sin, depravity, and the necessity of a renewal of heart, are as fully set forth in the Old Testament as they are in the New Testament. This we find in Jer. v: 16; Psalms cxl: 10; li: 3; xiv: 1-3; liii: 1; v: 9; Rom. iii: 9, 10-23; Gal. ii: 22; Isaiah i: 16-22; Ex. xix: 6.

Now, as I have only a minute or two left, I wish to remark to the audience, in closing my first speech, that I shall lay a broad and solid foundation for my arguments upon this question. It will take at least one or two more speeches to do this; and I should be pleased to see you all here this afternoon. As the argument is to be printed and published to the world, I do not wish to mar its solidity by anticipating any thing or leaving out any point. My design is to show that God had a spiritual church; that infants were members of that church in all ages of the world, and it was God's economy in his system of salvation given to man, to thus have children brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord; that that church was never abrogated or destroyed; that these fundamental principles remain in force to this very day, and that outward ordinances of the flesh that came in from the days of Moses to the crucifixion of Christ, had nothing to do with the question of infant church-membership; that they were members of the church of God, entitled to its ordinances, and that they are still entitled to its ordinances.

MR. WILKES' FIRST REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I rise to make the first reply in the negative of the proposition which you have just heard read. I propose this order of reply: After a few general reflections with regard to the proposition, I will notice, as best I can, what my respected friend has said. In this case, and to this extent, I shall pursue the line of *refutation*. There is, however, another way of meeting an opponent with whom it is not your happiness to agree; and that is, to show facts or present arguments which, being true, his position is therefore not true. This I shall denominate *disproof*.

I will unite with my friend in saying that the importance of this question is not small. He is right in saying that sometimes even *words* have afforded reason for the writing of large volumes, and that controversies which are merely verbal have agitated and excited the nations for ages. It would, therefore, seem that this question should be deemed important. I have another, and to my mind a much deeper reason for thinking it important. It is a question whether God, the everlasting Father, has demanded infant baptism at our hands or not; and when any man shall say, truly, that God hath said, then my theory, my religion, and my heart, conspire to say: "Let the earth hear, let the multitudes of the isles thereof be glad, for the LORD hath spoken!" that is, *if he has spoken*. I am happy again on this occasion, and peculiarly so, in feeling convinced, in being compelled to feel convinced, that if there be any additional light that can be thrown upon the question now under controversy, my respected friend is the man to give it to us. He stands here not only with a reputation of his own for scholarship, and especially for scholarship in the line of thought under consideration, but he stands here with a reputation commensurate with that of the church with which he is identified in this community. He stands here, the representative, the indorsed one, of his church, to define and defend the tenet that is now under consideration.

I have no antipathy in my heart against the practice of infant baptism, in itself. I have no *a priori* reason for opposing it. I see no inherent reason for opposing it. I see, in a word, no reason for opposition to it, unless it shall prove to be unauthorized by the word of God. You will unite with me at once in the conclusion that it is a dreadful—perhaps I had better say an awful—thing for a man to raise his hands toward Heaven, and declare before his fellows, and before his God, that the thing he does is by the authority of God, if that should not be the truth. It is a question of fidelity to God; it is a question of loyalty to the King eternal, immortal, invisible. Now, I grant that if it be authorized in the word of God, we must baptize our infants. If it be so authorized, I for one ought to know it, and I hope I shall know it. My little boy that plays about my knees, and laughs in my face, and makes my heart bappy, and that makes my hearthstone light and lithesome, ought in that case to be baptized; and if God has a blessing for that child in the matter of being baptized, I should like to know it; and if it shall here and now be demonstrated that he ought to be baptized, that it is a duty devolved upon me, as the parent of that child, to see that he is baptized, then my beloved friend shall have the honor of doing it, if honor there be in it.

I propose to pass over, in rather brief review, the points made by my opponent. I feel myself somewhat embarrassed in attempting a reply, from this consideration: I scarcely know which of the many scores of passages quoted, and points raised, to notice. I could not notice them all. I must notice some. In fairness I ought to notice the strongest. I may, by accident, be mistaken as to which are the strongest; but I mean to try faithfully to select them.

Now, calmly, and, as our work goes to the public, very deliberately and carefully, let me comment on some of the capital points in the address just concluded.

My friend says, "The commission given in the New Testament by the Lord Jesus Christ is the only authority for baptizing any body in the world." I agree that that is true. Said he, in substance, "We must examine that commission, and see the relations of all parties to it, and then observe the obligations devolved upon us growing out of these relations." I hope he will adhere to that. I, too, will present, and emphasize, with what force I can, this view of the case. From that very commission, where only we find authority for baptizing any body, and from other places where we may gain light upon this subject, we will learn that the duty of being baptized is a duty

devolving upon the party *baptizing*, and also upon him who is to be baptized; that is to say, it is declared in the Scriptures, and by the Savior himself, and in this very commission, that his apostles must go teach the nations, baptizing them. Christ makes it a duty of his disciples to baptize. Now, if the duty to baptize rested there, and there were *no qualifications* demanded of those to be baptized, then I admit that the apostles would most likely have gone forth and baptized *all* persons. But is that true? We are further taught that it is the duty of the *baptized* person to be baptized; but I deny that it is possible that the infant can be *baptized* in the scriptural sense of the words used in the law of baptism. There is clearly, to my mind, in the instructions given us on that subject in the Bible, a duty of being baptized devolved upon the parties baptized, which, of course, involves the idea of rational and voluntary submission to baptism, if not even the *seeking* to be baptized, which an infant can not comply with.

My friend tells me, after reading from the Discipline of his church, that the Fathers of the Methodist Church used the words church and kingdom in two senses; that they sometimes speak of the church or kingdom as being invisible, and then as a kingdom or church visible. I know that; at least, I know that some parties have done that. We have often heard from pulpits and read in books that that distinction has been made; but I presume to say that, when we come to examine carefully the subject of the church, and the different senses in which that word is used in the Scriptures, which my friend has not fully done yet, we will see that there is no authority for it given in the Word of God. My friend is a cautious man, so much so, that I think he walked all around this point, and around it again, and still he did not say definitely what position *he* would take on it. He ought not, then, to expect me to take any. He will not tell us whether there is an invisible church or not, and, therefore, he ought not to expect me to reply to him on this point. I will say, however, that the thing is a myth. It was an invention made by a man in the sixteenth century, and never before, in order to reply to his opponent when he was himself so pressed that he could make no other reply. I think my friend will not deny it. Whether he does or not, it is the truth. I know nothing of that mythical thing called the Invisible Church; and if it have no existence, of course there can be no such thing as membership in it. If not, there can grow out of the hypothesis no such thing as baptism. Of course not. When my friend talks about the church, he must speak the language of God

(1 Pet. iv : 11). If he expects me to submit to ordinances, he must show that they had their being and their birth in the mind of God, else my spirit will not, can not, bow to them.

With regard to the church, we ask, what is it, and what is it to be a member of it? The word church is used in two or three different senses in the Scriptures; *possibly* in three, *certainly* in two. I shall argue further, that whatever the name which the Spirit of God has placed upon the church may be, infants can not be members of it; that not only were they not contemplated as being members of it, but from the very name itself, or the signification of that name, they are necessarily excluded from it. What does the word church mean? My friend talks to us with regard to the Hebrew word. I intend, just as far as our circumstances will possibly permit, to avoid the use of all foreign words. If it should be inferred therefrom that my scholarship is at fault, I have the manhood to stand it. I am talking to an English audience, and I expect to speak the English language as well as I can, and avoid all foreign words, as far as possible.

The word church, in English, or, perhaps, more correctly, the word congregation, in English, is translated from a Greek word which I need not name. If there shall be a controversy over it, I will name it, trace it to its origin, give a history of it, and pursue it until we have gone to its root, and known it all, in both Hebrew and Greek. But it is translated from a Greek word which signifies "called out." It indicates congregation, because the calling out would congregate or collect together. It means "called out," and hence the church is made up of persons called out. "But," you will ask me, "shall we have a church just when and wherever we have a people 'called out?'" I answer, Yes. We will have a church in the generic sense, in the radical sense. Hence, if you will go with me to the account of Paul at Ephesus, you will find that there, as my brother suggested, the word church is applied to that lawless mob which would have, if possible, taken Paul's life (Acts xix : 32). You will find that the word church in the same chapter (Acts xix : 39), is applied to the town meeting called to consider the duties of the parties in the premises.

They were wicked men, panting for blood; but they were a church, and the Bible calls them a church, just as it calls the people of God, called out of the world and collected together, *the church*. But you can see there is quite a difference between *the church* of Jesus Christ, the church of God, and this collection of men otherwise called out.

My friend said that the people of Israel in the wilderness were *the* church. I suggest an amendment to this statement, and that is, that the people of Israel in the wilderness were *not* the church in our Christian sense of the term. They were the church of God at that time only, in the sense that they were the people that God called out of Egyptian bondage. They were separated from the Egyptians. They were called out from among the Egyptians, and were led by God out of Egyptian bondage; they were in the wilderness, collected together out of Egypt. They were at that time idolaters, in a large measure; but they were, nevertheless, *a* church. There were no conditions of membership there made that contemplated piety, change of heart, or faith; nothing of the sort as conditions of remaining among God's people at that time. The wicked might still remain in that congregation, and did still remain. There were some things that God would not endure; there were other things that they might do, though sinful, and still remain. One thing, at least, is true: there was never a condition made and provided that a man belonging to that congregation of God's people must be *born* again—without which, no human being can belong to the church of Jesus Christ, or the kingdom of God (John iii: 5).

My friend says the church and religion have always been the same, and since infants were members of the church in former days, therefore, the church always being the same, they are or ought to be still members.

I file objections here. In the first place, there was no church in the religious or Christian sense of that term, under the old dispensation, at all. I remark also, that the church, when it did first exist, did not grow out of religion. So far as there was a church in the religious sense, if I should be compelled to admit that there was a church at all in that sense, infants were not members of it. It is a very singular fact that in our version of the Old Testament Scriptures, the word church does not occur; nor does it occur in the New Testament until we have come to the sixteenth chapter of Matthew. That signifies something. It means this much: That our translators did not deem that it would be proper to translate any word in the Old Testament by the word "church," because the language of the original differed in sense so materially, in their judgment, from the idea the translators had of the church. They never translated by the word church in the Old Testament.

My friend says that the church existed for many ages, while there

were no ordinances. I will ask him to *prove* that the church ever existed, or, at least, a church in any strictly religious sense, when there were no ordinances. I ask him to prove that there was ever a church in any conceivable sense, when there were no ordinances. Further, I ask him to prove to me that there ever was a time, whether there existed a church or not, when there were no ordinances. I want to make the controversy as close as it ought to be made, and my friend is the man to prove his position, if it can be done.

My friend says the Jewish Church was spiritual. The Jewish Church, as such, was not spiritual. "But," says he, "surely it was spiritual," and I think he was inclined to rely very much on that position. I make this proposition: That while the Jewish Church, so called, was not spiritual, as a church, yet there were many spiritual principles taught in it; there were many spiritual, and godly, and pious men and saints in it, nevertheless. And this explains what Mr. Campbell said about it, and what my friend would have shown from Mr. Campbell, if he had read more. Mr. Campbell did not deny that under Judaism there were many spiritual and pious men, and many saints; many men that prepared themselves for the upward flight to the presence of God. But Mr. Campbell said this: That, as a condition of membership, or as a qualification for office-holding in the Jewish commonwealth, there were no spiritual qualifications required; that one who was born a Jew, and even before he was capable of spiritual qualifications, was a member of that church; and that one who was a bad man, that was really wicked, without any spiritual regeneration or new birth, or without a change of heart, might hold any office in the Jewish commonwealth. As a system or organization, it was not required that a man should be spiritually regenerated in order to be in it; and this my friend must know is true. Infants were, in a sense, in that commonwealth, just as they are in the commonwealth of Kentucky to-day; but they were not required to be regenerated, in order to be in it.

What my respected brother said with regard to Vattel's "Law of Nations" I agree was right, as far as I understand him. I recognized it as correct, as far as I caught the thought.

My friend repeated his words somewhat. He said that infants were members of the church, and were entitled to the ordinances of the church during the Mosaic dispensation, and perhaps before. I have answered that there was no church, in our sense of the word, at that time; and if there was not, my friend ought to see, and

doubtless does see, that he can not, therefore, argue infant membership in our church now, from the fact that there were infants in the church then. I will show that the Jewish Church, whatever it was, including circumcision, was swept away by the breath of God, like chaff from the threshing floor. It was broken down, demolished, destroyed; so that, if a man should even venture to be circumcised, he forfeited his right in the Christian Church, and was bonnd back to the law of bondage. (Gal. v: 2, 3.) My friend will see this, and more of these things, I trust.

I wish here to know the *grounds* of his position before pursuing this line of thought further; I may then hope to be able to proceed more methodically in the investigation of this subject. I wish to say that there is a fallacy running along through this whole controversy, and it is perpetrated even by my respected friend here, who ought to know better; and I hope I shall be able to teach him better. He says that the same names are applied to God's people, in the New Testament, that are applied to them in the Old. His argument is that because the same names are applied in the New Testament to the people of God that are in the Old, and since the name employed in the New Testament is the church, therefore the same word applied to God's people anciently must designate the same thing; and that, therefore, these two churches are the same church. Does he believe it? Does he cherish the thought for a moment that the thing is possible? He ought not to do it. I hope he may not. I hope that this is a Christian investigation. I hope that he will *tell* you that there is nothing to his purpose that is good in it. But there is a great deal in it, though it has nothing but mischief and ruin in it. It is fallacious and leprous all over, and must be, as I will show.

I told you that the word *ecclesia* was applied even to a mob. My friend has applied it to the church; therefore, on his principle of reasoning, the church is a mob! Does he like that logic? Admitting the premises, the conclusion comes like a conqueror. It must come. I think that our "sophomore learning," when my friend's attention is directed to it, will teach him better. If you will not deem the illustration inappropriate, I will show the absurdity of the position in rather a homely way. A man is an animal, is he not? Yes. A horse is an animal. Therefore, forsooth—supply the rest if you please. Does not my friend know better than that? Why not draw the cords as tight as possible, and march up to the conclu-

sion demanded by his logic? I wish now to present you my view of this whole matter of covenants, including the question of church identity, in order.

From the time the promise was made to Abraham, that "in thee shall all families of the earth be blessed,"—Gen. xii: 3—to the giving of the law at Sinai, there was no *church* in any religious sense. There was religion during this time, but it was personal or individual; and, in a sense, family. So far as the family may be regarded as a religious society, as signifying any thing distinct from the idea of a family as such, infants were not members of it at all. They became members of it as a religious association not until they became acquainted with and adopted the faith and worship of their fathers. If it be said that the promise aforesaid, made to Abraham, included all his posterity and all others, infants and adults alike, I reply, that is true. But it is far from being true that infants, as such, were parties to the promise. The *covenant* was made with Abraham; the *promise* was for the world. The blessings promised were then future, and no one entered into the actual enjoyment of them till the promised seed had come. Even Abraham, though he looked forward and saw the day of Christ and was glad, did not, during his life, actually enter into the blessings promised. The promise remained *as a promise* till Shiloh came. Up to that time there was no *organization* of persons on the promise into which members were received. There was, therefore, neither infant nor adult membership under *this* covenant made with Abraham, till the promised seed had come.

When Jesus came the promise, as it respects the medium through whom the world was to be blessed, was fulfilled. But yet the world was not blessed in the full sense of the promise. How the blessings were to be secured and enjoyed; who were to be members of the church, and on what conditions, the law that went forth from Zion and the word of the Lord that went forth from Jerusalem, were to reveal. If the mere fact that infants were embraced in the covenant made with Abraham, though they were not embraced *as infants*, necessitates the conclusion that they are of right members of the Christian Church and entitled to the ordinances, without any conditions precedent, it seems to me that the same is true of all adults also, without conditions; for they were embraced in the Abrahamic promise and covenant as fully as, and in the same sense that, infants were.

The general *principles* of the *new* covenant (which, in the days of Jeremiah, about six hundred years before Christ and more than a thousand years *after* the promise was made to Abraham, was not in existence) were dimly shadowed forth during all the ages since the fall of man. By the light of the prophecies, and that drawn from the types, symbols, and sacrifices of the patriarchal and Jewish dispensations, holy men, from Abel and Enoch through all time down to the birth of Messiah, were enabled to walk with and please God. Still they were never associated together as members of any society, organization, or institution that was strictly religious, or that could at all be regarded as identical with the church of Christ. The family existed and, after a time, the state did also. Infants were members of the family and citizens of the state then, just as they are now. We do not now infer infant membership, nor any kind of membership in the church of Christ, from the fact of family or mere citizen relationships. Nor ought we to infer infant membership in a society that is specifically different from the family and the state, from the fact that infants have now, and have always had, membership in these. The facts that may be cited from the older dispensations which are supposed to throw light on the question of membership under the reign of Christ, bear strongly against the idea of infant membership in the church of Christ. Not one of the long catalogue of worthies of ancient renown who pleased God that did not *walk by faith*. Every one who, in his character and life, would remind us of the elevation, spirituality, and purity of the church of Christ, was a man or woman of *faith*. So, then, they that be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham (Gal. iii: 9). The promise to bless the world was through Christ, or rather in Christ. Those in Christ are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise (Gal. iii: 29). That is, *the* promise did not look forward to the blessing of the world except through faith in Jesus Christ. Thus Paul explains it. Hence the promise to Abraham did not contemplate infant membership, since infants can not believe, but a community of believers, such as Abraham was.

But God made another covenant with Abraham, and through him another promise to the world. This we find recorded in Gen. xii: 2: "And I will make thee a great nation, and I will bless thee and make thy name great; and thou shalt be a blessing." In the next verse is the promise of a Savior, before noticed. The former promise was temporal, temporary, and typical in its character. The latter

was spiritual, everlasting, and anti-typical. In chap. xiii: 14-18, God promises Abraham the land of Canaan and a numerous seed. Though a numerous posterity had been promised to Abraham, he had, as yet, no child. In chap. xv, God in a vision appeared to him, renewed his promise, and said, "This shall not be thine heir, but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir."—v. 4. In that same day the Lord made a covenant with Abraham concerning the land, confirming it by the "smoking furnace and burning lamp that passed between those pieces."—Gen. xv: 17, 18.

After renewing the promise to make Abraham the father of many nations, or of great multitudes, God says (Gen. xvii: 8), "And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God." The word seed in this chapter is used in the plural sense, meaning posterity, and has no reference to Christ.

Circumcision is now instituted as a token of the covenant between God and Abraham concerning the land and posterity promised him. (See v. 11). A more definite promise of a son is then made, and the Lord assures Abraham that he would establish his covenant with his son Isaac, and with his seed after him.

This promise of a numerous seed, of being the father of great multitudes, and of possessing the land of Canaan, when fully developed, gives us the land of Canaan in possession, the great multitudes promised, and the law from Sinai. This law of Moses is called by Paul (Heb. viii: 7), the first covenant. Till the law from Sinai was given, the promise was unfolding and the elements of the Jewish economy and commonwealth were being prepared. The organization under the law was simply the promise made to Abraham verified and realized.

This covenant, as every Bible reader knows, was to be and has now been folded up and laid away. The promise of temporal blessing in Canaan was made first, and was first developed into an *actual* covenant with its laws, offices, and subjects. The promise of a spiritual seed was second, and in due time it developed into the second covenant, the New Testament, with its laws, officers, membership and ordinances.

Though it is allowed by all that the *Mosaic* institution was not identical with the Christian; that it has been abolished; that none of its laws or ordinances are now in force, except so far as they are incorporated into the new; still it is claimed that there was, during

its existence, the church of Christ, a kind of mystic institution, in which infants had membership. 1. Suppose there was such an institution, and of this there is no proof, does it follow that infants were members of it? Does any one know that they were, and can he cite the passage which proves it? It is impossible. Holy men lived in those days; they loved and served God, and, doubtless, enjoy his everlasting benediction. But must we infer infant membership from this fact? It would seem, rather, to warrant the conclusion that the supposed church was composed of a *believing* and *worshipping* membership, and that infants were, therefore, not members of it. 2. But suppose we grant that there was such a church, and that infants were members of it, it would not follow that infants are members of the church now, unless it can be shown, either that the two are one, or, if they differ, that there is some known reason that *compels* us to believe that they are identical in *this* respect. 3. Allowing that infants are now members of the church, proved by the fact that they were members of a former church, does infant *baptism* follow? From what does it follow? Because they *are* members? I deny that baptism was ever for the members of the church of Christ. The Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, page 188, contradicts it. And as this authority is final here, I shall treat this as a settled point. But is baptism to make them members? Whether this be true or not, it can not be argued from any thing known of any former church, real or supposed. In order to determine the character and conditions of membership now, we must look into the new covenant. All we propose here is to show that infant baptism can not be a necessary inference from any facts known of any former institution.

We speak of inferences. It happens to be a fact that my friend and his friends base their practice of baptizing persons in the name of God upon an inference, or upon inferences—a singular foundation, truly, for the practice of such an ordinance! But will Mr. Ditzler say that he gets the authority from the commission? Then to the commission let him go, and show that it authorizes the practice of infant baptism. When I get there, I intend to stay there, if I can; and I hope to get there soon. It would seem to me that if a man should practice the baptism of a person, he ought to have something better than a far-fetched and difficult inference for his authority; and more, let me say, there is not a very clear or distinct idea in the mind of a great many persons with regard to inferences. Wherever

an inference simply *may be* drawn, it is still true* that it *may not be* drawn. As long as it is true that an inference *may not be* drawn, so long is it not *proved* that the inference should be drawn; and just as long as it is not proved that an inference *must be* drawn, the man who makes it is a failure, and his effort must be held as void. He must show that his inference is a *necessary* one; and he ought, in reason, to place his finger upon passages of the Scriptures, one or more, that are unmistakable, as the ground of his inference. Then he ought to proceed from that ground of his inference, by a line of argument that could never be overturned, directly to his conclusion.

I will lay down, as I conceive it, the principle that should guide us in this investigation, and others. He says that infant baptism is authorized by the Word of God. Then to that Word we must go. When we get there what shall we find? In order that the Bible may authorize any practice whatever, I propose to say that it should furnish us a text that speaks of the practice; or rather, in order that the Bible shall authorize the practice of infant baptism, we should find in it either a command for the practice, which my friend says he does not find; or, secondly, an example of it, which I think he will not say he can find; or, thirdly, we must find something else from which the practice of infant baptism is a *necessary* inference. It is strange that it should be practiced, and there be no *command* for it; and stranger, perhaps, that it should have been practiced by the apostles and authorized by Jesus Christ, and no examples of it be given! We find examples of the baptism of *men*, and of *women*, all these being specified or named, and authority beyond question for the baptism of *believing* persons can be cited; but all the suggestions, and intimations, and circumstances connected with all the conversions mentioned in the Holy Scriptures, would lead us to doubt, if not to positively deny, the practice of infant baptism. Does it not seem strange, then, that we have no *example* of it? We have the law for circumcision in the Old Testament Scriptures, and yet, *after* the time for circumcision had elapsed, and after that old institution had been folded up and laid away, we still find many examples of persons being circumcised. And all along through history we find examples of persons doing every thing that God ever required at the hands of men, but not one single word do we find about infant baptism in the Old Testament or New! But my friend blames me, and I expect will scold me, for not baptizing my little boy. I love my child as well as other people love their children, and I want him to receive all the

blessings of God. I am anxious, and earnest, and zealous in trying to know all that God has said and appointed for that little one; but I would not, for this arm of mine, raise it toward Heaven and say: "I baptize this child," unless I felt in my soul that God had authorized me to do it; and that authority I do not find. I have said that we must find a command for it. That command is not found. If not, we must find an example of it. That example is not to be found. Then we must find something actually said or done from which the practice is a *necessary* inference. Not a merely possible inference, but a *necessary* one. Will my friend find such a passage? If he will our field of argument will then be very much reduced. He may then come forward and say: "Here is the verse referring to infant baptism. I will take my stand here. Here is something said or done to authorize it, and I place it before you. Now, from this thing said or done I march in a direct line on to my conclusion." Will he do that, instead of careering from the first of Genesis on through the Bible to the last of the Book of Revelation, and in that one speech covering almost the entire ground, and raising almost every possible point of controversy? Why not lay his finger on the verse or passage of Scripture from which his practice is a necessary inference? He can find no command for or example of it. This is admitted. But I have said that the Scriptures might authorize the practice in any one of three ways. What will you expect to see when you find the passage from which it is a necessary inference? You must find something in the passage that says, or at least necessarily implies, something about infants; for, if there is nothing about an infant in it, you can not prove infant baptism from it. Secondly, you must find something about baptism in it. Certainly, if there is nothing about baptism in it, you can infer nothing about infant baptism from the passage. There must be something said about baptism, or there must be something said from which baptism is a necessary inference. Thirdly, you must find in the passage not only something about baptism, and also about infants, but you must find these two thoughts so related to each other that it will be not only possible, but absolutely *necessary* to infer, the baptism of the infant from it.

MR. DITZLER'S SECOND ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

After a moment or two, I resume my argument right where I left off in my first address. My good brother, in commenting on the word church, gives his own definition to it, and scorns the idea of its including infant membership; and yet he admits, in the same connection, that that body is called in the Greek by *that very word* which he argues *excludes* them, and of course they are excluded also by the Hebrew term. If the word "call" excludes them, it of course excludes them from that which he designates as a commonwealth; yet their writers freely admit that infants were members of the commonwealth. If the word "call" excludes them, I do not know what he will do with such expressions as this, "Out of Egypt have I called my son;" and that of the prophet, where he speaks of calling certain ones "from the womb." But the first point he admitted, *i. e.*, that in the Greek this word is applied to that Jewish institution *that embraced infants*. So the whole of his argument is swept away. As to the terms "visible" and "invisible," we tell you what was understood by them, no matter whether right or wrong. He considers it all a myth. Will he take the position that the present organization of the church is coequal and coextensive with the whole body of God's children, God's family, for that is what these writers meant? Those old writers meant by the invisible church his people, such now as the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist, and all those that constitute the whole family of God—those that sustain to him such a relation that when they die they are saved. You can see there was something in their position. They used those terms to convey that idea; whether proper or not, I do not propose to discuss. I think it due to make this explanation of what they meant.

I will now resume my main argument, as I can not see that his argument, beyond what I have noticed, had any relevancy to the subject. I closed my first argument by saying that the Jewish Church

proper was a spiritual institution, developed out of a pure religion; a religion designed to purify their hearts, as it is now designed to purify ours, that we may dwell at last with God in heaven. This has always been the design of God's religion; for if it were less than that it would be unworthy of God, and of no avail to man. We had come to the point where the prophet spoke of the blessed Savior. And now I desire to say something about the characteristics of the Christian Church, in the popular sense of that term. What are the most prominent of those characteristics? I would suppose that to be "begotten of God," to be "pure in heart," to "have faith in God," to be pious and holy, and to "seek for a better country," were characteristics of the "New Testament Church." At least Paul seemed to think so; and we find these characteristics enumerated at least ten times in the Old Testament to every *one* time we find them named in the New. My brother may take any element his mind suggests, and he will find that characteristic dwelt upon as much in reference to the Old Testament saints as he can find in the New Testament in reference to the New Testament saints. Christ was "as a Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Isaiah preaching, in the fifty-third chapter, says, speaking in the past tense, in reference to the expected coming of the Messiah: "He *was* wounded for our transgressions; he *was* bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace *was* upon him; and with his stripes we *are* healed." They looked upon him as their Savior, centuries and centuries before Christ was born. They, by faith, looked forward as we now look back to this Lamb that was "to take away the sins of the world." The prophet says that by the blood of the Lamb sinners were released from the pit of degradation and sin in which they had been plunged. They, like sheep, had gone astray. Their iniquities were laid upon Christ centuries and centuries before he came into the world, and with his stripes they were healed. And yet my brother tells you this church was a carnal institution, and not spiritual, though he admits there were saints and holy ones there. He read also the text that I gave you—that "the gospel was preached unto them." The heralding of the new dispensation we find in Nahum i: 15, "Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace." Paul quotes it in Romans x: 15, "The feet of them that preach the gospel of peace and bring glad tidings of good things." In Isaiah lii: 7, we have it, "Good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that sayeth unto

Zion, 'Thy God reigneth.'" Now, here Isaiah, in the eighth century before Christ, according to popular chronology, is preaching unto the Jews the gospel which Paul calls "glad tidings of great joy;" and we find it so preached by Nahum to the ancient Jewish people. Now, was it intended by the Almighty to induce them to be pure, holy, and good, or not? Was it designed to make them a spiritual people or not? If it was not designed to make men spiritual, I do not understand its design. "Searching what or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ, which was in them, did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ and the glory that should follow." "The covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ." Then it was in his name before incarnation? This covenant embraced infants. The end of their faith was the salvation of their souls; of which salvation the prophets inquired and searched diligently. "The gospel was preached unto those that are dead."—1 Peter iv: 6.

They had, also, the Spirit and its promises. For instance, in Gen. vi: 3, God says: "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." Again, "Ye do always resist the Holy Spirit: as your fathers did, so do ye." "Uphold me with thy free Spirit." "Until the Spirit be poured upon us." This language shows clearly that they enjoyed the Holy Spirit, which implies regeneration. Whether or not they sometimes backslid, and the church became very sinful, has nothing to do with it; for we will agree that the church, in the days of Luther, became very corrupt, and Peter and Paul testify to the same truth in their day. That is no argument against the spirituality of God's church in those days. Then, in Ezekiel xviii: 30, 31, they are exhorted to turn from all their transgressions. In 1 Kings viii: 47, 48, it is said: "If they will bethink themselves, and repent, saying, We have sinned, and have done perversely, and committed wickedness, and so return unto thee *with all their hearts*." There is *faith*. That is the idea of repentance. We must repent and turn to God with all our hearts. It is the same in the Hebrew, and shows what spirituality was expected and demanded of this people in those days. Nothing in the New Testament is any stronger on that question. Again, they are called to repent and seek God, as we find in Hosea vi: 1-4; xiv: 1, 2, 5; Isaiah lv: 1-3, "Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters; and he that hath no money: come ye, buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price." Again: "Behold, the Lord's hand is not shortened," etc. "Seek ye the Lord while he may be found." These are only a

few texts which are given to show you that they were a spiritual people, and that they enjoyed justification by faith. Certainly the prominent doctrines of the New Testament were clearly taught them, as you will find in many texts: "If they humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, then will I forgive their sins." "Thou hast forgiven the iniquity of thy people; thou hast covered all their sin." "Blessed is the man whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered." "Whosoever believeth on him shall not be confounded." Such expressions are constantly quoted by the apostles from the Old Testament. "Abraham believed in the Lord (the Hebrew is Abraham *trusted in Jehovah*), and it was counted to him for righteousness." Hence, Paul, in Galatians, and Peter (Acts x: 36, 37), and James, all establish the doctrine of justification by faith from the Old Testament. These writers from the beginning teach the doctrine of justification by faith by *direct quotations* from the Old Testament writings; and, therefore, if the Old Testament writings were not spiritual, the apostles were teaching carnal doctrine and palming it off for spiritual. "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."—Acts x: 43-46. Thus you will see that it is shown beyond controversy that the gospel was preached unto them, as Paul testifies, and that regeneration was taught them also. And here my opponent makes a special point. Mr. Campbell and all their writers deny that the new birth was taught these people. They deny that any person was regenerated in the true sense of the word. They all believe that justification and purity of heart are the *results* of the ordinary processes of religion, such as faith, repentance, baptism, the reception of the Holy Spirit, embracing, of course, the forgiveness of sins, which precedes the reception of the Holy Spirit. If purity of heart be the result of this process, it can not be until we have faith, repentance, and regeneration; and so we find that their own position establishes the truth beyond contradiction. Says the Prophet Isaiah, "Come, now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool." Again: "Wash me thoroughly from my iniquity, and cleanse me from my sin." "Blot out my transgressions." "Purge me with hyssop." "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me." If there can be found any more pointed passages of Scripture than these, I have never seen them. Christ says, "Blessed are the pure in heart;" and this is a

direct quotation from the Old Testament. The term "pure in heart," as a New Testament phrase, is a direct quotation from the Old Testament, as is nearly the whole of the Sermon on the Mount. It is regarded as one of the most spiritual lessons in the New Testament. God says, "I have thoroughly washed you;" and so all those that trusted him were thoroughly cleansed from all their sins.

Circumcision nowhere occurs in the Old Testament as meaning the same thing as "putting away of sin." In Ezekiel xi: 19, the Lord says, "A new heart will I give thee, and a new spirit will I put within thee." Then God not only purified their hearts, but gave them a new heart, a new spirit, which implies regeneration—a being "born anew." They could not have this new heart without regeneration. They no more relied on mere ordinances than do we, or did Paul; and they distinguished as clearly between outward ordinances of the flesh and true worship, as we can distinguish at this our day, as you will see by reading the fiftieth and fifty-first Psalms, and the first chapter of Isaiah, where the prophet, by the command of the Lord, denounces them, from the eleventh to the seventeenth verse, in the most positive terms, for supposing such ordinances could be substituted for a pure, spiritual worship—for that *purity of heart*, "without which no man can see the Lord." He declared their sacrifices an abomination unto him, and that he would have no more of their burnt-offerings; for their "incense was an abomination unto him." He had created these ordinances to be rightfully used, but when the Jews substituted them for the spiritual religion, which they were intended to illustrate and represent, he denounced them as base and unqualified idolaters. This shows the spirituality of the religion taught in those days.

I was going to quote from Alexander Campbell on this point, but will reserve it till my next speech. In that speech I hope to make it perfectly clear to you that there was a spiritual church, a spiritual people, and that infants were members of that church. It will then devolve upon my brother to show that this church was destroyed, and the membership of children abrogated in the church of God by his own specific and direct command.

MR. WILKES' SECOND REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I will call your attention to some remarks made in my friend's last speech. If any one point may be regarded as made out by him on opening the discussion, this one is made out, viz.: that God had a spiritual people before the coming of Christ. If he will be contented to give us no other Scriptures or proofs of that fact after this, I will here say, with as much emphasis as I can, that what he says on that subject is true; and it is a thing I have never heard of any one's denying since I knew any thing of the church. But he makes an illicit use of that position. He demonstrates to us, by a series of arguments, or rather proof-texts, that God had a spiritual people in the world ever since the fall of man; a people that had faith and repentance, regeneration, love of God, change of heart; in whose souls the Spirit of God was put; who were new creatures, and passed from death unto life. They were saints; they loved God; they worshiped God; they adored God; and when they died went to heaven. I have said all that myself since I began this debate. Then what? What my friend ought to have shown, and what, from the exceeding multitude of texts which he has given us, it seems he intended to show, is that these worshipping people were formed into a church, and that their qualities of spirituality were made terms of membership in that church. This he ought to have shown. But this is what he could not show *to be true*. With regard to a spiritual people, there is no evidence that there ever was a *church* of such, that there was ever membership in such an establishment. The commonwealth, or institution in which these men lived, worshiped, and died, was itself, *as an institution*, a mere political one, semi-religious, in which it was competent that men should live as members, without one particle of spirituality. This is the point. Suppose Mr. Ditzler was able to make his point, and to show that, aside from the visible, organized church, so called, there was an invisible, intangible something, composed of

spiritual persons, etc., what then? Exactly what he does not want to prove. For then I would claim that that is not the place for infants. They can have no faith, they can not love and serve God. They can not be born again, nor pass from death unto life; and these things being true, *that*, in reason, would not be the place for them. And so he cuts up by the roots his own position.

But if he takes the visible, organized, Jewish Church in which persons had membership, or in which persons lived, I will show you, and to his entire satisfaction, I think, that that was abolished by Christ; it was taken away. It, or the law of it, was the middle wall of partition between Jew and Gentile. The Lord Jesus took it out of the way, nailing it to his cross; and thus he left both Jew and Gentile standing before God, upon the same footing precisely in view of the new covenant; for he received neither of them except he freely confessed and obeyed the Lord Jesus Christ.

Now, let me notice some points in my friend's speech. He comes back to the word *ecclesia*. I said it means "called out." He grants that to be true. I said there was something in the church use, and the present use of it, that forbids the idea of infant children being members of the church. I stated that, in the ground meaning of it, it contemplated no change of character whatever; that a mob might be a church, and was so called in the New Testament. In the present church sense of it, the word contemplates not a people called out from among others in the *literal sense*, for Christian men mingle with others every day, and ought to do so. It is not the material and visible separation of one people from another that is contemplated; but "called out," in the New Testament or spiritual sense, means that one people are called out *morally*, and separated as to moral character from others; and on the grounds of that kind of a separation they collect together and are the church. That is the sense in which *ecclesia* is used in the *New Testament*, as applied to the church, and that is precisely what can never be made applicable to an infant membership. Infants can not be "called out," for they are not capable of those moral qualities which distinguish a man in the Christian sense, in the church of God, from the world. A man that does not possess this distinguishing moral quality does not possess the qualities necessary for membership in the church, and can not rightly belong to it.

I now come to what is one of my great objections to receiving infants into the church. If I should receive them, and baptize them

into the church, I receive *flesh and blood; that only, and nothing more.* I baptize one who has *no faith*; one who does not *desire* to be baptized; *one who can not receive the command to be baptized*; one that is not changed at all, but having been baptized, is just what he was before we introduced him into the church, simply *flesh and blood, nothing more.* If by baptism we do put them into the church, as the Methodist brethren say we do, we introduce simply *flesh and blood, and thus we break down the principal, distinguishing, cardinal feature of the Christian Church, that which distinguishes it peculiarly and specifically from the Jewish Church and the world.* That spirituality which is the dividing line between the church and all worldly and carnal institutions is wholly lost sight of. We object to it on that ground.

My friend says something again about the invisible church. I wish to call your attention to a point which I hope he will carefully notice, *as he is in the habit of doing!*

He intimated, though he did not plainly say so, that there was something back in the days of Moses, and since that time, that he calls an invisible church, or that there was a people there and then who served God, and who, considered apart from the commonwealth of Israel or the national establishment, constituted such a church. Very well. He thinks there is something very much like that at the present time; that there are persons not in the church, but yet belonging to the body of Christ. He wants to know of me whether there is not in that larger body of men, an invisible church. I will notice that presently. I ask him now whether the infant is in the church. That would depend, would it not, very much upon what a church is? I turn to the Methodist Discipline, p. 17, Art. XIII, of *the Church*:

“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, according to Christ’s ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.”

There we have a definition of the church; it is an “assembly of faithful men.” That is the truth. Now, the question is, “Are infants in that church?” I know nothing of an invisible church; and my friend will not say *plainly* that there is such a thing as an invisible church. Where, then, shall we find the infant? It is, if in any church, in either the visible or the invisible church. In which of

them is it? If in the invisible church, he baptizes it to bring it into the visible church. Let us see what his Discipline says in regard to the baptism of infants. The prayer that is offered up at the baptism of a child (see the Methodist Discipline, p. 189) is as follows :

“Almighty and everlasting God, 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.”

Now observe, this child was in the invisible church, or in none; for, being baptized, it was brought into the visible church, as we have just read. While it was in the invisible church, or before it came into the visible church, it was under the wrath of God, for so we have just read. Now, if persons who are in the invisible church are under the *wrath of God*, “*and liable to eternal damnation*,” I think the fact that there is an invisible church, if it be a fact, will avail but little in this controversy to Mr. D.'s advantage. I would just as soon allow that the child was out in the world as in the invisible church, if being in that church it is under the wrath of God, from which it is to be delivered in baptism.

I proceed to another point. Mr. Ditzler says that there was religion in all ages. I answer, Yes, there was. But there was no church formed of religious men; no membership, either of infants or adults, or of any persons, in any exclusively RELIGIOUS establishment in any age of the world before the new covenant of the Christian Church. He says that people have looked to Christ in all ages as a Lamb slain for the sins of the world, and that the gospel was preached to Abraham and others. I admit that that is all true. He says the covenant made with Abraham embraced infants. I wish to have his attention directed particularly to this point. He says the covenant made with Abraham, saying, “In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed,” embraces infants. I answer, Yes; but his interpretation of it proves too much for him. It not only embraces infants, but adults as well. It embraces infants and adults; but it embraces neither infants nor adults as such. If it embraces infants, as infants, and they must, therefore, be baptized, simply because they are embraced, it embraces adults in the very same sense; and hence they must be baptized without conditions besides; for not only in him, but in his seed “*shall all the families of the earth be blessed*.” If

infants and adults are embraced, in the same sense, it follows that adults must be baptized apart from any condition previous to their baptism. Will my friend accept the conclusion? Will he baptize the infidel? If the infant is to be baptized because he is embraced in the covenant made with Abraham, then, since the infidel is embraced in the same sense, he must, for the same reason, be baptized. But he will repudiate that conclusion. Let him, then, repudiate the other, and be consistent.

He says, "Abraham was justified by *faith*." A man was never justified without it in any age of the world of which I have read any thing. My friend says, or, rather, infers, that which is not strictly true, that there was a church from the days of Abel down regularly to the Christian era. That is one inference. Secondly, he infers that infants were members of that church. That is two inferences, neither being true. Thirdly, he infers that this church and the church of Christ are identical. He infers, fourthly, that infants are in the Christian Church. He infers that, since they are in the Christian Church, they must be baptized, which is not true. It is not taught anywhere in the Word of God, that a person is to be baptized because he is in the church. His own Methodist Discipline denies that, and declares that the baptism of an infant is necessary to bring it into the church. His practice of infant baptism is based on five inferences. And these inferences are predicated—on what? You have now heard us one hour and a half; and I ask this intelligent audience, ready, and willing, and interested to know the truth, on what are they based? I appeal to your consciences, and to your interest before the throne of God, to do justice to this subject; I ask, upon what passage of Scripture can you place your finger in which it is declared that infants ought to be baptized; in which you have an example of infant baptism, or from which infant baptism is a necessary consequence? You know that the text from which it follows does not linger as a thing of life in your soul. You know that the chapter and verse is not remembered by you; at least, if it is, it is not remembered by me.

But again: I proceed now to a little advance on the argument. I have said what I desired to say in regard to the covenants from the Old Testament stand-point. The New Testament throws a flood of light on all those questions, and settles them beyond all controversy. In the first place, I call your attention to the book of Hebrews, to the eighth chapter. In this chapter Paul tells us, quoting from Jeremiah xxxi: 31, "The days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new cov-

enant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers in the day when I took them by the hand, to lead them out of the land of Egypt; because 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 law 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 their iniquities will I remember no more. In that he saith, A new covenant, he hath made the first old. Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away."

What is here said of the new covenant, and of the membership under it, is not true of the gentleman's church. In his church there are many who know not the Lord, and are taught by their neighbors and brothers to know the Lord. Let us look at this prophecy concerning the covenant. Jeremiah, the prophet, six hundred years before the Christian Era, looking down the stream of time, saw, in harmony with the promise that God had made to Abraham, and renewed to Isaac, and Jacob, and David, and Jeremiah, and others, that HE would bless the nations through his seed, prophesied that the days would come in which HE would make a new covenant. He is now looking into the *future*, and says that the time *will* come when he *will* make a *new* covenant. He tells us not only that it will be a *new* covenant, but that it will be unlike the old covenant; and he proceeds to name the points of difference that would exist between them. Under the new covenant "they shall not teach every man his neighbor, saying: Know the Lord, for all of them shall know the Lord." This precludes the possibility of infants belonging *as members of the church* to this new covenant. That was not true under the old covenant. Infants were born into the covenant, as members of it, or of the commonwealth formed under it, and they were taught to know the Lord after they were in it, and were recognized as belonging to the commonwealth of Israel. They had to be taught by their neighbors, and their brothers, saying, Know the Lord. But under the Christian economy every one, from the least to the greatest, who was a member of the church, must know the Lord. That excludes infants, of course.

Then, again, "Their sins and iniquities," says the apostle, speaking of the membership under the new covenant specifically, "I will remember no more." These were remembered against the transgressors until HE came, who could take away the sins of the world. It was not true of the transgressor under the Old Testament, that his sins and iniquities were forgiven finally and fully. They were only laid over, and they were remembered against him until Shiloh came, whose blood only could take away the sins of the world. I admit that that blood was *as* shed from the foundation of the world; that it reached back in its beneficial influences to the first man that sinned against God. At the same time I deny that the full and final remission of sins could, or ever did, take place until that blood *was* shed which only can or ever could cleanse from sin; therefore, the sins committed under the old covenant were remembered continually until Shiloh came, and then they enjoyed the forgiveness of their sins.

There is another view of the subject which I will present if I have the time. Allow me to read to you from the same letter to the Hebrews, ninth chapter, commencing with the fifteenth verse: "And for this cause, he is the mediator of the New Testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament" (as I told you), "they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance. 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." If the new covenant had any existence at all before the testator died, it was not in *operation*, it had no *force*; for the testator, Christ, had not yet died; hence it had no actual membership. The apostle here alludes to what we all know is true, that a testament or will has no force at all, its provisions do not go into operation, until the testator dies. So the apostle argues on this subject. I propose to press this argument. Allow me to read and comment on Ephesians, second chapter, commencing with the fourteenth verse: "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 far off, and to them that were nigh."

The apostle says: You Gentiles were far off; the promises were not to you. The covenant was not made with you, but with the houses of Israel and Judah. The old institution fenced around the Jews and separated them from the Gentiles, and was a ground of offense between the two. Now, in order, when the new covenant came, that God might receive Jew and Gentile alike, that he might destroy the enmity and make them both one, he broke down the middle wall of partition which separated them, and put it out of the way. Then they stood without a distinction, or separation, on a common level. God placed all of them on the same plane, and HE invited them to come to him on the same conditions. Let us inquire what the object was: "For to make of these twain one *new man*, and so make peace." That is, the Jew and the Gentile were invited into Christ on the same terms; and they, therefore, constituted, when united, a *new man*; not an old one. What is that new man? I answer, it is the church. Will my friend deny that? His own most distinguished commentators, Dr. Clark, Mr. Wesley, Bloomfield, and all the most distinguished writers on that subject, and all Pedobaptists, declare this new man means a *new church*; and so it does. For there is nothing it could mean, in all the wide world, but a new church. If, then, the Christian Church is a *new church*, it is not the old church. If it be a new church, it is not the church that was established in the family of Abraham. It is a *new church*. If the church of which Paul was writing was established in the days and in the family of Abraham, instead of being a new church when he wrote, it was an old church. It had been in existence at least two thousand years. But the Apostle Paul, by the inspiration of God, tells us that *it was a new church, and not an old one.*

MR. DITZLER'S THIRD ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My brother's argument is a very strange compound of contradictions. If I caught what he said it was equivalent to saying that the Old Testament church, to use popular language, was a church and was not a church; that it was a church in a certain sense, yet not a church; that it never had been a church, yet in a certain sense it was a church. How all that can be put together I can not understand. I told you, this morning, that the church existed independent of the law as contained in fleshly ordinances, which were brought into it, as Paul testifies, and were afterward taken away. The taking away of these does not affect the church, and that is the whole of his argument. I will read to you what Mr. Campbell says on that, and I think he will have enough. "They were Jews, not by choice, but by necessity. They were *compelled* to be members of that church, just as they were compelled to be born. They were, indeed, born of the flesh, and not of the Spirit, as preparatory to admission into *that church*. . . . Hence, there never was a missionary sent out of the Jewish church," etc. ("Ch. Baptism," 108). "Jesus was born a Jew, and came first to his own family and *church*," etc. (109). "He was the root of the Jewish Church" (389). "The Jewish Church, as such," etc. (*Ibid*). "The Jewish Church is not the Christian Church" (390). Mr. Campbell calls it a church, and all their writers call it a church, but say it was different from the Christian Church; while my brother is forced to deny that it was a church at all in any sense of the word. The Greek term for church, as ordinarily translated, *ekklesia*, is the constant translation of the Hebrew. In Hebrew it does not mean "to call out." Of course, the Greek, being a translation of the Hebrew, must have the power and meaning of the Hebrew word. The word in Hebrew originally, means "to call." I do not object to the "out," as it does not aid his cause one particle. This is the first time I have heard him try to make

his audience believe that he held that infants were subject to the wrath of God. Our Discipline troubles him. That prayer does not mean that the child is subject to the wrath of God; but the Episcopal service, which we retain, contemplates the fact that the child may grow up to responsibility, and may at some time become subject to the wrath of God. We do not believe that it will be so while irresponsible. We teach that the infant is made perfectly secure. If I thought he would try further to impress your minds to the contrary, I would dwell longer upon this point, but I am satisfied he will not.

I now propose to take up the argument where I left off. The summary of all is this: "The Lord thy God is one God;" "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might." "What doth the Lord thy God require of thee but to fear the Lord thy God, to walk in all his ways, and to love him," etc. "Circumcise, therefore, the foreskin of your heart." The admissions of my brother in regard to the spirituality of the Jewish Church are the first I have ever heard or read of in all their literature. He admits that there were saints, but this morning he denied that they were regenerated or born of God. Yet, when I show it beyond question, he makes admissions I have never heard before from his side of the house. Paul, in the eleventh chapter of Hebrews, gives a summary of the Old Testament saints, and in chap. xii: 1, he calls them "a cloud of witnesses" that go to make up the church of God. Then he calls them "the general assembly, the church of the first born, which are written in heaven." In Ephesians iii: 14, he speaks of them as forming "the whole family" of God; and in Revelation they are represented as having "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." The Old Testament Scriptures speak of the removal of men's sins as far from them as the east is from the west, and of the purification and washing away of all sin. If these passages do not express a full and universal pardon of sins, what can express it? But my brother says there was "a remembrance of sins every year." Of course his argument on the eighth of Hebrews will come in tomorrow; it is not yet time to notice it on our side.

Now, then, promises of perpetuity were given to this church that I have spoken of. My brother says it was not a church, and Alexander Campbell says it was a church. Paul says it was a church, and Stephen says it was a church, and I leave it between them. He

says that term, as found in the original text, is applied to a mob. I have taken pains to tell you in the outset that *ekklesia* was applied to any kind of an assembly whatever, and that we have to determine its true meaning from the context. But in the Old Testament it is constantly used for "the church," "congregation of the righteous," "Zion," and such terms as are used for church, such as "flock," "fold," "assembly," "household," "family," etc. They are constantly used in the Old Testament in this way, and in the most restrictively religious sense. That you may see how the apostle used it, I will read you from Hebrews ii: 10-13, inclusive: "For it became him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through sufferings. For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one; for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren, saying, I will declare my name unto my brethren; in the midst of the church will I sing praise unto thee. And again, I will put my trust in him. And again, Behold, I, and the CHILDREN which God hath given me." Here are the fundamental principles of the Christian Church. Here the church is clearly designated as the body of the spiritual children of God, a body of sanctified persons.

I now proceed on the argument of the oneness of the religion of the church. Such expressions as the following from the New Testament can not be misunderstood: "We are the true circumcision;" "Not all Israel who are of Israel;" "Unto us a son is born, unto us a child is given," etc. These Scriptures show that the church was not destroyed. They called each other "Jews," addressed each other as such; and used such language in speaking of the Gentiles as contradistinguished them from themselves as Jews. Hence we read in the eighth of Hebrews of "a covenant made with the house of Israel." The word "house" is used for "the church of the living God." It was promised that Christ "should reign over the house of Jacob," "and of his kingdom there should be no end." Christ's mission was "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel," "I am judged for the hope of Israel made of God unto our fathers, unto which (hope) our twelve tribes hope to come, for which hope's sake I am accused," etc. These lost sheep of the church, as they understood the term, were the people; and here the Apostle Paul declares he was "accused of the Jew," "for the promises of God unto Israel." "Christ was raised up to Israel a Savior," and the "new covenant was to be perfected (*συντελέσω ἐπι*) upon the house of Israel and the

house of Jacob." Again, it is recorded that "Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name."—Acts xv: 14. Until now they had operated as *Jews*, calling themselves "Jews." "And to this agree the words of the prophets; as it is written, After this I will return, and will build again the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again (*ἀνοικοδομήσω*, *rebuild*) the ruins thereof, and I will set it up; that the residue of men might seek after the Lord, and all the Gentiles, upon whom my name is called, saith the Lord, who doeth all these things."—Acts xv: 15–17. Hence Paul calls these times "the time of reformation."—Heb. ix: 10. The days of the apostles are called "the time of reformation;" and how could they be days of reformation if a spiritual religion, in the true sense of the word, had not come into existence, with regeneration and all its attendant blessings? Then we take up Isaiah x: 20, 21, 27, and we read: "And it shall come to pass in that day, that the *remnant of Israel*, and such as are escaped of the house of Jacob, shall no more again stay upon him that smote them; but shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel, in truth. The *remnant* shall return, even the *remnant* of Jacob, unto the mighty God; . . . and the yoke shall be destroyed because of the ANOINTING." Now, you all know to what this refers, and no question in relation to it will be raised, I presume. It is the coming of the Messiah. Paul refers it to the coming of the Messiah, and says, Rom. xi: 5, 11, "Even so then at *this present time* also there is a *remnant* according to the election of grace." "I say then, Have they stumbled that they should fall? God forbid: but rather through their fall salvation is come unto the Gentiles, for to provoke them to jealousy. Now if the fall of them be the riches of the world, and the *diminishing* of them the riches of the Gentiles, how much more their fullness?" Now, mind you, some of them had been broken off by unbelief, and by the election of grace a "remnant remained." "For if the casting away of them be the reconciling of the world, what shall the receiving of them be, but life from the dead?" (v. 15.) "For if the first fruit be holy, the lump 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 among THEM, and with them partakest of the root and fatness of the olive tree, boast not against the branches." This "remnant" is the "root" upon which the Gentiles, through their faith in Jesus Christ, are to be "grafted." "And they, also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall

be grafted in: for God is able to *graft them in again*. For if thou wert cut out of the olive tree, which is wild by nature, and wert grafted contrary to nature into a good olive tree; how much more shall these, which be the natural branches, be grafted *into THEIR OWN olive tree?*—Rom. xi: 23, 24.

Now, the argument of Paul, in brief, is this: That the Jews who rejected Christ, who refused to receive him as the coming Messiah, and believe on his name, were broken off; but “the remnant,” who received him as their promised Messiah, remained “the root of the good olive tree.” They, therefore, remained in the faith. Christ was born in the Jewish Church; the apostles were all Jews, and observed Jewish customs as long as they lived, and continued to call each other Jews. They died in the faith they had been reared in, and in which they received the Messiah. And now if in any future time the Jews shall repent and receive the Messiah, “they shall be grafted in again into their own olive tree.”—V. 24. If that church was entirely destroyed, and the Jews receive the Messiah, as the apostle represents, they are to be grafted back upon the old, original olive tree; but if entirely *destroyed*, they can not be grafted back upon their old stock. He argues that when they repent, they will come into their true position. The same argument is set forth in Ephesians ii: 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 now, *in Christ Jesus*, ye who sometime were afar off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.” Now, what was it to be an “alien from the commonwealth of Israel?” What constituted an “alien from the commonwealth of Israel,” which Paul called “a church,” and Mr. Campbell called “a church?” I answer, to be “without Christ.” Then, to have Christ is to be a member “of the commonwealth of Israel.” So Paul understood it. They were “strangers to the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world.” Then, if a man is an “alien from the commonwealth of Israel,” he is “without hope and without God in the world,” just as he was in the days of the apostle. “But now, *in Christ Jesus*, ye (Gentiles) who were sometime afar off are made nigh by the blood of Christ.” That is, they are brought up to the point where they can be “fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God.”

“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.” So, you see, the apostle Paul speaks of this as the law of commandments, which, he says in the seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth of Hebrews, “was the law” of ordinances promulgated at Sinai.

In my speech to-morrow morning, I will close up my points on this argument. I have shown that this Jewish institution was the church of God; that that church still continues, and that God's demands for a holy life were the same then as now; that infants were members of that church. I will show you to-morrow morning, by God's will, that Mr. Campbell fully admitted it; and infants being members of that church, their argument against infant baptism falls to the ground.

MR. WILKES' THIRD REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I promise you a brief address, not occupying even my time, possibly. I will first notice a few minor matters. My friend, in the very first part of his speech, said that I misrepresented the views of the Methodist Church, in stating that when a child was baptized it was delivered from the wrath of God. I simply quoted the language of the Discipline. The congregation is called upon to pray that the child "may be delivered from thy wrath and received into the ark of Christ's church," etc. My friend explains it. He says that the language there has reference to this, that the child might be delivered in the *future* from God's just wrath; that is, *after* it may have sinned in the future. Well, that is a possible view of it; but I am not prepared to think that baptism ever had such a design, that it should be administered to a person that had not sinned, before that person could be delivered from the wrath of God that would come upon him, in view of the fact that he would hereafter sin. I apprehend that that is by no means the correct view of the Discipline. To show that it is not, I will read the section that stands immediately before that one:

"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 can not enter into the kingdom of God', I beseech you to call upon the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy he will grant to this child that which by nature he can not have, that *he* may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's Holy Church, and be made a lively member of the same"—The Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, page 188.

In the next chapter occurs the language I first read. Now the view when this Discipline was made does not present, perhaps, the view of the Methodist Church at this time. I think it does not. But the view from the standpoint of the Methodist Church *discipline* is that

the child is conceived and born in sin, and that baptism is for the remission of that sin. If I misrepresent the Methodist Church, the Discipline is to blame for it, or those who made it. At least, so I reason and believe.

But again. I wish to call the attention of the congregation to the fact that my friend does not treat this question as I think he ought. Of course he can argue as he pleases. You will notice that he has not yet even so much as quoted the proposition to be proved. He has not as yet mentioned distinctly the terms of the proposition. He has not as yet particularly pointed out infants as the subjector burden of his discourse; nor has he yet told us any thing about the baptism of infants. Though he has a right to proceed as he chooses, he ought, I think, during all this time to have mentioned some passage of the Scriptures, and to have told us that upon this passage, or these passages, he intends to rest his case, or, from them, to prove infant baptism, or from them to deduce it. He has done none of these.

My friend reiterated the statement that the church existed without ordinances. If so, I know nothing of it, and he has not proved it.

Again, he says that Mr. Campbell takes this position: That no ordinances were needed to make persons members of the Jewish Church; and called upon you to notice what he had said with regard to the faith, repentance, conversion, etc., affirmed of Old Testament saints.

Mr. Campbell was talking of *membership* in the Jewish commonwealth, which is sometimes, I believe, called a church, in accommodation to the manner in which my friend speaks of it, though Paul calls it a commonwealth. Mr. Campbell was, I repeat, talking about MEMBERSHIP in the Jewish commonwealth. He said in substance that arguments, motives, demonstrations, etc., might effect a change of the heart, but that *spirituality* was never required as a *condition of membership* in the Jewish Church, and my friend knows that it is true. He ought, pardon me, to know it.

With regard to the remission of sins, I wish to read a passage from the tenth of Hebrews. My friend called my position on that subject in question. I insisted that, under the Jewish dispensation, there was no *final* and present remission of sins. He questions it. I am not speaking wholly at random on this subject. I propose to read you what Paul says on this subject. It is not reasonable that there could be remission of sins before the shedding of that blood on which alone remission of sins depends. The *shedding of Christ's blood* is for the remission of sins, and that blood takes its effect *after* its shedding,

not before. After its shedding it includes sins committed before, as well as those committed after. I read from Hebrews, tenth chapter, commencing at the first verse: "For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshipers once purged should have had no more conscience of sins. But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year. For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." I told you that there was no final remission of sins under the Jewish economy; for the plain reason that the blood of Christ had not then been shed; and his blood, only, can cleanse from sin. There was, in the second place, no remission of sins under that covenant while it stood, because Paul says it is impossible that such blood, as was that then shed, could cleanse from sins; but that there was a remembrance of sins every year. My friend says he has reference to the sins committed under the first covenant. While that covenant stood, there was simply and only a remembrance of sins every year; and the people were continually called upon to look at the fact that that blood was not yet shed that could take away sins. But the blood which they then shed admonished them that the great sacrifice, of which theirs were simply types, had not yet been made; that the true blood, so efficacious to the taking away of sins, had not been shed. But when Christ's blood was shed, the faithful were finally forgiven, and not until then.

With reference to the covenant that Paul calls a new covenant, my friend says that the word new is used there in the sense of perfecting the covenant. I simply say to that now, that I propose to meet him when he shall attempt to deal with the question as a scholar. Without making much profession of scholarship, I declare to you, that it does not mean the perfecting of the old covenant, but it means a new covenant. I will, in due time, argue it from the sense of the Hebrew word, as Jeremiah uses it. Jeremiah could not have referred to the Abrahamic covenant, allowing that he had a spiritual covenant in which there was a membership, because the one of which he spoke was new, as compared with this covenant that had then existed fourteen hundred years; for the covenant made with Abraham was made fourteen hundred years before Jeremiah lived. It was new, also, as compared with the covenant made with Moses at Sinai. It was a future cov-

enant, and had not been made in the days of Jeremiah, who lived six hundred years before Christ. It was a covenant *to be made*, and was, therefore, not yet made. Whatever the covenant made with Abraham was, it had been then made fourteen hundred years, and the Jewish covenant had then been made several hundred years; and in the days of Jeremiah, that was a *prospective covenant* of which he prophesied—one that was yet *to be made*.

The word *Kainos*, in Greek, does not mean "re-newed," "perfecting;" it simply means *new*, as opposed to all that existed at that time. I mean to stand, stubbornly, to this position until I see, at least, one ray of light leading another way. This my friend will never bring, with all his eloquence and learning, before this audience.

I can not, from the darkness of this evening, examine carefully the question of the tabernacle of David, and of the Olive-tree; but I will make some few remarks on them, to indicate what the direction of my thoughts will be, and what my position will be, on those subjects.

My friend says the tabernacle is the old Jewish Church, and his proof is found in what the historian Luke says in the Acts of the Apostles: "I will return and build again the tabernacle of David," etc. Does my friend say that the Jewish Church or tabernacle of David, as he interprets the passage, was very much fallen down, and that God proposed to build that up again, and that then men should be gathered into that? If so, let him say so plainly. I deny, utterly, that the tabernacle of David means the Jewish, Christian, or any other church. The tabernacle of David means the *family* of David, the lineage of David. David at one time sat upon the throne of Israel; but the time came when Israel was scattered, and the strength and power of David's family were broken, and when not one member of David's family sat on David's throne.

It was prophesied that one would be raised up to sit on David's throne; and one did come to sit on that throne. When Christ came, he was that one who was to sit on the throne of David. He descended from David and Judah. Thus God re-established David's family and lineage.

With regard to the Olive-tree, I have to say, simply, that it was not a church; not a Christian Church, nor a Jewish Church, nor was it a church at all. It had no connection with the church; therefore, the breaking off was not a breaking off from the Jewish Church. The bringing back was not a grafting back into the Jewish Church. He

said nothing to *prove* that it was a *church* spoken of. In the argument of that point his logic was as a rope of sand. There was no marching up to the point and showing us where he meant to land, and then, like a victor, landing there. Those that were broken off, were broken off because of *unbelief*, and those that remained, stood there *by faith*.—Romans xi: 20. That does not look much like infant membership. But no matter what it means, the idea of infant membership in the church is alien to what is meant in this passage, and is as far as the east is from the west from any such idea. It is not an opinion legitimately drawn from this passage of Scripture we now have before us.

My friend says, with reference to the Gentiles, that "you are aliens" *now*, that is, in Paul's day. He ought to be more careful in his reading. In the second chapter of Ephesians, about the thirteenth verse, it does not so read. It says, "But now, in Christ Jesus, you who sometime were far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ." It is not "were," it is "are," simply; all you (talking to the Gentiles) *were* far off, but *are now* made nigh by the blood of Christ.

Now, Mr. President, I propose to make some little advance in our argument. Allow me to call your attention to the third chapter of Galatians, commencing with the twenty-second verse. We have here the promise made to Abraham contemplated and considered by the Apostle Paul, who, I presume, understood the covenant made with Abraham. "But the Scripture hath included all under sin, that the promise by faith" (that does not look like a church in which there was no faith) "of Jesus Christ, might be given to them that believe. But before *the* faith came, we were kept under law, shut up unto the faith which should afterward be revealed. Wherefore the law was our school-master to *bring us* unto Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after that the faith is come, we are no longer under a school-master. For ye are all children of God by (or through) the faith in Jesus Christ. 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 ye are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." What was the promise? "In thee and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." How will you become Abraham's seed according to that promise? "By faith in Jesus Christ." So Paul explains it. Have that faith in Jesus Christ, and

be baptized into HIM; then you become one of Abraham's seed, and an heir according to the promise, both Jews and Gentiles. The middle wall of partition is broken down, and Jews and Gentiles flow together, and are one new body; or, as Dr. Clark correctly renders it, one new church. That which was the cause of offense between Jew and Gentile being entirely removed, and the new covenant, and the new law, and the new promises, and new subjects, and new conditions, in spirit as well as in outward ordinances, being introduced, the Jew and Gentile flow together; they have formed one new man in Christ Jesus, and have no grounds of alienation between them. They have peace.

But I call your attention more particularly to this: The promise to Abraham was the very promise which Mr. D. says guaranteed infant membership. It was "In thee and in thy seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Paul explains that promise, and tells us that those who are contemplated as being blessed, according to that promise, under the new covenant, are those who have *faith* in Jesus Christ. Look at it more narrowly. This new covenant, the apostle tells us, is a covenant of faith. He says that the law, in relation to the new covenant, was our pedagogue, to bring us to Christ. Now, since *the* faith is come, if persons may become members of it without any faith, why call that system *the* faith, that embraces persons without any faith as its members? If my friend could carry his point, we should have all in the church, and then you would have a church of the world. If you take all flesh and blood into the church, then you will have the church and the world united, and that great spiritual distinction which God meant should exist between the church and the world, would be altogether obliterated or broken down.

Again, there is a meaning in the phrase, *the faith*. The word faith is used in two senses in the Scriptures. It is used first, as indicating a certain quiescent or negative state of the mind, in which a man is recognized as believing, accepting, assenting to, or taking hold of a proposition. But the word faith is used in another sense; it is employed to designate a *system* of precepts, commandments, ordinances, ceremonies, and services, which belong to the Christian religion. In this sense you will find it used in various passages. At one time there were certain persons who had made inquiry in reference to the Apostle Paul. They had learned not much about him; but this

much they knew, that he "now preaches *the faith* which he once destroyed."—Gal. i: 23.

Again, the Apostle Jude says: "Contend earnestly for the *faith* once delivered to the saints. The law was our school-master, to bring us to Christ; but, since *the faith* is come, we are no longer under the school-master." Why call it *the faith*, if it embraces persons who have no faith? That would lead us to ignore the distinction between those who have no faith and those who have. Why not accept the new covenant as a thing that requires *no faith at all*? Under the Jewish law some persons had faith; some persons not; but there was no condition of faith in order to membership under that law. But so it is not under the Christian economy. Those who are received under the new covenant are members according to their faith, as Abraham had faith before he was received and blessed of God.

I ask you now to allow me to quote from memory the third chapter of Galatians, eighth verse: "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." Here is a reference to the promise made to Abraham, and to that *condition* on which the world was to be blessed, according to the promise made to Abraham: "Seeing that God would justify the heathen *through faith*!" That does not indicate that infants were included. That does not contemplate infant membership. It indicated clearly that the new covenant, or the constitution of the church that was to be set up under the new covenant, promised to Abraham, was a covenant of faith, and that it was promised to Abraham because of his faith. In view of this distinction, on account of his faith before God, the covenant is called a covenant of faith; therefore, I conclude that those who were to be members of it, or who should be gathered under it, should be men and women of faith.

I said that when Christ came, and when the apostles went forth to preach, including the reign, as I may call it, of John the Baptist, and of the Christian Dispensation proper, there never was a Jew, however good he might have been, either recognized as a member of the provisional government under John the Baptist, in his day, or of the Christian Church, whenever that may have been established; there never was a Jew, however good he might have been, good enough to belong to the church, or so good that he was recognized as a member of the church; but it was said to the very best people

that existed at that time, including the apostles themselves and John the Baptist, that they were not in the church of Jesus Christ. In Matthew xviii: 2, we read that the apostles contended with one another as to who should be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. The Savior brought a little child into their midst, and said to them: "Except you be converted and become as little children, you shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Of course the apostles were not then in it. He said not only that none of them should be the greatest in the kingdom of heaven, that not one of them should be gratified in that particular, but he let them know that they should not even so much as enter into the kingdom of heaven unless they should be converted, turn away from their ambitious views and wranglings, and become peaceable, and quiet, and innocent, and unambitious as a little child; a beautiful emblem of what they must be in order to be citizens of the approaching kingdom.

The apostles were not in the kingdom of Jesus Christ; neither were those devout persons that came together from all quarters on the day of Pentecost; neither were the Jews that worshiped in their own country, serving God, and praising and loving God. Not one of those devout persons gathered there from the four quarters of the earth, for the purpose of worshiping God, not even one of them, was in the church of Jesus Christ. In order to be in that church they had to believe in the Savior, and be like him, that they might live. They had to repent of their sins, and be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ, in order that they might belong to the church. Toward the conclusion of the second chapter of Acts we are told that there were added to the church about three thousand souls. Who, then, belongs to the church? I answer, believing men and women *only*.

MR. DITZLER'S FOURTH ARGUMENT.

WEDNESDAY, December 14, 10 A. M.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

In resuming the discussion this morning, we take up the same proposition that we had under consideration yesterday, *i. e.*, the scripturalness of infant baptism. I have not kept repeating the terms of the proposition, because I thought it unnecessary. It has been announced by the President, and the proposition under discussion has been made known to you by the Moderators, and I do not deem it necessary to be constantly repeating the same to you. If my brother chooses to do so, it is his privilege; I presume upon your intelligence, and think you know what we are discussing.

I will now notice some of the points aimed to be made by my brother. One is on the tenth of Hebrews, on the question of the pardon or actual remission of sins. His position, in substance, is, that their sins never were actually pardoned until Christ's blood was actually shed upon the cross; and he quotes Hebrews x: 3, "But in those sacrifices there is remembrance again made every year." His exposition is that their sins were never actually pardoned until Christ was crucified. From the beginning of time no man's sins were actually pardoned, but laid over: and this text is the only support he has for this position. Now, the apostle is here showing the distinction between a pure spiritual worship and a worship burdened with forms, and ceremonies, and ordinances of the flesh. Hence, he illustrates by the tabernacle of Moses, in which ordinances were held and sacrifices offered continually. He argues further, to show the advantage of Christ as a true sacrifice over the sacrifice of mere animals; and shows that the blood of animals never can take away sins; that only the *blood of Christ* can cleanse and purge from sins. Therefore, the point made is this, that those services never did take away sins, but were *typical*, and constantly referred to Christ, "the Lamb of God," who alone takes away our sins. Now, the worshipers

could never be made perfect by virtue of these sacrifices; and it is no argument here to say that their sins were not actually pardoned, but only passed over, for when a man was pardoned, he had to rely on the virtue of the sacrifice made by the *Redeemer*, who alone should take away sins.

In order that you may gather the idea clearly, I will read several verses of this chapter, Heb. x: 1-4: "For the law [of commandments in ordinances] having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never *with those sacrifices*, which they offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect. For then would they not have ceased to be offered? because that the worshipers *once purged* should have no more *conscience of sins*. But *in these sacrifices* there is a remembrance again made of sins every year; for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins" Now, here he declares that these worshipers were cleansed from sin, and that it is impossible for these sacrifices to cleanse from sin. The word in the Greek is καθαρίζω (*katharidzo*), and the same word is used in reference to the cleansing of sin by the blood of Christ. "But in these sacrifices there is a remembrance again made of sins every year; for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins." And then the term καθαρίζω (*katharidzo*), in the original, is applied to the remission of the sins of those under the old dispensation. The same word in the same form is used for cleansing from sin now. Further, Christ constantly pardoned men's sins. We saw that from the quotations of yesterday, which indicated a thorough cleansing from sin. God said, "Their sins and iniquities I will *remember no more*." If they were not actually pardoned, how could this be said of them? Like expressions fill the volume of the Old Testament.

But my brother's argument upon another point is equally defective. When those men were broken off from this church of the Jews because of unbelief, he says they had to have faith, and that this was their defection, that infants can not have faith, and therefore can not belong to that body. It is a little difficult to construe my brother's argument, or get at his position. Does he now take the position that they were not members "of the commonwealth?" He first denies that this institution was a church, and calls it "a commonwealth," and then turns around and does what no man ever did before, denies that infants were members of that institution. If he can believe that a commonwealth can exist without infants in it, his faith is larger

than history warrants. He urges that they stood by faith, that faith was a condition of their salvation, and that infants can not stand by faith. All the writers and fathers agree that infants were members of this Jewish institution, which my brother argues was not a church, but a commonwealth, yet speaks of its members being saved by faith. For three hundred years the Baptist Church has never questioned that; for three hundred years they have admitted that infants were members of the Jewish Church.

He says infants can not have faith; that faith was a condition of membership in this church; that such a requirement could not be expected to be made of infants, and that, therefore, they can not be members of the New Testament church. We know it was not applicable to those of the Old Testament church, and that ruins his argument as to the New Testament. Of course, every one knows that in the Old Testament church infants did not have faith. The Jews were broken off by unbelief, and to *cease to be members* of the Jewish Church, Paul teaches that they had to *reject* Christ; they had to reject Christ to be counted unbelievers. The infants did not reject Christ; they had membership with the remnant who remained in the church and kept the infants with them, and therefore they were not broken off.

In Ephesians ii: 13, my brother is equally unfortunate. I had commented on that text. I said, in substance, that Paul declared "*Now*" (*in his day*), "ye who sometime *were* afar off *are* made nigh by the blood of Christ." He argues that the word "*now*" is not so used (for present time), and taking up his Testament, read the second word, upon which he stumbled. Now I call your attention here to the use of the present tense. Here is the point: "But *now*, in Christ Jesus, ye (Gentiles) who sometime *were* afar off *are* made nigh by the blood of Christ." Ye Gentiles, who have been "*afar off*," "*being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel*," are "*now*" in Christ brought right to "*the commonwealth of Israel*." My point is that the commonwealth still stood, and was so recognized by the apostles in saying the Gentiles were brought nigh to it. They were brought into the Jewish Church. Paul says it was that into which men must be grafted; and of course it was the church.

On the eighth of Hebrews he is, if possible, still more unfortunate. "For finding fault with them, he saith, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will make a new covenant *with the house of Israel* and *with the house of Judah*." He says this does not mean to complete a covenant; and lets us know in Greek and Hebrew how

utterly untrue that is. He says it *συντελέσω* (*synteleso*) does not mean to perfect a covenant, and tries to prove that I am wrong. Well, I am willing to risk whatever reputation as a scholar I may have upon it. Let me read you Alexander Campbell's version of it: "But finding fault, he says to them, Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, when I will *complete* a new institution with the house of Israel and the house of Judah." Here Mr. Campbell is compelled to render it "complete." The original will admit of no such construction as this, and Mr. Campbell's rendering is correct. The word "new" in the Greek implies renew.

There are one or two other little items that I will pass over for the present. Then my brother makes the tabernacle of David mean the lineage of David. I would like to find the passage that James quotes where the word means lineage. I have never seen such a place; and though the Greek may have such a meaning, of course it has the meaning there of the Hebrew from which it is rendered. I now proceed, having shown you that God had a church developed from a pure, spiritual religion; that infants were members of that church; that that church still remains; and that infant membership has never been abrogated. I therefore give another illustration to enforce my position. I read the case of the "good olive-tree" yesterday, and there are others equally as strong. Matthew xxi: 36-43: "Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them likewise. But last of all he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. But when the husbandmen saw the son, they said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and let us seize on his inheritance. And they caught him, and cast him out of the vineyard, and slew him. When the lord, therefore, of the vineyard cometh, what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and will *let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen*, which shall render him the fruits in their seasons. Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the Scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, the same is become the head of the corner: this is the Lord's doing, and it is marvelous in our eyes? Therefore I say unto you, *The kingdom of God shall be taken from you, and given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.*" The blessed Savior is here illustrating the church under the form of a vineyard; a very common illustration of his church both in the Old Testament and the New. God's prophets had been badly treated, and at last God's own Son had been sent, and they had cast

him out My brother said yesterday that in the apostolic day no person was in "the kingdom of God," which he regards as "the church" Indeed, he used stronger language than that In John's day none were in the church or kingdom of God That is to say, the church was organized on the day of Pentecost That is his position; and until *then*, none of these persons were in the church, or the kingdom, as he expresses it

Now, God declared that the kingdom should be taken from those who rejected Christ, and given to a nation who should receive the benefits of it. Matthew viii 11 "Many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, but (οι δε υιοι της βασιλειας—*hoi de uioi*, etc) the children of the kingdom shall be cast out," etc Now, how could these children be "cast out" of that in which they had no membership, no being? He declares that it "shall be taken away from them and given to another nation" Here he calls them "the children of the kingdom," who enjoyed membership with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven Here, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were members of the kingdom of heaven, and, therefore, they were in that kingdom in which we have a place in the present day Again, Luke xvi 16, "The law and the prophets were until John since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it"

Now, since the days of John, men are represented as pressing "into the kingdom of God," and how could they press into that which had no existence at all? Again "The kingdom of God is within you," said Christ, long before the Pentecost Christ declares it was within them Then the prayer, "Thy kingdom come" presents another view, for, while it was enjoyed by some, to others it had not come; and there are millions upon earth to whom, in this sense, it has not yet come Yet there are millions to whom it has come, and it is within them It—"it had"—may refer to that which is very remote, or that which is in possession, or the right of one Matthew xxi 31, 32 "Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not but the publicans and the harlots believed him and ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him" Now, here he declares that the publicans and the harlots, even in the days of John, were entering into the kingdom of God, and it was by believing on Christ that they entered How could they enter into that which had

no existence? Yet Mr Campbell takes the position that the kingdom of God was not established until the day of Pentecost. I read from Mr Campbell's debate with Rice, p. 309 "No wonder that John the Baptist and the Messiah preached a new religion, a new repentance, a new birth, and that flesh must give place to faith, and blood to piety." Again, p. 434 "No wonder, then, that we have given a new emphasis to the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, inasmuch as the Messiah and his prophets send us to Jerusalem, to Pentecost, and to *Peter for the law of remission*. Can we possibly err, then, in regarding *Peter's sermon as the OPENING SPEECH of the gospel age?*" Again, p. 459 "If Peter had never spoken these identical words a second time, 'Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of the Lord Jesus, for the remission of sins,' after having, on the day of Pentecost, *opened the kingdom of heaven* with them, the other apostles speaking them in all languages at the same time—the Holy Spirit manifestly present, dictating and authenticating them—methinks it is enough forever."

Now, in order to refute the doctrine of infant baptism, which is implied in infant church membership, they declare that the kingdom, or the church, was not established until on the day of Pentecost, while the Scriptures clearly teach the reverse. Luke vi. 20, "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is *come upon you.*" "Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, for ye *shut up the kingdom of heaven against men*, for ye neither go in yourselves, neither suffer ye them *that are entering* to go in." Here the blessed Savior rebukes persons for hindering others from entering the kingdom of God, and yet our brother tells us that it was not in existence at that time at all. Now, I gave you, in yesterday's discourse, as well as those of to-day, the clearest proofs from Romans xi, and Ephesians ii, of the oneness of this church. I now read from Deuteronomy xix. 10-16 "Ye stand this day *all of you* before the Lord your God, your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, with all the men of Israel, *your little ones*, your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp, from the fether of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water: that *thou shouldest enter into covenant* with the Lord thy God, and into his oath, which the Lord thy God maketh with thee this day: that he may establish thee to-day for a people unto himself, and that he may be unto thee a God, as he hath said unto thee, and as he hath sworn unto thy fathers, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob." I read all of this to show you that there were "little ones" here embraced "*in covenant*"

relation with God. The whole assembly is addressed as if they understood the matter. In my brother's argument, founded on the eighth of Hebrews, he names conditions which *infants* can not conform to, but here we see, in a like condition of things, *infants* are embraced. I read, further, from the prophet Joel ii: 15-17: "Blow the trumpet in Zion, sanctify a fast, call a solemn assembly: gather the people, sanctify the congregation, assemble the elders, gather the children, and those that suck the breasts: let the bridegroom go forth out of his chamber, and the bride out of her closet." The Greek and the Hebrew (*kaddashu kahal*) are, sanctify the CHURCH—ἀγιασατε ἐκκλησίαν (*hagiasate ekklesian*). Now, here he addresses the church, for, in the Greek and the Hebrew, it is called the church, used in the *most restrictively* religious sense; and even infants, so young as those that "*suck the breasts*" are addressed in this sense. Yet, when our opponents find reference made to faith in the New Testament, or to any thing implying adult age, they say *infants* can not be included. Infants were embraced in that church, and *were subjects of its ordinances and immunities.*

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKES' FOURTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I will notice a few points in my friend's speech, and then I will proceed with my argument by way of disproof. My friend referred, in the closing part of his speech, to the twenty-ninth chapter of Deuteronomy, ninth and tenth verses. He tells us that Moses, in the covenant which he made in Moab, just before the crossing of the Jordan, included infants. My friend ought to know, and will if he will read the first verses of that chapter, that that was a second covenant that God made through Moses with Israel; that it was made after the one at Sinai: and he forgets, it seems, that I never have denied that infants were in the Jewish commonwealth, were included in it, had membership in it, just as infants have membership in the commonwealth of the state of Kentucky now, and rights in it. But that is not to his purpose. Will he say, that because persons were in the Jewish commonwealth, that therefore such persons are now in the Christian Church, and, therefore, have a right to its ordinances? If his mind will only dwell a little on that point, he will find that it proves altogether too much. Wicked men were in the Jewish commonwealth, had rights and immunities therein; they had privileges in it guaranteed by covenant with God through Moses. Will he, therefore, baptize wicked men? They were included in the Jewish covenant made through Moses. The fact is, the whole economy introduced by or through Moses was different from the Christian economy, as we shall show more fully to-day. I want my friend, if he relies upon his position, to come up to this point like a man, and let us understand this controversy, if there must be one over it. That economy included all the Jewish people, *all of them*, whether good men or not. That is not true of the Christian Church. He will not say so. Yet it was a provision of that law that, whether a man was converted or not, he might be a member of the so-called Jewish Church. If he was bought with Jewish money

or born of Jewish parents, he had membership and privileges in the Jewish commonwealth, whether he had any faith, or piety, or spirituality, or not. But must a man, *therefore*, under the Christian economy, which is one of faith, piety, spirituality—under that covenant where the ax is laid at the root of the trees, and every tree that brings forth not good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire, who has no faith or piety, be baptized? Does he suppose that, under the *New* covenant, every man born of a Jew, or bought with a Jew's money, may be baptized? He certainly does not.

He quotes from the prophet Joel a passage in which the word *infants* is found. Mr. Ditzler is a good-natured man as well as a Christian gentleman and scholar; he will, then, allow me to say that he seems to have a passion for the passages in which the word infant occurs, though there be nothing about baptism, but only the word infant in them. With regard to that convocation spoken of by Joel in the second chapter and fifteenth verse, I remark: The prophet there warns them of great calamities about to come upon them, and counsels the calling of a solemn assembly, to which *all* were to come. Even the infants were to be brought. That is all. They were to be *brought*. My friend's logic is of that character that says: *hence*, infants are to be baptized—just because, when there was a great calamity impending, and the prophet advised all to come to a solemn assembly, and the infants to be brought, also, therefore infants are to be members of the church, and ought to be baptized! Well, I have come to this conclusion with regard to such an argument as that: It is, probably, or possibly, excellent logic, a conclusive argument; but in my present state of mind I am disposed to let it pass. If it be conclusive, I am willing to surrender, and allow that, therefore, infants ought to be baptized!

But, again, I wish to take up a matter or two in Hebrews. My friend says that the sins of persons under the former economy were *actually* pardoned—*finally* pardoned. I said not. I admit that is the issue. I quoted from Paul, in his tenth chapter of Hebrews, that there was a remembrance of sins every year. Why remember them if they were actually pardoned? There is no reason for it. The fact is, they were not pardoned, and for the very good reason the typical sacrifices could not take away sins. So Paul says; and if it had been possible for those sacrifices to take away sins, then there would have been no need for Jesus Christ to have suffered; his sufferings and trials were all in vain!

But, my friends, it was necessary for Christ to come and suffer, for the simple reason that no blood on earth or in heaven could take away sin but the blood of Christ. Why that was so I know not, but God knows, and he tells us the fact. No blood but Christ's could take away sin; and I think that blood was not efficacious to take away sins until it was shed. I will read a passage or two more on that point. I read first from Hebrews, ninth chapter, twenty-sixth verse: "For then must he often have suffered since the foundation of the world" (that is, if he were like other priests), "but now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." He was not sacrificed under the old economy, nor until *after* it. Then, we must conclude that the forgiveness of sins did not take place under the old economy. I admit that Christ was *as* a lamb that was slain from the foundation of the world. The shedding of his blood is as efficacious now, to me, as it was when it was shed eighteen hundred years ago. It was efficacious in reaching back, and in reaching forward; just as efficacious eighteen hundred years before as eighteen hundred years after the Savior died; nevertheless, the *actual* forgiveness of sins did not take place until that blood was shed. I read, also, on that same point, from Hebrews, ninth chapter, commencing with the thirteenth verse: "For if the blood of bulls and of 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?" He offered himself to *purge* the conscience, to qualify persons for the service of the living God. "And for this cause he is the mediator of the new testament, that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions *that were* under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance." Why was it necessary that his death should take place? For the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first covenant. If they had all been acquitted and redeemed *finally*, there would have been no necessity for Christ to suffer for the transgressions that occurred under the first covenant. But Paul declared, emphatically, that it was necessary that he should suffer for the *redemption of the transgressions that occurred under the first covenant*. Is not that conclusive? It seems to me so. Paul still proceeds with the argument: "For where a testament is, there must also of necessity be the death of

the testator." What does that mean? Where a testament or will is, there must also be of necessity the death of the testator. It was a thing well known at that time, and it is known now, that a man's will is not in force, and that no one can claim any thing under the will, until the testator has died; and *after the death* of the testator, parties having rights may come in and claim them; still, not otherwise than according to the terms of the will. But before the Savior came, before he died, even if there was a testament, while the death of the testator had not occurred, that will was not in force. No persons who were to be sanctified through that will, or who were to gain possessions or blessings under that will, could do so, because the death of the testator had not occurred. It was of no force at all "while the testator lived." I hope that this will be satisfactory on this point.

My friend refers to the olive-tree argument again. I have a complaint against him. I respectfully submit to my respected opponent, that when he attempts to make an argument, he tell us what the *point* of it is! He tells us that the Jews were broken off from the good olive tree, and the Gentiles were grafted into the good olive tree. That is true. He tells us that the good olive tree was—what? Do you know? I know what he thinks about it. He thinks that it represents the church! Verily, I would like to have a little proof of it; just a little of the pure thoughts of heaven on that subject would be acceptable. I declare that there was as much leanness in his argument as there was in Pharaoh's lean kine. It is a flimsy thing, without the first sciutillation of divine light to support it. There is no evidence in the whole Bible that that good olive tree there represents any church, either Christian or Jewish. But, secondly, if my friend insists that it does represent a church, I will cross swords with him in support of the proposition, if he will affirm the other side, that it signifies *rather* the *Christian Church* than the *Jewish Church*. And, again, whatever church it represents, if any, in this case, it must be noted that the persons broken off were broken off because of *unbelief*; so Paul says expressly; and that they that entered in, entered in by faith and *stood by faith*. There is not much evidence of infant membership in it, whatever it was.

I have now some general remarks to make with regard to the patriarchal religion, so called. For two thousand years, according to popular chronology, my friend does not claim that there was any

church. He does not say there was none. He will not claim that there was. There was what we call the patriarchal religion, however. The father of the family was the priest. He erected his altar and made his sacrifices. He interceded with God in his own behalf, and in behalf of his family. In process of time, God chose to change the priesthood. He made, however, beforehand, a promise to Abraham, that he would give him a certain land, and that he would organize his people in that land, under HIMSELF as their king. During this patriarchal dispensation, however, there was no church; there was no infant membership. There was the family, and the infant was in it; that there were blessings in that family for the infant, I admit; and that there were obligations upon parents to teach their children, I admit; but there was nothing that was a church, in any spiritual and scriptural sense of that term. Under the Mosaic dispensation, when the promise concerning the land was fulfilled, and Israel was gathered into it, God changed the priesthood. He gave them, instead of the fathers of families for priests, the tribe of Levi; he gave them the Aaronic priesthood. He organized them under the first covenant; and under this first covenant he included all the people, whether they were good or bad, old or young. This I admit. But when the Lord Jesus Christ came, and established the *new* covenant, he laid the other aside. He folded it up and laid it away. His language is, "Now that which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away." This is spoken with reference to the introduction of the *new* covenant. Suppose I were to address an intelligent Jew to-day; one of the descendants of Israel, and of the family of Judah. Suppose I were to ask him, who is presumed to understand his own law, and his own religion, whether he holds that the Christian Church is the same thing as the Jewish Church. If he were an intelligent Jew, as I have supposed, he would laugh in my face. One evidence that he does not regard them as the same, is, that he does not believe or accept our religion. But, said my brother, that covenant which was promised by Jeremiah, and that was spoken of by Paul, in the eighth chapter of Hebrews, was a new covenant; that is to say, said he, it was a *renewed* covenant; it was a *perfected* covenant, a *covenant carried on to perfection*; whereas, before, it was imperfect. I deny that. Do you recollect what he brought to prove it? He said it was *renewed*; but who else said so? I am supposed, by courtesy, to be equal to my friend. He says it, the qualifying

word, means *renewed*. I say it does not mean renewed; thus we are at open issue—aye, and a very clear issue it is. I profess to know that the word *kainos*, describing that covenant as a new covenant, does not mean renewed. It never means renewed, but it means simply *new*, as opposed to old. If we must examine this matter still more closely and severely, I will do so; but before I examine it further, I will ask my friend to direct his mind or attention to the consideration of the passage with regard to the tabernacle of David falling down, as we have the account of it in Acts xv: 16, and of its being set up again. He says that the church in which David lived had fallen down between the time of David and the times of Christ and of the apostles; and that the apostles were to build *the same church* up again. I deny this. And where is his proof that such is the case? The tabernacle of David, I tell you, meant the lineage, or family, of David. It was broken down, as a royal family is sometimes broken down; so that no one of that family, for a long time, sat upon the throne of David. That throne was promised to be re-established, and it was prophesied that one of the line of David should sit upon David's throne. God promised this by one of his prophets. Jesus was raised up and sat upon that throne, as the historian Luke explains it in the second chapter of Acts of the Apostles. I have in my hand the New Testament Lexicon of Mr. Robinson. Those who know him, know that he catches at any straw that will give the least countenance to the cause of infant baptism; that he was an exceedingly zealous advocate of infant baptism. What does he say upon this subject? He says it, the word *skanee*, is, "metaphorically, for *the family*, or royal line of David, fallen into weakness and decay;" and then he quotes this very passage as one in which the word has this meaning. In the literal sense, it means a booth, etc. It is here put "for the family, or royal line, of David, fallen into weakness and decay." And he is by no means by himself on that subject. The authorities, the very best, are on his side of the question. But if I were without these great authorities, I would still deny that my friend makes any show of reason, in the attempt to prove that it means the Jewish Church, or commonwealth.

I now come back to Mr. Ditzler's argument in regard to the eighth chapter of Hebrews. I wish to look at it a little carefully. He says that *teleioo*, etc., means *to complete* the covenant. I myself have no doubt that *teleioo* means *to make an end*, or to complete. What does he pro-

pose to make out of that? What was it that Paul says God was going to finish? Was he going to finish up an old covenant, or to finish a *new* one? This house in which we are now was finished or completed, and yet my friend knows that it was not an old one repaired or mended. Does Paul mean that an old covenant was only to be dressed up and improved a little? He does not. When this house was *teleos*, or finished, it was simply completed. But was it not a *new* house? Had it ever existed before? Not at all. The apostle tells us that the covenant was finished, and he says it was a new covenant—a new one in contrast with that made with Moses fifteen hundred years before. It was, then, much more new than any one claimed to have been made before *that* time. This must be clear. Paul says, moreover, of this new covenant, that “it shall not be like” the old one; it shall not be according to it, but different; and then he proceeds to specify the particulars in which it differs from the old covenant. Again, I remark that in the prophecy of Jeremiah we have the statement, that “The days will come.” It was a *future* thing, then. It was then six hundred years before the Christian era. And Jeremiah tells us that the Lord would make a new covenant. A *new* one? Does Jeremiah say that he would *renew* a covenant?—that he would add to an old covenant? The words used by Jeremiah and Paul never meant such a thing in Hebrew or Greek since the world began. My friend is a Hebrew scholar, I suppose. I make no great pretensions to scholarship in Hebrew, or Greek, or Latin, or in any of these things; but I do pretend to know that the Hebrew word there does not mean *renew*; that it not only does not, but it can not mean *renew*. And more than that, there was a Hebrew word lying right before the selecting Spirit of God, in that language, that did mean *renew*, and it was not selected. Until my friend shall come to these passages, and lay his authorities or evidence down by the proposition, and attempt directly to establish it, he has no right to claim a verdict from this listening and respectful audience. It was a *new*, not a *renewed* covenant; it had a new priesthood; it had a new king; it had a new worship through Jesus Christ, a kind of worship never known before those days; it had new ordinances; it had a new law; it had a new membership. All were to know the Lord, from the least unto the greatest. So says the Apostle Paul. If you attempt to bring in a little one that does not know Christ, and is to be taught to know the Lord, you attempt therein to violate the provisions of the new covenant, “for,” says the apostle, “*all shall know the Lord, from the least to the greatest.*” “My

law must be written in their minds, and upon their hearts." Neither of these can be true of an infant child as they must be true of one Paul would introduce into the church. It is not only true that the covenant was a new one, but the parties that may be members under this new covenant are so described as to effectually and forever exclude the presence of infants under it.

I have another distinct line of argument to present, in answer to one that my friend presented. I will at least introduce it. It is on the question of identity. I wish it to be distinctly understood that I mean, in the fear of God, to concede what I believe to be true. I mean to concede no more; and for this reason I admit that, in the days of John the Baptist, there is a sense in which the kingdom of God was present, and men were pressing toward it, and into it. I will not controvert the point; though, in my own mind, I do not feel *entirely* satisfied about it. But, nevertheless, for the sake of argument, I will say that there is a sense in which the kingdom of God was present in the days of John the Baptist, and that good men were coming into it. But I propose to show you, as I shall have opportunity, that there was a sense in which it was *not present*, and that was the *actual* sense. It was not *actually* present. The whole ministry of John the Baptist was a ministry of preparation. He *prepared* the people for God, or for the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ. His preaching was for that purpose. His baptism, in addition to manifesting Christ to Israel, had that for its purpose.

MR. DITZLER'S FIFTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My brother seems to be a little excited on this subject, but only pleasantly so; and he is bothered over that pardoning of sins. Now examine that for yourselves in the light of other texts german to the whole matter. When you find a text in Scripture which is difficult to understand, and from which you might form opposite conclusions, the right way is to find all the other like points upon the same subject, and, with *their* light, examine and understand the whole subject; for in one place it may not be discussed in full, while in another it is, and thus you gather the true idea. Hence the question as to whether or not sins were actually remitted is understood by knowing whether or not the blood of animals can take away sins, a question upon which there can be no discussion or difficulty at any time. The prophets habitually spoke of sins being "blotted out," of the purification of the heart from all sins, and of their "removal as far as the east is from the west." "And I will remember their sins no more," etc. All these strong expressions are used to show that their sins were remitted, pardoned, washed away, covered up; and that, therefore, the blood of Christ was to them effective, and realized by faith as *already shed*. He "was as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Hence, in the seventh of Revelations, all those who have gone to heaven are represented as having "washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." Not that he was actually slain, but they realized its efficacious merit as much as though slain. "For he was bruised for our iniquities, and by his stripes we are healed." This implies the shedding of his blood.

On the word renew my brother is again troubled. קָרַשׁ, Arabic, *hhadatha*, to polish, shine, glitter; hence, *new, renew*.—1 Sam. xi: 14; Job x: 17; Ps. li: 12. To *rebuild*, etc.—Is. lxi: 4; 2 Chron. xv: 8; xxvi: 4; Ps. cvi: 5. Modern Arabic pronounces the same word *jaddad*, to renew; *amal tajdid almihabbit*, to renew friendship. Gese-

nius' "Thesaurus," ii: 449—*Chadash* (Ps.) *renovavit*. 1 Sam. xi: 14—"Then said Samuel, Let us go to Gilgal, and (*chadash*) *renew* the kingdom there." Ps. li: 12—"Restore (*chadash*) unto me the joy," etc. Davidson's Heb. Lex.—"to make new, *renew*, restore, be renewed." Fürst—"made young again," "new man," "new heart," etc. Ezek. xi: 19; xviii: 31; xxvi: 26—*ruach hadashah*, "new spirit"—*laebh chadash ve ruach chadasha*—"a new heart and a new spirit. Hence, Fürst—*chadash*—"to be fresh, pure, new, young." Arabic, *hadasha*—to begin anew, take place anew—to *renew*, set up anew, etc. "That at that time God would *renew* (*le chadash*) the world for a thousand years."—Herbac. Heb., Lightfoot, ii: 63.

And now I come to the Greek word ἐγγίζω, which is a translation from the Hebrew word נָגַשׁ (*nagash*), which means, first, "to touch, reach to, or join," second, "to draw near;" the primary sense being "touching," "reaching to," etc. I give a few scriptural quotations. Genesis xlvi: 10, "Now the eyes of Israel were dim for age, so that he could not see. And he brought them *near unto* him; and he kissed them, and embraced them." Again, Isaiah v: 8, "And (ἀγρὸν πρὸς ἀγρὸν ἐγγιζούτε) join field to field." Genesis xxvii: 21, 26, 27, "(ἐγγίσσον) Come near, I pray thee, that I may feel thee, my son." "(ἐγγίσας) Come near now, and kiss me, my son."—(v. 26.) "And he (ἐγγίσας) came near, and kissed him." In Matthew xxvi: 46, 47, it is said, "He is *at hand* that betrayeth me. And while he yet spake, lo, Judas came." Mark xiv: 42, 43, "Lo, he that betrayeth me is *at hand* (ἐγγίζω). And *immediately, while he yet spake, cometh* Judas." Luke xxiv: 15, "Jesus himself *drew near* (ἐγγίσας), and went with them." These examples show the force of the term. I could give other passages, but these are sufficient. It applies to things near, and to that which is remote, also, or that which is advancing.

And now, as to some other matters in connection with this. We have shown that the church of God was not destroyed; that it is the same church spoken of by the New Testament writers, and referred to in the second chapter of Hebrews. My brother can not show that any rite was destroyed; though he contends that a new church was established on the day of Pentecost. But suppose he is right. *Of whom* was it organized? All of his authors teach that, without baptism, we can not be in the Christian Church. You must have Christian baptism. John's baptism was not Christian baptism, they maintain. Now, let us suppose the twelve apostles assembled

on the day of Pentecost to *organize* the Christian Church. *Of whom* did they organize it? There is no record of any such thing at all; and, surely, a matter of this importance would have been recorded. But if we admit it of no special importance the difficulty still remains. How is the organization to be effected? It must originate with persons baptized with Christian baptism, of course. But *not one of those twelve apostles was baptized with Christian baptism*, according to their view, and *not one of them was in the Christian Church*. So, you see, to exclude infants, he must exclude *Christ and the twelve apostles*, and say they were not members of the Christian Church, *and the last one of them will be damned!* In order to exclude infants, he has to condemn the twelve apostles and the hundred and twenty disciples. They deny John's baptism *put men in Christ* or in the church; and, therefore, to get infants out of the church, they have to damn the twelve apostles and the hundred and twenty disciples; aye, not only so, but he condemns the Lord Jesus himself. These are a few of the difficulties lying at his door on this question. You see how he stands on the whole matter. He remarked, yesterday, that if a person was circumcised in the apostolic day, it virtually cut him off from the church. I read from the "Campbell and Rice Debate," p. 413: "I have yet one argument, out of many more not stated, which I hope to have time to state before my time expires. It is, that circumcision *never was done away by any apostolic word or action*. *The Jews practiced BOTH CIRCUMCISION AND BAPTISM IN THEIR FAMILIES DURING THE APOSTOLIC AGE*—a matter which would have been intolerable, had the one been divinely ordered in lieu of the other." Now, Campbell admits that it can not be shown from any record that it was done away by any apostolic action at all; and the New Testament shows Campbell to be right on that subject; and Paul was requested to conform to the Jewish custom of circumcision to keep down prejudice. We find that the Jews recognized circumcision as a religious ordinance, as the writings of the apostles, already quoted, show; and that they did understand it to have a *spiritual meaning*. This the writings of President Milligan—"Scheme of Redemption," p. 81, and Alexander Campbell, "Chris. Baptism," p. 99—of his own church, abundantly show. And this shows *that infants were regarded as members of the church of which these apostles were ministers and public expounders*. As they had been taught to keep these infants with them, and as he calls baptism and circumcision merely fleshly ordinances, the fact that the apostles practiced circumcision upon infants shows, beyond contro-

versy, that infants were recognized as members of the Christian Church.

Another point, which I will show in my next address, is, that *the Jews practiced proselyte baptism*. He and I may differ a little on that question; and I shall bring an array of facts to show that the Jews of that day habitually baptized households, and baptized their infants, which shows their recognition of infant membership. They read the commission in the light of these well-known facts, which are not repealed: "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 Corinthians x: 1, 2. Here some three million persons received baptism; and their infants were baptized. They understood whether this was so or not; and, as the apostles were Jews—called themselves Jews—they were used to infant baptism and household baptism; and, therefore, interpreted the commission, as given in the twenty-eighth of Matthew, as authorizing them to baptize infants.

I will still continue some arguments upon this important subject. For instance, the term "saint," habitually applied to God's people, represents the members of the church. They are referred to in both the Old and New Testament in this style constantly. 1 Corinthians vii: 14, "For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband, else were your children unclean, but now are they *holy*." Mr. Campbell teaches that this sanctification never was accomplished until baptism took place. He regarded this baptism as "immersion." If they did not do certain things their infants were neglected, but the apostle now shows that since they have become sanctified their children have also been made holy—the Greek is "*saints*." Here the children are called holy; they are termed "saints," and this term in the New Testament represents members of the church of the living God. This is habitually the case. There is another fact which goes very far toward establishing these truths. There were what we term household baptisms. We use it as a popular term. We have several records in the New Testament of the baptism of the households of certain persons, or their families. Lydia and her household were baptized. Then we are told that Paul and Silas spake the word of the Lord unto the jailer, and all that were in his house: "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their

stripes, and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." Now, my brother contends that infants were not in this house; yet, even if he could prove that infants were not in this house, he could not carry his point. I have here similar examples of the baptism of families, or households, that I might present. This was so well understood that the most ancient translation that we have in the world, the Peshito-Syriac, represents it in a very striking light. Of the case of Lydia it says: "She was baptized, and her *children*." In the case of the jailer it says: "And immediately he was baptized, *he and the children* (or *members*) *of his household*, ALL of them." I read the Syriac, Acts xvi: 15, *u' emdhath hi u' bhani bhithekh*—"and she was baptized, and her children;" Acts xvi: 34, *ve bar shithekh amad hu vabhnai bhithekh kũlhũn*. Here you see the ancient translation, made right at the apostolic age, as all concede. Infant baptism was so well understood that it renders the word "household" by "children;" and in the case of the jailer it says: "He was baptized and his children, ALL of them." Now, I can not say that infants were in the house, nor can it be said that they were not; but certain it is that he was baptized with his children, all of them. Thus the most ancient copy of the word of God of which we have any account says that infants are included in the rite of baptism. The Scriptures presume that we are reasonable and responsible men, who act for ourselves; but throughout the whole Bible infants do not act for themselves, but their parents or guardians act for them.

My next general argument is from the history of proselyte baptism, and the history of infant baptism in the apostolic age. I expect to be able to trace it back beyond the possibility of a quibble. I have given the substance of this argument. I have shown that it was God's economy to spiritualize his people and call the church into existence. We find that the New Testament writers call it by the term church, and kindred phrases. That the church is called a house, family, or commonwealth, all of which imply the idea of infants enjoying membership in it. They are terms which ordinarily express that idea. These points I have strongly confirmed, and shown that the church of God has never been abrogated, though it devolves upon my opponent to show where it has been abrogated or destroyed. The commission does not say a word about baptizing *infants*, nor *men*, nor *women*, nor *boys*, nor *girls*. He baptizes boys and girls, and men and women, though *neither* men, boys, nor girls, are named *as such* in the commission. "(Go teach (*disciple*) all nations, baptiz-

ing *them* in the name of the Father," etc., "and teaching them," etc. Therefore, the commission does not exclude infants any more than any other class of persons; and, of course, the apostles would interpret it in the light of these well-known facts, and in accordance with the teaching of Christ; for he said, referring to little children: "Let them come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of heaven."

MR. WILKES' FIFTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I think that it is possible we will close our arguments on this proposition to-day. I suppose that my friend is about through. It is usual for the advocates of infant baptism to close on the subject of household baptism. My friend has taken up that subject, and he has tarried on it about as long as he can, longer, in fact, than he ought to have done. I do not much think he will return to it again. He made use of a very singular remark while speaking of households. He said, "I can not say that there were any infants in that household baptized," that is, in Lydia's household. We ought, therefore, to baptize infants, I suppose! That is his argument. Mark you, he can not say that there were any infants in any of the households baptized. I know he can not. Therefore, because he can not say that there were any infants in those households which were baptized, we ought to baptize infants! That is the argument, if there is any in it. I repeat, he says he can not say that there were infants in any of the households that were baptized. That is true. I say that there were no infants baptized in any of these households that were baptized; and I suppose my friend is sufficiently acquainted with Whately or Hamilton, or some such authorities, to know that if I deny that there were any infants there baptized, and he asserts that there were, that *he* must prove it. He avers, however, with regard to the best selected case, that of Lydia's household, that he can not say that there were any infants there. He then concedes the point, as far as reason is concerned, to be against him.

I call your attention to another point. My friend says there is no authority for baptizing any body anywhere, except that which is found in the commission. Have you not observed that he has never got to the commission yet? The only passage in the Word of God authorizing baptism he has not discussed, except a few words in the last speech. If I do not misrepresent him, and I do not intend to do

so, in his last speech he said, "The Savior says in the commission, 'Baptize the nations;' but," said he, "the commission does not say, baptize *men*, and baptize women, but simply baptize the nations."

I know it says, "Go teach the nations, baptizing *them*," and that it does not name *men* and *women*; but I wish my friend would go to that passage, and look at it, and grapple with it like a man ought to do before a respectable audience. I deny that there can be a logical conclusion drawn from the commission that infants ought to be baptized. And more than that, when I come to it, I will not only deny that infant baptism can be proved from it, but I will deny most sternly that it is *possible* to do it. Nay, more; I shall assert that it can not be done; that there are facts and circumstances connected with the passage which show, most conclusively, that infants can not have been contemplated as included in the commission. One of the stern circumstances connected with it is, that if they were included, they are all damned, as sure as the Word of God is true.

Again, he says men are not mentioned, and women are not mentioned there. I admit it. Nor are infant children mentioned, but only nations. Does my friend mean to say that because persons belong to *nations* that he will baptize them? He knows he does not. The veriest infidel that walks these streets, and blasphemes the name of God, belongs to the nations. Will he baptize him, therefore? If he will not, then he can not baptize an infant, *therefore*. His argument is, that he will baptize an infant *because* he belongs to the nations. I hold, then, that he is, in logical necessity, bound to baptize every other person that belongs to the nations. But he will not do it. When he refuses to baptize an infidel and a blasphemer, *I* will then refuse, and for as good a reason, to baptize an infant, and I think I am right.

Again, Mr. Ditzler introduced the subject of proselyte baptism. He says the Jews were, before the Christian era, in the habit of baptizing their proselytes. I apprehend that he is mistaken; they did *not* baptize their proselytes at so early a period as that. He professes to be able to bring before you some important authorities on this point. I will wait for them, and see what he says.

He says that infants were baptized in the Red Sea. I respectfully deny that. He says that there were three millions of persons who passed through the Red Sea, and were baptized. I deny that the infants were baptized there. In the same sense in which infants were in that baptism, every thing else that the people carried with them was in

it also. Infants were without sense, or reason, or conscience, and were *carried* along. They were just like every thing else that was *carried* along through the Red Sea, when Israel was baptized in the cloud and in the sea. The Apostle Paul tells us who were considered and accounted of the persons who went through the Red Sea. I read from Hebrews xi: 29, "By faith they passed through the Red Sea." Who? "*All.*" Turn to 1 Cor. x: 1, 2, and there we have this language: "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." How did they pass through? They passed through *by faith*; and, although there were doubtless infants there, they were not considered as baptized on that occasion. It was those who were accountable to God, who were capable of faith, and able to recognize him, and to regard him as their leader, that were baptized. These are the facts in that case.

My friend says that, according to my view, all the apostles were damned. I thank him for all that is right; but I do not thank him to make any conclusions for me, nor force positions upon me which I do not accept. I do *not* believe the apostles were all damned. It is possible, I think, that *one* apostle was damned, but only one—Judas Iscariot. I do not think any of the others were. He says they were not baptized with Christian baptism. Possibly they were not. Neither was Abraham; neither was Moses. But how, he inquires, could they have been saved unless they were baptized with Christian baptism? Christian baptism had not been established when they became disciples. It had not been authorized, or appointed; and until the appointment of it, it was not a sin not to be baptized with Christian baptism. As before stated, when the apostles first entered into the service of Christ, Christian baptism had not gone into effect. But, my friend says, John's baptism had, and that they were not baptized with John's baptism. John's baptism was for the purpose of preparing a people for the Lord; and these people, who were so prepared, did not need the initiatory rite, in order to enter that kingdom that was *afterward* to be in force.

Suppose I wished to start a temperance society in this city, where, possibly, one may be needed, though I hope it is not. There is none here; how would we proceed in such a case? A few of us would get together and draw up a pledge, a constitution, and by-laws. Here are a dozen persons, for example, who form the society; who *simply initiate* the society; and afterward persons are taken into it. These first parties do not go through the form of initiation through

which others must pass, in order to become members of that society, afterward.

Now, the apostles were constituted, under Christ, and by his authority, charter members of the kingdom of God. To Peter were given the keys of that kingdom. Of course, *before* the keys were *delivered* to him, the door of entrance was not opened, and no persons had entered. Much more is this true of persons before Peter *used* the keys and *actually* opened the door. Now, Peter *used the keys*, and *opened the door*, and certainly he did not need to be baptized to enter into the kingdom. My friend understands me, at least, whether he thinks I am right or not. He says, that if a man be in Christ, he is a new creature; *entirely* new. Yes; "Old things are passed away, behold, all things have become new," is the language of Paul. It is a new creation, indeed. But an infant child can not be a new creature in the sense of this text.

My friend seems fonder of Hebrew than of Greek. He much prefers either of them to the English, and he is fonder of the Syriac, and the Arabic, and Coptic, than he is of any of the languages named. As we are discussing Christian ordinances, in order *that the people may understand us*, we ought, as far as possible, to confine ourselves to the English. After careering through all the foreign and dead languages, it is difficult for the mass of hearers, generally, to say where he has landed, or whereof he has spoken. He can not, on infant baptism, however, do any thing better than that, and ought not to be blamed. There is nothing from which to infer infant baptism in the entire Scriptures. But he insists that the Hebrew word *kadash*, the word *qualifying* the word covenant, in Jeremiah, means *renew*. I have said, I deny that. I used strong language; possibly too strong. I have not yet been created infallible, and, therefore, am not much akin to the Pope. But if I used language *too strong* in saying that the word *never* could be used correctly in the sense of *renew*, I will modify it so far as to say that its current or ordinary meaning is new; and very seldom, if *ever*, *renew*. What should be our rule in the interpretation of this word? It should be this: I am entitled to the current or ordinary meaning of a word in any passage, unless there be something in the connection that forces me from it. My friend specifies nothing which would justify me in taking that word in an unusual sense, and *there is nothing to justify it*. I claim, therefore, that the word in the Hebrew means new, as opposed to old. My friend gives as the meaning, *renew*. He took

the word *kadash*, as I pronounce it, and he went far down from the top of the column of definitions, and read a passage, in the middle of the definitions, "*made new again.*" That was not exactly right; and, in the most brotherly spirit, as courteously as I can, I must chastise my brother, if he does not be a little more careful to do things better than that. It was his duty to have given us the current or ordinary meaning of the word, and it was his duty also to tell us that it was the current or ordinary meaning, or to give us a good reason for varying from that meaning. Let us read from the same great Hebrew and Chaldee lexicon of Dr. Fuerst. He says it means "*new, as opposed to old.*" He not only says it means "*new;*" but, this great authority which my friend brings here and lauds so highly, says it means "*new,*" as opposed to another Hebrew word, which means "*old.*" Then Fuerst goes on further and defines the word, "*unknown,*" "*not worn out,*" "*newly erected.*" This is the ordinary meaning of the word, as Fuerst defines it. My friend quoted from Buxtorff. I have that work with me. Buxtorff gives "*new, recent,*" as the meaning of it. I turn you now to Gesenius, under the adjective form which Jeremiah employs. (I asked my friend to distinguish the adjective form from the verb form of the word, in meaning, but he could not.) Gesenius says it means "*new,*" "*fresh, of this year,*" "*unheard of,*" "*so, new gods, because not before worshiped.*" That exhausts what Gesenius says. He is the great father of Hebrew learning in modern times. Under the *verb* we have a form of the word which means, specifically, "*to renew.*" My friend knows that. It is a form of the word not used in Jeremiah (xxxix: 31), but the word that is used in Jeremiah is another and different one from it, and means simply, new. A new constitution implies an old one, and the making of a new constitution implies the abolition of the old one.

I remark, further, that if a new constitution is made and adopted, the old one is abrogated, necessarily. If a constitution is *renewed*, it is new, then, to the extent that it is changed; and the old provisions continue that are not changed. I admit that. Having said so much about this covenant, I am now prepared to say that my friend may have it, for the sake of the argument, that it was a *re*-newed covenant, though he could think of nothing further from the truth. Nevertheless, I am prepared to allow him to regard it as a renewed covenant, and still utterly to spurn the conclusion that infant baptism follows therefrom. Allowing that it was a renewed covenant, or an

old one made new, I then simply come to what Paul says in regard to that renewed covenant. I point out in what respects it is a new covenant. Paul says that every one under it must know the Lord, from the least to the greatest. They must have the law of God written in their hearts; and not only that, but their sins and iniquities will be remembered no more against them. These things can not be asserted of infants, claimed, on this hypothesis, to be in the church of Jesus Christ. Again: suppose that my friend could find more than this. Suppose that he could prove that the covenant was a renewed one; and suppose he could prove that infants were necessarily members under it, which can not be the case. I then deny that he can prove infant baptism—and that is our proposition, after all. As before argued, infants are not to be baptized because they are in the church. The very reverse of this is rather the truth. The members of the church are not the scriptural subjects of Christian baptism. He means to *talk about* the covenants, and the church, and *about* almost every thing that is controverted, *except* infant baptism. Though he should prove that the covenant is *renewed*, and that, by some means, infants are to be included as members under it, I still deny that he can prove infant baptism. If he should demonstrate that they are members of the church, that they are members by virtue of their relation to the covenant, as he tried to prove, they are not, therefore, to be baptized. If persons are to be brought into the church by being baptized, as his Discipline teaches, the very circumstance which proves that they are members of the church is the circumstance which proves that they ought *not to be baptized*.

Will the audience hear me attentively for a short time longer on this subject? He says that the language, "The kingdom of God is at hand," means that it is already *in hand*. I have never so learned Greek. I have never so learned English. I do not think he is correct. When we say a thing is *at hand*, we may allow it to be very near to us; but the circumstance of its being *at hand* demonstrates that there is a space between us and it. I admitted, as you remember, that the kingdom of Christ, in its preparatory stages, had actually come in the days of John, and I do believe it. I think it is true, though some persons deny it. But had it come in its full development? had it actually come, or, were they simply gathering up materials and making preparations for it when it should come? The latter is the truth, I think, My brother has given you a number of passages, which actually appear to show that the kingdom had already

come in the days of John the Baptist. I frankly concede that they look so; that they do in appearance bear this construction. My friend must, however, grant that there are other passages as striking and conclusive as these, which are apparently the reverse of his proposition. This being the case, he must feel the obligation upon him, as a Christian minister, to reconcile these, and show in what way *both* may be true, and neither of them false. In Mark i: 15, we have it said that Jesus came, preaching and saying: "The time is fulfilled; the kingdom of God is at hand." This demonstrates that it was not already there. In Mark xii and xxxiv, one of the scribes is represented as asking him, "Which is the first commandment of all?" Jesus answered him, in substance, with the golden rule. The scribe approved the answer, and said: "To do this, is more than all burnt-offerings and sacrifices." And Jesus seeing that he answered "discreetly" (he was a skillful arguist in the Jewish law; he understood it well, and was a good man), said unto him: "Thou art not far from the kingdom of heaven."

Now, here was a *good Jew*, one that answered very "discreetly," and yet he was *not far from the kingdom of heaven*. He was not in it. He was in the *Jewish Church*; and he would have regarded it as ground of offense, if he had been accused of not belonging to the Jewish Church. Joseph, in Mark xv, is called an honorable counselor, "*which also waited for the kingdom of God.*" He craved the body of Jesus. He was a convert, no doubt, of the Savior's, or of John's, and was there in the provisional or preparatory reign. He stood around the cross at the time of the crucifixion, and was one of the first, perhaps the very first, to crave the body of Christ from Pilate. And yet that man was *waiting for the kingdom of God*. Of John the Baptist it was said, that of those born of women, none greater had arisen; but the "least in the kingdom of God was greater than he." Again, in Luke, "The kingdom of God is at hand." Again, in Matthew iii: 2, "Repent, for the kingdom of God is at hand." Matthew vi: 10, "Thy kingdom come." My friend says that the disciples of Jesus Christ, and the Jews, generally, misunderstood the nature of Christ's kingdom. They thought he would be an earthly prince, and that he was to rule, literally, as a king, over the people, and restore the kingdom wrested from them by the Roman army. But here is a case into which that objection will not enter. It says the disciples of Jesus Christ came to HIM, and said: "John the Baptist taught his disciples to pray; now teach us to pray." *They un-*

derstood whether his kingdom had fully come, and whether they were in it or not. But if they did not, the Savior did; and this is what HE said. It is not what some mistaken disciple thought; it is not what some misinformed Jew thought. It is what the Savior himself thought. He taught his disciples to pray, "Our Father, who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done." His kingdom, then, had not yet come. They were taught to pray that it might come.

Nicodemus came to the master by night, and said: "Master, we know that you are a teacher come from God, because no man can do the miracles that thou doest, except God be with him." Then there occurred a conversation, which is not recorded, which had reference to entering the approaching kingdom. "But," said the Savior, "except a man be born again, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." He was a senator in the Jewish Commonwealth, occupying a high and distinguished position in the Jewish Church, so called. Nevertheless, the Savior lets him know that, even though distinguished by his birth and position, even *he* would be required to be born again, or he could not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Thus we see that none of these persons were in the kingdom of God, however faithful, pious, and true to the Jewish law and customs. None were in the kingdom of God in the sense in which the Savior used the term. Then, are the Christian Church and the Jewish Church the same? I answer, they are not the same.

MR. DITZLER'S SIXTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

We will resume the discussion where we left off, with a few preliminary remarks, noticing some things that the brother has said. He seems to have a faculty for misunderstanding the plainest of propositions. For example, he says that I said that the word ἐπιχειρῶ meant to bring into present enjoyment. I am not attempting to give his words, but his idea. He said I said it meant "in hand." Now, you all know I took distinct pains to make you understand me, and explained carefully that the word itself could not determine the question; that, in a word, it neither proved that the kingdom *had* come, or that it had not come. The point which I did make was that it applied equally to that which was coming, but was not at hand, and to that which *had already* come. I read a number of texts to show the latter, and having admitted the former, it was not necessary to adduce any proof upon that point. Yet he misconstrues my language, and answers me on a point I did not make. He misunderstands me in the same way on other points that I have not noticed particularly. But on the Hebrew word he waxes valiant. You heard him wax valiant, yesterday evening, when he was going to fight it out on the Greek, that the word *συντελέω* (*sunteleso*) never meant "complete;" but this morning his valor weakened when I read from Campbell. Yesterday evening he was very bold to the contrary, but now, with Campbell, he is compelled to admit it. Now he is very bold on the *Hebrew*, and calls for the pointing of a text that is never pointed, as he should have known. But the adjective, he says, does not mean what he is forced to admit the verb means. I read from Gesenius' "Thesaurus" on the word *chadash*, under the verb form of it. Third conjugation, "*renovavit, velut ædificia, offida,*" etc., to make new, renew, spoken of houses, cities, kingdom (*regnum*), etc. I read from "Herbac. Heb. et Tal." ii: 63: "God at that time (*le chadash*) would RENEW the world for a thou-

sand years." Then, it is applied to the very word he substitutes in 1 Samuel xi: 14: "Then said Samuel to the people, Come, let us go to Gilgal, and renew (*chadashi*) the kingdom there." It meant a temporal kingdom there, but it equally applies to a religious kingdom. The Greek word, as found in the New Testament, is constantly so applied. "If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a *new* creature." Does it, then, mean a new creature *de novo*, in the sense of a new body, new flesh, and a new organization entirely? My brother tried to make the impression that I had left out part of the meaning of the word, which was very unkind, when I admitted all he asked in regard to the meaning in the sense of *recent*, "new." He labored to impress your mind with the idea that I denied that, and took an opposite position. Has it the meaning of "*new*," in the sense of recent, unheard of, as applied to this covenant in the eighth of Hebrews? Was that unheard of, when it had been preached about and written about for six hundred years? Surely it was not "*new*," in the sense of, unheard of.

Now, I come further to the question of *proselyte baptism*, and household, or Jewish baptism, as it might also well be called. Mr. Campbell himself makes some very strong admissions on this point, which are, in themselves, valuable. It is hardly necessary for me to quote from the Talmudic writings of the Jews which speak of the baptizing of their children. They all testify to the baptizing of infants by the Jews, from the days of Jacob down. They consider the baptism referred to by Paul, as applying to infants as well as adults. The only question that can be raised by my worthy opponent is the date of those Jewish baptisms of infants. Some contend, as my brother will probably urge, that it was not till the third or fourth century that they practiced infant baptism, urging, as Mr. Owen and Alexander Campbell did, that the Jews borrowed the custom from John the Baptist. Now, as Koenael well urges, it is not probable that the Jews would have borrowed from John the Baptist this institution, unless John the Baptist practiced infant baptism, and my brother will not admit that John the Baptist practiced infant baptism, for *that* would destroy his whole position. How, then, could the Jews be supposed to have borrowed proselyte baptism from John the Baptist unless he practiced infant baptism, which they utterly deny? Therefore, his own position is altogether against them. I quote mainly from the *Mishna*, which dates two and three centuries before Christ. The Jerusalem *Mishna* says "that if a girl,

born of heathen parents, be made a proselyte after she be three years and a day old, then she is not to have such and such privileges there mentioned." The Babylonian edition says: "If she be made a proselyte before that age, she shall have the said privileges."—Wall i: 10. The Gemara comments on it: "They are wont to baptize such a proselyte in infancy, upon the profession of the house of judgment, for this is for its good."—*Ibid.* I need not quote the many passages on infant baptism among the Jews, quoted by Wall, Lightfoot (ii: 54-56), Witsius, Beza, Koenael, etc.

These Jewish writings showed that they baptized their proselytes, and with the parents their infant children. These facts of the Mishna date two and three centuries before Christ. They were compiled and published in the second century after Christ. Many of Christ's and the apostles' sayings and quotations are found in them. The fact is established, therefore, that the Jews practiced infant baptism before Christ came into the world. That such Jewish writers as Philo and Josephus should not speak of it, is no proof of the contrary, since the works they wrote would not naturally lead them to speak of it. Josephus promised to write a work that would have given light on the subject, had he lived to write it; or, if he did, it never was preserved.

The Gemara: "If with a proselyte his sons and his daughters are made proselytes also, that which is done by their father redounds to their good." R. Joseph saith: "When they grow into years they may retract." The Gloss. adds: "This is to be understood of little children," etc.

"If an Israelite take a Gentile child, or find a Gentile infant, and baptizeth it in the name of a proselyte, behold he is a proselyte."—"No man is a proselyte until he be circumcised and baptized."—Jewish axiom: Hebrac. ii: 55.

These their writings, however, establish the fact, and the men who have examined into the subject admit it without question, and those who have questioned it are those who never examined it. Those eminent men, such as Buxtorff, Selden, Lightfoot, Danz, Wetstein, Schoettgen, etc., who examined the original records, were convinced and admitted that the Jews before the time of Christ did practice infant baptism. Therefore, the apostles were used to this thing, and would interpret the commission in the light of this well-known and authenticated practice. There is no reason to suppose that they ever refused to baptize infants unless the Savior positively *prohibited* it.

It then devolves upon my opponent to show directly where the

word of inspiration nullifies infant membership and infant baptism. The very fact, as I have shown, that there was a pure, spiritual church, and that infants were members in that church, carries with it infant baptism. The membership of infants infers the idea of their baptism. I prove that these infants were members, and their baptism necessarily follows; I then prove that the Jews did practice infant baptism, and he can not refute it.

My brother misinterprets me on the commission. He tries to show that it excludes infants from baptism, because it does not name them. I say that it neither names boys, girls, men, nor women, *as such*; and the point I make is, that there is nothing in the commission that *excludes infants* from baptism; and my brother has not yet undertaken to show that there is. If he contend that the commission does not authorize the baptism of infants because they are not mentioned in it, *as such*, should he not also admit that it excludes men and women, boys and girls, because they are not mentioned *as such*? And yet he will baptize these as proper subjects. The commission mentions neither. It commands the disciples to go and baptize all nations, and can my brother baptize a nation, *as such*? No, no. But he says the Jews rejected Christ; yet surely the *infants* did not. If he will show where an infant did or can reject Christ, I will give up the whole question. The tone of the whole Bible is that those who rejected Christ were broken off; but it does not say that those who are incapable of a wicked and perverse act should be *legislated out of heaven*. Mr. Campbell, on page 100 of his "Christian Baptism," says: "The myriads of baptized Christian Jews continued to circumcise." "The believing Jews, down to the *end of the New Testament history*, circumcised their children."—335. But the point I wish more particularly to quote, is where he admits that the Jews practiced infant baptism. On page 413 of his debate with Rice, he admits that the Jews practiced family baptism. I quote his very words: "Circumcision never was done away by any apostolic word or action. *The Jews practiced both circumcision and baptism in their families, in the apostolic age.*" (Italics his.) Now we have the Jewish writings, saying they did practice infant baptism before the days of Christ, and the apostles were faithful in interpreting the commission in its true light, thus giving additional force to that part of the truth of Matthew, where we find the original commission, Matt. x : 5, 6,

Christ sent his apostles, "not into the way of the *Gentiles* [nations]," but "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." When this was done,

infant baptism was universal in the Jewish Church, and they practiced it. The commission designated the people to whom they were to go, "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel." They were restricted to the Jews. At last the Savior simply *raised the restriction which limited them to the Jews*, and commanded them to "go into all the world" and "make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost." In the first place, he sent them out to the Jews, among a people who recognized infant membership, and who practiced infant baptism; and finally, he raises the last restriction and sends them into the whole world, to make disciples of *all nations*. This very fact shows that the old economy had not been abrogated at all, for the Jews approved of the circumcision of the children as long as they lived, and the Christian Jews recognized infant membership, and continued to circumcise their children to the close of the apostolic age. Then we have it recognized down to the last days of the apostles in the Christian Church.

In his first speech, my brother made the church a political institution; in one of our former debates he made it a *Masonic* society, and now he makes it a *temperance* society—not that he regards it as the same, but he thinks its operation about the same. I shall close with a few remarks on this point. His position is that a man can not be in Christ without baptism, and that John's baptism did not baptize any person *into Christ*. He holds that *no man* can be a member of the Christian Church except he be *immersed into Jesus Christ* our Lord. I show that the *twelve apostles were not baptized with Christian baptism*, according to their unanimous voice, as all the writers of his church agree on this. Therefore, they were *out of Christ*; and, therefore, though he does not say so, he is obliged to *send the twelve apostles to hell without redemption*, and the *one hundred and twenty disciples also*! I do not believe that he holds that they went there at all. But my friend *dare not* follow the logic of the doctrine of his church.

Can a few men who are not themselves members of a temperance society organize a new society? Suppose two men meet and organize themselves into a temperance society, with a constitution and by-laws, and then begin to initiate others. Where is their authority for doing so? They have none. So, if the doctrine of my brother be true, we have the twelve apostles organizing a church of which they were never members in all their life. And Peter himself, holding the keys of the kingdom, could not get in; for the initiatory rite is *Christian immersion*, and without it he can not get in, though he hold the keys until

doomsday. He did not receive it, and therefore he stands forever holding the keys of a kingdom into which he has no admission, and therefore he is lost! What logic! And yet this is the teaching of his church, and all for the sake of turning infants out of the church.

This is the church that excludes the apostles and that long line of worthies over whom Paul becomes more eloquent than ever before; that line of martyrs, and holy confessors, and prophets that extend from the days of righteous Abel on down to his own times, and which he views as stretching on through the ages, on which he gazes until their front is lost in the splendors of the glory that encircles the throne of the Eternal.

MR. WILKES' SIXTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My friend was more happy in his closing speech than I have noticed him during this discussion. He bethought himself, within two or three minutes of the close of his half hour, to make an exhortation. I thought I had taught him that he ought not to exhort when I was debating with him. He has the advantage of me in that respect. He is a better exhorter than I am, and he ought not to avail himself of an accidental advantage to try to carry his question. He made, too, a better exhortation than I have before heard from him on this subject. I told him once that if he did not quit exhorting, and commence arguing, I would have to hire an exhorter to go around with me, and when the time came for exhortation I would have my exhorter to get up. I again notify him that if he does it much more, I will have that to do.

He says that I would turn the apostles out of the church—out of the Christian Church, before it was set up! They were never in it, before it was organized; and I here notify him that, if he is not careful, I will have to turn him out of it, that is, if he is in it.

A few words in answer to my friend's last speech:

He thinks it strange, if the apostles organized a church, that there is nothing written or said about it. But is it not recorded? I think it is recorded; and there is much said about it. But, suppose I grant that there is nothing said about it. *He* says there was a church started. Then *it was begun*, was established, organized, or it came into being at some time. I ask him, when? I ask him to tell us what is *written* about it; where is the record of *its* organization? It is as much his duty to give us light on this subject as it is mine; and, indeed, more, as he is in the affirmative, and I have simply to reply to him.

I remark that the apostles were in the first organized, or Christian Church. They were organized by God, through Christ, as its first members. I wonder if my friend knows what, in legal phrase, is

meant by "*charter members?*" They were charter members of the church of Jesus Christ—and the balance you can supply. My friend says that the apostles were sent, first, to the Jews, who were before this practicing infant baptism. I answer, the apostles were sent first to the Jews, who did not practice infant baptism; and that must stand as a sufficient answer till some *proofs* of his statements are furnished.

He says I ought to show a law nullifying infant membership. Infant membership in what? Perhaps he wants us to understand, the church of Jesus Christ. If they had ever been members I would show such a law, or still accept them. But I deny, first, that they ever had such membership, and I also hold, secondly, that the terms of the new covenant are such that they can not have; and, thirdly, if they *were* members of it—and that is the most perfect demonstration—they ought *not to be baptized*.

I ask my friend a question. Are they in the church, or are they not? If he says they are *not* in it, then his arguments from the identity of the covenants shows that they ought not to be baptized. If he says they *are* in it, I refer him to page 188 of the Discipline of his church, where he will read that they are to be baptized *to introduce them into "Christ's holy church."* Does he say they are out of it? Then his argument from the supposed identity of the covenants goes to the wall. It amounts to nothing, then, whether they are in the church or out of it while they are infants. He is a vanquished man in either case, on this proposition, as far as I can see.

My friend says I made an admission in regard to the meaning of the word *kadash*. I am not fond of these universal negatives. I did say that I did not believe that the word *kadash* ever meant, in the adjective form, "*renew*." I said it *might possibly* mean that, but I claimed that its meaning was "*new*," and not "*renew*," in the passage referred to. My friend would not deny that. To show that, in *one* case, it means "*renew*," he read from 1 Samuel xi: 14, "Then said Samuel to the people, Come, and let us go to Gilgal, and renew the kingdom there." There, says he, is the Hebrew word "*kadash*." In the adjective form? Did he say *that*? I am not *sure* that he did. I ask him now, if he did not say that the adjective was there used, that the word is in the adjective form in this passage, the very word, and the only word, over which we have any controversy? If not, where, I ask, is the point in his argument? I now say that the word, in this passage, is not in the simple adjective form; and there is that in

combination with it which demonstrates that there is present in this case something else to make it signify "renew," beside the simple adjective which carries the idea of new, simply. We are then to believe that the adjective, when unaccompanied, means "new," and not "renew."

My friend says that all the Talmudic writers, from Abraham down, testify to proselyte baptism. I propose to put that matter to the test, to see whether my friend is right or not.

I read from the work of Moses Stuart, and you know that he was a distinguished authority, second, perhaps, to no man in his day:

"In fine, we are destitute of any early testimony to the practice of proselyte baptism antecedently to the Christian era. The original institution of admitting Jews to the covenant and strangers to the same, prescribed no other rite than that of circumcision. No account of any other is found in the Old Testament; none in the Apocrypha, New Testament, Targums of Onkelos, Jonathan, Joseph the Blind, or in the work of any other Targumist, excepting Pseudo-Jonathan, whose work belongs to the seventh or eighth century. No evidence is found in Philo, Josephus, or any of the earlier Christian writers. How could an allusion to such a rite have escaped them all, if it were as common, and as much required by usage, as circumcision?"—"Baptism," by M. Stuart, p. 140, Nashville edition.

After arguing at length the same question, he says:

"But what has all this to do with the question: 'What was the ancient mode of Christian baptism?' Much; for it is on all hands conceded that so far as the testimony of the rabbins can decide such a point, the baptism of proselytes among the Jews was by *immersion*. . . . It is, therefore, a matter of no little interest, so far as our question is concerned, to inquire whether Christian baptism had its origin from the proselyte baptism of the Jews. This we have now done, and have come to this result, namely: *that there is no certainty that such was the case, but that the probability, on the ground of evidence, is strong against it.*"—"Baptism," by M. Stuart, p. 142.

I now turn to page 136 of the same work. My friend refers to the testimony given by Epictetus, who wrote in the first part of the second century, and says: "He testified with regard to proselyte baptism." I doubt whether the testimony is to the point or not, but, Mr. Ditzler having introduced it, I must say something about it. In commenting on this very passage, Moses Stuart says:

"On the whole, I concede this to be a difficult and obscure passage in some respects. The *τό παθος τοῦ βεβαμμένου και ἡρημένου* (*to pathos tou bebamēnou kai erēmenou*), is certainly a peculiar Greek phrase; yet, if we con-

strue it in whatever way is fairly possible, I think we can not make out from it any degree of certainty, that *βεβαμῆνον* (*bebamenou*) refers to proselyte baptism."—"Baptism," by M. Stuart, p. 136.

I hold in my hand the work of Dr. Robinson. On this subject he says :

"Purifications of proselytes indeed there were, but there never was any such ceremony as baptism in practice before the time of John. If such a rite had existed, the regular priests, and not John, would have administered it, and there would have been no need of a new and extraordinary appointment from heaven to give being to an old established custom, nor would it have been decent for John, or any other man, to treat native Jews, especially Jesus, who had no paganism to put away, as pagan proselytes were treated. This uninteresting subject hath produced voluminous disputes, which may be fairly cut short by demanding at the outset substantial proof of the fact that the Jews *baptized* proselytes *before* the time of John, which can never be done."—Robinson's "History of Baptism," p. 36, or London edition, p. 29.

And on page 43 he says :

"The modest Dr. Benson was pleased to add that he wished to see all these difficulties cleared up, and that he could not answer all that Dr. Wall and Mr. Emlyn had said in support of proselyte baptism; but with all possible deference to this most excellent critic, it may be truly said he hath, by stating his difficulties, fully answered both these writers; for, if what they call proselyte baptism was *not* baptism, and if there was *no* institution of such a washing as they call baptism in the Old Testament, and no mention of such a thing in the Apocrypha, or in Josephus, or in Philo, what, at this age of the world, signify the conjectures of a Lightfoot, and a Wall, or even an Emlyn?"

"A fact it is beyond all contradiction that this same proselyte-washing, which learned men have thought fit to call baptism, is no baptism at all, but, as Dr. Benson truly says, a very different thing, and that in which infants could have no share. It was a person's washing himself, and not the dipping of one person by another."—Robinson's "History of Baptism," pp. 43, 44, or London edition, p. 36

The very authorities which my friend introduced are here passing under review at the hands of men, some of whom are on his side, and they testify against him; and yet these are men anxious to support this very practice for which he is contending. But the facts stared them in the face and compelled them, unwillingly, no doubt, to yield the question, for they offered them no pretext for the practice of infant baptism.

I have that here which I regard as better authority. I read from the "Doctrinal and Historical Dictionary" of Dr. Blunt, a late work published by Lippincott, of Philadelphia, 1870. Dr. Blunt is a member of the English Episcopal Church, and is, I believe, the author of twenty or thirty other works. He says:

"But, independently of its supposed scriptural sanction, an attempt has been made to prove this usage in the apostolic age, upon the alleged fact that the Jews then baptized proselytes from heathenism. Now, this alleged fact of the baptism of proselytes is very uncertain, and, even if admitted, would, by no means, establish the apostolic usage of infant baptism. The baptism of proselytes is first mentioned in the Mishna, a collection of Jewish traditions, completed in the third century [A. D., 219]; and the usage there mentioned (baptism of adults and infants) might have been derived, directly or indirectly, from Christians."

This author is on my friend's side; is a practitioner of infant baptism; but truth is on the other side; it stares him in the face, and he is compelled to yield.

"But whether this supposed Jewish usage existed at all (among Jews or Christians) in the apostolic age is uncertain. It is not mentioned by Josephus, even when we might fairly expect that it would have been recorded—as when he relates that the Idumeans were received among the Jewish people by circumcision, without mentioning baptism. Were the usage undoubted, it would only have been an unauthorized addition to the scriptural command, since it was by circumcision only that proselytes were to be added to the Jewish Church. (Exodus xii: 48.)"

That is, Josephus speaks of proselytes, and of their being circumcised, but does not mention baptism, which he probably would have done had they been baptiz'd.

"It is, however, very unlikely that the Jews would adopt the usage of baptism from the Christians; and the Mishna being founded on previous collections reaching to the apostolic age, there is just a probability that, at the time of our Lord and his apostles, the Jewish custom prevailed of baptizing proselytes and their children. Even admitting this, yet before this custom can be alleged, in proof or confirmation of an apostolic usage, it must be proved that the Jewish custom was adopted by our Lord or his apostles; but of this neither the Scriptures nor the early Fathers offered any proof whatever. Besides, it should be considered that the baptism of proselytes widely differs in theory from the Christian doctrine of baptism. The convert to Judaism was baptized, and all his family then born; but if he had children born afterward, they were not baptized—the previous baptism of their parents being deemed sufficient."—Art. "Infant Baptism," "Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology," edited by J. H. Blunt, M. A., F. S. A., p. 344.

I now proceed to discuss the subject where I left it. I was speaking of Nicodemus, and of the Savior's saying to him that even he could not enter the church, not even the *preparatory church or kingdom*, without being born again. The Savior did not stop there. He not only tells Nicodemus that he could not, but says, "Except any one be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter the kingdom of God." So the Savior declares the fact that *all* men, including Nicodemus and all other persons, are forbidden to enter the kingdom of Christ, unless they are born of water and the Spirit. But again, let me say, that the terms here employed necessarily preclude infants. An infant can not be born again; and if he can not be born again, while an infant, he can not enter the kingdom of God, for the Savior says so; and if he can not enter the kingdom of God, my brother will not claim that he ought to be baptized. The Savior tells us, I repeat—and this ought to put the matter to rest—that unless a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter the kingdom of heaven. That excludes all not so born; and since an infant can not be "born again of water and the Spirit," he can not enter the kingdom of heaven. Thus the Savior has decided the question.

I wish to pursue this line of thought a little further. I repeat a text to which I called your attention last night. The Savior says, "Except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven."—Matthew xviii: 3. The disciples were contending among themselves as to who should be the greatest. The Savior takes them to task, and teaches them a beautiful lesson; and, to make it as impressive as possible, as the inimitable teacher always did, he called a little child to him, and set it in their midst, and, calling attention to it—the best specimen of humility on earth—tells his disciples that, except they be converted, and become as that little child, they could not enter the kingdom of heaven. Of course, they were not then in it, and they could not enter the kingdom of heaven without being converted and becoming as that little child. If any persons were in it, these apostles certainly were; but it is conclusive, from this passage, that they were not; and not only that, but they never could come into it, except they should be converted and become as that little child.

I argue, therefore, that, at that time no persons were actually in it. This conclusion must be accepted for another good reason, also, that the house or kingdom was shut; the door was not open, and Peter

had the key. He it was who was to unlock the door to the Jews and the Gentiles, which he had not yet done.

On the day of Pentecost, "there were Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven," who heard the gospel preached, and believed it, and who, at the command of Peter, were baptized and added to the church. The sacred history shows that these Jews were "devout men," but they were not in the church; for, if they were already in the church, they could not, then, have been "*added to the church.*" But the historian tells us that they were *added* to the church; they were *not*, therefore, at that time in the church; and if not, and yet were devout men "from every nation under heaven," I conclude that there were none, in the actual sense, in the church, at or before that time.

Let me recapitulate. John the Baptist was not in the church; Nicodemus was not in the church; Joseph, of Arimathea, was not in the church; the scribe who answered discreetly was not in the church; the rich young man, who had kept all the commandments from his youth up, was not in the church; none of the devout Jews on the day of Pentecost were in the church; and none of the apostles, as I before showed you, were in the church of Jesus Christ. If there *were any* who were in the Jewish Church, they were *not* in the *Christian Church*; and if they could be in the Jewish Church and not in the Christian Church, it demonstrates that these two churches are *not the same church*; but that they are the same is what my friend is trying to prove. Failing in this, his whole effort here falls.

I now proceed a little further. I turn to Matt. iii: 3-9, "For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. 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. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet for repentance: and think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father, for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham."

John came, as I have said, to prepare a people for the Lord. My object now is to show that what is said of the kind of material that

John was preparing could not in truth be said of infants; for, in the first place, it is said the people *came*, which infants can not do; in the second place, they came *desiring to be baptized*; infants can not do that; in the third place, they *came confessing* their sins; infants can not do that; in the fourth place, they *came claiming Abraham for their father*, claiming that, by virtue of their earthly connection with Abraham, they had a right to be baptized.

None of these historical facts are in harmony with the hypothesis that infants were being baptized. But they were told, in substance, that God could just as easily and consistently, under his new covenant then being ushered in, of the very stones that lay along the banks of the Jordan raise up children unto Abraham, as he could constitute any one a child of God who was *simply* descended from Abraham. No, no! There must be more than *flesh* to be entitled to membership even in the preparatory reign of John.

The sacred writer then proceeds to present us with one of the grand features of the Christian Church. He lets us know that the people could not claim any thing of John, or at the hands of John, or any thing in the presence of their God, from that time forward, on account of any *fleshly* connection or position. Besides that, he teaches "that the ax is laid at the root of the trees, and every one that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." It had never been so in any institution, organization, commonwealth, or church, so-called, in the world before this time. In all the establishments hitherto, it had been competent for a man to belong to the Jewish commonwealth simply because he was bought with a Jew's money or born of Jewish parents. No condition in regard to membership was demanded beyond this. It was not necessary to believe and repent, have a new heart, or be born again. But *now* the great regeneration is being introduced or ushered in, and now it is required that a man should be *born again*, that he should be a lover of God, a server of God, in order to belong to the church of Jesus Christ even in its preliminary state.

I now call your attention to John iii: 5, "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." "Born of water" means baptism. We settle that question and we have several questions settled; that is to say, except a man is baptized and born of the Spirit—whatever that may mean—he can not enter the kingdom of heaven. Now, if you will find me one that can not be born of the Spirit, I will show you one that ought not to be baptized, and therefore can not enter the kingdom of God.

That "born of water" means baptism I have demonstrated. I have read you the authorities upon which we rely, besides the common sense of the passage, upon which we chiefly rely. Mr. Alford says that nothing but prejudice and party spirit could cause a man to take any other position than that being born of water means baptism. Mr. Bengel says it means baptism; Moses Stuart says it means baptism; Dr. Barnes says it means baptism; Mr. Wesley says it means baptism; Dr. Bloomfield says it means baptism; Dr. Macknight says it means baptism; Cyprian, middle of the third century (vol. ii, p. 88), says it means baptism; Episcopal Prayer-book (p. 277), teaches that it means baptism; the Presbyterian Confession of Faith says it means baptism; and, finally, the Methodist Episcopal Church South, teaches that it means baptism. There is not a writer of authority in any language but says it means baptism. Dr. Wall says it never was different, so far as his reading enabled him to decide, until the sixteenth century. I quote him as follows:

"There is not any one Christian writer of any antiquity, in any language, but what understands it of baptism; and if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of water any more than born of wood."—
"History of Infant Baptism," by Dr. Wall, in two vols., vol. i, p. 92.

MR. DITZLER'S SEVENTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I will simply remark, while I think of it, that I explained to you, at the outset of this debate, that the language of our Discipline, in reference to baptism, means, that it is the outward act by which we, on our part, recognize the relation that Heaven, by his legislation, in accordance with his plan of baptism, gives infants in the kingdom of Christ. It is our duty to recognize them as having the relation in which the previous legislation and redemption of God in Christ has placed them. Our Discipline aims to recognize and meet that fact. If its terms are unhappy, unfortunately chosen, it is our misfortune, but has nothing to do with the *scripturalness* of infant baptism. We freely admit that many of the old theological terms do not suit so well, and that many of them are liable to abuse and misconception.

As to the Mishna, he argues that it can not be proved, to his satisfaction (though he seems to be in considerable doubt about it), that proselyte baptism, in the sense of "an *initiary rite*," was the "*consummation*" of proselytism at that time. I have nothing to do with "initiary rites," and care nothing about it being the *consummation* of proselytism. The point is, I have proved that proselyte baptism existed before Christ came. Infant baptism, all admit, was included in proselyte baptism. Hence, we have infant baptism in God's church before Christ came—in that church of which Christ and the apostles were members.

As to the authorities, all the more learned of them, such as Lightfoot, Selden, Dantz, Schoetgenneus, Wall, Wetstein, Buxtorff, Beza, Witsius, Clarke, who gave it a thorough examination, are unanimous in our support. But such as Owen, Carpzov, and Bauer, who never thoroughly examined the subject at all, but only a casual reading in part, do not believe it was taught as early as those authorities demon-

strate, but believe the Jews borrowed it from John the Baptist. This is equally fatal to my brother's views. Although the Mishna is put in the third century by some, no man denies that it is a faithful compilation; and the very fact that Christ quotes the Mishna extracts, settles that question. The Mishna teaches that the Jews practiced infant baptism; and, therefore, that question is settled. Again, he says that Josephus does not refer to it, which we may admit, though the assertion is open to question. We do not know that he referred to it at all. But is the silence of a man who does not write on that subject at all, any evidence that it did not exist? Why, I can find *twice as many* places in the Acts of the Apostles, where persons are spoken of as being saved, believing, etc., as the result of the apostolic preaching, whose baptism is *never named* at all, as cases where baptism is named. Do they prove they were not baptized? But he quotes from the third of John to prove his point: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."—John iii: 5. They now had a new order of things, as my brother says; "new principles were being introduced," and a "*new church organized*," though he does not tell us *when* it was organized. That there was a church, the New Testament expressly declares; yet my brother finds in the fifth verse of the third of John the necessary exclusion of infants from membership in the church. Now, we can make short work of this. In this chapter Christ reprimands Nicodemus for a want of knowledge of something with which he should have been familiar. And that the new church was set up on the day of Pentecost with a Christian baptism, as contradistinguished from John's baptism, was an idea that never entered Nicodemus' head; for, certainly, nothing reveals it as yet. The Savior says, in the tenth verse, "*Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?*" Now, whatever this language meant, it was something that Nicodemus, as a learned Jew, should have *thoroughly understood*; and, for *not understanding it*, the Savior justly reprimands him. If the Jews at that time had lost the spirit of the religion of the Bible, and looked upon the *outward services* of the church as the church itself, he must admit that what Christ meant by this text does not apply at all to the one supposed to be established on Pentecost. My brother says it does not apply to the Jewish Church, as such. Christ says it does, and I have shown that infant membership did pertain to the Jewish institution, as he calls it. It had infant members; therefore, that text did not antago-

nize their rights and immunities; it applied just where infant membership was in constant recognition.

There is another branch of the argument that I must touch. I refer to the prophecies. We have seen that "the Gentiles were grafted into the good olive tree," and that, at any future time when the rejected Jews should receive the Messiah, they should be "engrafted upon their own good olive tree."

Now, in Isaiah xlix: 6, it is said: "And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee (Israel) the preserved of Israel (the remnant) for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth." Here the remnant of Israel is to be God's covenant with the Gentiles unto the end of the earth. How, then, could Israel be destroyed? V. 8: "I will preserve thee, and give thee for a COVENANT of the people, to establish the earth, to cause (thee) to inherit the desolate heritages; that thou mayest say to the prisoners, Go forth; to them that are in darkness, Show yourselves." All agree that this refers to Christ's coming. V. 14: "But Zion (the church) said, The Lord hath forsaken me, and my Lord hath forgotten me." This was just before Messiah came. The prophet represents Zion as discouraged, desolate, disheartened, as she was indeed when Christ appeared. But says God, v. 15: "Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? Yea, they may forget, yet will I not forget thee." What strong assurance of perpetuation. But more, v. 16: "Behold, I have graven thee (Zion) upon the palms of my hands;" v. 17: "Thy children (Zion's children) shall make haste; thy destroyers (the Gentiles) and they that made thee waste shall go forth of thee. Lift up thine eyes round about, and behold: all these (nations) gather themselves together, and come to thee (to the Israel, Zion)." How could this be, if a new institution was set up on Pentecost, "new principles," the old abolished, and Zion destroyed? But he continues, v. 18: "As I live, saith the Lord, thou shalt surely clothe thee with them all, as with an ornament, and bind them on thee, as a bride doeth." Here "Zion," "the remnant," "the preserved of Israel," was to be enlarged to inherit all the nations—all should come to her; she was to clothe herself with them, as saved; for she was to be "for salvation to the end of the earth," etc. What follows now after this enlargement? The next verse, nineteenth, says: "For thy waste and thy desolated places, and the land of thy de-

struction, shall even now (*at once*) be too narrow by reason of the inhabitants." So great will be the incoming of the Gentiles, that you shall at once begin to extend far beyond all thy former bounds. V. 20: "The children *which thou shalt have* (shall be born to thee, see Heb. ii: 10-12), after thou hast lost the other (the unbelieving, who, rejecting Christ, shall be broken off by unbelief) shall say again in thine ears, The place is too strait for me: give place to me that I may dwell." That is, remove now the obstacles—circumcision—all those fleshly ordinances; let the work spread, and Zion no longer be trammelled. V. 21: "Then shalt thou say in thine heart, Who hath begotten me these (Gentile converts), seeing I have lost my children (those broke off, besides the many who had backslid, and those also destroyed in wars, persecutions, etc.), and am desolate, a captive? and who hath brought up these? Behold, I was left alone; these, where had they been? Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I will lift up mine hand to the Gentiles, and set up my standard to the people: and they shall bring thy sons *in their arms*, and thy daughters shall be carried upon their shoulders." Now all "the Gentiles," "begotten" also—renovated, regenerated, sons, "all nations"—were to come to this Zion, and be an ornament to her. She was to be enlarged to inherit "them all." If these prophecies failed, *all* is failure; for they are by far the clearest and most striking, as all admit, that we have as to Messiah and his work. Hence that church, of which infants were members, never was destroyed. If it was, all prophecy is false, and there is no Messiah.

Again, Isaiah lii: 9, "Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem: for the Lord hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem." Isaiah liv: 2, "*Enlarge* the place of thy tent, and let them *stretch forth the curtains of thine habitations*; spare not, *lengthen thy cords, and strengthen thy stakes.*" In the tenth verse he says: "My kindness shall not depart from thee, neither shall the *covenant of my peace be removed.*" Here he was going to give the Jews "a covenant for salvation," and the Gentiles were to be brought unto them. His covenant with them *is perpetual*. The conversion of the Gentiles is further foretold in the sixtieth and sixty-first chapters; and in the fourth verse of the latter it is said that "they shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations." I could quote almost innumerable passages to show that when the Messiah should come, the Gentiles should be converted, and brought

into the Zion of Israel; that "the middle wall of partition should be taken down," which was the "law of commandments contained in ordinances" militating against them.

But my brother insists that the kingdom had not come, that it had only partially come. I have already read a number of texts in regard to this. Then we have the following in Matthew viii: 21, "And I say unto you, That many shall come from the east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven." Now, here those who were converted and had received the Messiah are represented as sitting down in the kingdom or church with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who lived from sixteen to eighteen hundred years before; and Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, who represent the church of those days, are here recognized as having been in the kingdom of God at that time, though my friend says it was not established until the day of Pentecost. "But if I with the finger of God cast out devils, no doubt the kingdom of God is come upon you."—Luke xi: 20. "Verily I say unto you, That the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and the harlots believed him."—Matt. xxi: 31, 32. Various other passages to the same effect might be quoted. He seems to consider such passages as going to show that the kingdom had not yet come. One young man was told by the Savior that he was "not far from the kingdom of heaven;" but this does not argue that it had not come, but that it had not come to him *in person*. "The kingdom is within you," says Christ himself (Luke xvii: 21); and he said it should be taken away from the Jews and given to the Gentiles, which could not be if it had not been established, or if it had not been established until the day of Pentecost. The Savior could not rebuke men for not entering the kingdom if it had, as my friend seems to believe, only an *anticipated* existence. No; it had an existence, or it had not. The Savior represents men as entering into the kingdom of God, and others as being kept out of it, long before the day of Pentecost, and Christ's terrible rebukes are founded on, and have all their force in, that fact; hence it could not have been established on the day of Pentecost.

Again, my brother finds trouble in his temperance society. Mark you, he necessarily teaches that you can not be a member of the church of Christ unless you are *immersed with CHRISTIAN immersion*. He admits that the twelve apostles and one hundred and twenty

disciples *were not so baptized*; and his church *unanimously* teaches that *without Christian immersion* you CAN NOT BE IN JESUS CHRIST. Under the gospel age, he admits, to be *out* of Christ is to be *out of salvation*, and the disciples lived *under* the gospel age. If this is so, why were they not baptized, if nothing but this want kept them from being in a kingdom which they were about to establish, and of which they held the keys? He turns the Savior out, the apostles out, and the one hundred and twenty disciples out, together with all the patriarchs, that goodly company, all to organize such a church as he wants; but he leaves me in good company, a church that has *Christ and his apostles* in it, and recognizes infant membership. I accept the good company, and leave him with his organization and its ordinances to take care of themselves.

But the three thousand that "were *added to the church*" in one day—how of them? They could not have been so "*added*" unless there was a *church* to which they *were* added. They "were added to the church." My brother says the apostles were not in the church. The church was organized on the day of Pentecost, yet on the day of pentecost three thousand persons *were added to the church*. He says there was no church, yet "three thousand persons *were added to the church*." This is a point which is clear and distinct. It requires no Greek or Hebrew, which we have to use sometimes, to make it clear. We can all understand this. The temperance men would *organize themselves* into a society *first*, of which they propose to make *others* members, before they would take such a step. So the apostles should have been members of the kingdom of heaven before they would have been authorized to hold the keys of the kingdom to let others in. He represents Peter as standing outside, holding the keys and ushering others into a kingdom in which he had no membership himself.

John i: 1-18, teaches that *in all ages* men were "born of God;" and the twelfth verse tells us that "to as many as received him gave he power to become the sons of God, even to those who believed on his name: who (*ἐγεννήθησαν*) were born, not of blood, (*ἐξ αἱμάτων*)—*ex haimaton*—plural, of bloods—fleshly ordinances, as circumcision and sacrifices,—nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man (not by natural descent, nor by another's intervention), *but of God*." Here they "*were born*." It was not a mere privilege of being born *in the future*; they *were born* of God. The tense in Greek is aorist, a *complete* past, where action is a simple act, and not to be continued

in action as a custom. The word *born*, in verse twelve, is aorist, also. He suppresses verse thirteen, that continues the sentence showing that in all ages all who believed in the Messiah "*were born of God,*" just as we are. This is one of the grandest and most philosophic chapters in the Bible. Verses one and two, "In the beginning was the Word," etc., teaches the eternal existence of Christ as "*existence.*" Verse three teaches that all things came into being by him—all were made by him. In the next verse, in philosophic order, he is the source of life and light. In verse five this light reveals itself in all ages. John's point is to prove that, in and through Christ, all things have existed—all things made—all blessings received; that grace, love, truth, salvation, have always come through Christ. "He lightens every man that cometh into the world;" verse ten, "He was in the world, and the world was made by him." All this refers to periods *before* his incarnation. "The world knew (recognized) him not." "He came unto his own (his people, in different ages), and his own received him not." As a whole, they rejected him. "But *as many* (*οσοι, such*) *as* received him (such as Abel, Enoch, Isaiah, Abraham, Moses, and all those faithful ones), to them gave he (*εδωκεν αυτοις εξουσιαν τέκνα θεου γενεσθαι*) power TO BE BORN *children of God,*" those who believed in his name, who *were born of God.* The word *εξουσια* means power, most generally, and is rightly rendered here; and the other rendering does not change it at all, since the fact that they *did* believe is declared, and they *were born of God,* a past fact. Then verse fourteen ushers in the incarnation; and he then introduces the "we" as opposed to "they," the "us" as opposed to "them." Then, says he, verse seventeen: "For the law was given by *Moses*"—he was the human legislator and representative of law, "but (*ιχαρις*) the grace and the truth were *δια* (*through*) Jesus Christ." Christ was there as the source of all spirituality and truth. Then he generalizes, verse eighteen: "No man hath seen God at *any* time; the only-begotten *Son*, who dwells in the bosom of the Father, he hath (always) (*εξηγήσατο*) *made him known.*" It means to lead out, to take the lead, make known, just as the record shows. Hence, the world never had a revelation of God except through Christ. Hence, there was spirituality, regeneration, and all the work of grace among the Jews that we have *now*, so far as these matters go.

Infants were members of this Jewish Church, all admit. They are recognized in church relation. When the Prophet Joel (xi: 16, 17) represents the church (*ἐκκλησια—ekklesia*) as assembled in a strictly

religious manner, for religious purposes, infants of the tenderest age are named, even "those that suck the breasts," as a part of the church. The New Testament calls it a church in the most spiritual sense of the word. He can not claim that all the people in his church, or in my church, are pure, therefore it is no argument to say that many of the people of that day were not holy. Christ himself says that many of the priests were corrupt, and great sticklers for ordinances, fleshly ordinances, so much so that they turned the temples into market places. No wonder, then, that they must be told that they must not plead descent; that these ordinances were not religion, and God would hate and curse them if they looked upon these ordinances as embracing the fundamental principles of religion, instead of illustrating them as types, shadows, etc. Infants had membership in this church; the Savior was in it, the apostles were in it, and they lived in it and died in it. The apostles understood these things, and practiced them to the end of their lives.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKES' SEVENTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I have concluded to recommend my friend, Mr. Ditzler, to Dr. Kleeburg's clemency, and to membership in the Jewish Church in this city; but I do not know whether the Doctor will accept him or not, or whether any Jewish Rabbi will receive him. Certainly, if they were present they would not acknowledge his advocacy of the Jews' religion. He (Mr. D.) says he is in Abraham's church. The Jew says so too. If he is in Abraham's church, he ought to be willing to be recognized in that church; but my impression is that he would not be received.

My friend, after quoting perhaps the most favorable allusions, intimations, and prophecies, to be found in the Old Testament, which would seem to lead to his conclusion, concludes by saying that infants are, then, in the church. This is the first time since I have had the privilege of discussing with him, that I remember to have heard him say that "infants are, *then, in* the church." Ought they, then, to be baptized? The Methodist Discipline represents the parties, before a child is baptized, praying as follows:

"Dearly beloved, forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin, and that our Savior (Christ) saith: Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God; I beseech you to call upon God the Father, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that of his bounteous mercy he will grant to *this child* that which by nature *he* can not have; that *he* may be baptized with water and the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy church, and be made a *lively member* of the same."—"The Doctrine and Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church South," p. 188.

Brother Ditzler says the child is already in the church, whereas his Discipline says you must baptize him to put him in. All his arguments, and the necessary arguments in his case, are to demonstrate that the infant, from its birth, is in the Jewish Church, and

that the Christian Church is just the same thing. It would, therefore, follow that the infant is in the Christian Church from its birth. He then infers that it ought, therefore, to be baptized; but his own Discipline tells us that baptism is to *bring the infant into the church*, and that it is not to be performed because the infant is already in the church. I wonder what church the gentleman belongs to now?

Again: suppose that I grant that the two churches are just the same. In the Abrahamic church, if there was such a thing, there was not baptism, at least in order to make persons members of it; there is now, according to his Discipline, and according to the Bible, a baptism in order to introduce persons into the church. This my friend knows. Now, if the infant was in the Jewish Church, and yet was not baptized, and stands in the Christian Church on the same terms; then, first, why not circumcise it? and, second, why baptize it?

Is not the Jew right? Will my friend say that the rite of circumcision has been dispensed with, and that baptism is in its place? I tell him that to change the law of God, and the kingdom of God, requires a special enactment. Where is that enactment? Will he say that it is in the commission? Then why not go to the commission and show it? He has gone every-where else in the wide world, except to that one passage in which alone is there authority to baptize. That the commission is the only authority for baptizing any one he himself is witness. But he has not gone there for these two days, and he is now through. He has given us no exegesis of that passage, and he does not intend to do it; but I now notify him that if he does not do it, I will.

He tells us that in John i: 10 we have, in speaking of the Savior, substantially this language: The Savior "came to his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." That is a singular passage from which to show any thing about infant baptism. The Savior is represented as coming to his own—whatever that may mean—and his own received him not. There is here represented a *rational rejection* of him. Infants are not capable of this, and hence are not considered. "He came unto his own, and his own received him not, but as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name."

Infants can not meet or fill these conditions. I can hardly conceive of a passage in all the New Testament which it was more unfortunate to quote than the one he has here cited.

Again, he says the Apostle Peter puts other people into the church, but was not in it himself. He tells you that I said that Peter is one of the charter members of the church. So I did. He says that Peter, on my hypothesis, brings others in, but that Jesus is left out. I reply that Jesus *made* the church. In talking to Peter, and the other apostles, he asked: "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?" The Apostle Peter replied: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answered and said unto him, Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-jona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven."—Matt. xvi: 16–19. This was, in effect, to make them charter members of the church. Jesus then proceeded to say: "Whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." He then gave Peter the "keys of the kingdom," but he allowed him not to use them yet, for it was not his pleasure that the kingdom should yet be opened to receive members. But the time soon came, and Peter and the other apostles stood up in Jerusalem and unfurled the banner of Prince Emmanuel, declaring the kingdom of God opened for the reception of members. He preached the gospel to the people, who were cut to the heart, and three thousand of them came to repentance; but those *only* who *believed* and *repented* were baptized.

My friend says that "the law and the prophets were"—and *there* he stopped. He came very near quoting the passage, and, probably, would have done so, but he happened on one that is directly against him. But, as he suggested it to me, I will quote it. Luke xvi: 16: "The law and the prophets were until John: since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." My friend says the kingdom of God was preached before that time; but "the law and the prophets were until John, and *since* that time the kingdom of God is preached, and men press into it," as I have shown; or, if he thinks I have not, I am willing to leave it to the people who hear us, or who may read what we say. Men and women did, I will allow, press into that introductory kingdom or institution

which John the Baptist preached; but John did not preach the *actual* presence of the kingdom of God in its fullness. Before John, the law and the prophets were preached. With his ministry, the kingdom of heaven *at hand*, near at hand, was preached, and people pressed into preparedness for it. After this the kingdom was fully set up, and the law and the Word of the Lord went forth from Jerusalem.

Nicodemus, my friend says, ought to have known or understood the matter. What matter? Did he tell you? He said Nicodemus ought to have understood all these things. He has a singular way of *talking about* a thing without ever naming it. What things, I ask? The Savior said to Nicodemus, in substance, "Neither you nor any *person* (it is not *man* in the original) shall enter into the kingdom of heaven unless born of water and the Spirit." Now, I presume the Savior told the truth, and if he did, no human being, small or great, ever did, since that time, enter the kingdom of God without being born of water and the Spirit. Under Judaism, all persons were in the church, so called, by a birth of flesh and blood, but not so here; and this is the fact alluded to when the Lord says, "Born not of flesh and blood, but of the Spirit of God. And, Nicodemus, neither you, nor any one, unless born of water and the Spirit, can enter into the kingdom of God." But, says my friend, this is a law *then* in operation, and Nicodemus is blamed for not understanding it. Now, I suggest, respectfully, that my friend's exegesis is not a very good one. The law alluded to here was *not then* in operation. Nicodemus inquired concerning a kingdom not in *existence* at that time, and about the law of entering it.

Allow me to give my paraphrase of the passage. Nicodemus came to the Savior, and says: "Teacher, you tell us that the kingdom is coming; and John the Baptist, your forerunner, told us the kingdom of God was at hand; prepare yourselves, he said, for it, for it is nearly here." Nicodemus, noting the miracles the Savior wrought, and seeing the mighty deeds he performed, believed that he certainly was a prophet sent from God, and that, hence, the statements he made concerning the kingdom of God must be true. Nicodemus says: "Teacher, upon what terms or conditions shall I be a citizen in that kingdom? Upon what terms shall I be a member of that church?" This senator in Israel was distinguished by his position and birth; was descended from Abraham, and was a member of the Jewish Sanbedrim. It may be supposed that he trusted in his distinguished position and lineage; that he supposed that, on this ac-

count, he would be privileged to come into that kingdom; but the blessed Lord cuts all his hopes up by the roots, by telling him that there is no royal road to the favor of God; just as we say, "There is no royal road to geometry." As the king must come down to the level of the plow-boy, and study and toil like him, else he can not become proficient, so the Lord says to Nicodemus, "Unless you, or any one, be born of water and the Spirit, you can not enter into the kingdom of God." He was speaking of the *coming* of the kingdom, and in allusion to a law which was not yet given. Now, every man knows very well that, just as a figure is explained by its fact, so is an allusion to a law to be explained by the law itself. If you go to the mount, where the Savior gave the commission to his disciples; where he gave the great magna charta of our Christian privileges in the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and hear the Savior say, "He that believes and is baptized shall be saved," you will see what he meant in this allusion, and that he contemplated no infant membership. It might not have been easily understood at the time; but thus the Savior himself explained it.

My friend says that proselyte baptism existed from the days of Abraham; *at least*, long before the days of Christ. I remark, that it *commenced, possibly*, in the second century, certainly by the third century, A. D.; that he knows, and I know. But my friend made a very respectable, nay, a better effort, I must say, than I have before heard from him, to show that the Gentiles, after the Christian era, were brought into the Jewish Church. There is a truth that lies at the basis of the prophecies which represent the privileges and blessings of the Gentiles as coming through the Jews, or the blessings of the Gentiles being vouchsafed through the Jews. The new covenant was made with the house of *Israel* and with the house of *Judah*. It was not made with a single Gentile. The apostles were all Jews, and they must have been Jews, according to the pre-will of God. The Savior himself was a Jew, descended from Judah; and the new covenant was inaugurated, ratified, and first set in grand motion by the Jews. Into these Jewish privileges it was the right of the Jew first to enter, and to which the Gentiles were *afterward* permitted. It was some eight, or ten, or fifteen years, according to the consent of all parties, after the Christian Church came into existence or was in operation, before any Gentiles were received into it. The apostles were required to preach, *first*, to the Jews, *then* to the *Samaritans*, and *then* to the uttermost parts of the earth, or, to the Gentiles. But they

were to commence at Jerusalem, because the law, according to the prophecies of Isaiah and Hosea, was to "go forth from Zion, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem." It was to *commence* with the Jews; and after that the Gentiles were to be brought into the privileges already enjoyed by the Jews.

I am now prepared to make a little advance. I turn to the commission. If my friend will not go there, I will. After the stone had been laid at the foundation, without which there could, of course, be no building; after it was laid in sufferings, tears, and blood; after it was tested or tried, as it were, with level and plummet (and, of course, in the days of Abraham, it could not have been laid, for, as yet, the chief corner-stone in the spiritual temple of God Almighty had not been tested, for the *preparation* of it was *after* the Savior's birth; the Captain of our salvation, Paul says, was made perfect through suffering. He was not prepared to lie at the foundation of the temple of God until he had gone through his overwhelming sufferings endured in the garden and on the cross; until he had shed the blood of the new covenant, which is for the remission of sins. But having suffered and died, and been buried in the bowels of the earth; having gone to the home of the dead, or place of death; having conquered the grave; having conquered death and the devil; having conquered the last enemy that ever caused pain in the heart of man, or tears to flow), Jesus goes forth and stands, a triumphant conqueror over every enemy of man. There he stands, a mighty conqueror, on the little Mount of Olivet, near Jerusalem. He assembles his disciples about him, and tells them to "go into all the world and proclaim the gospel to the people; to teach all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit."

I ask, then, are infants included in this commission? I answer no. I wish that my friend would, and, in fairness, I insist that he ought to, give us his exegesis of the passage, or explain his position, so that we may examine it. This he has not done, and this he will not do. At one time he had the credit of *shrewdly* avoiding an issue with me on the commission, but he shall not have that now, for I intend to examine it whether he does or not.

The Savior said, "Go, teach all the nations, baptizing them," etc. In the original it reads, and it would be better to render it, "Go, disciple all the nations, baptizing them," etc. I take *my* position *distinctly*, but the most my friend will do will be to criticise, a *little*,

what I may say ; at least so I prophesy. "Go, disciple all the nations, baptizing them." The "discipling" of a man, in that passage, necessarily includes the idea of instruction. Will my friend deny that? Instruction is contemplated as being present in the discipling, and before the baptizing. That an infant child can receive baptism, is not, therefore, contemplated in this passage. My friend may argue, as he has intimated he will, and as I have heard him, that infant baptism is authorized in this passage, because infants belong to the nations to which the disciples were commanded to go, and which they were required to disciple and baptize; that, *therefore*, infants ought to be baptized. If he takes that position, and gives no other reason for it than what is found in that circumstance, why, bless your souls, he is *compelled*, as I told him, to baptize the *infidel*. I do not say that he would do that, but his logic demands that he should, and he must not shrink from the position to which his logic leads him.

Will he baptize the infidel? He says the infidel is *actively opposed* to Christ, and that therefore he will not baptize him. Still he belongs to the nations. I will take another case, that of a man who is not an infidel, but an idiot, one who does not *actively* oppose the Lord Jesus Christ, but who has no faith. Will he baptize him? I suppose he would not; yet that man belongs to the nations, and if so, he must, to be consistent, baptize him; and, moreover, I deny that he could, consistently, avoid the baptism of *any man*, however wicked or opposed to Jesus Christ, even if hypocritical, if the man would allow him to do it.

Again, I must hold that the part of the commission that Matthew records is in precise harmony with the commission as recorded by Mark. Mark says, "Go, preach the gospel to every creature." There the Savior is contemplating such persons as may be preached to; then he says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Where you have Mark declaring that the apostles were to *preach* to the people, and that the people were to *believe*, you have precisely the thing in substance that Matthew has when he says, "Go, *disciple* the people." The preaching to the people, or giving them instruction, bringing them to believe, and be ready to obey the Lord Jesus, in Mark, is the precise complement to Matthew's account of discipling the people. This must be true; if not, let my friend show it to be false.

Are infants included in this commission, especially when looked at in the light of the teaching and practice of the apostles, and after them of the several evangelists? I answer, they are not included in the commission; but if they are, their case is hopeless, and when we place our little ones in the grave, they are buried without a hope of resurrection,

The Savior says, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." The condition specified in this part of the commission is that whoever believes not, shall be damned. Now, if the infant is included in this commission, since it can not comply with the terms thereof, it is, therefore, doomed and lost. So my friend must accept, as a *necessary* consequence of his position, the destruction or damnation of the infant. He may ask me what my position is; I answer, God does not make children or men incapable of obeying him, such as idiots or men incapable of understanding the conditions and penalties of transgression, *amenable* to law; such persons, even among intelligent men, are never considered as included, by either God or man, in the terms of their laws; never. Infants, therefore, are not included in the commission. But my friend says he finds in the commission all the authority he has for baptizing infants; and as I have shown that there is no authority at all for the practice, in that, therefore, infant baptism is not authorized by the Word of God.

I wish once more to examine the passage found in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. I presume the apostles understood their commission, that they practiced under the commission correctly, and that they applied the commission to just the parties for whom it was intended, and did not apply it to any others. Let me illustrate. If a man makes any statement or gives a command, no matter what, to a third party in my presence, it may be that I do not understand him. But I shall assume, in this illustration, that the third party in the case does understand the Master's command. Now, if I do not fully understand him, I should watch that third party and see what he actually does; and whatever he does in obedience to the command received, and which I did not understand, but which I assume he did, I take to be the explanation of that command. Now, whether we truly or fully understand the meaning of the commission given to the apostles by the Savior or not, one thing we may safely do, and that is, assume that the apostles understood it. I watch them as they

leave that little mountain in Judea; I watch them as they go forth, and I see how they apply this commission to men and women, and to *children if they applied it to children*—

[Time was here called by the Moderators.]

I should have been glad to finish that thought.

MR. DITZLER'S EIGHTH ARGUMENT.

THURSDAY, December 15, 10 A. M.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My good brother thought yesterday he would have to employ an *exhorter* to go around with me, and do my exhorting. I thought we came here to discuss questions, not to exhort any one; and those who have heard me, know that I have neither exhorted him nor the audience, though he is now exhorting me, and yesterday he both preached and exhorted. So it is *he* that needs the *exhorter*, and he may save the expense of employing one for me.

In commenting on the second of Acts, he said that Peter unfolded the doors of the kingdom, and declared unto them the kingdom is now open. If he will turn to the second of Acts, and read me that passage, we will be very glad. Where is it? Nowhere. In Luke xvi: 16, he will find that, from the days of John until now (Christ's day of speaking that), the people are represented as coming into the kingdom. "The law and the prophets were until John; *since that time* the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it." This is the language of Christ, and it is used to show that they had no excuse for not repenting and believing what they had heard and seen; for the gospel had been preached to them from the days of John the Baptist. Then, where is my brother's argument to show that the kingdom had not existed before the day of Pentecost?

I will now notice another point. He quotes from the sixteenth chapter of Matthew the words, "I *will* build my church," to indicate that it will be built in the future, whereas the word *οικοδομήσω* (*oikodomæso*), means not only to build, but to "rebuild," "to establish," "renew," etc.; *i. e.*, a building that is *decayed*, as may be found in 1 Corinthians viii: 1; iii: 9, 10; Ephesians ii: 20, 21; Luke xi: 47, 48, and Deuteronomy xxix: 13. It may mean both; therefore, it does not establish his position, and we must find another test. He says I will not go to the commission. He says it implies instruc-

tion, and that it not only implies instruction, but such instruction, of course, as will exclude infants from church membership. But making disciples in the Jewish Church implied it. He denies, in substance, that any person was ever received into the Jewish Church until he had been instructed in the doctrines of the church, until he acknowledged that there was but one God. But they circumcised their children at eight days old, therefore the instruction related to parents, while the child had membership with them by virtue of God's laws and their relation thereto; and the word makes no application to children. The doctrine of the commission: "Go ye, therefore, and disciple all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit." Now, my brother and other persons on his side of the question, treat the commission in this way. Taking Matthew, Mark, and Luke together, they say they find the same terms, such as teaching, repentance, faith, salvation, condemnation, and baptism, and say we will have none of them except the *water* of the commission, and a very little of that—just a little sprinkled on them. On the contrary, for this is appealing to public prejudice, we believe and demand for the commission all that is in it. We believe infants are saved by virtue of the atonement of Christ unconditionally. I would remark, by the way, that I do not deem it necessary to comment on the commission, as recorded in Mark xvi: 15, 16, because it is now repudiated by all great scholars as not belonging to the text. It is not found in any of the most ancient Greek copies of the Bible. All agree that it was not found in the Bible in the earlier age of the church, and that it was added thereunto afterward, whether properly or not, of course we can not tell. As it can not be shown to belong to the Bible, I will not stop to comment on it. It has been rejected by all the great scholars, though some of them append it with notes. I say the word *ἔθνη* (*ethnæ*), does not destroy the idea of infant membership, though he believes the terms of the commission do.

The interpretation he gives to the commission necessarily damns infants, for he says they can not be baptized, and he quotes the text: "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved;" and the very same verse damns them, according to his theory, for it says in the next clause, "He that believeth not shall be damned." Therefore, if they can not believe, neither can they be saved. If not believing forfeits baptism here, it forfeits salvation. The apostles went forth interpreting the commission as sensible men; they had been used to infant

church membership. They had no instruction to repudiate this ancient practice of the church, and, therefore, whenever they received a proselyte or any other convert, they baptized the infant as well, interpreting this as it always had been interpreted, unless they had express restrictions. They had always been used to circumcising their children, and the faith of the parent always justified them in recognizing the membership of the infant also. Of course, the apostles would interpret the commission in the light of these facts—be guided by this practice, unless *express restrictions* were placed upon them, which was not the case. The commission was to proselyte *the world*. They were used to proselyting, infant baptism being the universal custom. They would interpret this great proselyting commission in the light of universal and unchanged custom.

We showed from 1 Cor. vii: 14: "Else were your children—*τὰ τέκνα ὑμῶν ἀκάθαρτα (akatharta) unpurified*. But now—*νῦν ἔτε*—since ye believe, and—*ἡγιασμένα*—are sanctified, your children—*ἅγια ἱσθῆ*—are sanctified"—are "saints;" but chapter i: 1, 2, shows, as do many other passages, that "saints"—*ἅγιος*—is never applied to any save *members of Christ's church*. Were any unbaptized persons called saints in the New Testament?

I now proceed to the historical argument upon this subject, and will read to you, in my next discourse, the opinions of many eminent men on the commission. We now come to the history of infant baptism, as it is popularly called. Now, my friends, we receive the Bible, or New Testament itself, mainly on historical evidence. These historical records are sometimes external and sometimes internal, as we sometimes say, and upon historical records our faith, or at least our knowledge as to any thing, is based. [History is exceedingly clear on this subject of infant baptism—*more so, perhaps, than upon any other point*. As I can not finish my argument on history this morning, I shall attempt to make the preliminary argument as clear as possible. First. *There is no record of any organized antagonism to infant baptism until the sixteenth century of the Christian Church*. In the second place, *there is but ONE record in the whole history of the church, before the sixteenth century, of even an individual man opposing infant baptism*. That was in the second century. That individual man, Tertullian, also opposed the baptizing of young men and women, and urged the postponement of baptism until old age or the hour of approaching death. This is the only opposition it met with for the first fifteen hundred years of the Christian Church. The next case was that of the father of Gregory

Nazianzen, of the fourth century. He did not favor the more tender age of infant baptism, it is urged, yet that is very doubtful; but he *did not oppose it at all*. In the next place, we can trace every schism and false doctrine that crept into the church after the apostolic age, even from the very death of the apostles. You can trace, for instance, the introduction of the worship of the image of the Virgin Mary; wafers introduced instead of bread as an element in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; the rise of Arianism, Pelagianism, the various shades of Gnosticism; the parties and disputes about rebaptizing heretics, about receiving or not receiving backsliders to the fellowship of the church;—all these and scores of other sects and issues arose, while all is profound silence as to the rise of infant baptism. The very dates of the rise of these issues, the founders of the sects, and all the facts, can be given.

While we can trace out all these historical facts, the whole world is as silent as the grave on the question of infant baptism being introduced into the church, unless it is admitted as taught in the Word of God. Among other heresies that crept into the church was a belief that by sprinkling water on a person, or immersing him, moral pollution—sin—was taken away. The heathen converts held the most absurd notions as to the efficacy of water, the remedy for sin, and a world of absurdities. When they came into the church, they introduced all their peculiar heathen ideas into the church, which were the heresies I have spoken of. But *they did not practice infant baptism*; therefore, we can not believe that infant baptism was introduced as an innovation of those days. Looking over the broad historic page of those ages, we find those heathen philosophers, some of them, being men of learning, and becoming ministers in the Christian Church, reading the Bible, and forming an idea of sin from the teachings of the Word of God, and dividing themselves on the question of depravity. Pelagius, of the fourth century, may have denied infant depravity, but as early as Justin Martyr, and from the days of the apostles down, the fathers admitted infant depravity. They believed it, whether true or not; and that baptism was given for the remission of sins was taught by Justin Martyr, and by Origen, and the Greek fathers generally of the second and third centuries. Tertullian, who opposed infant baptism, had been raised and educated as an advocate or lawyer. He was a man of profound learning, but lacked solidity of character, and did not hesitate as to any means to carry his points. He opposed infant baptism in the year 190. Tertullian himself never pretends that it was an

innovation. If it had not been universal in the church, he would have made *that his main argument against it*; and if a small part of the church in those days did not practice infant baptism, he certainly would have appealed to that fact as favoring his side. Pelagius says "he never heard of any one denying" it. As books did not circulate in those days as now, they had not read Tertullian. His opposition had perished with him—found no adherents at all.

As I will read in the next discourse, Origen taught that the church practiced infant baptism. He was born in the year 185, only eighty-five years after the apostles' days. Now, Origen himself found no place in the church where infant baptism was not practiced. He treats it as an apostolic institution, using the word tradition, which means a precept, order, or command, which is not written down. He says they have that unwritten precept "from the apostles to give baptism to infants." That is the opinion of Origen, who wrote in the year 215.

A. D. 253, sixty-six (66) bishops were assembled in Carthage in council, when Fidus, an obscure country bishop, asked them whether it was necessary, as in case of circumcision, to delay the baptism to the eighth day after the birth of the child, or must they baptize it on any day after birth? This matter is often misrepresented, and it is presented as if the question of infant baptism arose there—a most dishonest trick. They answer Fidus thus: "We read your letter, dearest brother, in which you write of one Victor, a priest, etc. . . . But as 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 the *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."—Wall i: 79, 80; Cyprian, vol. i, epistle lviii; Oxford edition, lxiv, § 2. Now, here, within a hundred and fifty-three years of the apostolic age, a whole council, without a dissension—without a hesitating voice—decide that it is not necessary to delay baptism till even the eighth day after birth. This proves the practice to have been *universal* and without opposition. The *only* agitation was as to delaying to the *eighth day*, and that was with one single man. Had any part of the country not practiced infant baptism, or had there been any opposition to it, it

would have been utterly impossible for this council, with the learned Cyprian as one of its members, to have decided such a question as they did with such unanimity.

The great John Chrysostom, so eminent, pious, and exalted, says: "For this cause we baptize infants also, though they are not defiled with sin." Again: *τα βρέφη ἀναμάρτητα ὄντα βαπτίζονται*—"infants that have no sin are baptized."

St. Augustine: "For infants are offered (*offeruntur enippe parvuli*) for the receiving of the spiritual grace, not so much by those *in whose hands they are brought (gestantur manibus)*," etc.—Wall, i: 164.

"Which the WHOLE BODY of the church holds, as delivered to them, in the case of *little infants* baptized, who certainly can not yet believe . . . or confess, etc., that which *the whole church practices*, and which has not been instituted by councils, but was *ever in use*," etc.—"De Baptismo cont. Donatistes."

Had the practice in the third century been limited, how could it have obtained *universality* in the fourth century without a breath of opposition, *especially* when it was the vital interest of Pelagius to deny it, as Augustine crushed his doctrine of sin by his infant baptism argument? Pelagius knew not *why* infants were baptized—could offer no reason—yet admitted he never heard of any one, no, not even a *wicked heretic*, who denied it. It was universal in 253, at the council of Carthage.

Every innovation made a disturbance that lasted from one hundred to eight hundred years. Now, let us suppose for a moment that infant baptism was post-apostolic, that it was not practiced by the apostles, but came in between the days of John and those of the Council. Would not such a thing have produced a sensation? Would it not have produced discussion? and would not the literature of that day have contained an account of it, as of all other matters? But the whole history of the church is as silent upon this subject as the grave itself. Therefore, it is simply impossible that it should have come in as an innovation under such circumstances, and when Tertullian so vigorously opposed it, and would certainly have used that as a reason why it should be opposed. We have no record of any person allying himself with Tertullian on this issue. He rose to the surface and sank again without making a convert. In my next address I will take up the other fathers, and read to you from them, that you may see all those points clearly.

MR. WILKES' EIGHTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

By the divine mercy we are permitted again, this morning, to resume our discussion.

I will, in the first place, notice a few things in my friend's speech. He says that, after having chided him somewhat for his attempts at exhortation, I proceeded both to *preach* and *exhort*. I have no special reply to make to that, except to admit that, in my attempts to exhort, I generally fall quite short of the efforts of my opponent, and I have felt the necessity of employing a special exhorter to meet him where I was not able to do so.

My friend says that the kingdom of heaven was *in hand*, and persons were entering into it from Abraham down, and especially in the days of John the Baptist. I would just put this question to him: Why did the Lord Jesus Christ say to Peter, only a very short time before his crucifixion, "Upon this rock *will* I build my church," putting it in the future? It is in the future in the Greek, as well as in the English translation. John, in his preaching, says the kingdom of heaven is *at hand*; and the Savior says to Peter, "On this rock" *will* I build my church. This rock never existed before, as it then soon would, as the foundation of the church. But, says my friend, "*will build*" may mean will improve, or will perfect. Now I grant that the word *may possibly*, in some cases, be used in that sense; but I insist that, to claim a meaning for a word in a given passage *simply* because it may have such a sense in *some cases*, is, as a rule of interpretation, ruinous to the Bible. It will make shipwreck of all faith.

My friend comes here under a *necessity* as stern and as inexorable as fate itself, to take a word in its *current* or ordinary sense; but the sense he gives the word in question is not the current or ordinary one. He thus violates a great, fundamental, and an essential rule in expounding all the Scriptures, in order to make out a case; and a bad case it is.

But I raise another question. If the kingdom had already been in existence and open for persons to enter it, why did the Savior say, "I will give you the keys of the kingdom?" Why did he say that? What use for keys if the kingdom was already open, and persons were going into it continually? None in the world. All of these facts or statements harmonize perfectly with the view I am urging, but they are wholly incompatible with his interpretations.

I wish now to come to some graver matters. My friend says that the latter part of Mark is repudiated by all the best authorities. I propose to show that this is a mistake. I read first from Tischendorf, than whom there is not a more distinguished collator of Greek manuscripts in the world:

"The ordinary conclusion to the gospel of St. Mark, namely xvi: 9-20, is found in more than five hundred Greek manuscripts, in the whole of the Syriac and Coptic, and most of the Latin manuscripts, and even in the Gothic version. But by Eusebius and Jerome (the former of whom died in the year 340), it is stated expressly that in nearly all the trustworthy copies of their time the gospel ended with the eighth verse; and with this, of all existing known Greek manuscripts, only the Vatican and the Sinaitic now agree."—"Introduction to Tischendorf's New Test.," page 13, Tauchnitz edition.

Let me now read from the distinguished Lunge, or rather from the commentaries that go under his name. On this passage the author says:

"The reasons for assuming that verses 9-20 are an original portion of Mark's gospel, much outweigh those to the contrary."

He tells us, and this is a very late commentary, that just the opposite of this is true.

"They are found in the Uncial Codd, A, C, D, X, Δ, E, G, H, K, M, S, U, V.; as well as in the 33, 69, and the rest of the Cursive MSS., which have been collated. They are in copies of the Old Latin, in the Vulgate, Curetonian Syriac, Peshito, Jerusalem Syriac, Memphitic, Gothic, and Ethiopic. 2. Irenæus (Cont. Hæer, iii: 10, 6) recognize their existence; as do also Hippolytus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose, Augustine, Nestorius. Scholz also claims that Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, and Clement of Alexandria, sanction the passage; but Tregelles regards this as an error."—Lunge on Mark

And let me tell my friend that all reliable authorities claim it, with but few exceptions. Says my friend, "I will not stop to comment on this verse in Matthew," on the Commission. That was wise.

He told us a few days ago that this was the only passage in all the Scriptures where there is any authority found for baptizing any body; and yet this is just the passage, it seems, which he does not intend to examine! Now I think this is just the one which he ought to examine, and make it apparent that it commands, or demands, the baptism of infants.

I wish to examine this commission more carefully. Matthew says, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing *them*" Baptizing whom? My friend says, "the nations" I tell him that there is no good authority for this view, as far as I know; and though I am not particularly pretensions, I do pretend to know that there is none. There is not only no authority for it, but what authority there is on it, is expressly against it. The "*them*" in the Greek is not of the same gender with the word for nations (*ta ethne*), and does not refer to it as its antecedent; and, therefore, from this passage we have no authority for baptizing the nations as such. The "*them*" is masculine in the Greek, and *nations* is neuter, and hence the pronoun does not refer to the noun nations. That is the first point. But if it did refer to the word nations—and my friend manifestly feels the force of this fact—it proves too much, and, therefore, destroys his whole position, for he would, on his interpretation, have to baptize an infidel, if he belonged to or was one of the nations. If he is to baptize persons *because* they belong to the nations, he *must* baptize the infidel also. Disciple first, then baptize them, is the correct view. Compare this with the accounts given by Matthew and Mark. Mark says, in order to make disciples and bring persons into the kingdom of God, "Go, preach the gospel to every creature." But that does not contemplate the presence of infants, on the plain principle, that no law given, human or divine, ever included parties in the provisions of a law who were not capable of understanding and acting upon them.

"Go, preach the gospel to every creature" Why? To make disciples of them. He that *believes* is to be baptized, says Mark. Matthew says, Go, disciple the nations, and baptize the disciples. Now, the preaching to them and bringing them to believe, is the mode of "discipling," according to Mark, and, therefore, to disciple the nations, according to Matthew, is to bring them to believe by preaching to them.

My friend says that I preach infant damnation, according to my logic. No, no; it is just *his* logic. I say that if infants are contemplated, as embraced in the terms of the commission, they must be

damned, because they can not comply with the terms. There is preaching in the commission; there is *hearing*, and there is *believing*, in being disciplined; and there is repentance, as recorded by Luke; there is baptism for the remission of sins; and there is, "He that believeth not shall be damned." Now, as an infant can not meet these terms, if infants are included and required to meet them, they must be damned. My friend is not the man to criticise these passages. Infants can not be preached to, therefore *he* dispenses with it. An infant has no faith, it has no discipling, it has no repentance. My friend *simply baptizes* it; and I do insist, kindly but firmly, that in the making of disciples, according to his theory, he uses *only water*, and, as he says, but little of that.

My opponent says that many corruptions had entered the church as early as Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine. I admit that. But he says that he can trace all these corruptions to their source, except in the case of infant baptism. But he must allow me to say, courteously, that he can not do that. I can name corruptions by the score, of the origin of which he can give us no account. Where and when did the having of sponsors begin? what is the date? Where and when did the confessional take its rise? Where the custom of putting salt in the mouth? Where the custom of putting fingers in the ears? or blowing in the mouth? Laying on of hands for the purpose of conferring the Holy Ghost? or for the casting out of devils? He does not know. He may come near to telling us the time when and where *some* of them had their origin. But I can tell him much more precisely when and where infant baptism began. But I will have more to say of that at another time.

He *talks about* the *old* covenant, and spends two days upon it, only occasionally alluding to the New Testament, by way of objections to the arguments which I drew from it, and then he leaves them without commenting much upon them. He could have made every remark he has made on the *New Testament* in one-half hour. This morning he takes up the line of *history* at the fifth century, and omits the entire New Testament. In the fifth century he finds much said about infant baptism. In the fourth he finds less. In the third century the light grows fainter; it grows less, and less, and . . . less till about the first of the third century the light of history goes out and leaves him in Egyptian darkness. As he nears the apostolic age, instead of light in favor of infant baptism increasing, it diminishes, and finally goes out, leaving a rayless night of a hundred years between him and the last

word uttered by inspiration. Therefore, he would have us to understand infant baptism is authorized by the Word of God!

My friend says that the word *μαθητεω* (*matheteuo*), to *disciple*, used by Matthew, does not necessarily mean to give instruction. I will see about that. I read from Dr. Gale's reflections on Dr. Wall on Infant Baptism:

"And therefore, I think, I may safely conclude from the whole, that it is fully demonstrated to be one of the plainest things in the world that *μαθητεω* (*matheteuo*) signifies properly to *teach*, and that this is the sense of it particularly in the commission, Matt. xxviii: 19. And, therefore, our adversaries, when they cavil at this sense, do at best but trifle, and contradict the constant use of the Greek word and common sense of mankind, the unanimous agreement of the several versions, the joint authority of the primitive saints, the judgment of the most learned men, and the clear meaning and declarations of the Spirit of God in the Holy Scriptures."—"History of Infant Baptism," by Dr. Wm. Wall, M. A., vol ii, p. 207.

My friend may say, however, that this is an authority from my side. I grant he was a Baptist. I reply, however, that nearly all the authorities he quotes are on *his* side. This fact, then, must not be urged as an objection to my reading, while he quotes from authorities that are Pedobaptist. But I have matter in my mind more important than historical authorities. However, I promise them just consideration in due time.

In closing my remarks yesterday, I was about to discuss some matters presented for consideration in second of Acts. I was holding that some men of learning and thought (though I believed it hardly possible) *might* not fully understand the object and bearing of the commission. Now, in order that we may fully understand it, we should notice those men who were inspired and did understand it, and see what they did when they commenced operations under that commission. I notice to see whether they baptized infants or not, and if they did not, I conclude that I ought not to do it; but if they did, I will allow that I ought also.

What are the facts in the case? The first sermon after the commission was given, at least the first one recorded, is in the second of Acts. I commence at the thirty-sixth verse, "Therefore, let all the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus whom ye crucified both Lord and Christ. [He is talking to somebody who could understand, not to infants.] Now, when they heard that they were pricked in their heart [he is talking to those who had crucified the Lord; they

could not have been infants], and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles, Men and brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." He is talking to persons able to make a response, and intelligent enough to know what was their duty in the premises. He is not contemplating the presence of infants. "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. And with many other words did he testify and exhort, saying, Save yourselves from this untoward generation. Then they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added to them about three thousand souls."

Now, who were baptized? "They that gladly received the word." My friend's practice is not in harmony with the practice of the apostles. He baptizes infants who *do not gladly receive the word*, and, therefore, his proposition is not in harmony with the teachings of the apostles.

The text continues. "And they continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." He is talking of believers. "And fear came upon every soul; and many wonders and signs were done by the apostles." . . . "Praising God, and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved" But they did not add infants to the church, because they were not capable of being saved, according to the instructions. They were not lost; that is my view; but whether lost or not, they were not capable of being saved according to the terms here indicated; they, then, were not added to the church; and, as to baptism, those only were baptized who gladly received the word; therefore, infants were neither baptized nor added to the church on this great occasion, yet three thousand persons were saved and added to the church.

I proceed now to Acts viii: 12, where we have this language: "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" *When* were they baptized? *When they believed*, just as the commission required—"he that believes and is baptized shall be saved." *When they believed* Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God they were baptized, but not before, and the force of this language teaches that they ought not to be baptized before. *When they believed* Philip they were baptized. It is

also worthy of remark that Philip baptized both men and women. What a beautiful place it is to have said "and their little infants;" but it is not so said, and this ominous silence, in this case, is evidence, to my mind, that there were no infants baptized. If my brother had made that record, and if infants had been baptized, he would most likely have mentioned that also.

I further call your attention to Acts xviii: 8, "And many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." How harmonious that is with the commission, from which the apostles were never to depart! They were to preach the gospel, and the people were to hear it; those that believed it and were baptized, were to be saved. In precise harmony with that it is said: "Many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized;" that is, hearing the Scriptures—the word of God—they believed and were baptized.

In Acts iii: 25, we have this language, spoken just after the lame man was healed: "Ye are the children of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with our fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the kindreds of the earth be blessed. Unto you first, God, having raised up his son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities." This was the promise and covenant made with Abraham: "In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed." It contemplated the sending of Christ into the world, that he might *bless the world in turning man from his transgressions*. That is not at all in harmony with baptism or membership for infants, for they can not be *turned away from their iniquities*.

In Romans ii: 28, we have the new and old covenant contrasted: "For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh." This means that at one time they were Jews, who were so only outwardly, and that God's providence and blessing were upon the Jews and circumcision, but that that dispensation is all past, and he is not now a Jew who is one outwardly, "but he is a Jew who 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." But what about infants? They can have no such circumcision as that, and therefore the whole spirit and style of the New Testament is out of harmony with infant membership or infant baptism.

There is another argument I would like to present. In the First Epistle of Peter, iii: 21, we have this language: "The like figure

whereunto even baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Here we are told, as I understand it, that baptism is for the answer of a good conscience toward God. It would, perhaps, be better to render it "baptism is an *inquiring* for a good conscience toward God." My friend, I think, agrees with me that this is the radical and current meaning of the original word.

I present this argument in the form of a syllogism, that my friend may have it in a tangible shape: He that can not have the answer of a good conscience, in baptism, can not be scripturally baptized. An infant can not have the answer of a good conscience in baptism; therefore, an infant can not be scripturally baptized. Now, the major premise, in that argument, must be true; for it is a statement, in substance, of what the Bible says. If this Bible statement be true, then he that can not have the answer of a good conscience toward God, in baptism, can not be scripturally baptized. I have said that an infant can not have the answer of a good conscience toward God; he can not, in baptism, seek for a good conscience. At the time of his baptism he is not presumed to know any thing of a conscience. An infant can not have a good or a bad conscience at all; and, hence, in the act of baptism, he can not *seek a good conscience*. If these premises be true, the conclusion is as certain and fixed as the sun in the center of the solar system: that infants can not be scripturally baptized. Therefore, infant baptism is *not* authorized by the word of God.

I call your attention to the fact that baptism puts the person into Jesus Christ; for, says Paul to the Galatians, iii: 27, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." I ask, if "putting on Christ" does not mean something; and what is that something? But whatever it may or can mean, it is not possible that infants can put on Christ, or be baptized into Christ.

We have, in the letter to the Galatians, iv: 21, where the apostle is arguing with the Jews, who contended that it was necessary to keep the law of Moses in order to be saved, this language: "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham had two sons, one by a bondmaid, the other by a free woman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the free woman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants," etc. These

two women are the two covenants, or represent the two covenants. It has reference to Abraham's two wives, one a bondwoman, the other a free woman. Each of them had children, and the question arose, whether the child of the bondwoman should inherit with the child of the free. God decided that it should not, and commanded that the bondwoman *and her children should be cast out*, and that they should have no inheritance in Abraham's estate.

Now for the application. That bondwoman represented the covenant made on Sinai, or the covenant of the church which the gentleman says he is in. The free woman—the legal wife—represents the new covenant, the covenant made by Christ. Now, the question is, shall the child, under the Sinaitic covenant, represented by the child of the bondwoman, inherit with the child under the Christian covenant, represented by the free woman? The language of the Bible is, that it shall not. Cast out the bondwoman (the covenant made at Sinai) and her son (or those who were members, or might be, under that covenant). Now, I would like to know where my friend's church is.

He says, find a passage that puts infants out of the church, or that conflicts with the idea that they are in it. The Jews worshiped and served God according to the terms of the covenant under which they lived. Though it were proved that infants were members of the Jewish Church, or were children of the Sinaitic covenant, the Apostle Paul says, "Cast out this covenant and its membership, now that the new covenant and church are introduced."

MR. DITZLER'S NINTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My brother seems to be away behind on the road after me, and I have to come back to keep him company.

Mr. Wilkes.—According to the Scriptures, I am just up exactly.

Mr. Ditzler.—Oh, no; you are away behind on the Scriptures. Hear President Milligan, one of the highest authorities in my brother's church. I think there is no scholar superior to President Milligan in his church. On page 75, of his "Scheme of Redemption," he says: "But the promise was afterward limited to Isaac (Gen. xvii: 19-21), and then to Jacob (Gen. xxv: 23), and, finally, to Christ (Gal. iii: 8). And hence the covenant, of which this promise is made the basis, is, by the same apostle, called 'The covenant concerning Christ' (*εἰς χριστόν*) (Gal. iii: 17). *This is the same which is also frequently called the new covenant, and which is fully developed in the New Testament.* And hence we find, moreover, that all the subjects of the new covenant are, by this divine arrangement, regarded and reckoned as the children of Abraham."

But on the authority of Mark xvi: 15, I have a word to say. My brother will say things sometimes which he will afterward modify very much. I read from Alford's "Greek Testament Commentary," vol. i: 392, 393. "The passage which follows [after eighth verse of sixteenth chapter] to the end of the gospel, appears to have been ADDED BY ANOTHER HAND in very early times." "II. It is omitted in B. k. (Bis Code, Vaticanus—oldest and best copy of the Greek Testament,) A. [Alexandrinus, 4th cent.] L. . . . The catenæ take no notice of it; nor do Clemens Romanus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Justin Martyr (all second century)," etc. "III. It would thus appear that, while the passage was appended as early as the time of Irenæus [A. D. 185], it was still absent from the majority of codices (texts) (italics Alford's) as late as Jerome's day"—last of fourth century. "The legitimate inference is, that it was placed as a completion of the gospel soon after the apostolic period."—Alford. "V. The internal evidence,

which is discussed in the notes, will be found to *preponderate vastly against the authorship of Mark.*"

There are the facts. It was never found in any manuscript of the Bible as early as the fifth century. It was referred to by the Fathers of the fourth century, and by one of them in the closing part of the second century. A part of it is quoted. Justin Martyr does not name it, though my friend says he does. Samuel Davidson says: "In like manner, Gregory Nyssa and Severus of Antioch say that it was not in *the more accurate* manuscripts of their day (4th century); while Victor, of Antioch, testifies that it was absent from *the greatest number*. A similar statement is made by Euthymius Zygabanus," etc.—Intro. N. T., i: 164, 165. Davidson, this highest and most learned of critics, says (p. 169): "4. The phraseology and style are adverse to its authenticity." He then shows that the language, the words, the phrases, are all contrary to Mark's style—just the reverse. "5. The seventeenth and eighteenth verses contain various suspicious circumstances. The desire for the marvelous is too great for Mark. The kind of miracles indicated, and the power of performing them, attributed to *all believers*, are adverse to the supposition of the evangelist being the writer. Thus, the haudling of deadly serpents with impunity, the drinking of deadly poisons without harm, savor of the superstition that prevailed after the apostles. The ability to speak in foreign languages is taken from, and is recorded in, the Acts of the Apostles." He urges that the virtue attributed to baptism "reminds us of the post-apostolic period." "The manner, style, and phraseology are foreign to Mark. What judgment, then, has the critic to pronounce? . . . Why Mark was suddenly interrupted belongs to the unknown facts connected with the literary history of the New Testament. According to Michaelis, the death of Peter, his voucher, was the cause of the abrupt termination. . . . Perhaps Mark's death was the cause. . . . Some unknown person appended the conclusion."—*Ibid*, 171. Hug omits it all in his "Einlitug.," though it had been in his third edition—Olshausen, Bloomfield, Griesbach, Schott, Koenaël, Theiss, and quite all great critics. It is not in the great manuscript found by Tischendorf, dating in first half of the fourth century.

As late as the last half of the second century, a majority of the copies of the Bible did not have it. Will you risk your eternity upon a text which all admit was appended to the Scriptures long after the apostles died? Davidson shows that it is simply impossible that this

should be an inspired document. It is clearly shown to be of later date, and, therefore, a Catholic forgery.

But he says I will not come to the commission. I have been there too often for him; that is the trouble. His criticism on Greek genders will bring a broad grin on the face of every Greek scholar. I could quote any number of passages from Greek in which, after such nouns as *εθνη*, neuter, others feminine, masculine and feminine relatives were brought out, and Greek rules are so abundant on it, it were useless to detain you with quotations. (See chapter xxv: 32—all nations—*εθνη*—them—*αυτους*.) But the commission. Alford: "The *μαθητεειν* (*mathateuein*) consists of two parts—the *initiary*, admissory rite, and the subsequent teaching . . . from baptism to instruction." Bengel: "*Disciple—baptizing*. The verb *μαθητεειν* signifies to *make disciples*; it includes *baptizing* and *teaching*."

Olshausen holds the same, and that it does not imply antecedent teaching, and he is worth fifty Kendricks. I am surprised at his manner of viewing this subject. Disciple them. He says first make disciples of them, and then baptize them. Now, *does he believe that a man can be a disciple*, in the New Testament sense of the word, of Christ without baptism? *He does not*.

Mr. Wilkes—*I do*.

He says *he does*. Well, he is the only man in his church that will say so. You could no more get Alexander Campbell to say that than you could get him to stick his hand in the fire. Let that point be noted, for it will give him trouble on the next proposition. How, now, could a man be a disciple of Christ, with my brother's idea of religion, who has never been baptized. If a man can become a disciple of Christ without being baptized, he may *continue* so without being baptized, and he may *die* a disciple of Christ without being baptized. If that exceedingly logical statement does not give him and his friends trouble in the future, I do not know what will. I never expected to hear him admit that. If, then, as we believe, that to be a disciple of Christ a man must be baptized if he can, what becomes of his argument. Most writers agree that *μαθητεειν* (*mathateuein*) is the commencement, *baptism* the means, and *διδασκοντες* (*teach*) the conclusion of the work. So the critics agree with me.

But I come to history again. My brother says I can not show, for instance, when sponsors came into the history of the church. As sponsors are directly mentioned with infant baptism by Tertullian, I admit that I can not show when either the one or the other came in,

because it can not be shown that either was an innovation. He next mentions the sacred confessional. Well, I will show that in the year 391, or within a year or two of that period, sin became so gross in the church that the confessional had to be resorted to. The confessions were open up to that time, but the sins of the church became so gross that men and women would not confess to each other, and the private confessional was adopted. Between the years 585 and 593 John Jejunator wrote and published the first code of the confessional. Now, these are the facts and dates, and if he will name a dozen more, and I have the time, I will give the dates and historical facts. Now, if he can, let him show when *infant baptism* came in as an innovation. He knows he can not do it. He tells you baptism is the answer to a good conscience, and, therefore, infants can not be proper subjects of baptism. He takes a text that is so obscure in meaning that all commentators are perplexed as to what it means, and even as to how the Greek words are to be punctuated, divided, and rests an objection to a practice on such a doubtful assumption. All the commentators disagree about the exact meaning of that verse in Peter. The Greek word *επειρωτημα* (*eperotæma*)—"promissio, sponsio"—a promise, pledge—a pledge given beforehand as a guarantee.—Wahl's "Greek Clavis." Schleusner—sponsio, stipulatio—promissio, obligatio. The guarantee, promise, or pledge, goes before the thing promised, which is the good conscience, and so sustains our practice. It applies to any pledge, promise, or stipulation, given in advance of the reality meant or intended. You see it can not be *against*, but *favors* infant baptism. It shows that baptism may be conferred before the good conscience comes, and that it does not militate against infant baptism. My brother says the records of the baptism of men and women do not mention infant baptism. True, and I might baptize twenty or thirty adults and not a single infant, but there are at least *twenty-three* records of persons being converted to the faith, and only ten records of persons being baptized, in the Acts of the Apostles. In two-thirds of the conversions mentioned in the Acts, nothing is said about baptism at all, but we *infer* that they were baptized from the *general teaching* of the word of God.

Having disposed of this point I resume my historical argument. I want you to take the question from its true standpoint. In the third and fourth centuries we find infant baptism universal. To-day you can find no place on earth where the Christian Church, Greek, Coptic, Protestant, Roman Catholic, does not baptize infants, save the

Baptists of the last three centuries. Go back to the eighth century and it is the same. Go back to the fifth century and the same thing is true. Go back to the fourth century, and still it is the same. Go back to the third century, and there is no record that gives the remotest idea that it was not universal; and, if in those times it was not universal, that body of the church which held out against it certainly would have opposed it vigorously. If any portion of the church did not believe it was apostolic, would they have received it as an innovation and no record be made of the contest raised over it? As late as the year 789, and as late as the tenth century, we find the council at Frankfort warring against picture worship, which agitation was kept up for five hundred years, and the history of the church is full of it. When one died another took it up, and thus the contest was waged vigorously during all those years. Therefore, it is impossible to suppose that infant baptism was an innovation in the Christian Church. Tertullian, born about A. D. 140, wrote 190, was a North African teacher. I will give the Latin, then the rendering. He begins the paragraph thus: "But they whose duty it is to administer baptism are to know that it must not be administered rashly . . . Itaque pro cujusque personæ conditione ac dispositione, etiam ætate, *unctio baptismi utilior est; præcipue tamen circa parvulos.* Quid enim necesse est, si non tam necesse, *sponsors etiam periculi ingeri?* Enim et ipsi per mortalitertem destituere promissiones suas possunt, et proventis malæ indolis falli. Ait quidens Dominus, '*Nolite illos prohibere ad me venire!*' Veniant ergo dum adolescent, veniant dum discunt, dum quo veniant doceantur: fiant Christiani quum Christum nosse potuerint. Quid festinat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?" "And so, according to the conditions and dispositions of every one, yea, and even the age, the delay of baptism is the more preferable; yet specially in respect to infants [or little children]. For why is it necessary, except in case of necessity, that the sponsors (god-fathers) likewise should be thrust into danger? because they may fail to fulfill their promises by death, or be disappointed by the development of an evil disposition [in the infant for whom they stood]. The Lord does indeed say, 'Forbid them not to come unto me.' Let them 'come,' therefore, when they are growing up; let them 'come' when they can learn; let them come when they can be taught what it is to what they come. Let them be made Christians when they may be able to know Christ. Why should the innocent age hasten to the remission of sins? More caution will be exercised

in worldly matters, so that one *who is not trusted with earthly substance is trusted with divine*. Let them *know how to ask* for salvation, that you may seem (at least) to have given to him that asked. *Nerent petere salutem ut patenti dedisse videaris*. For no less cause must the unwedded also be deferred, etc., such as never were married, etc., and in the evidences by means of their freedom [from the nuptial yoke],” etc. Now, note: 1. They are little children, or infants, such as *can not ask* for baptism. 2. They are the *infants* Luke speaks of whom their *mothers* carried to Christ, and whom Christ took up *in his arms*. Tertullian quotes that passage as applying to them. 3. There were god-fathers to act for them, as infants. 4. It was before *any disposition* is developed in them. 5. It was before they could know Christ, before they could be *taught*, before they could *learn*. 6. It was before they could be guilty of personal wrong—“innocent, guiltless age.”

Notice, Tertullian never urges that it was not apostolic, or not universal. His *opposition* to it proved its universality, since, had any part of the church not practiced it, so shrewd a man as he would have appealed to that as in his favor.

We have not only Tertullian, but I now quote from Pelagius: “Who can be so impious as to hinder infants from being baptized, and (born again) regenerated into Christ, and to make them members of the kingdom of heaven, since the Savior has said that none can enter into the kingdom of heaven that are not born again, of water and the Holy Spirit? Who is there so impious as to refuse to an infant, of whatsoever age, the common redemption of mankind; and to hinder him that is born to an uncertain life from being regenerated to an everlasting and a certain life?” By the word regeneration, the Greek fathers mean Christian baptism, as Alexander Campbell fully admits. “For he came to save all persons by himself; all, I mean, who by him are regenerated [or baptized] unto God (omnes, inquam, qui *per eum renascuntur* in Deum; *infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores*. Ideo *per omnem venit ætatem; et infantibus infans factus, etc.*), infants and little ones, and children and youths, and elder persons. Therefore he went through *the several ages*; for infants made an infant, for little ones a little one, sanctifying those of that age,” etc.—Wall, i, 45.

Mr. Campbell freely admits that the word regeneration means baptism. But I will read from the authorities of *those days*. Justin Martyr, who flourished about the year A. D. 140, says: “I will

relate the manner in which we dedicate ourselves to God," etc. "After fasting," etc., says he, "then they are brought by us where there is water, and are regenerated in the same manner in which we ourselves were regenerated; for they then receive the WASHING with water in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the Universe, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit. For Christ also said: 'Except ye be born again,'" etc. Now, mind you, I quote this to show you in what sense the fathers used the term regeneration. Then he goes on to quote Isaiah i: 16: "Wash ye, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil." "And for this (rite) we have learned, etc., and may obtain, in the water, the remission of sins, etc. *Then is pronounced over him who chooses to be regenerated, and has repented of his sins, the name of God, the Father and Lord of the Universe, He who leads to the laver the person who is to be washed.*" I read this to show you that there can be no doubt that by the word regeneration they meant baptism. All the fathers of the first four centuries taught that the manner of our regeneration was in the act of baptism, and used the word regeneration for baptism.

Then we have Irenæus, who was born A. D. 130, and here we trace infant baptism by a man born within thirty years of the death of the Apostle John. Irenæus was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of John the Apostle; and being intimate with him, Irenæus often talks with Polycarp of John, and Polycarp repeated to Irenæus the teachings of John. He had all opportunities, therefore, to know that baptism was apostolic.

I read again from Alexander Campbell: "*Regeneration and immersion are, therefore, two names for the same thing.*"—Mil. Har., Extra, 1830, p. 28. (Italics his.) "The diction of the Holy Spirit, who calls nothing personal regeneration, except the act of immersion."—Ibid., 29.

He then sums all up in "PROPOSITION xi," the same as found in his "System"—here on page 42 (all in italics): "*All the Apostolic Fathers, as they are called, all the pupils of the apostles, and all the ecclesiastical writers of note, of the first four Christian centuries, whose writings have come down to us, allude to, and speak of, Christian immersion [baptism] as the 'regeneration' and 'remission of sins' spoken of in the New Testament.*" Hence Ambrose: "There is no regeneration without water." Augustine calls those by whom infants are baptized, "*ea per quos renascuntur*"—"those by whom they are regenerated."—Wall, i, 49.

The testimony of Origen is important from this fact also. He was born in the year A. D. 185, and was the most learned man in the Christian Church. In it he had no equal in learning for a thousand years. His ancestors were cotemporaneous with the apostles; his father was a martyr; his grandfather was a Christian. He traveled a great deal, examining church records, and at the age of twelve studied such works as men usually do not study until thirty or forty, and he testified that they had a precept from the apostle to baptize infants.

Origen says—having just quoted Job: “There is none clear from pollution, though his life be but of the length of *one day*.” “Besides all this, let it be considered, what is the reason that, whereas the baptism of the church is given for the forgiveness of sins, infants also are, by the usage of the church, baptized (*secundum ecclesiæ observandum etiam parvulis baptismum dari*); when, if there were nothing in infants (in *parvulis*) that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them.”—Origen in Lev., c. 4; Wall, i, 64, 65.

This shows that *parvulus*, Tertullian's word for infant, is applied to persons only one day old. The baptism of infants was “the usage of the church.” Mind you, Origen argues from a universal usage to prove his doctrine of *infant depravity*. They do not argue, as our opponents pretend, and urge infant baptism from the doctrine of depravity. That never occurs. They found the whole church baptizing infants. They inferred it was because infants needed regeneration as depraved creatures. Now, had any part of the church *not* practiced it, that would have broken the force, in part, of their argument. The Pelagian party would have appealed to it—Tertullian especially would have appealed to it as aiding *their* view of depravity, or of the necessity of delay, as in Tertullian's view. But *no such* appeal is made—no flaw appears—the practice is universal.

Again, says Origen in Lucam 14; Wall, i, 65: “Having occasion given in this place, I will mention a thing that causes frequent inquiries among the brethren. *Infants* (*parvuli*) are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. Of *what* sins? Or *when* have they sinned? Or how can any reason of the *laver* [baptism] 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 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 (*parvuli*) are baptized.”

On Romans—ad Romanos lib. v, c. 9; Wall, i: 65—Origen says: “For this also it was that the church had, from the apostles, a tradition [or order] to give baptism even to infants.” The word *παράδοσις* applies to any thing delivered over, as a city surrendered; then to precepts, orders, injunctions, orally delivered, as opposed to written or recorded precepts. It means precept, order, injunction, unwritten—“res, oratio, institutio, are tradita.”—Wahl. “In the New Testament, ‘any thing orally delivered’—a precept, ordinance, instruction. Of precepts or doctrines delivered, . . . traditional law, precept, doctrine.”—1 Cor. xi: 2; 2 Thess. ii: 15; iii: 6.

Now, if infant baptism had not been the universal practice of the church, Origen certainly would have discovered when such an innovation came in. It is, therefore, impossible that infant baptism could have come in as an innovation in those days, for he was born within eighty-five years of the death of John. We have, then, all this unanimous testimony back to the middle of the second century, and within forty and fifty years of John’s death, in favor of infant baptism. These are clear records, and here I might rest the whole matter as to history, but will bring more in my next argument. Had it come in as an innovation, it is impossible for it to have become *universal* in those days; and if it had come in, Tertullian would have discovered it at once, as he opposed infant baptism with all his powers, and nothing would have been such an argument against it as proof that it was not apostolic.

Now, my friends, look carefully into these historical records. If the practice of infant baptism had not been universal in all ages, could not my brother show it from the great mass of church history we have? If it was only partially practiced, Tertullian himself could have procured living witnesses to refute it. He himself became a follower of Montanus, and was a most sophistical heretic, and, as I have frequently said, he was the first man who opposed infant baptism until the sixteenth century. These records show the practice to have been apostolic, and, if so, *scriptural*. Such are the strong confirmations of the fact that infants were members of the church, circumcised as such, and baptized as such. Therefore, our proposition stands true. There are some minor matters I would like to take up, but my time has expired.

MR. WILKES' NINTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I propose, before noticing my opponent's speech, to call up one point in regard to what is called the Bible argument, which has been overlooked, by me.

It is very common for those on the opposite side to argue infant baptism from what is said in the Scriptures concerning household baptisms. My friend has touched that class of arguments or proofs lightly, as he has every allusion to the Bible, and very much as he did that passage in Peter which he regards as a very obscure one—as, indeed, most of those Scripture passages are which have a bearing on this question. I wish to lay before our hearers, and that it may go to record, what is the precise truth in regard to household baptisms. Let us see what bearing the facts of the case will have upon the question in controversy.

We have a record of several household baptisms in the New Testament, and also of several other households that were in the church, and that were, of course, baptized; in all, about nine or ten. The baptism of the household of Cornelius is recorded in Acts x, where it is said that all who were there, heard, etc., spoke with tongues and magnified God. There were no infants there.

In the case of the jailer, Acts xvi: 32-34, it is said that the word of the Lord was spoken to him—that is, the jailer—and to all that were in his house; and it is said he believed in God and rejoiced, with all that were in his house. *All* in that case had the word of the Lord spoken *to them*; they *believed* and they *rejoiced*. There were no infants in that household.

In the case of the household of Crispus, Acts xviii: 8, it is said he “believed on the Lord, with all his house.” In the case of Stephanas, 1 Corinthians i: 16, it is said of his household that they were baptized; and in chap. xvi: 15, of the same epistle, it is said that that household “*addicted* themselves to the *ministry* of the

saints;" and Paul recommends that Christians should "submit themselves to such." The household of Onesiphorus (2 Tim. iv: 19) were capable of giving and receiving salutations. I presume there were no *infants* in that household capable of receiving salutations, yet the household of Onesiphorus is said to have been capable of giving and receiving salutations. The household of Cæsar is said to have been capable of giving and receiving salutations. The household of Narcissus (Rom. xvi: 11), Paul says, "are in the Lord; greet them." The household of Aristobulus (Rom. xvi: 10) is said to have been capable of giving and receiving salutations. The household of Lydia (Acts xvi: 15) is said to have been baptized; and in the fortieth verse of that chapter, it is said that Paul and Silas went into her house; and when they had "comforted the brethren, they departed." Our opponents say that the persons comforted were those who gathered in to see Paul and Silas after getting out of prison. There is no proof of this, and the *probability* is that it is not true. Lydia's household were grown, or adult persons, capable of understanding the instructions of the apostles, and of being comforted by the gracious words which God enabled them to speak. This is at least probable. In eight out of the nine household baptisms, there is proof beyond contradiction that there were no infants in them. In the case last named, the probabilities are strong against the supposition that there were any infants in that household; and I conclude, therefore, that my friend does not demonstrate infant baptism from the accounts given of household baptisms.

To demonstrate infant baptism from household baptisms, my friend must adopt and defend the two following syllogisms:

First: All households have infants in them. The apostles baptized some households; therefore the apostles baptized infants.

Now observe, if the major premise be not true, that *all* households have infants in them, households might have been baptized, and yet no infants baptized. The minor premise is true, that the apostles baptized some households; but it does not follow, since the major premise is known to be false, that infants were baptized. The major premise must be true, and the minor must be true, else the conclusion sought to be arrived at does not follow. Yet that conclusion is precisely what my friend is compelled to prove, or what he has undertaken to prove.

His statement is that infant baptism is authorized by the word of God. This will require another syllogism, growing out of the pre-

vious one, viz.: If the apostles baptized any infants, then infant baptism is authorized by the word of God. The apostles did baptize some infants; therefore infant baptism is authorized by the word of God. The minor premise states that they did baptize some infants; and the conclusion is that, therefore, infant baptism is authorized by the word of God. But in order to reach this conclusion, it must be shown that there are infants in all households, which we know is not true. If there were infants in all households, then by proving that the apostles baptized households, it would follow that they baptized infants; but since we know that there are households with no infants in them, it does not follow that the apostles baptized infants from the fact that they baptized households.

One of my brethren, from Illinois, states that he has baptized three households of jailers in which there were no infants. Another brother tells us that he has baptized as many as ten households, and yet he never baptized any infants. It does not follow that because the apostles baptized some households, therefore they baptized infants; nor has my friend proved any thing of the kind from the word of God, yet that is the very thing he promised to do in this controversy.

In regard to the credibility of the latter part of Mark, Professor Stowe, who is high authority in this country, as my friend knows, gives credence to it. Alford, from whom my friend read, says more than he read. His inference is that it is an "*authentic fragment.*" He says:

"The *inference* is that it is an *authentic fragment*, placed in very early times as a completion to our Gospel, which, for some unknown reason, had been left unfinished. This verse agrees with John xx, —, but is unconnected with the former part of the chapter."—Note, "Alford's Greek Testament," p. 139.

My friend says that Justin Martyr does not mention it; Scholz says he does.

Again, my friend says that President Milligan holds that the Jewish covenant was identical with the Christian covenant—at least this was the impression his words made on my mind. I have not read one word from President Milligan since my friend read the passage; but I venture to state that President Milligan does not believe and does not say that the Christian, or new covenant, is identical with the Sinaitic covenant. He does teach and believe, and so do I, that the promise made to Abraham, which was a covenant with Abraham, but with nobody else, except those with whom it was renewed, was de-

veloped and fulfilled in the new covenant, the Christian covenant, through our Lord Jesus Christ.

I now proceed to answer another matter which my friend presented. He asks me if I believe a man is a disciple before he is baptized. I answer, yes; for Matthew tells us, the *disciples* were to be baptized. Go, disciple the nations, baptizing *them*, the disciples. This is the sense of the passage, as I profoundly believe. A man, therefore, is a disciple, in the sense in which Matthew used that term, before he is baptized. May not a man be a disciple before he knows much? Does it require that a man must be *perfectly* instructed in order to be a disciple? The very reverse is the case. A disciple, in plain English, is a pupil or learner in a school. According to Mark, in order to be baptized, persons were to have the gospel preached to them; and so far and fully preached that they were to believe it, and *then* they were to be baptized. When a man has the gospel preached to him, and he believes it and resolves to obey it, he is already a disciple; though I admit he may not be *fully* disciplined, disciple meaning simply a learner, according to the commission.

My friend presents another difficulty. He asks: If "*matheteuo*" means to *teach*, why, in the same passage, do we have *didasko*, which means to teach also? I answer, to *disciple* means more particularly to teach the elements or first principles, in order to introduce a person into a *state* of discipleship. The former signifies the elementary instruction necessary to discipleship; whereas *didasko*, the latter, means to go forward and teach the *disciples*, who have been so far instructed as to be initiated into the school of Christ. *This is the fact as Matthew presented it: "Go, disciple the nations,"* etc.

My friend said in the closing part of his remarkable speech, that in his next speech he would go further in his historical argument. He commenced with Augustine and passed along up toward the apostles' day, quoting from Justin Martyr, from Irenæus, from Tertullian, from Origen, and from the Council of Carthage, 252 A. D. I am glad that he took up the historical argument, but I think, for his own sake, he has gone too far with it, as we will find when we examine these matters more particularly. The very moment he passed the third century, he went beyond the point where infant baptism is mentioned, or even alluded to. He can not find, in all the annals of history, a single mention of infant baptism before the commencement of the third century, *not one*. If he can, I know he will find it, but he has not, as

yet, and he can not; and he is not to be blamed by his brethren if he does not find an example or an allusion to it.

I propose now to read a few words on the subject of "*mathetewo*," in regard to discipleship. Archbishop Kendrick (Roman Catholic), says :

"Rosenmüller, '*in loco*,' contends that *μαθητewωρε* (*matheteusate*), which means to *make disciples*, may be understood of taking into the number of followers of Christ, infants, who are afterward to be instructed. I do not, however, choose to rely on this verbal criticism, as the most obvious meaning of the term is to instruct effectually, so as to bring over to the number of disciples and believers those who were strangers to the truth. It is used of a scribe thoroughly instructed in heavenly truth, *μαθητευθεις* (*matheteutheis*), Matt. xiii: 52, and of Joseph of Arimathea, who was instructed by our Divine Master, and believed in him, Matt. xxvii: 57. Protestant writers have been led to forced explanations of words of Scripture, to sustain the principle that all things necessary for salvation can be proved from it."—"Kendrick on Baptism," page 128.

Further on he says :

"Without the aid of tradition, the practice of baptizing infants can not be satisfactorily vindicated, the scriptural proofs on this point not being thoroughly conclusive; yet we do not, on this account, neglect the arguments which it furnishes, and which have considerable force."

You see, this Catholic writer did not think it was necessary to find Scripture authority for every thing he practiced; but Protestants make this mistake; for they try to find in Scripture authority for infant baptism, which this distinguished author says they can not find.

I propose now, if my audience will hear me a little, to take up the historical argument in regular order. I will be as brief as possible. First, I will dispose of some irrelevant matter. I commence, as my friend did, with Augustine, in the forepart of the fifth century, and pass, as he did, along up toward the apostolic day.

I grant you that in the age of Augustine infant baptism was common. Let there be no controversy here. Augustine, I concede, was a mighty man, and a mighty friend of infant baptism. I also grant that he was a very *desperate* and a very *wicked man*. My friend, I think, will not deny that; if he does, I ask him to read what Dr. Robinson says upon the subject, and he will not deny it then. I pass to Pelagius, who believed in infant baptism. From him I pass without any remark, till I come to Carthage in Africa, 252 A. D., where I find a council of sixty-six bishops sitting in consultation on the

question, whether infants ought to be baptized before they were eight days old or not; and the answer was, they ought. Infant baptism was there. Let my friend put his finger upon that. That is where he finds infant baptism, in the darkest hole and corner of this earth; in a city, where, *at that time*, the people, generally, were idolaters; where they burned infants on their altars; and where, at the time, the smoke of their torments was going up at that very place. They brought in the little ones from the country for sacrifice, just as we send cattle to our markets.

But, says my friend, before that, Origen, 220 to 240 years after Christ, mentions infant baptism. What does he say about it? Our opponents had better be a little careful about what they say in regard to Origen's testimony. In the fifth century there was a blaze of light on the subject of infant baptism. There was a little of it in Carthage, 252 A. D.; but go a little further toward the apostles, and inquire of Origen, who speaks on this subject; what does he say? I mean to investigate that question. I read from Neander, the great German historian, who, though Mr. D. says he was prejudiced against Tertullian, was not against Origen. He says:

"In the Alexandrian church also, which, in respect to its whole theological and dogmatical direction of mind was so essentially distinguished from the church of North Africa, we find prevailing, even at a somewhat earlier period, the doctrine of the necessity of infant baptism. Origen, in whose system infant baptism could readily find its place, though not in the same connection as in the system of the North African church, declares it to be an apostolical tradition; an expression, by the way, which can not be regarded as of much weight in this age, when the inclination was so strong to trace every institution which was considered of special importance, to the apostles; and when so many walls of separation, hindering the freedom of prospect, had already been set up between this and the apostolic age."—Neander's History, page 314, vol. 1.

Here Origen tells us that there was an apostolic *tradition*. For what? To give baptism to somebody. To whom? Does my friend *know* that it was to infants, and that it was from the apostles? Origen does not say so; he says there was a *tradition* that something, to that effect, was taught among the people; but does he say it was from the apostles? But if there was conclusive evidence that Origen *believed* that the *tradition* was from the apostles; the question still is: to whom should baptism be given, even according to Origen? To infants? The record does not say so. Origen's language, translated into Latin by Rufinus, is this:

"Pro hoc et ecclesia ab apostolis traditionem suscepit, etiam parvulis baptismum dare."—Wall's "History of Infant Baptism," vol. i, p. 66.

Which I translate: "For this, also, the church received a *tradition* from the apostles, even to give baptism to *parvulis*." Who are they? Infants? I admit that Wall translates the word, infants. Pedobaptists strain the passage to mean infants, but it does not necessarily; it means young persons. The word *infantes* even, does not necessarily mean infants, in our sense of the term. In fact we ourselves use the word *infant* in the sense of any one who is a minor. When I receive a license to unite certain persons in marriage, the young lady, for instance, who may be seventeen years of age, is yet termed an "infant," and has to obtain the consent of her parent. The word is constantly used in that sense, and may possibly be so taken in the passage referred to.

Origen says it is a *tradition* that the church had received. What does that mean? Whenever my friend bangs his cause upon a mere tradition—that dangerous thing upon which the man of sin, the son of perdition, has built up the most gigantic oppression and ruin the world ever saw—whenever he does that, he is "a gone man," and his cause is gone. I object, wholly, to building upon such evidence. He is bound by the terms of our proposition to bring evidence, not from *tradition*, but from the Word of God; and, if he goes to historians, he must cite them only so far as their statements throw light on the teachings of *the Bible*, and tradition is not worth a farthing in this respect. My friend says there were a great many other traditions and perversions of the truth practiced in those days. That is just what I believe. Infant immersion was practiced only a little after those days, and we have also baptismal regeneration, which I do not accept; neither does my opponent. Then, we have "anointing with oil;" exorcism, or the casting out of devils from persons before they were baptized, consecration of baptismal water, etc. There was no noise or controversy over these things. Then there was the imposition of hands; the insufflation or breathing, in imitation of the Savior's breathing upon the apostles; and anointing the eyes with clay, giving honey and milk, the application of salt to the tongue, covering and uncovering the head, and various other things unknown to apostolic practice, and without divine authority. When we consider these and other gross errors which existed from Tertullian's time down to the time of Augustine and

after, I can very well see how infant baptism could become common without much opposition.

I wish to call your attention to what Irenæus says. I will examine what Tertullian says in my next speech. Irenæus lived and wrote about 190 A. D. I read from Neander, vol. i, 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 apostolical *tradition*, seems to confirm this hypothesis. Irenæus is the first church teacher in whom we find any allusion to infant baptism, and in his mode of expressing himself on the subject, he leads us at the same time to recognize its connection with the essence of the Christian consciousness; he testifies of the profound Christian idea out of which infant baptism arose, and which procured for it at length universal recognition. Irenæus is wishing to show that Christ did not interrupt the progressive development of that human nature which was to be sanctified by him, but sanctified it in accordance with its natural course of development in all its several stages. ‘He came to redeem all by himself; all who, through him, are regenerated to God; infants, little children, boys, young men, and old.’ Hence, he passed through every age, and for the infants he became an infant, sanctifying infants; among the little children he became a little child, sanctifying those who belong to this age, and at the same time presenting to them an example of piety, of well-doing, and of obedience; among the young men he became a young man, that he might set them an example and sanctify them to the Lord.”

Now, this Neander was a Pedobaptist. No man was better acquainted with the whole range of church history than was he, yet see what his testimony is.

Irenæus says that Christ must pass through every age. He was an infant, he was a little one, he was a young man, he was a grown man. He passed through all the conditions and stages of human life, giving, in each one of them, an example of what a person ought to be in such a stage of life. Then he says, *in this way*, those persons, according to their situations, positions, or ages, were sanctified or regenerated to God. There is not a word in this testimony about *baptism* having any connection with regeneration to God.

MR. DITZLER'S TENTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

In my brother's criticism on μαθητεύω (*matheteuo*), he makes me go into some strange contradictions—a thing I never do. Stier and Alford, and others, I have read. Koenael, Olshausen, Stier, Lange, Nitzsch, and Alford, the most learned and renowned commentators of the world, agree that the two participles, βαπτίζοντες (*baptidzontes*) and διδάσκοντες (*didaskontes*)—"by baptism and teaching"—are constituents of the μαθητεύειν (*matheteuein*)—make disciples. Hence, they made disciples, baptizing and teaching—the baptizing being the commencing, teaching the continuance afterward. Olshausen declares the teaching never preceded the baptizing; and Lange agrees with him, save as far as (λερύσσειν) heralding or preaching went—announcing Christ. But it never occurred (μαθητεύειν) in the sense of (διδάσκειν) teach. They completely refute the untenable theory of Grotius.

1. If it be insisted Mark xvi: 15 excludes infants, then it excludes them from heaven.

2. We repeat: a man can not be, from his own teaching, a μαθητής, a disciple, as used by Christ after his resurrection, who was not baptized, though he is forced to say he can. It ruins him on "baptisma for remission."

3. It is used by Justin Martyr for baptism, "Many of us, . . . who (εμαθητευθησαν) were *discipled* to Christ from childhood." All the learning is against my brother. "Go, disciple all nations by baptizing and teaching them," etc. So Mr. Campbell's rule demands, also. Hence, Koenael says: "μαθητεύειν is not to teach (*edocere*); for μαθητεύειν particularly distinguishes from διδάσκειν (*teach*), v. 20; and those who were received into the community of the Christians—the Christian Church (*in cœtum, church*)—were afterward more particularly instructed (Acts ii: 41; iv: 4); but it *always* (*omnino notat*) means to make disciples, to receive them into the church (see Matt. xiii:

52)—*how?* This the following words teach, ‘*baptizing them.*’”—Latin Commentary, tomus i, in loc.

He says he has a brother in Illinois who has baptized a number of households, yet never baptized any infant. That may be; but that brother in Illinois was a very different specimen of a preacher from the apostles. They have decided rules in their church that *forbid* a minister to baptize an infant; but they can not show any such restriction in the apostolic days.

I was astonished at my good brother on another question, which I will bring up in time; but before I do that, I wish to read, lest it slip my mind, an extract from Wall, since his brethren have published it in their speeches that he admitted that infant baptism was not authorized in the Word of God. Mind, I do not bring this up as an accusation against my good brother, but I have heard his brethren reiterate it over and again. In vol. ii, p. 466, 467, Wall severely rebukes Gale and others who misquoted and falsify his language. He charges that, in accusing him of admitting infant baptism was not taught in the Scriptures, they set up against him “the falsest accusations and most abominable calumnies,” as the work of “lewd or slanderous pen;” “viz.: that I ‘freely allow that it can not be made to appear from the Scriptures, that infants are to be baptized.’” Gale says, p. 145: “You may be pleased to observe his (Wall’s) *concession*,” etc. 144: “In short, to grant that infant baptism can not be proved from Scripture.” 147: “For if infant baptism can not be found in Scripture, as he *confesses*.” Wall quotes these (vol. ii: 467), and calls them “slander;” refutes them in detail, and adds: “If I had said any such thing as these accusations amount to, I ought to take shame to myself. But if all this be *notoriously false*, etc., I have been forced, by this *foul* and importunate cavil, to look over those places of my own book, where I do enforce the proof of infant baptism from several texts of Scripture.” His argument was, *that* argument had been exhausted on both sides—be wrote from a *historic* stand-point. P. 469, he shows he had written a separate book on infant baptism, “wherein I insist chiefly and almost only on *Scripture proof*.” So of Moses Stuart, as I could quote.

I could read you many more such passages, to show you how Dr. Wall regarded this matter. I do not apply this to my brother; but that is the way Wall and M. Stuart are quoted; and as our debate is to be published, I want the truth to appear. Remember that my brother

does not make the charge. But his brethren, and the immersionists generally, have done so constantly, thus utterly misrepresenting him.

I turn again to the historical agreement. My brother thinks that the word *parvulus*, in the Latin translation from the Greek of Origen, does not apply to infants, but to well-grown persons. Now, it is the diminutive of *parvus*. Andrew's "Latin Lexicon," a great standard, says of it: "Little, small, petty." Freund says: "Little, small, puny—of tender years—little children." Now, *parvulus* means still less than *parvus*. Andrew thus defines *parvulus*: "Very small, little—a *parvulus*—from their infancy." Freund's "Leverett": "Very small; very little, petty, tiny; a *parvula* state; from their infancy; an infant." These are the highest authorities in Latin Lexicography, as he will admit.

Then I showed that it applied to infants only one, two, and three days old; that *parvuli* were named as only a day old in Origen and the Fathers; and yet he would make the impression upon your mind that it did not apply to infants, but to persons about *eighteen years* old, or thereabouts. I will turn to Tertullian again, and read of "sponsors" acting for them: They knew not Christ, had yet to grow up; could not yet learn; "let them come when they can learn, when they can be taught, when they can know." Why are they thus spoken of if *responsible*? If they were several years old, it aids not his case. They are too young to know, to learn, to act for themselves, to believe, to come, are represented by the babes brought to Christ in their mothers' arms. A. Campbell would not risk his reputation in denying they were infants.

That *parvulus* may be applied to older persons than infants we do not deny. But these writers were using that word in its strictest, general, and *well-known historic sense*. For there were other words to represent young men and women; and those authors would have used them, had they meant persons other than infants. Campbell's "Christian Baptism," pp. 269 and 355: "Tertullian is the first of the Latin writers who, early in the third century, mentions *infant baptism*. He does, indeed, name it; but I have long since said, and no one has yet presumed to refute it, that he opposes it as an innovation." Again: "Tertullian, the first who mentions *infant baptism*."—269. That is Alexander Campbell's assertion. He admits it was practiced in Tertullian's age, but he says nothing about "innovation." Tertullian lived contemporary with Origen, though born earlier. Origen wrote of *infant baptism* as universally received,

A. D. 215—twenty-five years after Tertullian wrote, but while he yet lived. It could not have come in then, or he would have sprung all his followers against it as an innovation. He declared it apostolic, and met not a single opponent; and Tertullian never opposed it as unapostolic or as an innovation, but as an existing fact to be met as contrary to his views of religion. I might quote several other passages, in order to show that he never questioned the fact; nor has any other Baptist writer, until Mr. Robinson volunteered to do it. Let us see whether or not Tertullian referred to persons eighteen or twenty years old as infants. He says: "Therefore, according to every one's condition and disposition, and also their age, the delay of baptism is the 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 promises by death, or they may be mistaken by a child's proving of a wicked disposition. . . . Therefore, let them come when they are grown up; when they understand; when they are instructed whither it is that they come; when they can know Christ. What need their guiltless age," etc.—Wall, i, 58.

Now, examine this language, and see if it applies to sponsors required by the church for persons *eighteen years old!* Look at it! The gentleman is driven to such an extremity that he is compelled to deny that this language is applied to little children. Would Tertullian have opposed the baptism of eighteen-year old people on the score of the *innocent age* needing no remission? Has not the disposition been indicated at *eighteen*? Can not eighteen-year old people be instructed? Can they not learn? Can they not know Christ? Is it great haste for persons eighteen years old to come to seek remission of sins? You see the terrible straits of my brother. He wants you to believe that Tertullian is speaking of persons eighteen years old volunteering to receive baptism. Now, would my brother baptize a person who did not understand these matters? Tertullian's argument is that they know nothing of these matters, and therefore they must wait until they grow up. Then he says, "Let them come."

Carthage, he and their people especially would make you believe, was the seat of debauchery, and the council there composed of "ignorant negroes," as some have told. He surely knows that Carthage was settled in the eighth century before Christ by the Phœnicians, the most intellectual and enterprising people in the world. Sesostris, Amasis, Mnevis, and Hannibal were among the mightiest intellects

of the world. Egypt was the cradle of sciences and earlier civilization. The women of Carthage, whose long hair swept almost to the ground, gave their hair to their warriors for bow-strings when besieged. Do you often now see our African ladies sweeping the streets with their long, straight hair? Desperate must be the cause that resorts to such subterfuges.

In Irenæus's works, book iii, it is said, "And again, giving to the disciples the power of regeneration into God, *την δυνάμιν τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως εἰς θεόν*, he said to them, 'Go, and teach all nations, baptizing them,' etc., p. 334. B. i, chap. xxi: "They [heretics] maintain that they . . . must of necessity be *regenerated* into that power . . . since this [regeneration] it is which leads them down into the depths of Bythus: *For the baptism instituted,*" etc. He goes on to interchange baptism and regeneration over and again.

I read this to show you the sense in which they used the term regeneration. Alexander Campbell, in speaking upon this question, says, in his *Harbinger*, "*Regeneration and immersion are, therefore, two names for the same thing.*" I have already quoted it all, where he states that all the fathers of note for four hundred years always used regeneration for baptism, and meant baptism when they said regeneration. Now, here Mr. Campbell declares that the act of immersion they called regeneration. Then Irenæus himself shows that in all those ages they used the term in the sense of baptism.

The interpretation my brother gives is simply worth nothing, and I do not want to lose time in further arguing that point. We have ample testimony to the fact that infants were baptized as well as others. They all believed that infants were depraved, as their writings show, and he will not question it. They believed that baptism was regeneration in the sense of washing away original sin; that infants were depraved by original sin, and could not be saved without this washing away of that sin; and, therefore, they baptized infants that they might be saved. Now, the apostolic fathers speak in this manner, and refer to the baptism of infants. I quoted Hermas, "For all infants are honorable with the Lord, and esteemed first of all." He calls the church a "tower built on the water," "because . . . ye shall be saved by water." To be saved, they had to "be sealed"—"that seal is water" baptism. Clemens Romanus, in the apostolic age, quotes Septuagint Greek of Job xiv: 4, "No one is free from pollution; no, not though his life be but . . . a day." So they all believed in Hermas' day, and that baptism alone took it away.

The fathers, I say, believed this, though there were some departures from the rule. Justin Martyr, who flourished about 140, taught that infants were guilty of original sin; that in baptism people were regenerated from original sin. They also held that baptism was in the place of circumcision, though Mr. A. Campbell says that "hundreds of years passed away before any one thought of making baptism a substitute for infant circumcision." Justin Martyr, born in the apostolic day, Cyprian, and the fathers generally, held that baptism was in the room of circumcision. In the famous Council of Carthage, 253, they name it also, and it was so held by all the bishops there. That the apostles practiced infant circumcision *all their lives*, until A. D. 100, is fully stated by A. Campbell, "Debate with Rice," 413, and "Chr. Baptism," 335. He says: "Circumcision never was done away by any apostolic word or action. *The Jews practiced both circumcision and baptism in their families during the apostolic age.*" (Italics all his.) He refers to Acts xxi for proof. Again: "The believing Jews, down to the end of the New Testament history, circumcised their children."—"Chr. Bap." 335. Now, circumcision was the full recognition of infant membership always.

Now, as the apostles, 1st, recognized infant circumcision and practiced it all their lives, and all the Christian Jews, that was recognizing them as in the church of which they were ministers. 2d. *We all agree*, membership necessitates baptism, whether, as some held, it be to initiate them, or as an outward *recognition* of their God-given membership, as others hold. 3d. No Jew ever made an objection that the Christians failed to recognize this custom and usage, which was as old as religion. 4th. The Jews practiced proselyte infant baptism for centuries before Christ. Christianity was *the grandest* of all proselytism, proposing to proselyte the *whole* world. Infant baptism was always the main feature in such an extension of the religion in which the apostles were reared. Had they changed their views and practices, records would have been given.

But, to return to the earlier fathers: they held that the one superseded the other, which shows that they held circumcision to be a recognition of membership. Indeed, no one doubts or questions this fact. They all held to infant depravity, save a few of later years. Therefore, though Justin Martyr did not name infant baptism, we have it beyond contradiction that the fathers practiced infant baptism. But my friend argues that Origen did not mean infants. What could he mean by such language? Why speak in the manner he does in

various places of their having such an apostolic precept or tradition given unto them? Would he gravely declare over and again that there was such precept unwritten to give baptism to *adults*? Did even Tertullian or any one doubt that they had the clearest possible command written—the commission—to baptize grown people? What silly, ridiculous writers you make these great scholars and philosophers to be by such assumptions! No historian or scholar has ever doubted the meaning of Origen.

Origen says infants are depraved, if but a day old, and if but a day old they, therefore, needed baptism. He uses the word *parvulus*, which settles the use and meaning of this word, *parvulus*. Origen argues infant depravity, and urges in that connection infant baptism, using the same word, *parvulus*. What a way my friend has of turning things about. Now, where is his temperance society? He tells us the kingdom was not established until the day of Pentecost, and yet the Scriptures tell us that men were pressing into the kingdom years before that time. He says men's sins were not pardoned, but laid over until the organization of the kingdom. Thus they have to mystify the eternal principles and simplest truths of the Bible in order to get infants out of the church, and assume a position, as I have already told you, that sends them all to perdition. Mr. Campbell says, "To be out of him [Christ] is to be unpardoned, unreconciled, and an alien from the family of God, lost in trespasses and sins."—Harb., Extra, 9. In a word, Mr. Campbell taught that to be out of Christ, was to be damned, and he contends that only by Christian baptism can a person be in Christ. The apostles never received Christian baptism; therefore, the apostles were damned. But my brother says they were *charter members* of this society, and were, therefore, saved. So we are to suppose Peter, John, James, and Matthew are to be *charter members*. Peter, holding the keys to a kingdom to which he has no admission, says, I am a charter member, I do not have to undergo Christian baptism, the only means by which a man can enter the kingdom, and so passes through that way. My brethren are chartered members, also, *chartered and checked* all the way through. That's a beautiful idea of religion. Well, why can not the infants be chartered members also? My brother believes a little in logic, sometimes. He would be a logician, and give us syllogisms, and I will now propose a syllogism to show the absurdity of his. All innovations in the Christian Church were marked so that we know every one of them; infant baptism is nowhere in all history marked, as an

innovation; therefore, infant baptism never was an innovation, and is, therefore, apostolic. Again, whoever is admitted into the kingdom or church of heaven is certainly a worthy object to be admitted into the church on earth. Infants are admitted into the kingdom of heaven, therefore they should be recognized in the kingdom on earth. The truth is, the New Testament never speaks of any body as belonging to the kingdom of heaven except those who belong to the New Testament church on earth. This is the broad doctrine of the New Testament. We find no exception of infants in the church on earth. For in the last day, when all who are in heaven may be supposed to be assembled before God, there will not be one there who had not been a member of his church on earth, and the assembly in heaven will prove to be co-equal with the entire church on earth. That is the true Bible view of the whole subject.

Now remember the historical argument I have read before you. I have traced infant baptism down to the apostolic age, even supposing that Justin Martyr and Hermes do not refer to it. Irenæus was born within thirty years of John the Apostle. He was converted under Polycarp, who was acquainted with John, and those records of the apostolic age which show the practice of infant baptism. We have the testimony of the church down to the sixteenth century, and there was but one voice raised against it. For sixteen hundred years Tertullian alone spoke against infant baptism, which proves its existence in his day. Nothing can be adduced to show that it was an innovation; and the manner of the opposition proves that it was universal in the church. If it had come in as an innovation, he would have known it, and spoken of it; for he goes back within sixty years of the apostles—born within forty years of them—when it was universal in the church, as the record unquestionably shows.

MR. WILKES' TENTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I wish to notice a matter that was referred to in the last speech, and which was mentioned in previous speeches.

My friend insists that the discipling, in the commission by Matthew, and the baptizing, are the same thing. I propose to call your attention to a passage of Scripture where a *distinction* is expressly made between these two things. In John iv: 1, it is said "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, though he baptized not himself, but his disciples."

The point I make is this: that "Jesus made and baptized more disciples," etc., shows that the *making* and *baptizing* of a disciple are to be considered as different things.

On this passage I desire to call your attention to a rule which I presented. I mentioned, this morning, that a pronoun sometimes does not refer strictly to the noun which appears to be its antecedent. That is the case in this passage (Matt. xxviii: 19). The pronoun is in the masculine, and the noun to which it refers is neuter; the pronoun, therefore, does not refer strictly to the noun, but to the *sense of the passage*. On this subject I have the very highest authority that can be produced. I quote from "Winer's Grammar of the New Testament," Section 24, page 141:

"It is a peculiarity common to the pronouns, whether personal, demonstrative, or relative, that they not unfrequently take a different gender from that of the nouns to which they refer, regard being had to the *meaning* of the nouns, not to their grammatical sex. This is called *constructio ad sensum*, the *meaning*, and not the grammatical gender of the word, being mainly considered. It is used particularly when some animate object is denoted by a neuter or an abstract feminine noun. The pronoun is then made to agree grammatically with the object in question."

And then Winer proceeds to give us the passage in Matthew xxviii: 19, as a case in point, under his rule.

Again, my friend says I mentioned that some of my brethren had baptized households, but no infants; "but," said he, "they have rules in their church which restrict them from the baptism of infants." What was my point? Was that it? By no means. My point was this—and I made it so clear that this audience did not misunderstand me—that households might be baptized without baptizing infants; and I produced cases that demonstrated it; and I have brethren, all around me here, who have had instances of this in their own ministrations. Now, it is said that the apostles baptized households, and my friend infers that they baptized infants. I gave nine instances where households were baptized, but no infants; and, therefore, the fact that the apostles baptized households does not prove that they baptized infants. His case, therefore, is not made out from the Scriptures, from the instances given of household baptisms. I wish, now, with a little particularity, to take up my friend's historical argument. He referred to Origen's account of infant baptism, as he thinks. I state, first, that Origen does not use the word for *infant*, but the word for *little persons*; and Irenæus, who wrote just before Origen, clearly makes a distinction between infants and little ones. In the very passage quoted by my friend, upon which he commented, and by which he thinks he can prove infant baptism, Irenæus makes a distinction between *infantes* and *parvuli*. Between the two he let us know that the word Origen used, which is supposed to signify infants, is not the word he himself uses for infants, indicating that those who were *parvuli* were older than *infants*.

And now I have to say that the passage in Origen to which my friend refers, and from which he would prove infant baptism, is probably not genuine. As this is a question of fact, to be decided only by the best authorities, I will read from *his* favorite work, written in defense of infant baptism. Mr. D. quoted from "Origen's Commentaries on Romans," Lib. v, C. 9 (see Wall, vol. i, p. 66) as follows: "For this also it was, that the church had from the apostles a tradition [or order] to give baptism even to infants." That this is from the translation of Rufinus, see Wall, vol. i, p. 67. "Of these which I have brought, the homilies on St. Luke were translated by St. Jerome; but those on Leviticus, and the comments on the epistle to the Romans, by Rufinus." That the translations of Rufinus are not reliable is evident from the following, on same page:

‘ For, whereas Origen’s books contained in them several expressions not consistent with the faith in some points, St. Jerome changed nothing, but expressed every thing as it was in the original, as he owns himself; but Rufinus altered or left out any thing that he thought not orthodox; and in the homilies on Leviticus, he himself says that he took a greater liberty than ordinary. All the world since have approved the method of St. Jerome and blamed that of Rufinus; for it is fit for a translator to give a true account of what his translator says, be it good or bad; whereas now, in these translations of Rufinus, the reader is uncertain (as Erasmus angrily says) whether he read Origen or Rufinus.’

So we see, from this authority, which is probably the highest that could be brought on this point, that it is doubtful whether Origen was the author of the language or not, or whether it was not some perversion of Rufinus.

Besides, if it should be genuine, if it must be accepted, it is no proof of infant baptism; or, if proving that infants were baptized at that time, it is still not according to the word of God. Admitting it to be genuine, I say it is no proof that *infants* were baptized at that time, Origen not using the word according to that which Rufinus gives us, meaning infants, but the word for small or little persons.

I now call your attention to what Tertullian says, and as my friend has made all the points on it, I shall be saved reading it. He uses *parvuli*, the word for *little persons* also. He does not so employ the word as necessarily to mean infants, but he frequently applies it to persons very far grown. I said that we sometimes apply the term “infant” to persons nearly eighteen years of age. Tertullian uses *parvuli* (*little persons*), sometimes in this sense, and was strongly opposed to baptizing very small persons. But was he opposed to *infant* baptism in our sense of the term? Whether true or false, one thing is certain, it can not be *proved* that he ever considered the question; and, if not, his testimony is worth nothing on *our* question.

“But,” says my friend, “he referred to infants.” He uses the expression “innocent age;” uses the term “*sponsor*,” and he speaks of their “growing up,” and of their “learning;” “let them come when they learn;” he speaks of their coming “to know Christ, and then let them come.” From these expressions my friend infers that *infant* baptism was the thing that he opposed.

I answer: there is no proof in all this. There is proof that Tertullian was opposed to certain persons being baptized at that time, on account of their being too young; they were innocent, and ought to wait till they were grown larger; they should wait till they could

know Christ; till they could understand the reason why they came; till they could learn to appreciate, according to a very plain principle recognized every-where, the blessings they were thus seeking; till they were capable of knowing Christ, and of understanding the value of the salvation they sought; for, as my friend said, they all recognized the fact that baptism was for the remission of sins.

But my friend says "they had *sponsors*." They had. But I would like to know whether, to save trouble, my friend will not just concede the fact to be a fact, that there were sponsors then for persons, as long as they were *minors*, answering for them in all transactions? Does he not know that? I have told him that before, in our discussions. Robinson gives us an account of sponsors who answered for little boys seven years of age. He refers also to the writings and time of Tertullian as identical with the time when boys of seven years of age had sponsors. I give it as my opinion that that is the kind of persons Tertullian is talking about. I have occasionally met with just such cases, where one thinks the person ought to be baptized, and another thinks the little boy or girl is too young, too innocent; that it does not know Christ, is not prepared to understand the step about to be taken.

A great man like Tertullian opposes their baptism. It is not, then, conclusively demonstrated that Tertullian was talking about *infant* baptism. I do not think he was. Some persons on my side of the question think he was, but it is not *proven*, and till it is, Tertullian's testimony does not avail here.

My friend says that Tertullian not only opposed infant baptism, as he understands it, but he opposed the baptism of unmarried persons and widows. But he does not represent the case correctly, or, I should say, he does not represent it fully, and therefore not fairly. Tertullian did not oppose the baptism of young persons, as such, nor did he oppose the baptism of widows, as such; but of young persons, widows, and others, who were supposed to be incapable of being *faithful*. It was upon that ground, and upon no other, that he opposed their baptism, and the history, if my friend had read on a little further in the same connection, tells him so.

I come now to the passage from Irenæus, upon which my friend particularly relies. Irenæus, he thinks, speaks of infant baptism. I think he does not. Irenæus mentions the infant, but he does not mention baptism; he says not one word about it. Any passage, whether in or out of the Bible, that may be fairly quoted in support

of infant baptism, must contain the idea of infants, and of baptism as well, and these two terms must be so combined as to express the idea of infant baptism; but Irenæus does not say any thing at all about baptism, as connected with infants. I have in my hand a work by Lyman Coleman, a distinguished Presbyterian, in which he refers to the very passage quoted by my brother, and he gives his opinion respecting it as follows:

"This testimony he has given obscurely in one vexed passage, which has been a thousand times claimed and rejected by men of equal learning and research. It runs as follows: 'He represents Christ as sanctifying every several age by the likeness it has to himself, for he came to save all;' all who by him are reborn of God, infants and little ones, and children and youths, and persons of mature age; therefore, he passed through these several ages. For infants he was made an infant, sanctifying infants; for little ones, he became a little one, sanctifying thereby those of that age, and, also, being to them an example of goodness, holiness, and dutifulness."—"Ancient Christianity Exemplified," by Lyman Coleman, p. 384.

He not only tells us that HE sanctified and regenerated every several age, by passing through every age; but he tells us that he became a little one, and *thereby*, sanctified little ones; and thus he explains the *way* in which he brought his influence to bear upon every age.

So far from this passage proving any thing in regard to baptism, it is expressly stated *how* he influenced every age, namely, *by his passing through that age*, and by his being an example to those of that age.

I could read you to the same effect from Wall and others. But this passage, I say, is not genuine, either. As proof of this, I will read from Dr. Wall's "History of Infant Baptism," vol. ii, p. 297:

"But, to give this passage the weight they pretend it has, they ought to have proved that St. Irenæus does certainly say thus, which is very doubtful, upon two accounts. 1. It is questioned whether the passage be genuine, or, rather, it seems to be undeniably spurious. Cardinal Baronius observed this above one hundred years ago; and, I think, the reasons he gives have never been answered yet.

"He notes that the latter part of the chapter, from whence the words are taken, contradicts the beginning; for to say Christ was baptized at about thirty, and to enumerate three passovers after that, in the last of which he suffered, is as plain an argument that Christ suffered about thirty-three, as can be desired; and yet, in the latter part of the same chapter, it is pretended Christ lived till

above fifty. If St. Irenæus was guilty of so palpable a contradiction, he must have been strangely inconsiderate, and not to be trusted in any case; and then his testimony, though ever so full, is justly condemned. But since both sides agree the holy father could not fall into so gross a blunder, I infer, with the cardinal, the latter part of this chapter is not his."

Thus we are told that the passage is held to be spurious. Dr. Coleman suggests the same thing; he says it is an obscure passage, and claims nothing from it. He, the strongest kind of a Pedobaptist, occupies exactly the same position that Dr. Wall does.

My friend reads from the "Pastor" of Hermas, the date of whose writing I think he did not give us, thus: "For all infants are honorable before God, and are the first persons with him." Therefore, Mr. D. thinks, infants ought to be baptized! He sometimes laughs at logic, and I think that is a good place for the laugh to come in. Will it surprise you to find, by reading a few lines before this passage, that my friend has not only made no point in reference to baptism, but that the author he quoted was not on the subject of infants, or baptism, either? What do you think of that? But I will read from the commencement of the chapter, page 429, of the "Apostolic Fathers:"

"And they who believed from the twelfth mountain, which was white, are the following: they are as infant children, in whose hearts no evil originates; nor did they know what wickedness was, but always remained as children. Such, accordingly, without doubt, dwell in the kingdom of God, because they defiled in nothing the commandments of God; but they remained like children all the days of their life in the same mind. All of you, then, who shall remain steadfast, and be as children, without doing evil, will be more honored than all who have been previously mentioned; for all infants are honorable before God, and are the first persons with him. Blessed, then, are ye who put away wickedness from yourselves, and put on innocence. As the first of all will you live unto God."

The Savior called his own apostles children, and it is, precisely in that sense that the "Pastor" of Hermas used the words "little children." The Pastor tells his readers that little infants are honorable before God. I have no doubt of that in the world; they are pure in the sight of God, and lie under no self-condemnation. Those persons "*who believe in God are as little children.*" It is *these* of whom the Pastor asserts the things said in that passage.

Next my brother speaks of Justin Martyr. Now, Justin Martyr does not name *infants* in his remarks about baptism. He speaks

about baptism, and about being regenerated to God, but he says not a word about infants in the connection. One writer may assert something about infants, and another writer forty years afterward may say something about baptism, and from this would Mr. D. have you infer that the fathers taught infant baptism! Very far from it.

I hope I may not be deprived of the privilege of using the amount of matter I think I have a right to put into this discussion. I desire to refer now to another eminent authority. I will read from Dr. M. Stuart. On the baptism of infants, he says:

"I have only to say that I believe in both the propriety and expediency of the rite thus administered; and, therefore, accede to it *ex animo*. Commands, or plain and certain examples, in the New Testament relative to it, I do not find, nor, with my views of it, do I need them."—"Christian Baptism," by M. Stuart, p. 190.

His view, and the ground on which he supported it, did not demand any thing from the *Bible* in the shape of precept, or authority; just what he did hold as the *ground* of infant baptism I do not know, but some theory similar, it may be, to that of Henry Ward Beecher, who said that he had no authority from the *Bible* for the baptism of infants, and that he wanted none; that he had better authority for it than even if the *Bible* commanded it; "that he had tried it, and knew from actual experience that it was a good thing;" "he had the same divine authority for it that he had for making an ox-yoke—it worked well—and, therefore, it was from God." So states one of the greatest men in the land, and a Pedobaptist.

I now read from Neander's "Planting and Training," page 161: "Since baptism marked the entrance into communion with Christ, it resulted from the nature of the rite, that a confession of faith in Jesus as the Redeemer would be made by the person to be baptized; and in the latter part of the apostolic age, there are found indications of the existence of such a practice. As baptism was closely united with a conscious entrance on Christian communion, faith and baptism were always connected with one another; and thus it is in the highest degree probable that baptism was performed only in the instances where both could meet together, and that the practice of infant baptism was unknown at this period. We can not infer the existence of infant baptism from the instance of the baptism of whole families, for the passage in 1 Cor. xvi: 15, shows the fallacy of such a conclusion,

as from that it appears that the whole family of Stephanas, who were baptized by Paul, consisted of adults; that not till so late a period as (at least, *certainly* not earlier than) Irenæus, a trace of infant baptism appears; and that it first became recognized as an apostolic tradition in the course of the third century, is evidence rather *against* than *for* the admission of its apostolic origin," etc. On page 162 the author says: "And if we wish to ascertain from whom such an institution originated, we should say, certainly not immediately from Christ himself." And on page 163 he says: "Could it, then, have been Paul who first, among heathen Christians, introduced this alteration by the use of baptism? But this would agree least of all with the peculiar Christian characteristics of this apostle."

There is the testimony of a Pedobaptist. Let me now call your attention to the testimony of the distinguished Dr. Knapp, in his "Lectures on Christian Theology," page 494:

"There is, therefore, no express command for infant baptism found in the New Testament, as Morris (p. 215, s. 12) justly concedes. Infant baptism has been often defended on very unsatisfactory *à priori* grounds—*e. g.*, the necessity of it has been contended for, in order that children may obtain by it the faith which is necessary to salvation, etc. It is sufficient to show (1) That infant baptism was not forbidden by Christ, and is not opposed to his will and the principles of his religion, but entirely suited to both; (2) That it was *probably* practiced even in the apostolic church; (3) That it is not without advantages."

It is sufficient, Dr. Knapp thinks, to show that Christ did not condemn it, but that it is in harmony with what HE preached; that is, if Christ *did not condemn it*, you may lift up your hand toward heaven and say: "I am now going to do, in the name of the Lord, a thing which the Lord Jesus Christ never mentioned in the world!" That is the kind of ground we have for infant baptism.

Another one finds the ground of his practice of infant baptism in the circumstance that Christ said and taught very many things that are not recorded in the Bible; and, "for aught we know, the authority for the practice of infant baptism may be found among the *unwritten* things Christ said and taught!"

Allow me, in conclusion, to say, that I have objections to infant baptism on several accounts.

The generic reason is, that it is not authorized by the Word of God; and I am not willing to do, in the name of God, that which God has not authorized me to do. I regard it as a sin.

In the next place, because, as there are scarcely two of the advocates

of infant baptism that rest their case upon the same ground, it shows that there is not a settled conviction in their minds as to the authority for it. One clings to this, and another to that, and the same man sometimes to this and then to that, and that what is supposed to be valid now is cast by the board at another time.

The following are some of the grounds upon which infant baptism is argued: Identity in the churches or covenants; baptism in the room of circumcision; it is in the commission (which I have shown is not true); it is argued from household baptisms (which my friend does not rely upon); from its utility, as Mr. Beecher teaches; from the fact that infants have original sin; that was Cyprian's view. The first one that we *know of as advocating infant baptism* was Cyprian, and he predicated it upon the ground that the infant was guilty of original sin; that all born were sinners, and that unless this sin were washed away in baptism, they would be lost. So great, indeed, was the haste to baptize an infant, lest it be damned, that it was often baptized as soon as it was born.

Again, it is contended for, because it was not forbidden, and from the olive tree, and tabernacle of David, etc.

Thus we have given ten grounds upon which sometimes one and sometimes another attempt to defend infant baptism; and these grounds are equally objected to by those who advocate infant baptism, and are set aside as improper or irrational ground for such a practice.

MR. DITZLER'S ELEVENTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen

This will be my closing speech on this proposition. My brother refers to Irenæus, and says that, by the word *parvulus* he can not mean infant. I will read Andrew's "Latin Lexicon," the work he has here for defining terms in Latin "*Infans, that can not speak; speechless, dumb, hence, a child that can not yet speak, an infant.*" Freund's "Leverett's Lat Lex" "*Infans (in and fans), that can not speak; speechless, dumb. Hence, of children that can not speak, a child that can not speak, a little child, an infant, babe*" I need not requote Irenæus' words to show you that nothing but that age could be meant by him. The next word is *parvuli*—little ones *v e*, that are little children between the age that *can not speak*, and *children* from five to eighteen years—"infants, little ones, children and youths, and older ones" But Origen, Augustine, Jerome, and the fathers generally, use *parvulus* for *infant*, because it applied to any age of infancy that could or could not speak, before they became *pueri*—children large enough to be responsible. Origen's *parvuli* were those of only *one day's* age, and on to two or three years.

Now, he makes out that these were not Origen's writings, or urges that they were included in certain of his writings which were translated by Rufinus; but, if he pleases, I will not quote from that part of the work, which, mind you, does not throw out all that Origen says upon the subject of infant baptism. The parts translated by Jerome are true copies of Origen. "Beside all this, let it be considered what is the reason that, whereas the baptism of the church is given for the forgiveness of sins, *infants*, also, are, *by the usage of the church*, baptized; when, if there were nothing in infants wanting forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them."—"Homil." in Lucam, 14. "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, by the sacrament of baptism the pollution of our birth is taken away, that infants are baptized.'—Wall, i, 65. You see from this that it was universal in the church. *Parvulus* applies to those only a day old. It is the general ecclesiastical name for real infants. But my brother would have those persons to be fifteen, or sixteen, or eighteen years old, when Origen says, "If they be *but a day old*." Tertullian uses the same word, yet my brother says he did not refer to *infants*. Tertullian and Origen were contemporaneous, Origen being born about twenty-five years before Tertullian died. Both of these authorities use *parvulus* as applying to persons only *a day old*, yet my brother says *parvulus* does not mean infant. Infant baptism was, then, universal in the church, according to Origen, who was the most learned man of his age. My brother says the word "sponsors," according to Robinson (a most unreliable and notoriously sectarian Baptist historian—*no authority at all*), occurs for minors in state, who can not act or speak for themselves until a certain age. But infants in *law*—minors, who are *infants in law*—can not speak in law—are infinitely different from infants who are so young they can not speak with their *mouths* at all, even to their mothers, etc. Of all low sophisms, that of Robinson is the most dishonest in imposing on ignorant people by such a use of terms. He knew Irenæus was not writing on civil law and minor's rights, but on religion, and here on baptism.

Again: he quotes Neander in such a way to make you believe that he figured in those days, whereas he died only a year or so ago. He is a German historian, who has no feeling in this matter. I will read what he says in vol. i, pp. 93 and 683, by which you will see he is very inconsistent with himself. As Neander's greatest gift, as a historian, was a deep discernment of character, I quote his language on Tertullian: "But an author so wanting in critical judgment can not possibly be received as a credible witness for a story which wears on its face all the marks of an untruth." Again: "His profoundness of thought was not united with logical clearness and sobriety; an ardent and unbridled imagination, moving in a world of sensuous images, governed him. His fiery and positive disposition, and his previous training as an advocate [lawyer] or rhetorician, easily impelled him, especially in controversy, to rhetorical exaggerations.

When he defends a cause, we often see in him the *advocate* [lawyer], whose *sole anxiety* is to collect together all the arguments which can *help his case*, it matters not whether they are *true* arguments or only PLAUSIBLE SOPHISMS."

Such is the character Neander gives to Tertullian; and Mosheim gives him the same; yet, in the same volume, strangely takes Tertullian's opposition to infant baptism as proof against its apostolic origin, though not hinted by the sophist at all; when *against* him, Neander admits, are arrayed the infinitely more sober and reliable Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Jerome, Augustine, Chrysostom, Pelagius, Gregory Nazianzen, and the whole body of the fathers. Neander states expressly that Irenæus testifies to infant baptism long before Tertullian opposed it. *No historian has ever denied or questioned but that Irenæus and Tertullian admit infant baptism was practiced in their day.*

Infant baptism was universal in the church in the days of Origen, who wrote in 215. Now, could infant baptism have been incorporated in the church as an innovation in the year 190, which is the true date of Tertullian, and Tertullian not know it, nor any person raise one word of objection to it? A man who can believe that, can as easily believe that with his own hand he can pluck the sun from heaven. If Tertullian was opposed to the baptism of "*young persons*," he would have much more opposed infant baptism and contended against this innovation. He would have opened fire with his strongest guns against infant baptism. He was still alive when Origen stated that it was "the usage of the church;" and if it originated *after* A. D. 190, it must have spread very rapidly to have become universal in twenty-five years. Let us suppose, however, that it did not exist in Origen's days, as my brother now contends, yet we still have the sixty-six bishops who met in council at Carthage in 253, only thirty-eight years later, showing it to be universal.

Let us suppose it crept into the church between the days of Origen and the council of Carthage, in the year 253. How could this be so without exciting discussion or any opposition, when the question of *barely deferring it to the eighth day* engaged the attention of sixty-six bishops together, and left a clear record? A man who can believe that, has unlimited credulity. But Irenæus does refer to it. He sent a written rebuke to the Pope of Rome, so distinguished a man was he. If infant baptism had crept in about the year 160, when Tertullian was a young man, he would have discovered it, and would have opposed it with all his shrewd sophistry; for he even opposed with all

his strength the baptism of "young persons," according to my brother's position. Much more would he have hurled his keen anathemas against *infant* baptism, had it crept in then as an innovation. Hence it did not come in as late as A. D. 160. We have this settled from unquestionable authority. But how could it have crept into the church between the days of John and those of Irenæus, and become so universal that it was recognized every-where by all ministers? No, my friends, it *could not* be; for of those whom the apostles baptized, thousands lived to the days of Tertullian, Irenæus, and to the infancy of Origen. Now, could such a thing be done in those days, and no record of it be made, or receive no mention in the church? It is impossible. Therefore I have traced infant baptism into the bosom of the *apostolic church*, and, therefore, *it is authorized by the word of God.*

Mr. Wilkes.—To show that Irenæus did not, necessarily, use the word regeneration in the sense of baptism, I propose to read from Wall, i, 47: "They are altogether vain, who undervalue the whole economy of God, and deny any salvation of the flesh [or body], and do slight the *regeneration* of it, saying that it is not capable of a state of incorruption.' By their slighting the regeneration of the flesh, he must mean either their denying its resurrection, as many of them did, or else their refusing to give it baptism, which several sects of the Valentinians did, who are mentioned by Irenæus. By his making two sentences of it, his meaning seems to be, that they, not believing any resurrection of the body, but that the soul is all that survives, did not think the body worthy of baptism."

Mr. Ditzler.—This refutes his own position, and shows, as the *only* passage in Irenæus that doubt is pretendedly raised, that I am right. I will meet him also by reading from A. Campbell, "Debate with Rice," 430: "Well, now it comes to pass that I represent ALL the primitive fathers as using the term *regenerated* as equivalent to the term *baptized*. . . . I AM ASSURED that they used the term *regenerated* as equivalent to *immersion*, and spoke of the *spiritual choice* under other terms and modes of speech."

Irenæus said, "And again, when he gave his disciples *the commission of regenerating unto God*, he said, *Go, teach all nations, baptizing them,*" etc. I have before read you Justin Martyr's clear and decisive language, as well as other passages in Irenæus, that show that he used it in this evident sense. Read the passage: "For he came to save all persons by himself; all, I mean, who by him are regenerated unto God: infants (*infantes*) and little ones, and children and youths,

and elder persons." He believed in original sin—that it was washed away in baptism. He names elder persons, who surely had to be baptized for remission, according to Irenæus' views, yet all together as regenerated alike—baptized.

Here Irenæus calls regeneration that authority which the Savior gave the apostles, and then quotes the commission, "Go ye into all the world, baptizing them," etc., showing that he means it for baptism.

There is one other point that I can not fail to notice, as he has referred to it before, where, in these acts of baptism, they all rejoiced. I can only throw in an idea, but can not dwell on it. Where household is referred to, it represents *only one*—the *father*—as rejoicing. "*He* rejoiced, believing in God with all his house," and the word in the Greek is more distinct. It is *ἠγαλλίασε το πατριὸ πιστικῶς τῷ Θεῷ*. The words, rejoice and believe, are singular number in the Greek—he rejoiced, he believed in God—*πατριὸ* is an *adverb* in the Greek, describing how he rejoiced and believed. We have no English word that expresses it; he rejoiced in a domestic manner, in a household manner, is as near as we can express it. If the others who were baptized rejoiced, rejoice would be plural in the Greek. My friend makes an *adverb* nominative case to rejoice here.

I must now hurriedly run over the subject matter already laid down. I showed you that *religion* originated the church; that from the principles of religion we saw the development of *organization*, and in Moses' day we saw them, as God's people, in organized form. I will, for the benefit of future readers, run over the leading facts and texts in order:

1. To this people he gave laws, precepts, fleshly ordinances, assurances of love, mercy, grace, and explained to them the whole plan of religion, with the constant assurances of a Savior who was "as a lamb slain from the foundation of the world." They were "called" "by his name," and he "led them as a flock," "all the days of old." They are habitually called "his people"—"hear, oh my people," "the house of Israel," "called by my name," "the redeemed," "the church of Israel—of the righteous," "flock," "Israel is my son, my first born," "ye are the children of the Lord your God," "Zion, the holy city," "his witnesses," etc.—Is. lii: 1, 2; lxii: 11; i: 27; xlix: 14; Ps. ix: 15; Dent. xiv: 1; Ex. iv: 22; Deut. xxxii: 6-18; Jer. xxxi: 9; Lev. xviii: 14-30; Heb ix: 1-19.

2. God revealed himself to them as the only object of worship, as holy and demanding holiness. "Be ye holy," fills the chapters of

Moses law. Ex. xix: 6, "Ye shall be a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation." Deut. xiv: 2, "For thou art a holy people unto Jehovah thy God; and Jehovah hath chosen you to be a *peculiar people unto himself.*" 1 Pet. ii: 9, same.

3. Before he gave them either "ordinances of divine service" (Heb. ix: 1) or a civil polity, he proclaimed the great doctrines and fundamental principles of *religion*. Hence the prophet—Nah. 1. Paul says the promise and covenant were "confirmed of God *in Christ* four hundred years before the law was given."—Gal. iii: 16–25. "The law [of carnal ordinances] was *added*" simply.

4. The New Testament calls this Israel a *church*, aside from its general teaching, which is far more important. Heb. ii: 12, "In the midst of the church (*ἐν ἑσθῶ καθ' ἑαυτοῦ*) will," etc. Quoted from Ps. xx: 22, 23. Its connection with *ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις ἡ μὴ εἶδον τὸ Θεοῦ* makes this clear. Acts vii: 38, "This is he who was in *the church in the wilderness.*"

Did the pious Jews have proper ideas of God, of redemption, of depravity, sin, feel need of atonement, seek and obtain remission of sins, experience a change of heart, repent, believe, seek God, love, serve, obey, trust his goodness, comprehend his providences, seek to save their fellow-man, distinguish between mere forms and carnal ordinances and the reality—the shadow and substance?

1. God's being, power, unity, wisdom, mercy, grace, willingness to save, etc., revealed in the Old Testament, Deut. vi: 4, 5; x: 12, 16, 17, 20, etc.

2. Sin, depravity, necessity of renewal, are as fully set forth as in the New Testament: Jer. v: 16; Ps. cxl: 3, 10; li: 3; xiv: 1–3; lii: 1; v: 9; Rom. iii: 9, 10–23; Gal. iii: 22; Is. i: 16–22; Ps. liii: 2, 3; Ex. xix: 6.

3. The atonement and redemption through Christ was preached to them. Is. liii: entire; Zech. xiii: 1, 2; Gal. iii: 7, 8–14, 17, 18; Rom. iv: 8–12; Gen. xv: 1–6; Heb. ix: 1–6; Rom. v: 15, 16; Acts x: 36; 1 Pet. i: 11; 1 Cor. x: 3, 4; 2 Pet. ii: 5; 1 Pet. iv: 6; also Is. lii: 7; Nah. i: 15, "Behold upon the mountains the feet of him that bringeth *good tidings*, that publisheth peace." Paul quotes it, Rom. x: 15, "The feet of them that preach *the gospel of peace*, and bring glad tidings of good things." Is. lii: 7, "Good tidings, that *publisheth salvation*; that saith unto *Zion*, Thy God reigneth." "Searching what, or what manner of time the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of

Christ, and the glory that should follow." "The covenant that was confirmed before of God in Christ." Then it was in his name—under his ministration before incarnation. If by Christ's authority, then Christian in all true respects. "The end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls, of which salvation the prophets have inquired and searched diligently, who prophesied," etc. "The Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify, when it testified beforehand the sufferings of Christ," etc. "The gospel was preached unto those that are dead" (1 Pet. iv: 6). Noah, "a preacher of righteousness" (2 Pet. ii: 5).

4. They had the Spirit and its promises. I read Gen. vi: 3-5; Acts vii: 51; Heb. iii: 15; Ezek. xxxvi: 25-7; xxxvii: 1-14, where breath in Hebrew is spirit, as in verse 14; Joel ii: 18-21, with Acts ii: 18-21; 38-40.

5. Repentance, its nature, a deep sense of guilt and helplessness in ourselves, we showed from Gen. xlii: 22; Ps. xxviii: 14; Ezek. xviii: 30; xxxiii: 11; Deut. iv: 39; Ps. vi: 3-8; especially 1 Kings viii: 47, 48.

6. Calls to contrition, repentance, and seeking God, Hosea vi: 1-4; Is. i: 8-14, and the above.

7. Pardon of sin, blotting out of transgression, are as clearly set forth as in the New Testament. 2 Chron. vii: 14; Ps. lxxxv: 2; ciii: 3, 10-12; Ex. xxxiii: 13-19; xxxiv: 7; Is. i: 18; xliii: 25; Iv: 6, 7; Ps. li: entire, etc.

8. Justification by faith was clearly taught and acted on. Gen. xv: 6; Heb. ii: 4; Rom. i: 17; iv: 2, 3, 6, 7, 9-13, 16; Is. xxviii: 16; quoted 1 Pet. ii: 6, 7; Rom. x: 11. Paul, Peter, and James all argue it from the Old Testament always.

9. Regeneration, the new birth, etc., were well understood. We read Ps. li: entire; xxiv: 4; Ezek. xvi: 9; Rom. ii: 28, 29; John i: 1-18; Is. i: 16-18; Jer. iii: 12-14; Ezekiel xi: 19; xviii: 31, and others just referred to, to show this sufficiently.

10. The summary of the Mosaic law Moses gives in Deut. vi: 4, 5; x: 12-16. Christ gives this as the sum of all religion, Matt. xxiii: 23; xxii: 26-40; Mark xii: 30-33, etc. These principles are eternal. "The law of the Lord is perfect," Ps. xix: 5-8; "spiritual," Rom. vii: 12; "just, good," "ordained unto life," "holy," "makes us wise unto salvation," Rom. vii: 12; 2 Tim. iii: 15-17. Yet the "Living Pulpit" says: "The Old Testament is no longer a book of authority."—Errett's sermon, 478.

I then read Is. x: 20, 21, 22, 27; xi: 1-5, 10, 12, and showed that Paul quoted these in Romans ix: 27; x: 1-5, and especially chapter xi: 1-5, 7-11, 16-26, to show that a remnant should remain when Christ should come, as I will show you directly; when I showed that the apostolic days were "times of reformation," simply, Heb. ix: 10; Acts iii: 19. "Carnal ordinances were imposed till the time of reformation," Heb. ix: 10; Col. ii: 14-20; Eph. ii: 15.

Promises of perpetuity and enlargement were given in all ages to the Jewish Zion. These, all agree, referred to Christ's coming, and never were fulfilled, if my opponent's position be correct. Of this class of prophecies, Is. xxx: 5; xliii: 22; xlvi: 4; lviii: 11, 12-14; xlii: 19; lix, lvi, entire, which Paul applies; Gal. iv: 26-28; Is. xlix: 6, 12-23, inclusive. Now, if these promises of inheriting all the Gentile world failed, where have we any prophecy that has been fulfilled?

Promises of *perpetuity* and *enlargement* filling the Bible, such expressions as the following can not be misunderstood, as found in the New Testament: "We are the true circumcision"—Jews. "Not all Israel who are of Israel." "We are the seed of Abraham." "Unto us a son is born, unto us a child is given." (Is.) Christ "shall reign over the house of Jacob, and of his kingdom there shall be no end."—Ps. ii; cx; Dan. ii: 44. "Citizens of the heavenly Jerusalem." "Behold an Israelite indeed." "He is a Jew who is one inwardly."—Rom. ii: 29; Gal. iii: 7, 9, 29. Christ's mission was "to the lost sheep of the house of Israel."—Matt. x: 6. Only sent to *them*. "I am judged for the hope of Israel, made of God unto our fathers; unto which (promise) our twelve tribes . . . hope to come. For which hope's sake . . . I am accused," etc.—Acts xxvi: 6, 7. "Christ raised up to Israel a Savior, Jesus."—Acts xiii: 23. The new covenant was to be made—*perfected*—*συντελείω*. "With the house [church] of Israel and with the house of Jacob."—Heb. viii: 8, 10. Acts xv: 14-17, "Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take OUT OF them a people for his name." [Till now they operated as Jews—(called themselves Jews—"thou being a Jew")—solely among Jews.] "And to this agree the words of the prophet (Amos ix: 11, 12); as it is written, After this I will return, and will BUILD AGAIN (*rebuild*—*ἀνοικοδομήσω*) the tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will build again (*ἀνοικοδομήσω*) the ruins thereof (*ἀν-ῆς*, of it), and I will SET IT UP: that the residue of men

(*οἱ καταλοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων*—the rest of mankind) might seek the Lord, and *all the Gentiles*, on whom my name is called."

In the beginning, I showed you, from Ephesians ii: 11-21, the spirituality of the Jewish Church. I showed you how persons were aliens from that church by rejecting Christ; and I read to you from Ephesians iii: 6, this verse: "That the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of his promises in Christ by the gospel." I read also Ephesians ii: 12, "That at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." But when they received the Messiah, they were received as members of the commonwealth of Israel, which the apostle here terms "*the church of God.*" They were then members of the commonwealth *by the reception of Christ.* My brother himself believes that by the reception of Jesus Christ through baptism they were made members of the church of Christ. He himself believes that no person at that day was made a member of the church of Christ that did not receive baptism, and that no person was made a member of the church or was in Christ except those who received baptism, and that by that act they were initiated into the church of Jesus Christ. The apostles here declare that through Christ they were brought into "*the commonwealth of Israel,*" and that those who rejected Christ were "*aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers to the covenant of promise.*" "But now, in Christ Jesus, ye who sometime 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." They had become different elements in relation to religion, and the law contained in ordinances was the disturbing element; but having abolished in his flesh the elements, Christ made peace, "that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross." And I showed you from the eleventh of Romans, whenever the Jews who rejected Christ should receive him as the Messiah, they were to be "*grafted in the good olive tree.*"

My brother argues that because there is a Jewish Church to-day, it is some other of which Paul speaks. Does he believe that these people are the same that Paul calls "*the remnant,*" "*the good olive tree?*" Does he believe that if the Jews were converted in the recep-

tion of Christ, they would be engraft on the Jewish Church as it exists here to-day? No, he does not so believe. He believes that this is another body, and not the true church of God. Now, mind you, whenever these Jews shall receive the Messiah, they shall be *grafted together* "again into their own olive tree." Will these Jews be graft into the Jewish church as it exists here to-day? No; but into "the remnant," of which *the apostles* were a part, of which *Christ* was the great central figure in those days, and of those holy ones who received him, who were likewise a part. But such men as Nicodemus were broken off by unbelief, and had to receive the Messiah to be received into the kingdom. "They were broken off by unbelief," and those Jews that were "broken off" had no lot in the kingdom of heaven. Hence, the language, "The kingdom of heaven shall be taken from you and given to another." The Greek is, it "shall be *leased out* to another;" you shall not have the benefit of this kingdom that has been leased out. It shall be taken from you and given to another, to bring forth the fruits thereof. Persons are represented as being kept out of it, and yet he says it had no existence at all until the day of Pentecost. How could men be said to have entered, passed into it, suffered violence, be taken from them, if it had never existed at all?

But we know that infants were members of this kingdom, not only from the language, "Of such is the kingdom of heaven," but history tells us that they were members of that church of which the Jewish prophets spoke. As infants were members of that institution which the apostles called a church and John the Baptist called the kingdom of heaven, and there never was any law passed to exclude them from it, they still remain members of the kingdom of heaven; and whether our Discipline uses the terms visible and invisible, or not, does not affect the Bible question at all, or the truth of infant baptism. They were members of the kingdom of heaven. Kingdom of heaven was a familiar term when Christ was born. It often occurs in rabbinical writings and the apocrypha. He spoke to the Jews, of course, and used their own language in their proper sense of it; and there is nothing in the Scriptures to show that it is there used in any other than its popular and well-understood sense. Then, accordingly, the argument that they rely on more than any other, that the church of the New Testament is spiritual and the church of the Old Testament is not spiritual, is square against them. I have shown you that spirituality pertained to it then as much as now, though we have many ad-

vantages that they did not have then, more light, etc. I have shown that infants were members of that church, and that they were so recognized. Christ regarded them as such, though he never baptized either an infant or an adult in his life. "Whosoever receives such little children receives me," and "of such is the kingdom of heaven." From such passages as these we know, and from the *very organization* of the church we know, that infants had a place within it. If, then, they were members of the church, that of itself implies infant baptism, and my brother can not destroy infant baptism until he shows that they were not members of the church.

Now, observe, 1. Religion, its benefits and principles, were enjoyed thousands of years before any law of commandments was given or existed pertaining to ordinances of the flesh.

2. Infants were in fellowship with *the church*, with the *ἐκκλησία*, whose *very meaning* he urges excludes them, and enjoyed this privilege for hundreds of years after all the ordinances were introduced, many of which *they* could not perform, none of which they could understand.

3. Gal. iii: 16-25, especially verse 17, teaches that the promises were confirmed *in Christ four hundred years* before the law of ordinances was given. "It was *added . . . till the seed* [Christ] should come," v. 19.

4. Neither the bringing in nor doing away of "the law of commandments *contained* in ordinances" affected any right of membership, or changed the principles of the church.

5. Eph. ii: 15; Col. ii: 14, 16, teach that Christ did "abolish in his flesh the enmity, even the *law of commandments contained in ordinances*," and *that only*. Nothing else—no right, no privilege—was abolished. Christ came to *extend* privileges, *not* to abridge; to enlarge the sphere of the church, *not* to *narrow* it.

6. The apostles show, then, that by "the law of Moses" was clearly meant the ordinances of the flesh, when they speak of it as being done away; for Christ said expressly he "came not to destroy the law or the prophets" (Matt. v: 17, 18), where he speaks of God's general law of salvation as contained in the Scriptures; and 2 Tim. iii: 14-17, shows it is still in force. That means the Old Testament, as when Timothy was a child not one word of the New was written, nor was it yet written when Paul wrote this, only in part. This will appear further from Acts xv: 5, where certain parties urged that it was "needful to circumcise them and to command them to *keep THE LAW OF MOSES*."

That law, as a whole, required *faith, love, purity*, love to God and man (Deut. vi: 4-6, etc.), which could not be done away. That law was "perfect." But they *define* what they meant, *i. e.*, to *circumcise*, and regard meats, things strangled, etc. Now, we have here the apostles defining that by the law that was done away, they only meant that law of Moses that came in later, and pertained only to meats, drinks, circumcision, etc. Indeed, that law at Sinai brought in no new principle in addition to that law formerly given that had all the principles of religion, nor did its removal, therefore, take any thing valuable away. Verses 10, 20, 24, 28, 29 show that only ordinances are meant.

7. Hebrews viii: 12, 13 will be understood by reviewing Paul's argument. Ch. vii: 11, he shows that "perfection" can not be by the Levitical priesthood. Note the word for perfection, *τελειωσις* (*teleiosis*). V. 12, he shows, "the priesthood being changed, there is made, of necessity, a change of the law," *i. e.*, of the priesthood; for the Aaronic priesthood attended to the "ordinances of the flesh." Compare, also, v. 5, the law pertaining to tithes. Now, verses 15-18, "There ariseth another priest, who is made, not after the law of a carnal commandment. . . . For there is, verily, a disannulling of the commandment going before, for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof. For the law made nothing perfect." Now here, you see, it is the law of carnal ordinances, pertaining to the Levitical priestly office, of which he speaks, that could not give perfection. Yet God's holy law "was perfect," and "makes us wise unto salvation," and exists "that the man may be thoroughly perfect."—2 Tim. iii: 16, 17. Heb. vii: 28: "For the law maketh men high priests which have infirmity; but the word of the oath, which was since the law [*i. e.*, of commandments contained in ordinances], maketh the Son," etc. Ch. viii: 6: Christ is "the mediator of a better covenant, which was established upon better promises." Ch. vii: 22: Christ was, from the beginning, "made a surety of a better testament," or covenant; as Gal. iii: 17, showed, also, it was confirmed in Christ from the first. This covenant was made with Abraham, confirmed of God in Christ; *i. e.*, Christ became its "surety." Then, ch. viii: 8, having shown that this covenant was ratified in Christ, and he was its "surety," he quotes Jeremiah to prove this fact, and "the new covenant" was the one confirmed in Christ to Abraham in promise. Then, in view of the fact that this covenant stood apart, divested of fleshly ordinances, disencumbered with Levitical rites, and is only perfected in

Christ's death, it is called a *new covenant*. It is not new as to principles of religion; but new as completed now, for the first time perfected, and for the first time *carries into effect the promises* on which it was based—to bring in all the Gentiles. It was not new as to laws of pardon, means of grace—these remain one and the same forever—but *new* as to those other matters just named. Ch. ix continues the argument, showing he is writing about mere fleshly ordinances as the *damaging feature* of the “Old Dispensation,” having “a law of commandments contained in ordinances” that “stood ONLY in meats, and drinks, and diverse baptisms—*carnal ordinances IMPOSED* [added Gal. iii] on them *until the time of reformation.*” Now, having shown up all these things, he shows the fruits of the Levitical office. These sacrifices made *nothing perfect*; for the blood of bulls, etc., *can not take away sin.*

Hence, Heb. viii: 8, “Behold, the days comè, saith the Lord, when I will (συντελέσω—*sunteleso*) *complete, perfect a new covenant* (ἐπι) *upon the house* (church) of Israel and *upon the house of Judah.*” συντελέσω means to finish wholly, complete, perfect, consummate.—Robinson’s “Greek Lexicon.” Schleusner, “*consummo, perficio, impleo*”—consummate, perfect, fulfill, complete. Thus the new covenant *was the perfected* covenant that had been made with Abraham, confirmed in Christ on better promises, Christ being the *surety* thereof.

As to his τελέω (*teleo*), I said nothing about that. That any thing *perfected* is called new in the Bible is already abundantly established. But look at this text on which he relies so exclusively. Grant all he contends for as to its meaning, wherein does it abrogate infant membership? *Absolutely in nothing.* It was made *with the house of Israel.* That house of Israel had infant membership. This “new covenant” was made *with a party* recognizing infants as *members of the church*—ἐκκλησία. Now, if this right was to be destroyed, it was imperatively the duty of the legislator to specify distinctly that fact. And nothing is named *as a condition of membership at all*; but certain duties and privileges are enumerated that were constantly pressed on their attention from the days of Abraham. So, you see, all his criticisms fall together.

He quotes us, at great length, from “Dr. Robinson,” the Baptist historian. The idea of introducing *him* as authority is absolutely monstrous. A more unreliable, one-sided, bigoted, untruthful author never dipped pen in ink in the world. I shall pay no more attention

to what he says than to one proved guilty of perjury His book is simply detestable.

M. Stuart, I showed you, never saw any of the Mishna extracts. He shows that, had he found one reliable Mishna quotation, he would have been satisfied of it. As for Dr. Blunt, he is not known as the man he pretends he is at all; is obscure; not held as authority in his church, and amounts to nothing. One such authority as Buxtorff or Lightfoot would weigh down ten thousand such authorities.

I will have to pass over many other arguments I would like to use. The question of household baptism has not been developed as freely as I would like. But it is an argument that the masses of the people can understand without the close critical investigation necessary for other matters I have presented. I have gone over the whole subject very hurriedly, but have endeavored to show the points wherein I differ from my brother in relation to the general economy of God's church, and to bring it clearly before the people.

MR. WILKES' ELEVENTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I will now bring this discussion to a close. This audience and the reporters have what can be said, in the State of Kentucky by our Methodist brethren, in favor of infant baptism; they have, at least, heard all that can be said in three days, or the best of it; and when I am through, you will be the judges of the result. I offer a word or two in reply to my friend's last speech; then my review, and I close.

I do not know what was my friend's object in exalting Irenæus so wonderfully. He made him a very great man. He says he wrote a letter to the pope and reproved him very sharply, showing that he must have been a great man. I apprehend it would take more lawyers than are in this country to prove that there *was a pope then*. It was some centuries after that before there was a pope, and, therefore, Irenæus never wrote a letter of reproof to any pope in his life.

I have already read you from Irenæus that he did not always use the word regenerate to signify baptism.

Mr. Ditzler.—May I explain? My brother seems to think that Irenæus did not write to the pope. The fact is, all the more learned prelates of that day were called by the title "papa," which is the word for pope. I said Bishop or Pope of Rome; but Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, as well as Latin authorities, have all used pope for papa. The title pope was used after 1073, under Hildebrand, who was made pope under the title of Gregory VII. After this the term pope, or papa, was restricted to the bishops of Rome: but up to that time it had been used for any aged prelate.

Mr. Wilkes.—The papa, at that time, was, then, nobody particularly. Pope, *now*, means something, and the explanation goes to deprive the word of its present, current meaning; therefore, the effort to make a great man of Irenæus was a failure, as a pope *then* was *nobody*.

My friend quoted from Irenæus to show that he used the word

regeneration in the sense of baptism. He just lacked one line of reading what he should have read, so I will quote the remainder of it. I read from Dr. Wall :

“And again, when he gave his disciples 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,’ where the commission of regenerating plainly means the commission of baptizing.”—“Hist. of Infant Baptism,” by Wm. Wall, vol. i, p. 46

The latter part of this my friend did not quote. Taking it altogether, it is plain that Irenæus used the phrase “regenerating” in the sense in which Matthew said: “Go, disciple the nations, baptizing them.” So that Irenæus did not here use the word regeneration in the sense of baptism, *restricting it to that alone*.

I have a little quarrel with my friend Mr. Ditzler. I told you that Origen’s writings had been tampered with very much by Rufinus. We had a passage under investigation. I read from authority of the first order to show you that Jerome translated a part of Origen’s writings, and that Rufinus translated other parts. We have good authority for believing that Jerome was much more faithful as a translator than was Rufinus. But, says my friend, Rufinus translated the Homilies on Leviticus and Luke; and then to demonstrate that Origen talked about infant baptism, he read to you, from Origen, on the “Homilies of Luke,” which were translated by Jerome.

Let us look into that with a little care. On page 64 of Wall, vol. i, c. 5, my friend read a passage from Origen’s “Homilies on Leviticus,” translated by Rufinus. By turning to page 67, we have this language:

“Of those which I have brought, the ‘Homilies on St. Luke’ were translated by St. Hierome; but those on Leviticus, and the comments, on the Epistle to the Romans, by Rufinus.”—“Hist. of Infant Baptism,” vol. i, p. 67.

In chapter v, page 65, we have the “Homilies of Leviticus” that were translated by Rufinus, and the passage which my friend read to show you that Origen talked about infant baptism, and infants particularly, in which the word infant is used. He read from what Rufinus gives as the translation of that which Jerome gives us.

Mr. Ditzler.—Will you allow me to correct you?

Mr. Wilkes.—I am not wrong. I will now read from Dr. Wall, vol. i, p. 65:

"Hear David speaking. *I was, says he, conceived in iniquity, and in sin did my mother bring me forth*; showing that every soul that is born in the flesh is polluted with the filth of sin and iniquity, and that, therefore, that was said which we mentioned before: that *none is clean from pollution, though his life be but of the length of one day.*"

Then my friend became very eloquent, giving us to understand that Origen was talking of infants but one day old, and asserted that Jerome was the translator here, and not *Rufinus*, whereas the very reverse is the fact.

Mr. Ditzler.—Have I not a right to explain?

Mr. Wilkes.—Not now [continues reading]—

"Besides all this, let it be considered, what is the reason that, whereas the baptism of the church is given for forgiveness of sins, infants also are, by the usage of the church, baptized; when, if there were nothing in infants that wanted forgiveness and mercy, the grace of baptism would be needless to them."—"Hist. of Infant Baptism," by Wm. Wall, vol. i, p. 65.

That was the ground of infant baptism. They were supposed to be totally depraved, and the passage in John iii: 5 was supposed to teach that those who were not baptized would be lost, and infants, being totally depraved, were supposed to be damned, if not baptized; hence the indecent haste to baptize the infant as soon as it was born.

Mr. Ditzler.—I desire to remark that the passage I read, by a slip of the eye, I did not notice, was from Leviticus, but the other one was from Luke. But I will now read—

Mr. Wilkes.—I am only giving you the right to *explain*, not to *argue* the question.

Mr. Ditzler.—I can give you a dozen passages from Origen. I ask for the right of reading from Origen; but if my friend prefers I should not, I will submit.

Mr. Wilkes.—I shall not press any objections, only I do not wish to *prolong* the controversy.

Mr. Ditzler.—I will read a passage from his comment on Matthew:

"There is, perhaps, in our generation (or first birth) none clean from pollution, though his life be but of one day; because of the mystery of our generation (or birth), in respect of which every one of all that are born may say that which was said by David in the fiftieth Psalm, which was this: 'I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me.' But in the regeneration (or new birth) by the laver (or baptism), every one that is born again of water and the Spirit is clean from pollution."—Dr. Wall, vol. i, p. 76.

Again, p. 73:

“According to that saying of our Lord concerning infants (and thou wast an infant when thou wast baptized), their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.”

Mr. Wilkes.—My brother has introduced three or four passages on the spur of the moment—passages which I have not had an opportunity to examine; and I do not believe they teach just what he states. I can not, consistently, without sitting down to examine them, give my opinion on them, and therefore I will proceed.

My friend has not mentioned one uncontroverted passage in which baptism and infants come together. The passage quoted by him from page 76 mentions one of the terms, but not the other. *One* passage mentions infants and baptism; but, although I have not had time to examine it, I am convinced that the statement is not unqualified.

I now propose to briefly review what we have said, and done, with regard to this proposition.

My friend has placed his argument upon the ground of the identity of the ancient covenant with the Christian covenant. I have shown, in regard to that covenant made with Abraham, that it was made two thousand years before the Christian era; and that six hundred years before the birth of Christ it was prophesied by Jeremiah, that God *would* make, after that time, a *new* covenant; that is, in the days of Jeremiah, the covenant, under which we now live, was not made, and would *not* be for six hundred years; and that when it should be made, it would be with the house of *Israel* and with the house of *Judah*—houses which did not exist in the days of Abraham. My friend insists that there was a church in the days of Abraham—a covenant and a kingdom. It is not said there was a church, but he *infers* the fact; and then he *infers*, which, also, is not said, that there were infants in that church. He *infers* that there was a commonwealth, and that infants were in it; and he *infers* that it was identical with the Christian Church, which has not been proven. He *infers* that infants are, then, in the church. “Infants are, then, in the church,” is his language. He then concludes that, as infants are in the church, they ought to be baptized!

I deny that there was a church, in any religious or Christian sense, in the family of Abraham, or during the Mosaic dispensation. I admit there was a kind of commonwealth, but I deny that there

was, in that commonwealth, any conditions of *membership*, such as demanded piety, faith, or change of heart. I contend, and my friend will not say that this is true of the Christian Church, that a man might be continued in that church who was as wicked as a man could well be. He was not excluded on account of sin; he was not required, as a condition of remaining in that church, to love and serve his God. As conditions of membership, there were no such terms under that covenant. If my friend could prove that his church was identical with the Sinaitic or Jewish Church, of which he says a remnant was left when the Savior came, into which the Gentiles were grafted; if he could demonstrate that his church is the same as that, he ought to keep every man in it, because the Jewish Church did that very same thing.

I deny that there was any Christian or Jewish *church* during the days of Moses, or during the continuance of that dispensation, or even before that. There was nothing of the sort. I state, then, a general proposition: that there never was, from the time the world began, or from the fall of man, till the organization of the Christian Church after the crucifixion of Christ, any organization of any kind into which persons were introduced as *members*, and in which they lived as members of that organization, that was religious—*strictly and spiritually* religious. There never was any such thing in the world as a *Christian Church*, until the Lord organized it after his crucifixion and resurrection. If that be true, then the Christian and Jewish churches are not identical; and if not identical, the entire argument of my friend goes to the wall.

He argued that the house of David, or tabernacle of David, means the church; that the falling down of the tabernacle means the falling down of the Jewish Church into entire or partial ruin; and the promise to rebuild that tabernacle, and the fulfillment of that promise, were realized in the re-establishment of the Jewish Church; and that it was actually re-established. I answer, that—whatever my friend or his friends may think about it—the time is at hand when my view of the subject will be generally accepted—a view not always taken, but which is, nevertheless, now held by some of the best authorities among the pedobaptists; viz.: that the tabernacle of David means the family or lineage of David, which was re-established in the person of Jesus Christ, who sat upon David's throne.

I propose, now, to call attention to another matter in regard to one

of his positions. He called our attention to the olive-tree; and you will remember that he attempted an argument to prove that the "good olive-tree" was the church. He said over and over, and over again, that it was the church. He said, also, that the good olive-tree was the same as the "remnant" not broken off, which, I contend, is not true; there is no authority for it in the Word of God. He said, so often, so persistently, and so emphatically, that the good olive-tree was the church, that he seemed to expect the people to believe it. But did he *prove* it? He never proved one word of it; and, unless he had proved *that*, he proved nothing; and if he had succeeded in proving it, he would have proved that it was the *Christian Church*, established with the house of Israel and Judah first, and that the Gentiles were, after awhile, permitted to enter it.

Let me recapitulate a little. I said, in the commencement of this discussion, that in order to prove a practice from the Bible, or prove that a practice is authorized by the Bible, it would be necessary to show, in the first place, that the practice was *commanded*; as, "Repent, and be baptized," for example. If that can not be done, it would be necessary, in the second place, to show that there was some *example* of the practice; as, for instance, keeping the Lord's Day by inspired men, showing that that day was authorized to be kept. I would not accept such an example as my friend's baptizing an infant, because I would not think that authority sufficient; but we should be authorized by a *divinely inspired example* of the baptism of some infants. But, mark you, he has not claimed that the Bible authorized the baptism of infants by a command, and that is the most natural way in which we would suppose it would be authorized. In the next place, it looks very strange that during all the ministry of John the Baptist, the Savior, and the apostles, for sixty or seventy years, we have no mention, no *suggestion* even, that a single infant was ever baptized. During the continuation of *circumcision*, we frequently hear of persons being circumcised; here one, there another; sometimes large families. These things are *mentioned, recorded, and dated*; but in respect to infant baptism, of a single case, by the apostles or during their personal ministry, the Bible is entirely silent. Is this not strange? So far from its being true that there is any mention of the baptism of infants in the Bible, the attending circumstances of the conversion of parties during the apostles' ministry, or even during the ministry of John the Baptist and his disciples, strongly impress us with the conviction that there could have been no infants among those

that were baptized. This, I insist, means something. There is no divinely approved example of it, then.

In the third place, I admit that a practice may be authorized in the Bible by a *necessary inference*; but it must be an inference from something *actually stated*, and that something from which the inference is authorized ought to be most specifically laid down before us. Inferences are very dangerous things, and it is a difficult thing to draw them accurately. Therefore, the grounds of our inferences ought to be stated with great precision; especially so, when the matter in question is of vital importance.

Please tell me, you who practice infant baptism—and I speak to conscientious men and women, who must stand before God in judgment; to persons anxious to seek and to find the truth—do you remember that passage of the Scriptures upon which my friend leans his faith and relies, for the practice of infant baptism? During these three days of polemical discussion here, has he brought this matter home *clearly* to your minds? Do you not know that if there was solid ground upon which he could base the practice, that he would have found and presented it to you? He talks to us about Irenæus, who does not mention infant baptism; and of Origen, of whom it is doubtful if he says any thing about the Savior and the apostles authorizing the practice of infant baptism.

But suppose that some place or passage is found and cited in proof of infant baptism, what must the passage contain in order that it shall be accepted as undoubted proof of the practice in question? Of course, if there be a command for it, there can be no controversy; or if there be an example of it, *divinely approved*, the practice must be regarded as right. But suppose we must rely upon an inference, what must we find in the passage from which the inference is drawn? I answer: something must be said or implied in it concerning infants, and something must be said concerning baptism, or necessarily implying it; and these two ideas must be so associated together that the *baptism* must necessarily be affirmed of *infants*. The Bible, therefore, must authorize infant baptism by commanding it, which it does not do; or, secondly, by an example of it, which it does not give; or, thirdly, it must authorize it by giving us some statement from which infant baptism *must* be deduced; or, when that passage is found, we must find in it something about infants and something about baptism, and these two terms must be so bound together that baptism *must* be affirmed of

infants. But instead of this, he has gone to history, beginning with Augustine and going up toward the apostles' times.

The first ray of light we have about infant baptism, did not occur till the end of the second century; and there the darkness of night sets in, and between my friend and any inspired writer there is a chasm of night, as broad as that between Lazarus and Dives, the rich man in the abodes of the lost.

I shall briefly allude to my objections to infant baptism.

When John the Baptist came to preach to and prepare a people for the Lord, he commanded the people to *repent*, telling them that the kingdom of God was at hand; and he baptized those who did repent and confess their sins, refusing to baptize those who did not confess their sins.

The Savior, when he authorized the apostles to go and baptize, in that commission which alone authorizes the baptism of any one, said, Go, *teach—disciple—the nations*, and baptize them. To *disciple*, as I have shown, includes the idea of primary teaching. Some conclude that it means more teaching than that; but it necessarily includes primary teaching, and *then* the "baptizing them" was to take place. But infants can not be taught, therefore the infant is not considered or included in the terms of the commission.

If the nations are to be baptized, and infants are to be baptized *simply because they belong to the nations*, it follows that a man who is an infidel, since he belongs to the nations, must be baptized also. The very theories that my brother would apply to the teaching of the Savior in the commission would destroy his own church. It proves too much, and therefore proves nothing at all.

According to Mark the Savior says, "Go, preach the gospel to every creature;" but the gospel can not be preached to infants. The parties contemplated in the commission as having a right to baptism, are the parties to whom the gospel is to be preached, who are able to believe, and of whom it is said "he that *believeth* and is baptized shall be saved; and he that *believeth not* shall be damned." The apostles went forth and preached; the people *gladly received* their words; they were *pierced* to the heart, and, *confessing* their sins and *desiring* to be saved, were baptized; "and as many as *gladly received* his word were baptized;" and then "they were added to the church." Men and women were baptized. The circumstances of their baptism are mentioned, as they occurred under the ministry of the apostles, but not a word is uttered about *infant baptism*.

The Apostle Peter tells us that baptism is the seeking of a good conscience toward God. Any body may be baptized who seeks a good conscience in baptism, because the seeking for a good conscience is one of the objects of baptism. But infants can not do that. In every scriptural baptism there is a seeking for a good conscience; infants can not seek for a good conscience, therefore infants can not be scripturally baptized. If that be true, infant baptism is not authorized by the Word of God; yet my friend says it is.

APPENDIX A.

LOUISVILLE, KY., December 16, 1870.

BEFORE entering upon the discussion of the second proposition, Mr. Wilkes said:

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

It will be remembered that, yesterday evening, *during* the last address which I made, a question was raised in regard to a passage purporting to be from Origen. I showed that the passage, whether from Origen or not, was not translated by *Jerome*, as my friend thought it was. He afterward said, during my address, "that was a slip of the eye." I propose to raise a point of order. After some remarks by me, at the time, my friend was allowed to present several other passages, to which I, *then*, could make no reply, as I told him, owing to lateness of the hour when the passages were sprung upon me. I have since examined the principal passage, and I claim, on the score of order, I claim, on the score of courtesy, that I should have the privilege of reading a passage or two which will show the true intent and meaning of the passage read by my opponent. I first ask my opponent whether or not I have the privilege?

Mr. Ditzler.—I am willing to grant the privilege asked, but, of course, claim time to present an answer to it.

Mr. Wilkes.—My friend has *already* presented his answer. He is in the affirmative.

Mr. Ditzler.—It was all sprung in a moment. The gentleman may, as is not unfrequently done in debates, file a document, to which I will file a response, and which may be read to the audience and form part of the report.

Mr. Wilkes.—My friend has *already* presented his document, but I have had no opportunity to present a reply. I wish, now, merely to present counter-evidence. His authority is on record, and mine, as yet, is not.

Mr. Ditzler.—If the matter is entered into, I shall want to reply, as is but fair.

Moderator.—The decision of the Moderators is, that you make your statement of the point you desire to present, and then write out what you would have said in your speech yesterday; then hand it to your opponent, who can write any response he desires; both of which papers will form part of the report.

Mr. Wilkes.—Are they to be of equal length?

Moderator.—Yes, sir.

Mr. Ditzler.—I can prepare it by morning.

Mr. Wilkes.—In that case, the audience that heard his remarks might not hear mine. I wish now to state what I would prove.

Moderator.—That is allowed. You can make your statement, and Mr. Ditzler can make his.

Mr. Wilkes.—The statement I would make is, that whereas my friend read a passage from Wall, vol. i, page 74, "Thou wast an infant when thou wast baptized," etc., and asserted that that passage was given us by *Jerome*, instead of *Rufinus*, who was not considered reliable, is a mistake. That very passage is given us by *Rufinus*, instead of *Jerome*, which is another "slip of the eye." Besides that, I should have read an authority from Dr. Chase, which I would give in reviewing that passage, stating in clear terms that Origen was considering the case of infants that were capable of *believing*; it being well known that believers were frequently called infants, in Origen's style of speech.

Mr. Ditzler.—I will simply state to the audience, that my opponent sprung a question that I did not suppose would be introduced, as it never was before in our debates. I hurriedly ran my eyes over the pages of Wall on Origen, and Wall stated that Leviticus and Romans, as I caught it, were translated by *Rufinus*; and that was the part that he represented as being unreliable, and that Luke and others were reliable. One of the main passages I had read was from Luke, another was from Leviticus, which I did not happen to notice, because the Latin was given alternately with the English, and it required some attention to discriminate between the two. All this was done in a hurried manner. I will file such passages as I wish to present, after an examination. I do not believe, however, that the point he raises is at all on his side, but against him.

Moderator.—That is another thing. That is an *argument*, not a *statement*.

Mr. Ditzler.—It pertains to these matters of fact.

Moderator.—I think not.

Mr. Ditzler.—The question of fact is—

Moderator.—State the facts, leaving your conclusions out.

Mr. Ditzler.—The facts are, then, that the part I quoted at the time, and the main part, was from Jerome, and the other part I will carefully examine and bring before you in due time, a portion of which I am satisfied is that which Origen held, and Jerome translated, though one of the phrases may not be, as I have not had time to examine.

Mr. Wilkes.—As regards the question of fact, two or three lines below where my brother read, it is said that *Rufinus did translate that very passage.*

APPENDIX BY MR. WILKES.

By decision of the moderators (q. v.), Mr. Wilkes is permitted to make the following appendix to his closing speech on the first proposition :

It will be seen that Mr. Ditzler quoted a certain passage—Wall, vol. i, p. 65—as from Origen, translated by Jerome, to which Mr. Wilkes, in his closing speech, replied that the passage in question (Homily 8, on Leviticus, chap. iv) was *not* translated by Jerome, but by *Rufinus*, and, therefore, untrustworthy by the consent of all the authorities. To which Mr. Ditzler replied that he had made a mistake, through haste, and would read another passage which was equally strong in his favor, which was from Jerome's version, and, therefore, genuine, to wit: *Homily 9, in Josuam, § 4, "Quod et tu fuisti infans in baptismo,"* etc. "Thou wast an infant when thou wast baptized."—Wall, vol. i, pp. 73, 74.

This being read in the midst of Mr. Wilkes' speech, he had no opportunity of reply, but *now* says that *this* passage is not quoted from Jerome, but, like the other, is also from Rufinus. (See Wall, vol. i, p. 74.)

Being from Rufinus, the presumption is, the passage is spurious.—Wall, vol. i, p. 67.

But, even allowing it to be genuine, it is easy to show from the

context in this same Homily that Origen was not using the word "infant" (*infans*), in its usual sense, which will appear by the following extract from "*Infant Baptism*," by Rev. Irah Chase, pp. 220, 221 :

"We are aware that, in order to support infant baptism, Mr. Wall, in his history, part i, chapter v, introduced a passage from the ninth Homily on Joshua, in the course of which these words occur: 'And thou wast an infant in baptism.' That Origen means an infant, not in age, but in a figurative sense, is manifest from the consideration that he proceeds to speak of our Savior's writing his law on the heart at the time. Of course one would think it must have been a heart that could receive and understand. That this is the true sense, is more abundantly evident from the subsequent remarks of Origen, which Mr. Wall has not quoted. These show clearly that the writing is connected with instruction and faith. It is in the hearts of believers (in *cordibus credentium*) that the new law is written. Origen says, expressly: 'But even now, by these things which we speak, Jesus writes the second law in the hearts of those who, with sound faith and a whole mind, receive those truths which are proclaimed.' In reference to the little ones connected with the congregation of Israel, as mentioned in Joshua viii: 35, Origen speaks also in his ninth Homily on that book; but he says not one word favorable to baptizing unconscious babes. On the contrary, he remarks (§ 9), in making out, after his manner, a parallel under the new dispensation: 'But the infants will be those who, having recently believed, are nourished with the evangelical milk.'"

APPENDIX BY MR. DITZLER.

In the above Appendix, Mr. W. first *misstates the facts*. They were not as he represents. *E. g.*, (1.) One leading quotation I made was from Origen on *Luke*, which was translated by JEROME (*St. Hierome*), Wall, 165, which states, "Infants are baptized for the forgiveness of sins. Of *what* sins? Or *when* have they sinned? Or how can any reason of the *laver* [baptism] in *their* case hold good, but according to that sense that we mentioned even now: no one is free from pollution, though his life be but *the length of one day upon earth*? [Are not such "*parvuli*" infants?] And it is for this reason, because, by the sacrament of baptism, the *pollution of birth* is taken away, that INFANTS (*parvuli*) ARE BAPTIZED." This passage no one doubts. Yet Mr. W. sought to impress all that I quoted *only* from *Rufinus'* translation.

(2.) Mr. W. pretends that Rufinus is untrustworthy "by the consent of all the authorities." Nothing is more groundless than this assertion. The truth is, we are indebted to Rufinus for many of the works of the greatest of the fathers of the first three centuries of the church.

(3.) Mr. W. misrepresents me by saying that I said I made a mistake through haste, as if my quotation was wholly from Rufinus [see his remarks, last speech], whereas, while quoting Jerome's Origen, I also unintentionally read one extract from *Rufinus' Origen*, as quoted by Wall. The whole question being unexpectedly sprung in the heat of debate, and such absurd and unheard-of positions assumed by Mr. W., I looked at Wall, and read vol. i, 67, "Those [Homilies] on Leviticus and the Comments on the Epistle to the Romans, by *Rufinus*," connected with, "some reject the quotations here brought out of the Homilies on *Leviticus* and the *Romans*," leaving the just conclusion that *all other* references were altogether reliable—and from Jerome, the Latin, English, and Greek mixed together—and having only a moment to glance at it, in the hurry of debate I read several passages given on Joshua and Matthew, since neither the name of R. nor Hierome occurred over them, 72, 73, 75, the inference being that they were by Jerome.

(4.) Mr. W. says of one quotation on Joshua, "Being from Rufinus, the presumption is that the passage is spurious." Mr. W. refers for proof to Wall, i, 67, where Wall says JUST THE REVERSE. Here, *not in haste* and heat of debate, *without chance to examine*, but *in his room*, surrounded and aided by *numbers of his brethren*, Mr. W. deliberately makes Wall say the opposite of what he *does* say. P. 74, Wall says, of Rufinus' translation of Joshua, "In the translation of these Homilies, and those on Judges, he has neither added nor admitted any thing, but *truly rendered what he found in the Greek books*." So says Rufinus also, *ibid.* Rufinus frankly tells us when he abridges the works of Origen. Because Origen refers to infants once or twice to illustrate believers, Mr. W. tries to cover the passages where he speaks historically of infants only a day old being baptized, with doubt as to the *meaning*, a thing beneath the name of debate or criticism.

Then, first, Origen tells us, where all agree the work is Origen's, A. D. 225, infants are baptized, as a universal truth unquestioned.

Secondly, Hierome, who read Origen more than all others, says Origen built certain peculiar theories on the fact of the church baptizing infants who had never lived to commit sin.

Thirdly, Rufinus did not need to mistranslate Origen on this subject; and the Greek of Origen, the same facts in Jerome's version, the sameness of texts quoted on the same subject in the two translations, demonstrate the fact that Origen did say, "Infants, also, are by the *usage of the church baptized.*"

Fourthly, Hierome, so perfectly read in Origen, Wall, i, 74, says Origen held that the birth sins of infants are remitted in baptism. R., only *abridged Romans*, added nothing, and there occurs the passage I read, "The church had from the apostles the tradition to give baptism to infants." Wall renders this, also, "ordered by the apostles." That is correct.

MR. WILKES' FIRST ARGUMENT.

SECOND PROPOSITION.

“BAPTISM IS FOR REMISSION OF SINS.”

FRIDAY, December 16, 1870.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The question before us, this morning, is whether baptism is for remission of sins. Of course, baptism having been instituted and authorized by Jesus Christ, has some purpose; and it is incumbent on me to show, and I have assumed the task of showing, that it is for remission of sins. I embrace this opportunity, in the beginning, to state what I mean by our proposition.

By “baptism” I mean just what we are generally understood to mean. As we are to discuss that in the next proposition, I will not discuss it here.

By “remission of sins” I mean the sending of our sins away, the putting of them away, blotting them out. I do not mean any simple change of heart. You will not understand me to deny, however, that a person must have a change of heart; but, I mean that “remission of sins” is not the change of heart; so that when I am contemplating “remission of sins,” I am not contemplating a change of heart. The act of remitting sins is one that takes place with God. It is his own act, and takes place, first, in his own mind, and we are certified of that fact only when and as he may please to make it known to us.

Sin, the Bible teaches us, in substance, is an act. “Sin is the transgression of law,” says the apostle; and again, it is said that

"all unrighteousness is sin." Whatever infracts a law of God is sin; and whoever is responsible to the law, and fails to comply with the law of God, sins. So, I presume to say that sin is either the doing of that which God forbids, or the failing to do that which God commands. Sin, looked at in the *abstract*, may not be forgiven; but, looked at in the concrete, it may. The forgiveness of sins consists in sending away, first, the *guilt* of sin, and, secondly, the *consequences*, or *penalties*, of sin. Now, my proposition asserts that baptism is for the remission of sin, or the sending away of sin.

There are some things I do not mean when I say that baptism is for the remission of sins. First, I do not mean that baptism, *by itself*, is for remission of sins. Not only so; I hold that we can have no such thing as baptism by itself. Take a man and put him under the water; bury him in the water and raise him up again. He is, then, not necessarily baptized, in the Christian sense. If he have no faith, if he have no repentance, if he have no change of heart and love of God, placing him under the water and taking him up again is not baptism. Therefore, when I say that baptism is for remission of sins, I am not talking about simply placing a man in the water and taking him up again. That is baptism, I know, in the original sense, in the generic sense, but it is not baptism in the Christian sense.

Again, I do not think that there is *in baptism* any virtue; that is, in baptism *itself*. I mean by this, that there is no virtue in the *abstract act*, whatever that may be, of being baptized, to take away a man's sins. Nor do I believe there is any virtue, adapted to remove a man's sins, *in the water*, or the element in which he is baptized. I do not mean that, nor do my brethren mean that, nor did they ever mean that. I desire to illustrate this point, especially so, as it has seemed to be difficult for our friends, who do not agree with us, to understand us on this subject, especially, too, because we are disliked and opposed more on this account than on any other. By some illustrations, then, I would attempt to make our hearers and readers understand what we really do mean by "baptism for remission of sins." First, then, the illustrations will show what we do *not* mean, and, secondly, what we *do* mean.

You recollect that Israel, at one time, came to the Red Sea in escaping from Egyptian bondage. The Red Sea was deep, and before them. The hosts of Pharaoh were behind them. They were defenseless. They stood there on the banks of the Red Sea, attempting to escape from Egyptian bondage. They were unarmed, and had no means

of escape, as far as they could see. They murmured against Moses; and Moses, to quiet them, said to them, "Stand still, and see the salvation of God!" Now, here they were to have a salvation which was of God. God commanded Moses to stretch his rod over the waters, and he did so. The waters were divided. Then God told Moses to say to the people, "Go forward." They did so. They passed over, and were saved. It was then and there they raised their shouts of deliverance, and sang their songs of praise and joy. *There was a salvation of God.* Now, the power, the efficacy, of the salvation was not in that water, nor in the act of passing through the water. It was, as Moses said, a salvation of God. And yet the passing through, and the destruction afterward of the enemy, were the *means* of their salvation, and *necessary to it.*

Another illustration will, perhaps, make the point or position which I hold on this subject still more palpable.

At one time the Israelites, as they passed through the wilderness, were bitten by very poisonous serpents. For their cure God commanded that a pole should be erected, and on it a brazen serpent should be placed. The bitten ones were commanded to look, with the promise that they should live. Surely there was no efficacy in the mere act of looking, nor was there efficacy in the brazen serpent to heal them. Yet, when they did look, they were healed. The salvation was in the grace or power of God. Yet the condition of their being saved was that they should look at that brazen serpent. Now, just so in regard to our baptism. I do not hold that there is any *virtue* in the abstract *act* of being baptized for taking a man's sins away, nor yet in the water. Nor is there goodness in the man, that should cause the removal of his sins in the act of baptism. But, at the same time, just as a bitten one would look, in obedience to the command of God, and he was healed, so it is that a man may be baptized and have his sins remitted. *It is God that saves.*

Let me give you another illustration of this, which the Bible furnishes. Naaman, the leper, was very desirous of being healed. He had tried all the skill of his people, and all the means in his reach, in his own land, for his healing, and still the leprosy was upon him. A little Jewish girl told him that there was a prophet in Israel who could heal him. Omitting all irrelevant matters, it is enough to say that Naaman went up to Israel, seeking the man that could heal him. He finally stood before the prophet's tent-door. The prophet sent his servant out and told him to go and wash himself seven times in the

Jordan, and he should be healed. Now, Naaman was not willing to do it. He felt rather insulted than otherwise, in view of the command given him by the prophet of God. He could not see how it was possible that he could be healed by washing himself in the turbulent and muddy waters of the Jordan. He reasoned that the waters of Abana and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, were better than all the waters of Israel, and if it were possible that *washing in water* could take away his leprosy, he would have been cleansed before. He thought the prophet would come to him and strike his hands over him, and, calling mightily upon his God, do some great things, and he would be healed, forgetting the sublime and blessed lesson that God teaches that it is God who saves, and that we must rely upon Him. It was *in his obedience*, he ought to have known, that he would be saved, and that his salvation must be of God. He finally went, however, at the suggestion of one of his servants more prudent than himself, having learned that it is better to obey than to sacrifice. He went, and washed, and was clean. Now, the waters of that river had no potency to remove his leprosy in themselves; and the act of dipping and washing, whatever number of times repeated, had no efficacy in itself to remove the man's leprosy; but still the removal of his leprosy stood suspended upon his obedience to the command of God. He washed, and was clean. So we hold that water in itself has no power to take away a man's sins; that, but for the appointment of God, it would do a man no good—nay, to attempt to serve God by being baptized, if HE has not appointed it, would not only not be efficacious for good, but it would be a sin in the sight of God. You, then, have precisely the sense in which I hold that "baptism is for remission of sins," and I hope, in fairness, that my friend will treat our question in that way, for that is precisely as we hold it, as he already knows.

Again, I do not hold that no person or human being can be saved without being baptized; nor do any of my brethren hold any such view. I, therefore, do not say that baptism is for the remission of the sins of an infant. I do not believe that, nor hold it. The reason I do not hold it is this: Infants, as I have endeavored to show during the past few days, are not subjects of the baptism appointed by God for remission of sins, and where there is no law there is no transgression. I hold, further, that it is not for the infant, for the reason that the infant does not need it, being already pure and uncondemned, the condition which is necessary to entrance into the joys of heaven. It is not, then, for the infant, for the same reason that it is not for the idiot. It

is not for those who lived under the former dispensation, before baptism was appointed; it is not for the man who is sick, and *can not* be baptized, and is not responsible for that inability; it is not for those on islands, where they *can not* be baptized; nor for those in prisons, or on a cross, or in a desert, or at the North Pole. All these I exclude from consideration while discussing this subject. And the reason I exclude them is this: They *can not be baptized*. I believe that that passage in the commission by Mark which says, "He that believeth not shall be damned," would condemn the infant, if I believed that the infant was capable of believing, and had the opportunities to believe and would not. But that man in the desert, though he may read his Bible, and see that it requires him to be baptized, may, nevertheless, be so circumstanced that he can not be baptized; and where there is no ability to obey the law of God, there is no obligation to do it, and no penalty if it is not done. I not only hold that baptism is not for the remission of the sins of that man, but that baptism is not for the man at all. In a word, I hold that God never makes a law for a man who can not, no matter what the circumstances are which prevent him, obey that law. When it is *impossible* for a man to obey the law, he is not responsible for disobedience of it, or, rather, he *can not disobey it*. I believe the laws of our land recognize that principle as a correct one. If you bring a man into court, and prove by witnesses that he killed a certain other man, it does not follow that that man is, therefore, to be hung. Suppose that he demonstrates, by evidence direct and conclusive, that the killing was accidental and unavoidable. The case would not, then, be considered for a moment. The jury would not entertain it. They would dispose of the case at once, and set the man at liberty. And upon what ground? On the plain common-sense principle, recognized in heaven and on earth, at the bar of every man's reason and conscience, that where there is no ability there is no accountability. Therefore, in the discussion of this subject, I expect the cases that shall pass in review shall be cases where men are responsible for being baptized. It is then, and then *only*, that baptism is for the remission of sins; and in no other case in this world is it for *any purpose*.

Again: I accept the rule in the discussion of this subject, which I laid down for our guidance in the discussion of the previous question. It was there stated, that the Bible might authorize a practice in any one of three ways: It might authorize it by commanding it; secondly, by giving us an example of it; thirdly, by stating something from which a certain practice is a necessary inference—not a merely possible

inference, but a *necessary* one; for, while the inference is merely possibly true, and no more, it still remains that it is possibly false; and just as long as an inference is possibly false, it is not *proven* to be true; and until it is proven to be true, the question is not carried. I accept that rule, for it addresses and commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. I accept it in all its force, and hence I expect to prove that God commands and teaches baptism for remission of sins in so many words, and that we have examples of it. I expect, also, to show that we have abundant circumstances and statements in the Bible from which it is a necessary inference that baptism is for remission of sins.

Again: I grant that the passage which authorizes it, in whatever way it may authorize it, must contain, substantially, the terms of the proposition. In *this* case, it must contain the idea, or term, baptism. It must also contain the term remission of sins, or, rather, that phrase; and these two must be so related, so united together, or so joined, that the remission in the predicate is affirmed of baptism, the subject. If you consider that I assume, in these preliminaries, grave responsibility, I answer, that I assume nothing but what is a just responsibility. I expect to find a passage, and say to my worthy opponent, *here my proposition is taught*. I expect to examine it. I expect to subject it to severe scrutiny, severe analysis, and to apply to it all, as far as necessary, the inexorable laws or rules of language. Will my friend meet me thus? I trust he will.

It is just for me to say before I proceed, directly and formally to the proofs of my proposition, that there are, in the Scriptures, some, apparently, counter propositions or texts. It is said in the Scriptures, John ii: 18, "He that believeth on him is not condemned." Again, it is said, John iii: 36, "He that believeth on the Son hath everlasting life." There are other passages to the same effect. Now, our opponents say, and I confess with a show of reason, that if it be true that "he that believeth on him is not condemned," it would follow, that just *as soon* as a man believes on him, he is not condemned; that is, that he is pardoned. And, if it be true that faith, as I teach, precedes baptism, and if we are not condemned, or are forgiven at the moment of faith, the forgiveness would seem to come before baptism, and, therefore, baptism is not for the remission of sins. This is putting the case fairly, as my friend will not deny. I admit, I repeat, there are a few passages in the Scriptures which *seem to teach* as Mr. D. holds; but I must contend that there are others which seem not to so teach. Now, he that deals fairly with the Scriptures, or does not pervert them, who

would not be a sectarian, building a theory upon his construction of a few passages which seem to be in contradiction to others, will take all of the passages, and look at them in the light of reason and the context, and reconcile them. That can be easily done. Let me give you a few passages that seem, at first sight, to teach the very contrary doctrine to what those passages seem to teach, which we have cited above.

I call your attention to John i: 11, 12, "He came unto his own, and his own received him not; but as many as received him, to them gave he the privilege of becoming the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name."

Now, here we have it stated that the Savior "came unto his own," whatever that may mean, "and his own received him not; but as many as received him;" what does that mean? To believe on his name. But to as many as received him, gave he the privilege, or right, as it is in the original, to become the sons of God, even to those that believe on his name. Now, the clear sense of that passage is, that the one who believes on Jesus Christ, *then* has the *privilege* of becoming a son of God. But, clearly, what a man has the privilege of becoming, he is not already; and if, at the moment of believing, he then has the privilege of becoming a son of God, he is not already a son of God; and if not a son, then, of course, his sins are not forgiven. This seems clearly to be the teaching of that passage. Again, in John xx: 30, it is said, "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through his name."

Now, the writings of the Apostle John, he himself says, were for the purpose of bringing men to believe; and then he lets them know that "believing they might have life." They might have the *privilege* of life. Now, it is here just as in the other case; when a man simply has the power, or right, or opportunity of becoming a child of God, he is not already that child.

It would seem, then, to follow, that when a man believes on the Lord Jesus Christ, he is *not already forgiven*. He is not already a child of God. He simply has the right, as this passage teaches, or privilege, of becoming a child of God.

Again: by turning to the fifth chapter of the first letter of John, and first verse, we have this language, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus

is the Christ, is *begotten* of God." It reads born *here*. My friend will not deny, I suppose, that it means begotten. The apostle here tells us the precise situation or spiritual condition of that man who believes on the Lord Jesus Christ. He tells us that, at that time, he is only *begotten* of God. Now, surely, a man is begotten of God, before being born of God. When born of God, his sins are remitted; but when begotten of God, his sins are not remitted. Yet my friend will tell us that when he believes on the Lord Jesus Christ, he is born of God, or pardoned.

Again: the Apostle James tells us, that "Ye see then how that a man is justified by works, and not by faith only." I am fully aware of what, I suppose, my friend will say in answer on that passage. I will not anticipate him on that point, however. A man is justified by works. There are several kinds of works mentioned in the Bible. There is a work of *merit*. There is a work of *law*. There is a *work of faith*. The apostle is here considering the question, whether a man can be justified by faith, by itself. He says no, he can not. It is not only true in regard to one class of men, but it is a universal truth, and has always been such; it has never been otherwise, in any dispensation of God. It *must* be true, that a man, to be justified before God, must not only believe in HIM, but he must do the work of faith, whatever that may be. That is to say, when God commands a man to do any thing, the man must not only believe him, but, he must so far and so fully believe in him that he is willing to do, as to his God, the thing commanded. So I, at least, reason and believe.

The Apostle James is discussing that very question. He asks: "Can faith save a man?" Again he says: "As the body without the spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." Does dead faith save any body? And yet that is just the condition of a man's faith when he has not works; that is, if any work is demanded. It is dead. I will examine the case of Abraham, in reply to what may be said about it, in due time; but, just now, I present my own view.

From these passages I have presented (and I have presented them fairly, I think), it would seem that a man is not justified, that a man is not pardoned, at the moment in which he is *first* a believer. Those other passages seemed to teach that he is. I propose, now, to read a passage which comes in, as it were, to explain all of them. I read from John xii: 42, "Nevertheless, among the chief rulers also many believed on him; but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue."

Now, here, many of the chief rulers believed on him. The language in the Greek, as in the English, is just as strong a form of speech as can be employed. It is not only "believed him," but it is believed—(εἰς) "eis"—on him. The Greek makes it just as strong as it can be made; and is in the precise form of construction that it is in those passages which my friend will stoutly contend proves his contradictory view—I mean his view as contradictory of mine.

If the theory were true that a sinner is justified and saved at the first moment of believing, were not these "chief rulers" saved? for it is said that they believed *on him*. Will my friend say they did believe, but that they did not have the true faith? My answer is, that the revealing Spirit of God says, in just as strong a form of language as any in which it can be said, that they did believe. It must be accepted, or we become skeptical. Will my friend say, however, that though it is true they did believe, yet it is not true that they had *genuine* faith? Will he say that? I answer, if he does, that that is precisely what I believe is true. But, then, the question arises, What was lacking in their faith? I answer just what the Apostle James says, that "by works faith is made perfect." Though a man may have faith, if he have not that degree of faith which leads on to perfect obedience to the commands of God, he may have faith truly, *in a measure*, but not such as will commend him in the sight of God; and that is precisely the case *here*. It is said, these rulers believed on him; but then there was another thing to be done in order that they might be justified—in order that they might be the Lord's disciples—and that thing, *at that time*, was the duty incumbent on all who believed on Jesus Christ—of confessing him; of turning away from the world, and acknowledging him; and of identifying themselves with the meek and lowly one, and of becoming his humble disciples. That was a duty. Though they might believe, and though, indeed, they all did believe, yet it was not true that they could stand justified before Prince Emmanuel before they had openly confessed him. How prudent, how reasonable, how scriptural that is; and how perfect it is! Sinners, standing against the Lord Jesus, opposed to him, and to his government, practically, can not be saved, though they may believe on him. In their hearts they may feel, and with all their hearts, *nearly*, they may feel, that he is the Emmanuel, that he is the Christ, that he is the Son of God; nevertheless, if they do him the great injustice, if they do him the immeasurable wrong, of standing identified with the world, and of casting

their influence against him thereby, it is not reasonable that they could be "accepted of him," and receive his blessing. No, never. The Savior says, "If you confess me before men, I will confess you before my Father and his holy angels;" but if you will not confess me, if you shall be ashamed of me, "I will be ashamed of you before my Father and his holy angels." It is a principle of reason that a man, in order to enjoy the blessing of heaven, should come out of the world and say he is on the Lord's side; just as, in the controversy concerning the true God, in the days of one of the great prophets: "If Baal be God," says God's prophet, "serve him;" if he be truly God, I do not object to your serving him; "but if Jehovah be God, serve him." Be on one side or the other.

Now, here, if faith by itself, stated in the very strongest form in which it can be, would suffice for our justification, surely those parties were justified. But were they justified? I answer, no; for "they would not confess him;" "they feared the people;" they feared lest they would be turned out of the synagogue; and from this circumstance it is plain, that though they believed on him, they were not justified.

Now, Mr. President, ladies and gentlemen, I propose to indicate, in the conclusion of my morning's address, my course of arguments.

I read from the first chapter of Mark, fourth verse: "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."

You will please note this, my first proof-text, which, I claim, proves my proposition, as far as John's ministry and baptism are concerned. You will observe that the text embraces the terms of my proposition. Baptism is one of the terms of my proposition, and the phrase, "remission of sins," is the other; and, therefore, here I have the two terms of my proposition. There is one thing, however, which I have not yet shown; and that is, that these two terms are so tied together that we *must understand* that the *baptism* is for the remission of sins.

I now affirm that the two terms of my proposition, present in this passage, are so related or tied together, according to the laws of thought and rules of language, that it is a necessary inference that "baptism is for remission of sins." The writer says that John was preaching baptism of repentance. In the Greek, the article is not present. He was preaching baptism for the remission of sins; not baptism alone, but baptism, of *repentance*, for remission of sins. There

is but one thing in this case that can be presented as an objection to this being regarded as conclusive, as far as John's baptism is concerned, and that is, whether the *baptism* of the passage is for remission of sins, or the repentance that comes after the baptism. He came preaching baptism of repentance for remission of sins. What devolves upon us now is to present an exegesis of the passage; that is, it devolves upon us to show what "baptism of repentance" means. I state for the present, that the rule of the genitive following the noun is that the genitive qualifies the noun, and indicates the source or origin of the noun. The genitive case is the generating case, as the word genitive would seem to indicate. It is the generating case. The baptism is of repentance, as a son is of the father. The baptism originates out of the repentance, as a man is led to be baptized from the fact that he has repented. I can not see how a man could be led to desire to be baptized unless he had repentance. It seems to me that a man who had not repented would have no incentive to be baptized. Why would he wish to be baptized? Baptism is no act of obedience to God, or to Jesus, if a man has not repented. Why, then, should he wish to be baptized, if he had not repented? I can see no reason that would lead him to desire to be baptized, except that he had repented of his sin, and wanted now to obey and serve God. That is precisely what the genitive means. It is the origiu or source case. It indicates that from which the noun that governs it comes or descends. Therefore, when John is said to have preached baptism of repentance, it means that he preached *that* baptism to which a person would be inclined to come on account of the fact that he had repented, and to which, without having repented, he would not come. If I am right in this, what is baptism for? I am not talking about baptism by itself; neither was John, who wrote this. He does not say that baptism is for remission of sins *by itself*; neither do I. But he says baptism qualified by repentance; the baptism which grows out of repentance; the baptism to which a man is brought because he has repentance; such a baptism is for the remission of sins. I think that, as far as John's baptism is concerned, my proposition is carried.

My friend, in his reply, will no doubt bring forward what Winer says on this question. I want *him*, however, to have the honor of it. I would not anticipate him. I know what Winer says. I have it marked and noted. And I will say more than that: Winer, in his "Greek Grammar of the New Testament," is one of the highest authorities, though it is a *little old*. I have better authorities, and some a

little later; but I shall not demur to Winer on that account. I admit, when my friend has Winer in his hand, he has one of the best authorities on grammar for the criticism of Greek texts. I believe my friend has Stockius, and I believe Stockius is regarded by him as good an authority as Winer. In fact, he has himself made Stockius very celebrated in this country, which fact has induced me, at some little expense and trouble, to look all over Europe and America to get that work. Stockius teaches the precise office of *metanoias* in this verse, as my friend will find, under the word *baptisma*, by reference to his work. Stockius teaches that baptism here is that which is "*joined to the repentance*" That is his language; and if the baptism is "*joined to the repentance*," of course it comes *after it*. Besides that, the form, "*baptism of repentance*," is the precise one in which the Greeks would express that sentiment, if they wished to say that the ordinance of baptism comes from and grows out of repentance. It is the usual form in which the Greeks expressed that sentiment, and my friend knows that I ask him for, and I want, a fair discussion on this subject. I want to impress our respected and respectful hearers with the conviction that we are *trying*, at least, to be Christian men; men who deal faithfully with these things that appertain to the interests of their undying spirits. I wish he would come forward here and promptly acknowledge whatever is true, and deny, "*to the bitter end*," whatever is false, and let us have a fair grapple over this passage. I claim it as conclusive, as far as John's baptism is concerned, of the controversy between him and me to-day. That is *fair, at least*. I notify him, also, that I shall quote on this passage, which shall be at his disposal, "*Trollope's Greek Grammar*," page 174; and I shall quote, also, "*Robinson's New Testament Lexicon*;" and then others and others, just as far as he pleases. I will quote them to show that I have the Greek construction in my favor, on this passage, according to the best authorities in Europe and America.

I have a suggestion or two, in conclusion of the morning's discourse, which I will make. There are passages which are suggestive, simply, and in demonstrating my proposition I will claim for them not a great deal. It is said, for example, that certain of the Jews "*rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of him*," that is, of John.

Now, it seems to me, that there was much depending at that time upon being baptized of John, for, not being baptized of him, was to "*reject the counsel of God against*" themselves. Their acceptance at

the hand of God depended upon their being baptized; not because there was any thing of inherent value in the baptism, but because God had commanded them to be baptized. And it is competent for HIM to command baptism, or any thing else, as a test of their loyalty and condition of their acceptance. And if they refused, on account of not seeing any adaptation of the means to the end, and set their own judgment up in opposition to the will and authority of God, they did it at their own peril. These Jews "rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of him."

In Matthew, third chapter and fifteenth verse, etc., we have an account of the Savior's baptism, and of the conversation which took place between him and John, which seems to be important and suggestive, on this subject. The Savior came to John, and desired to be baptized. John forbade him, saying, "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" Why did John forbid it? You will see, from the language of the conversation which occurred between them, that the very ground on which John refused to baptize the Savior, was that, relatively, the Savior was better than he was, in his own estimation. If John had been baptizing men because they were good, and already pardoned, because they were already accepted, the ground of this objection would seem to be unreasonable. But he understood his commission; and, therefore, since the Savior was such an one as he had not been baptizing, he refused to baptize HIM. John was accustomed to baptize men "confessing their sins," and he would not baptize them unless they would confess. Knowing that he was baptizing persons for remission of sins, when the Savior, having no sins to remit, came to him, John said: "I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me?" But the Lord Jesus taught him a lesson. He said: "*John, it becomes us to fulfill all righteousness,*" which I understand to mean, substantially, to comply with all the appointments of God, or to ratify every appointment of God, by submitting to it. In view of that fact, losing sight of every thing but the simple idea of obeying God in this ordinance, he submitted to baptize the Savior. I think it is plain, from this entire connection, that the "baptism of John was for remission of sins."

My friend, in this controversy, has quite an advantage of me. On the first proposition, he being in the affirmative, I could not anticipate what he would say, and, hence, my replies were necessarily without as much preparation as otherwise they would have received. We have discussed our last question several times. Sometimes he

began the discussion at one end of that question; sometimes at the other, and again he would "flank the question in the center." I take up the present question, where I am in the affirmative, just as I believe it ought to be treated, and say on it only what I think ought to be said. Now, as he and I have argued this question several times before this, he is fully aware of what my proof-texts and arguments will be, and is the better prepared to meet me.

I refer, now, to the conversation which took place between Christ and Nicodemus, recorded in the third chapter of John, commencing with the first verse: "There was a man of the Pharisees, named Nicodemus, a ruler of the Jews. The same came to Jesus by night, and said unto him, Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God: for no man can do these miracles that thou doest, except God be with him. Jesus answered and said unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he can not see the kingdom of God." Then, after the question of the fourth verse, "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God."

From this passage I think it is a necessary inference that my proposition is established. The terms of my proposition are neither of them here, but they are in substance present, and I shall attempt to demonstrate that they are, in substance, here present. "Except a person be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." We have the "birth of water" here. What is that? Evidently the language is figurative. What is the *fact*? What is that thing represented by this figurative language? I answer, it is baptism. Does any body deny it? My friend, I believe, sometimes almost denies it. I am not sure that I have ever heard him deny it, but I have heard him come very near it. He knows whether it means baptism or not, and I wish him just to *say* whether he believes it means baptism or not. It will not be sufficient for him to say it *might* or *may* mean something else; for, if it *might* mean something else, it *might* mean this. I believe it means baptism. I have several reasons for believing it. The great Alford says it means baptism; Bengel says it means baptism; Stuart says it means baptism; and Barnes and Wall say it means baptism; Wesley says it means baptism, Bloomfield says it means baptism, and the Methodist Discipline says it means baptism; the Presbyterian Confession of Faith says it means baptism, and the Episcopal Prayer Book says so.

Dr. Wall says that for four hundred years, as I read on the former proposition, no man ever denied it; and he says that in no language was it ever denied until a very short time before he lived, and that has not been long since. As I stated, it was for sixteen hundred years never denied, that I know of, and the best authorities state, on this subject, the same thing. I quote from them, as I stated to you. All the confessions of faith, the formulas, disciplines, commentaries, histories, and critics (though *some few, perhaps*, may doubt it), all of them, from the beginning of the gospel and the church of Jesus Christ, down to the reformation, and through the reformation; and all persons, in all nations, of all standings, believed that "born of water" means baptism. I shall assume that it does. I do not believe that any small doubts that my friend may raise here will have very grave weight with this listening audience, or with those who may read what we say. "Born of water," then, means baptism. Now, Jesus says: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of heaven." That which stands between the sinner and the kingdom of God is his sins; and those things which he must do before he can enter the kingdom of God, after he is a sinner, are for the remission of sins. Whatever things a man must do to get into the kingdom of God are, practically, the things he must do for the remission of sins; or, whatever a man must do to get into the kingdom of God, *is for the remission of sins*. But the Savior says, and it must be true, *as I have explained*, that "Except a man be *baptized*, and born of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." It means, substantially, that unless a man is born again, including "and is baptized," he can not have remission of sins. This must be true, and my friend ought not to, and can not, successfully, deny it.

In the next place I take up the commission by Mark, and by Matthew; though, as my time has about expired, and my friend will not wish to be interrupted by persons leaving near the dinner hour, and as I want to favor him with two or three minutes, I will give him that much time, and hear what he has to say in reply.

MR. DITZLER'S FIRST REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

You have heard the proposition that has been presented for discussion, *i. e.*, that "baptism is for remission of sins." Here you might truthfully say that both parties leave their intrenchments and fairly confront each other on equal ground. There may be propositions discussed in which the doctrine of one party may be staked on a single practice, tenet, or law. Then it will be the duty of that party to defend or establish those facts, or tenets, while the opposite party tries to overthrow them. But here is a doctrine which reaches the *fundamental principles of religion*. Not a *practice* growing out of these fundamental principles merely, but **THOSE PRINCIPLES THEMSELVES**; and, hence, to use a military phrase, we both form in open field—a field in which he who suffers disaster, meets with disaster, indeed; not only so, but to my brother it would be *entire* DESTRUCTION. "Baptism for the remission of sins," is the central sun of their moral and religious system; that to which all things gravitate, and from which all proceed. But there is this difference in one respect. In relation to this proposition I am on the safe side. We do not oppose baptism. We do not try to undervalue baptism. We do not make war on baptism, for we baptize all of our people. So, if baptism be "for the remission of sins," we are perfectly safe anyhow. But not so with my good brother; for, if it be shown, as I think I shall show, that baptism is *not* "for remission of sins," then the foundation, from beginning to end of his whole system, is destroyed, and *irretrievable* disaster ensues. I want to be understood. I come not in your presence to discourage any person from being baptized. We belong not to that extreme that *undervalues* the ordinances of the New Testament, nor to the other that attaches entirely *too much* value to the *act itself*.

But before I begin my argument proper, I will notice a few points in my brother's address. I had supposed he would do me the simple

justice to remark that since I arrived in the city, and before the debate commenced, I wrote him a note informing him how I would commence the proposition. On a consultation with my friends I concluded to commence on the Bible argument, and immediately addressed him a note telling him of the change. Could a man act more honorable toward an opponent than I did?

Mr. Wilkes.—I rise to a point of order. I wish to say that my friend informed me several weeks before of his plan of argument, but soon after arriving in the city, I was informed that he would commence at the other end of the track.

Mr. Ditzler.—That is to say, he was informed that I would commence as he was notified a month before. Was that not honorable? On a consultation with my friend as to the best course of getting the most argument in the first speech, I concluded to begin with the historical argument, and with all due respect, I notified him of the change. He can not find another opponent in all America who would have taken so much pains with him.

Mr. Wilkes.—I agree that that was very honorable.

Mr. Ditzler.—I shall now proceed to my reply. The phrase "Christian baptism," be it known, does not occur in the word of God. The word baptism occurs very often, as does the word baptize, but "Christian baptism" is one of our coined phrases. I read from Hebrews ix: 10, where the apostle speaks of the appointments of Moses, "which stood only in meats and drinks and divers—*βαπτισμοῖς (baptismois), baptisms, δικαιώματα σαρκός*—ordinances of the flesh, imposed on them until the time of reformation." The word *καί, and*, does not belong to the text. Now, here Paul declares that baptism was appointed of God by the command of Moses, which was over fourteen hundred years before the coming of Christ. And in 1 Corinthians x: 1, 2, the apostle declares that "all our fathers were baptized," referring to the Hebrews, more than a thousand years before the coming of Christ. Remember, then, that the New Testament and the Old Testament alike teach that baptism by the appointment of heaven had existed for centuries and centuries before Jesus Christ came into the world. The use I will make of that will come up hereafter. I do not see that my good brother gains any thing by referring to James ii: 22-24, where Abraham is spoken of as "justified by works." I will just state, James was not discussing justification, or pardon of sins, but was representing the case of a man who *had* been justified in the sense of *pardon*, for at least *forty years*. James was not speaking of the *remission of*

sins at all, but of the life of a man who was holy, a prophet of the Lord who had "walked before God with a perfect heart," for forty years at least, before he was said to be justified by works, when he had offered Isaac his son, in the sense of *commendation*. So Luke says, "The people *justified* God," commended, approved, were pleased with his doings.

My brother has also quoted John i: 12, "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." Some translate this the right, or privilege to become the sons of God. I have only the Greek before me, and will read from that, and will translate as I read: "But as many as received him (they *received* him as their redëemer in faith), to them he gave power (*εξουσιαν*—*ezousian*) to become (*γενεσθαι*, be born, *τίκνα*) children of God, (*τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*), to those who believed in his name. who *were* born, not (*εξ αἱμάτων*) of blood, neither of the will of the flesh, nor of the will (*οὐδέ—οὐδέ*) of man, but (*they were born*) of God, *ἀλλ ἐκ θεοῦ γεννήθησαν*

Now my brother interprets that to mean that those persons, merely had the privilege (*ἐξουσιαν*) of *afterward becoming* the sons of God—that is to say, whenever they should undergo certain acts—where is the text shows that this is not the meaning at all. On the contrary, the word *εξουσιαν* is rendered power, as its frequent or constant meaning. But the context settles it; whether *εξουσιαν* meant privilege or power, it has nothing to do with the fundamental fact. The word "born" is in the *aorist* tense, the past. They *were*, therefore, "born of God." Whenever they *believed* they were born of God. Therefore, their *birth* is solely attributable to the fact that they "*believed*."

My brother tries to anticipate the argument of justification of faith, by quoting John xii: 42, where "many believed on him," but did not confess him for fear of the Pharisees, etc. Now, first, He has no proof that they were not pardoned, none whatever. Hence, he can not use it as an illustration or argument. Second, He believes, as they all teach, that Simon Magus was pardoned, who *did not* "believe on Christ," but they simply "believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God. . . and were baptized."—Acts viii: 12. V. 13, "Then Simon himself believed (*i. e.*, Philip preaching), and was baptized." Now, because Simon was baptized, sorcerer as he was, though at once said to be "in the gall of bitterness and bond of iniquity," his "heart not right in the sight of God," and Peter's very words, "*I perceive* thou art in the gall of bitterness," etc., implies he discovered he

never had been right, yet he believes Simon was pardoned and at once *backslid*. Why may not those have backslid who failed to confess Christ for fear of being cast out of the synagogues? Third, But were this not the case, he is overthrown in his position by *this* fact, if these persons *were not* pardoned by virtue of not embodying their faith in an overt act, *that act was not* BAPTISM; for Christ never baptized *any person* with water or in water. (John iv: 2.) If these persons failed of pardon for want of baptism, then Christ's words were all untrue, since he declared to hundreds that their sins *were pardoned*, yet not one was baptized as a means, or expression. He even sent some to Siloam to wash their eyes; yet not a word about baptism. *Is it not remarkable that Christ, in all his life, never ordered one to be baptized? That not one ever was baptized in his presence?* Fourth, My brother quotes in all debates Gal. iii: 27, to prove his point, "baptized (*εἰς*) into Christ." The *εἰς* puts them into a *saved* relation. But here (John xii: 42) it is, "Many of the chief rulers (*ἐπίτιτοι εἰς αὐτόν*) believed INTO HIM." So if the one argument is good, so is the other.

His main argument on Mark i: 4, I will pass over for a few minutes, and notice his position, which he will have to defend. What has my good brother done? He has commenced to read law to the eternal and all-wise God, a God absolutely perfect in himself, infinitely wise, and forever the same. Yet he represents this God as ordaining a law of pardon to which a number of exceptions are made, which have occupied one-half of his discussion in their mention. Now, to suppose that the all wise God, in preparing a general law of pardon, would lay down a law to which he would make exceptions far greater than those who came under law itself, is to make God a caricature, a myth. What kind of a God is it that, in giving a law for the pardon of sins, at once makes so many exceptions, and proposes to save so many persons outside of and in violation of it, that the number saved in violation of his law seems to be infinitely greater than those saved by his law of pardon? All writers agree that it is one of the simplest principles of law, that he who lays down a *general rule* to which there are *exceptions*, shall *clearly define those exceptions*, their nature, character, and what may be supposed to govern them. Now, every text he has quoted and will quote in support of his theory, *comes in direct contradiction to his EXCEPTIONS* and destroys them. For instance, he tells you in a breath that people by the thousand can be saved without baptism, but quotes John iii: 5 to prove that we *must* be baptized to be saved: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he

can not enter into the kingdom of God." He quotes a text to prove that no man can be saved unless baptized, and then turns right around and admits that a portion of mankind *can* be saved outside of baptism, and thus questions the truthfulness of his own proof texts. Now, look at it. He quotes Mark i: 4, to prove that baptism is for the remission of sins, and then admits that men may be saved by the million without baptism. How does it look in an all-wise God to make such a law? He quotes Mark xvi: 15, "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not shall be damned," to prove that without baptism we can not be saved, and then admits himself that we can be saved without it.

His quotation from Mark i: 4, I will fully elaborate, but as he is here to affirm what his church affirms, and I to affirm what my church affirms—

Mr. Wilkes.—I wish to say that I am not here to affirm what my church believes; I affirm only what is in the proposition, and not what the church believes.

Mr. Ditzler.—Well, I had hoped that my brother would not go back on the church of which he is a member, and which is here to indorse him. I affirm for my church, which indorses me.

I now propose to read to you from their standard writers and speakers, to show you what they *do* teach. I read first from Mr. Alexander Campbell's "Christian Baptist," in which he elaborates their doctrine. In vol. v, p. 401, he says:

"In my debate with Mr Maccalla, in Kentucky, 1823, on this topic, I contended that it was a divine institution designed for putting the legitimate subject of it in actual possession of the remission of his sins, that to every believing subject it did formally and in fact convey to him the forgiveness of sins. It was with much hesitation I presented this view of the subject at that time, because of its perfect novelty. I was then assured of its truth, and, I think, presented sufficient evidence of its certainty. But having thought still more closely upon the subject, and having been necessarily called to consider it more fully as an essential part of the Christian religion, I am still better prepared to develop its import, and to establish its utility and value in the Christian religion. I beg leave to call the attention of the reader to it under the idea of the BATH OF REGENERATION.

"In the outer court of the Jewish tabernacle there stood two important articles of furniture of most significant import. The brazen altar next the door, and the laver between the brazen altar and the sanctuary. In this laver, filled with water, the priests, after they had paid their devotion at the altar, as they came in, and before they approached the sanctuary, always washed themselves.

This vessel was called in Greek, λουτήρ, and the water in it λουτρον, though sometimes the vessel that holds the water is called λουτρον. In English, the vessel was called laver, and the water in it loutron or bath. The bath of purification was the literal import of this vessel and its use. Paul more than once alludes to this usage in the tabernacle in his epistles, and once substitutes Christian immersion in its place—that is, Christian immersion stands in relation to the same place in the Christian temple, or worship, that the laver or bath of purification stood in the Jewish, viz, *between the sacrifice of Christ and acceptable worship*. In the Jewish symbols the figures stood thus: 1st The brazen altar; 2d. The laver or bath; and 3d The sanctuary. In the *antitypoi* or antitypes it stands thus: 1st. Faith in the sacrifice of Christ, the antitype of the altar; 2d, Immersion, or the bath of regeneration, the antitype of the *loutron*, or bath of purification; and 3d. Prayer, praise.”

I read the whole paragraph so that it can not be charged that the quotation is garbled in any respect. From the same work, on the 454th page, I read:

“Some say that we substitute water for the blood of Christ. This is so far from fact, that we give no efficacy to water, but *through the blood of the Savior*. Had he not shed his blood, all the waters which once deluged the world would be unavailing. They who say that faith is necessary to salvation, include neither infants nor those who never heard of the Savior, and argue that faith would be as unavailing as water, were it not for the blood of the Messiah. Yet they make faith necessary. Why then censure us for making immersion necessary to our enjoyment of forgiveness? We, like them, neither include infants nor those who hear not of the Savior; and like them we make immersion nothing independent of the blood of the great sacrifice, and of faith in that blood. *But we make immersion as necessary to forgiveness as they and we make faith, or as necessary to our being entitled to the blessings that are contained in the New Covenant, as they make sprinkling or immersion necessary to admission into the church.* They will not (I mean Baptists and Pedobaptists) receive into the church unbaptized persons. We say that baptism or immersion is *just as necessary to our obtaining the forgiveness of our sins, as they make it to admission into the church.* And if they will allow that there is a possibility of salvation without faith, baptism, or admission into the church, why should they object to our remarks upon immersion, which are not more exclusive than their own, seeing they can take so much latitude after laying so much emphasis upon faith, baptism, and admission into the church as to admit the possibility of salvation to infants, idiots, and pagans, remote from Christian privileges? I now argue with them upon their own principles.

“In fact, I say no more than the Lord Jesus said, ‘He that believes and is immersed shall be saved.’ And he spoke only of them to whom the gospel was preached. I make immersion just as necessary as they make faith, or as the Catholics or Protestants make sprinkling to admission into the church. The only difference is, that I give to immersion with faith the precise import which the New Testament gives it; and they give to immersion or sprinkling, without faith, a significance which it has not. I do earnestly contend that God, through

the blood of Christ, forgives our sins through immersion—through the very act, and in the very instant; just as, they say, God receives infants into the covenant or church in the very act, and in the very instant they are sprinkled.”

On page 439 I read:

“Before the Holy Spirit can be received, the heart must be purified; before the heart can be purified, guilt must be removed from the conscience; and before guilt can be removed from the conscience, there must be a sense, a feeling, or an assurance that sin is pardoned and transgression covered. For obtaining this there must be some appointed way—and that means or way is immersion into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. So that, according to this order, it is incompatible, and therefore, impossible, that the Holy Spirit can be received, or can dwell in any heart not purified from a guilty conscience. Hence it came to pass, that Peter said, ‘Be immersed for the remission of your sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit.’

“No man can have a holy spirit otherwise than as he possesses a spirit of love, of meekness, of humility; but this he can not have unless he *feel himself pardoned and accepted*. Therefore, the promise of such a gift wisely makes the reception of it posterior to the forgiveness of sins. Hence, in the moral fitness of things in the evangelical economy, baptism or immersion is made the first act of a Christian’s life, or rather *the regenerating act itself*: in which the person is properly born again—“born of water and spirit”—without which into the kingdom of Jesus he can not enter. No prayers, songs of praise, no acts of devotion in the new economy, are enjoined on the *unbaptised*.

“The question is, Why is the Holy Spirit promised as consequent upon immersion? I answer, first, because forgiveness is through immersion; and because, in the second place, the spirit of holiness can not reside in any heart where sin is not absolved. This is an invariable law.”

You see that he admits that Baptists and Pedobaptists teach that you can not be in the church without baptism; and “We make immersion,” says he, “as necessary to salvation as you make baptism to admission into the church.”

Now, we make faith just this necessary: that there is not a sinner in all the land, who has heard the gospel of salvation preached, and who is not an idiot, but will be damned if he does not believe. Every Baptist and Pedobaptist in all this land makes faith just this necessary: that unless you believe you will be damned, unless you are an idiot. Then, says Mr. Campbell, we “*make immersion as necessary to salvation as they make faith*.” Now, I could read many more passages to the same effect from that work, but I now read from Mr. Campbell still later, when in the very zenith of his strength, and when he had settled all his points of faith. I read from his “*Christian Baptism*,” p. 296:

"Arg. iv.—A fourth argument is derived from another fact, which calls for special consideration just at this point, to wit: *whatever is essential to regeneration in any case is essential to it in all cases.* The change, called regeneration, is a specific change. It consists of certain elements, and is effected by a special agency. If it be a new heart given, a new life communicated, it is accomplished *in all cases, as generation is, by the same agency and instrumentality.*"

So say I. Mr. Campbell is right on that point. "*Whatever is necessary to regeneration in ANY case, is necessary in all cases.*" God has but *one law* of pardon, and he has not reserved a list of exceptions.

And now I read from another authority (Walter Scott), who was an associate with Mr. Campbell in their "reformation," as they consider it. I read from his "Evangelist," vol. i, p. 62:

"Oh how beautiful will be the scene, when all the watchmen shall lift up their voices together, speak the same things, ADMINISTER THE SAME REMISSION [there is popery for you—what priest claims more?] on the same faith, and by the same authority. How near to us has God brought *the blood of Christ by the Christian laver*; nay, *he has by this bath PUT US INTO THE BLOOD OF CHRIST.* . . The new convert cometh forth from the laver, washed in the blood of the Lamb."

Now, I can read from a number of public debates which I have, such as that of Fitch and Brooks, of their side, and also Braden, president of one of their colleges in Illinois. If I have time I will read an extract from Braden, in his debate with Hewey, 1868, and will afterward read from Dr. Hopson, and others, to show the same thing. Now, to examine further on this point. The teaching of my brother's church is this: *First, we hear the gospel; second, then believe; third, then repent; fourth, then we are immersed, and in the act of immersion, our sins are remitted, washed away by the blood of Christ.* They say that it is then we receive the Holy Spirit. Every writer of theirs that I have read puts it in this order. They further teach that *faith* changes the heart, or, as it is sometimes expressed, purifies the heart, and that *repentance* changes the character. Now, they hold that a man's heart is changed and his character is changed before they will immerse him. They tell you they will not immerse a man until he is a believer. They say this belief has changed his heart and repentance his character, and with this clearly before you, I want to read to you from Hayden, in "The Living Pulpit," page 507: "When the heart is changed the conscience is *purged from defilement*; the heart is *purified of its love of sin*; it delights in holiness; and in its *reconciliation* it cries out, with Saul, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' The conscience is now pure. IT LONGS FOR THE PARDON OF THE SINS

which it now mourns." All this is to occur—all these changes to be effected, ere he is immersed "for remission of sins."

Now, Mr. Campbell, in his writings, teaches, in the most decided manner, that faith is the first principle of religion, the soul-renewing principle of religion; that it is the regenerating, justifying, and sanctifying principle of religion. In his "Christian Baptism," p. 293, he says: "Now, as faith in God is the *first principle—the soul-renewing principle of religion*;" as it is *the regenerating, justifying, sanctifying principle, without it,*" etc. P. 390: "We are not baptized because of our *fleshly* descent, etc., but because '*born from above—born of the Spirit.*'" Here, Mr. Campbell teaches that a person who *believes* is possessed of "the soul-renewing, soul-regenerating, and soul-sanctifying principle of religion." In the same connection, he teaches that baptism is not designed to possess us of that spiritual life which we already had before baptism, but to bring us into the *enjoyment* of that spiritual life which we *already possessed* before immersion—when we *believed*; that is to say, in order to be made conscious of that soul-renewing principle of religion. Hence, their position is, that a man's heart and character are changed, and that he is purified and possessed of this "soul-renewing principle of religion" *before he reaches the blood of Christ*. He is saved before he reaches Christ himself; for Mr. Campbell declares that "nowhere, save in baptism, can we meet with God." He declares that his heart and character are changed before he can reach the blood of Christ. Now, this is worse than Arianism. The idea that a man can be pure without God and without Christ! In the next place, I would ask how a man could be lost in that condition? How could a man be damned in such a condition as that? Possessed of "the soul-renewing, soul-justifying, and soul-sanctifying principle of religion," surely such a one can not be lost. I read further from Mr. Campbell. In the "Millennial Harbinger," extra, vol. i, p. 35, he says: "The question, then, is, *Where shall we find him? Where shall we meet him? Nowhere on earth, but in his institutions.* 'Where he records his name,' *there ONLY can he be found*; for *there only* has he promised to be found. I affirm, then, that *the first institution in which we can meet with God* is the institution for remission. And here it is worthy of notice, that the apostles . . . never commanded an inquirer to pray, etc., but always commanded and proclaimed immersion as the first duty or the first thing to be done after a belief of the testimony." Of "the converting act," "*Immersion ALONE was that act of turning*

to God."—Ibid. Again, p. 40, "If blood can *whiten* or cleanse garments, certainly water can *wash away* sins. There is, then, a transferring of the efficacy of blood to water; and a transferring of the efficacy of water to blood. This is a plain solution of the whole matter. God has transferred, in some way, the whitening efficacy or cleansing power of water to blood, and *the absolving* or PARDONING power of blood to water. This is done upon the same principle as that of accounting faith for righteousness. *What a gracious institution!* God has opened a fountain for sin, for moral pollution. He has given it an extension *far and wide as sin has spread.*" How eloquent Mr. Campbell grows! Hear him. He becomes fervid in eloquence, warm in spirit. He is enthused at the grandeur, breadth, the extent of the remedy for sin. It spreads—where? Wherever sin taints? wherever moral paralysis is felt? Wherever penitent hearts feel the burden of sin? Does it extend to dying sinners; sinners in prisons, in deserts, in narrow cells? Hear him: It is a remedy extending "FAR AND WIDE AS WATER FLOWS! *Wherever WATER* (immersion), faith, and the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are, *THERE* will be found the *efficacy* of the blood of Christ. Yes. As God first gave the efficacy of water to blood, he has now given the efficacy of blood to water."

I have read nearly the entire paragraph from where I commenced. You see, Mr. Campbell declares, in substance, that we can not find God except in immersion in the water, and that it is not necessary to come in contact with the blood of Christ. This great catalogue of exceptions are to be saved without the blood of Christ. Are they saved in their sins or out of their sins? If saved *in* their sins, then sinners are saved in heaven. If not, how can they be pardoned without the blood of Christ? for the Bible teaches that by the blood of Christ alone our sins are washed away. They are either saved by the blood of Christ in the forgiveness of sins, or they are lost. That we can not reach the blood of Christ, save in baptism, is the doctrine they all teach. In immersion only do we meet with the blood of Christ; and, therefore, men may be saved in their sins. How can my brother get around these conclusions? They lie at the foundation of his doctrines. They are the principles from which his church proceeds to act in the world, and he can not meet them. He can not meet the law, and so he attempts to make an exception of sick and dying persons. It will not do to say they are all turned into hell, yet he has no way to save them. Sick persons have

as much need of the blood of Christ as well persons do. I tell the sick sinner that unless he believes on the Lord Jesus Christ, and repents, though he be a sick man, God will not excuse him, and he will be damned. He must believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. Mr. Campbell says they make baptism as necessary to salvation as we make faith. The inspired Word says, "He that believeth not shall be damned;" and Mr. Campbell illogically says, he that is not immersed shall be damned. Where are the exceptions? They can not be found.

I now proceed to read from a sermon by Dr. Wm. H. Hopson, of Louisville, one of our worthy moderators. The sermon is published in "The Living Pulpit," one of their authorized works. He says, p. 281: "Salvation, in the proposition, is *essential* to pardon, remission of sins, or forgiveness of sins. '*Essential*' is that which is not only very important, but **INDISPENSABLY** necessary." Mind you, the proposition includes all who have heard the gospel, except infants and idiots. Dr. Hopson says they must hear in the true sense of the word. I quote further: "They (the Savior and his apostles) did always and every-where . . . command their hearers to believe, repent, and be baptized; and they never gave the most distant intimation that *any one* of these three commands should, *under any circumstances, be dispensed with.*" Where are the exceptions, save the three he names—heathens, infants, and idiots? Then he goes on, and asks, p. 282, "Is baptism essential to salvation?"—and, mind you, he defines the word essential as something which is "*indispensably necessary*"—and answers: "*We affirm that it is.*" This, then, is the only law of pardon; and he does not admit of the long catalogue of exceptions which my good brother makes. On p. 288 he says: "The promise is made to depend upon *full obedience* to the *three*—faith, repentance, and baptism. They equally possess the element of a condition precedent, and, *in this sense, are equally essential.*" And on p. 290 he says: "Baptism, then, is *indispensably necessary* to salvation. If not, then a man can be saved who refuses to obey the commandment of the Lord," etc. No, no; *that* does not follow. There is no logic or reason in *that*. If "*indispensably necessary,*" *none* can be saved without it, no matter how sincere, if only prevented by sickness, death, imprisonment, etc.

"No law of pardon, enacted by divine authority, in any religion, patriarchal, Jewish, or Christian, can be found which does not contain, as a conspicuous ele-

ment, a positive institution. Baptism is the positive institution which occupies this place in the law of pardon, under the Christian dispensation."

Now, he has argued these points very elaborately, and having made all of his points and defined his terms, he now comes to the conclusion. He puts himself on record along with other brethren, as Brooks did in his debate with Fitch, that the *laver* stands between the sinner and Christ. Therefore, their logic compels them to say, No immersion, no salvation. Hence, Dr. Hopson is compelled to say, page 300, " 'But will I be damned if I am not baptized?' *Certainly. Why not?* It is the blood of Christ that really washes away the guilt of sin. We come to the blood 'unto the death' of Christ, through faith and repentance, and *in baptism*. You *believe* and *repent*, but say that baptism is a non-essential, and, therefore, *will not obey it* [no, no; that follows not; no *believing* penitent talks that way—no logic or fact there], that is, you will do nothing for the love of Jesus but just so much and no more than is necessary to 'escape the damnation of hell.' *Why* should you be damned *if you do not believe*, and not be damned *if you are not baptized?* *Why* is *faith* essential to salvation, and baptism not? [For the best of all reasons; 1. Because THE BIBLE NOWHERE says that any one will ever be damned if not baptized; it does teach we will be, if we do not believe. 2. There is a divine philosophy in faith, in its relation to all the graces and virtues of religion; none such in baptism. 3. The one suspends salvation on the will of second, third, and on to the tenth party; faith does not. Wherever responsibility is, faith can be exercised. I continue to quote:] Is faith essential? Yes. Why? Is there any intrinsic merit or saving efficacy in faith? None. [Miserable logic—worse philosophy.] Is Jesus under any obligation to you because you believe? No. Is there any merit in faith and repentance? None. [Worse still.] The efficacy is in the grace of God and the blood of Jesus. Of *three things* which *equally* are void of merit, how can *two* of them be essential and the other not?" If "*faith changes heart,*" "*repentance changes character*"—is there no merit in them? He adds below, "If one is essential, so is the other." Finally, he adds, 301, "*The BAPTIZED, penitent* believer, according to the Savior's promise, *will receive the remission of sins. No OTHER MAN WILL.*"

He makes an exception of infants, idiots, and persons who have never heard of the gospel. With these exceptions, all others will be damned if they are not immersed. But the worst feature of the case

is, that these persons are all damned with *pure hearts and pure character*; and as Mr. Longan argues, as I will read in the future, that when heart and character are changed, divine clemency would seem satisfied. The sinner's heart is right; reason fails to see the need of more. Were there not *others* to be influenced by his example, it would stop here. But there must be *a test* of obedience for the benefit of others. God proposes to forgive the sinner on obedience *to that test*. Hence, he suspends his salvation on this test solely for the benefit of others! Here is the only reason given—the *only philosophy* in baptism for the remission of sins. They feel forced to make *some show*; here it is: "Faith and repentance must be embodied in an *overt act*, that *men and angels can see*." It is no test. For, 1st. The man may be baptized, and only one man be witness to it, the baptizing minister. 2d. He may be off a thousand miles in a few days, and *his word* alone is the evidence we can have. But, especially, 3d. It *can not* be a test, since the vilest hypocrite can also undergo the mere *outward act* of immersion as solemnly in appearance as the most pure. Yet, not that it tends to better the man, or has any reason in it, but that *others* may see it, it is to be a test of salvation, and on such a test men are to be damned! and an infinitely wise God has suspended regeneration on that very act!

But hear Dr. Hopson further, p. 293: "The *proof* of our faith in Christ, and of our loyalty to him, is found in an honest, cheerful, willing obedience to his positive institutions. They are proofs of faith," etc. He reasons as does Longan. It is the only attempt at reason or philosophy they can make; and how shadowy and void! How can a mere submergence of the body be a test or proof of faith or heart obedience? It is simply ridiculous. Very different is it as to repentance and faith. Repentance is a condition of mind and heart precedent to *trust in ANOTHER* for that we must feel conscious of being destitute as to ourselves.

There is a divine philosophy in the whole idea of faith. There is a divine efficacy in faith, and we can exercise it wherever responsible to God. Not so as to ordinances of the flesh; for, if my salvation depends upon them, then it depends upon the action of a second, third, or even tenth party. This, then, is a sufficient reason why I ought not to be damned for not being baptized, and my faith should be made the true turning point. But all this I will argue fully in the future. There are many reasons why I should be condemned for not "believing in the only-begotten Son of God," but God has never

proposed that my salvation shall be suspended upon the action of other parties. By this doctrine it is suspended upon the state of my health, the commands of my physician, the action of parents or guardians, etc. It may depend upon the legislation of a nation, or the marching of an army; for the ordinances of religion have often been suspended, and again might often be. Therefore, salvation hangs upon the will of men, the caprice of politicians, generals, and conventions. They have suspended the ordinances of the church, but, thank God, they can not suspend our faith in the Lord Jesus Christ. The hungry soul has but to reach out the withered arm of faith and take hold of the cross to make sure of eternal life. Christ is a fountain from which the thirsty can drink, though dying in a desert. The dying man can look upon the cross, and from that source comes his salvation. This is the anchor that holds, and with a firm faith in the merits of his dying Redeemer, his salvation is secured. "But," he asks, "will I be damned if I am not baptized?" and brother Hops on answers, "Certainly; why not?" "The baptized penitent will receive remission of sins. *No other man will.*" None but the immersed will receive remission of sins. None but the immersed will be saved. However, my friend makes a long catalogue of exceptions. That is their idea of faith, but this will be discussed further in due time.

I will also then take up Mark i: 4, and show you that it has no such interpretation as he gives it; that every author he quotes is directly against it. They are all square against him. Baptism for the remission of sins does not occur in the whole Word of God. They tell us we are commanded to be baptized for the remission of sins; but, if your salvation depended upon it, you can not lay your hand upon a passage that says, "Baptism is for the remission of sins." There are passages that, by eliminating and taking out parts—changing them—may be made to read that way, but it is not the language of Almighty God. I will take his quotation from Mark, where he says he will make his main battle, and test it by the laws of the Greek, and show you he is utterly stranded there. It must be the Gibraltar of his position, his Thermopylæ, where he will fight in his last ditch, and nobly perish; for he will have to perish unless he leaves it and flies to the cross of Christ, and lean upon Christ, by faith, as the source of eternal life.

My friends, take these facts home with you, and study them carefully. As Whately says, in his "Logic," you can show the untruth-

fulness of a system by showing its absurdity, and I show the absurdity of my brother's theory by showing the ridiculous results to which it necessarily leads. By showing its infinite absurdity here, I show its infinite failure to meet the wants and necessities of a sinful world.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKES' SECOND ARGUMENT.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My friend stated that baptism for remission of sins is the central idea in our system of religion, as he terms it, or the central fact. I wish to undeceive him, and also those who heard him make that statement, and may have believed it. Jesus Christ is the sun of our religious system. He is the light, morally, of our world. To him exclusively we look; and on him, for every spiritual and temporal blessing, we rely. So that it is by no means the case that baptism, either for, or not for, remission of sins, is the central idea of our religious system. I prefer that he will not urge that. It never has been so stated or held among us. We never believed any thing of that sort. We as truly and sincerely rely on Jesus Christ, and his shed blood, for the remission of our sins, and our acceptance with God, as my brother himself does, or could do. I state, in the next place, that the question we are discussing is one of fact. It is not one of consequences. When it can not be determined as a question of fact, it will then be competent that we discuss it in the light of its consequences. When the decision is made to turn upon a question of fact, the discussion of consequences is out of order, as my friend ought to know. Again, he says that he is on the safe side; for, whether baptism be for the remission of sins or not, he baptizes, and his friends baptize, so they are safe. In some cases the statement is true, as he makes it. But he has no advantage, in this respect, of me. For, whether baptism be for the remission of sins or not, *we* baptize also, and I can not see, therefore, that he gains any thing by that allusion.

He refers to the fact which I mentioned, that baptism was not instituted in the days of Abraham and of the prophets. I did so state, and do so believe. He tells us, however, that from Corinthians, tenth chapter and second verse, and Hebrews, ninth chapter and tenth verse, we learn that baptism existed back not far from the times

of Abraham; certainly in the times of Moses, and of Israel, before Christ. Now, I deny that there was any *Christian* baptism, in either case, according to the Mosaic law, or at the Red Sea. I admit that there was baptism. I believe that. Paul states that in his letter to the Hebrews, and also to the Corinthians. At the same time, there was no *Christian* baptism. They had baptism in its generic or primary sense, but no further. As, for example, when we place any thing, even a rock, or stone, in water, we baptize it, according to the classic sense of that term; but that is not *Christian* baptism. You may place a man who is an infidel in water, and take him up again, and he is baptized, but not in the Christian sense. In the primary and simple sense, there were baptisms under Moses, and at the Red Sea.

Again, my brother says that the Apostle James, second chapter, was not considering justification in the sense of pardon. I have not asserted that he was. What does he mean by that? He would try to show us that James is considering the acts of men who are *already pardoned*, in harmony with the will of God; and that they are considered, when they obey God, in *after* acts of obedience, as justified. Very well. I suppose that is true. James says that our father Abraham was justified by works when he offered Isaac, his son, upon the altar. My friend says that was a good many years after he was justified in the sense of pardoned. That is true. But the next verses tell us that then was that Scripture fulfilled which says, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." That is, just when Abraham did, in offering his son, what God told him to do, *then* was "the Scripture fulfilled, which says, Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness." More than that; is it true, and does my friend believe that it is *impossible*, that a man must be baptized in order to be pardoned of his sins? because baptism is a *work*, and yet, *after he is pardoned*, he *must work*, in order to enter heaven; that a principle on which it would not do to allow a man to be *pardoned*, is, nevertheless, essential to his getting to *heaven*? I object to my friend's philosophy, in this case. He can not defend it.

He has a very strange position in regard to the first chapter, and eleventh, twelfth, and thirteenth verses of John. It is said there, that "He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he privilege" (he says it ought to be power) "to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: which were born, not of blood, nor of the will

of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." The passage says, they had the *privilege* of becoming the sons of God, even those who believed in his name, who were born, etc. Does my opponent mean that after a man is born, and after he is pardoned, that he has the power of becoming a son of God? I thought, when a man was born again he was a son of God; but he teaches that *after* he is born, he has the power or privilege of becoming a son of God. That is not a very clear or satisfactory exegesis. It is absurd. He says that I make a great many exceptions; that my exceptions are more numerous than my rule. I wish to state, once for all, on this question of exceptions, that I make *no* exceptions to the law of God; not *one*. I simply teach, or mean to teach, what the law of God is. That is all. I claim that the law of God does not itself place the obligation on a man to do a thing who *can not* do it. I make no exceptions to the law of God whatever. Whatever the law of God says with respect to a man's being saved, that is true, *without any exception*.

But, does the law of God teach that unless a man is baptized he will not be saved, where he *can not* be baptized? I deny it. "Where there is no law there is no transgression," is a great principle, enunciated by the Apostle Paul. But how does *my friend* deal with such cases? for he has just such cases on his hands. What does *he* say? Suppose you turn to the commission. Does it not say, "He that believeth not shall be damned?" My friend will admit that it does. While I claim that there are some parties that *can not* be baptized, such as infants, and idiots, and heathen men who have never heard of Christ, or the gospel, is that any proof that I make exceptions to the law of God? No; there are no exceptions, only in the sense and to the extent already explained. Or, rather, there are, *really*, no exceptions to the law of God for salvation. The law of God is addressed to men capable of understanding, and having, besides, the ability and the opportunity of obeying it. It is addressed to no one else. Every man who does believe, and is not, but *can* be baptized, will be damned as sure as he is a man. That is what I believe. Allow that to settle the question. Now, let my friend bring up a case where a man *can* be baptized, who believes, but who will not, and ask me my opinion. I say he will be damned. That is, in substance, what the Bible states. It is said in John, third chapter, fifth verse, that "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." *Not* another *one* can enter into the kingdom of God. "Now," said my friend, "*he* then proceeds to

make exceptions where there were none named." How does that look? This passage is precisely like that other passage which says, "He that believeth not shall be damned." But of *this* text he says, "It does not include children, and idiots, that can not believe, and it does not include the man that has never heard of Christ, and has never had any chance to believe." He is right, and *I* am, therefore, right also. Why not confine this discussion to the question whether baptism is for the remission of sins for those to whom the law was and is addressed? That is the question.

It is true, that "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God;" but it is true only of the man to whom it is addressed.

My brother says that baptism is as necessary as faith, according to *our* doctrine. I do not know in what sense he uses that expression. I have never been able to weigh the relative importance of faith, and repentance, and baptism, or any of the duties imposed by God. I just suppose that when God says I must believe, I have that to do. If he says I am to repent, I have that to do. If he says I am to be baptized, I *must be baptized*. If he wishes me to pray, I must do that. If he says to me, labor, I must do that; *all* things must be done, according to HIS will. We must do whatever HE says, and I have not the ability to discriminate between the commands of God, as to their value. I do not assess valuations on the commands of God. A man had much better go and perform them, and leave it with God to decide which are the more important.

My friend says that Mr. Braden (and he quotes from him because he is president of a college) says, "We come into Christ through baptism." That is dreadful, is it not? The idea of coming into Christ in baptism! Paul says, in Galatians iii: 27, "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." Paul here says the same thing that brother Braden does, and yet my brother finds much fault with brother Braden! Paul says, distinctly, that we are *baptized into Christ*. But my brother says, my exceptions involve the idea of being saved without the blood of Christ. I answer, no. His exceptions do the same thing, if mine do. How is the infant saved? Without the blood of Christ? I suppose not. Is the idiot saved without the blood of Christ? I presume not. Still, neither of them *believes*; and yet the law he preaches is, that he who believes not shall be damned. Whenever he saves an infant, or an idiot, or a

heathen who has never heard of Christ, he will understand exactly my position on all these matters.

My friend says, "It is not said in the Scriptures, that if a man is not baptized, he shall be damned." But he says it is said, "If a man believes not he shall be damned." He means by this, that, unless the fires of purgatory, or the fires of damnation shall be shaken in his face, he will not believe that God tells the truth; that, unless he is to be damned, if he is not baptized, he does not intend to be baptized. The Bible says that baptism is for the remission of sins; but he says that is but a partial view, and that nowhere is it said that "Except a man is baptized, he shall be damned." He means by this, that, unless he is threatened, and threatened awfully, he will not be baptized. This seems to me to be the temper and spirit of my opponent.

With reference to the quotations from authorities, I believe my friend made the best speech, this morning, I have ever heard him make. I fear, however, that he will never make such a one again. I felt, while he was speaking, that if he would only *continue* to quote from his authors, there would be no necessity for my being here to reply to him. Dr. Hopson, through Mr. Ditzler, made a glorious speech; Brother Hayden made an elegant speech; Brother Brooks did also. All my other brethren will, in due time and order, be brought forward and heard on this question, I hope.

If the audience will allow me to tell a story, and temper it so that it will be entirely respectful and appropriate to this occasion, I will do so, for the sake of illustrating the point now before us. A little school-boy once was playing truant, or doing some other little wicked thing. The teacher brought him up and proposed to punish him. In those ancient days they had a peculiar way of bringing boys "to a *feeling sense*" of their obligations. So the teacher commenced laying the rod upon the little fellow pretty heavily. Tho little boy commenced laughing, inordinately. The teacher asked him, "Why do you laugh?" But the boy was so full of laughter, that he could not stop to answer, but continued to laugh; and so the teacher continued to whip him. After awhile the boy recovered sufficiently to explain, "Why, master! you have *got the wrong boy!* You are whipping the wrong boy!" Lo! my friend has been thrashing brethren Hopson, Pendleton, Hayden, and others, and they are not the right ones! They are not here. He is "whipping the wrong boy!" Though Brother Hopson is here, he is not permitted to speak.

Mr. D. has, by selecting an extract from "The Living Pulpit,"

here one and there one, and every one *out of its context*, succeeded in making a long speech. He has not noticed, fairly, the *Scriptures* which I have introduced, but has contended himself with replies to my brethren who are not here to answer, in person, for themselves.

If that constitutes a discussion with *me*, I would like to know it. I thought, this morning, that I was very respectful; or, I put on an appearance of respect and fairness, at least. I presented just what I thought was the truth in the passages on which, I felt in my heart, I could and would rely; but, for all that, my friend tells the audience that there is not any thing in them worthy of note; and he has spent an hour in examining arguments of men who are not here.

That may be all very well, but it does not strike me so.

My friend tells us that there is something peculiarly fitting in faith as a condition of a man's salvation. I suppose there is something quite appropriate in faith. I have no doubt of it, because God says that men must believe, and I am willing to stop there. There is something philosophic in it, he says. I think so. Let me ask my friend, however, how it was that the fall of man took place? A *false* teacher went into the garden of Eden, and told Adam and Eve that "it was not necessary to do *all* that God said. I know, said he, that God has said, if you eat of a certain fruit you shall die, but God is mistaken in that matter; and, said he, instead of dying in consequence of disobeying him, you will not only 'not surely die,' but will become like God himself, knowing good and evil. Besides, the fruit is good for food, and desirable to make one wise. It is a mere *arbitrary*, unphilosophic *arrangement* to deprive you of it. I would eat the delicious fruit. I *would eat it!*" By these insinuations, Satan, the great destroyer, brought sin and death into the world. He, first of all, taught that it is not very necessary to do precisely as God has said. Satan was the first to introduce this philosophy, and its baleful fruits we, by sad experience, know. Mr. Ditzler's undisguised position is, that if he can *see* an acceptable philosophy in the commandments of God, he will obey them, but not otherwise. And yet the fall and all of our sins and sorrows have come of that same position.

There was no reason for not eating the fruit except that God had forbidden it, saying, "For in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." The poor driveling spirit of man honors itself much more when it says, "*God said.*" "Let the earth rejoice," and "the multitudes of the islands thereof be glad," "for the Lord has spoken," etc. That is enough. It *should* not matter, it *does* not, whether there is a

philosophic reason for what God says or not, whether a man should be baptized or not. Nay, more; there is a deep philosophy in the circumstance of there being no philosophy in being baptized, no natural philosophy in it. God says, Believe on me, and he lays the evidence before you. If you do justice to this, you will believe. God says, Turn away from your sins, for they killed you, and nailed Jesus to the cross. I can see why a man should repent of his sin. There is a reason why a man should repent of his sins. But will a man stop when he fails to see a reason? God says, "Come on, my followers, come on, whether *you see* a reason or not." The case is like that of the little girl who was on the floor where the light was, and her father was in a dark cellar below. The father said, Throw yourself down here, my child; I will catch you in my arms; I can see you. But, said the child, I can not see you, father! The father replied, You can *hear my voice*, at least; and now, relying on your father's word, throw yourself down, and I will catch you. So she dropped down into her living father's arms, and was safe. It is precisely so in regard to our baptism. I do not know that there is any reason for it; but I can see a grand reason why a man ought to be tested; to see whether his faith and love for God have ascended high enough for his acceptance. And in imitation of the death, burial, and resurrection of our Savior, do you, says God, in substance, "go down and be buried, and then be raised up again," as I understand baptism. "Then I will forgive; but I will bring you to a test point before I will impart to you the wonderful blessing of forgiveness."

I propose again to call your attention to Mark i: 4, which reads: "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." It is not denied that the remission of sins depends here upon something, and the question is, what is that something? I would be understood. It will not be denied that the remission of sins depends upon something, here stated to be for the remission of sins. I ask, what is that something? I deny that it is repentance simply. I do not deny that repentance is for the remission of sins, but I do deny that this is the verse where that is stated. I deny that repentance can be for the remission of sins, as taught in this verse; or, I deny that *eis* here connects *metanoias*, on the one hand with *aphesin amartion*, on the other. I deny that there is any grammatical rule in the world by which my friend can connect repentance on the one hand with "remission of sins" on the other, by the preposition *eis* in this passage. Repentance is in the genitive case, but repentance is

not the thing stated *here* to be preached. It is not the thing which it is here stated that John preached. He preached baptism, but not baptism *by itself*. It is a qualified baptism. It is that baptism which grows out of repentance, which is accompanied by repentance, and to which a man is brought on account of repentance. The rule of grammar requires that construction. I propose now to read from the best authorities to that effect. First, I read from Buttman's "Gr. Gram.," sec. 132, p. 330. The genitive case is the origin case, that out of which the other noun grows or proceeds. I read as follows:

"In order to comprehend the genitive in its full syntactical relations, especially with verbs, we must premise that the fundamental idea of the genitive is that of SEPARATION, a *going forth*, whether *out of* the interior of any thing, or *from* its exterior; and that, therefore, the idea of the prepositions *ἐκ* (*ek*), *out of* the interior, *ἀπό* (*apo*), *from* the exterior or side of an object, is primarily in the genitive case itself."

I now read from Dr. Winer:

"The genitive is acknowledged to be the *whence* case (the case denoting source, departure or descent; cf. Hartung, *Casus*, § 12), and is most clearly recognized as such in connection with words expressive of action, and accordingly with verbs. Its most common and most familiar appearance in prose, however, is in connecting two substantives; here, through its gradually extended signification, it denotes every sort of *dependence* or *belonging*, e. g., ἡ κίριση τῶν κόσμων Ἰακώβου"—"Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament," by Dr. G. B. Winer, p. 184.

Again, I quote from Stuart's "Grammar of the New Testament," p. 161:

"(1.) The fundamental idea of this case has already been shown (in § 96); it is the *whence* case. This general idea may be applied to *space*, *time*, and finally to *causality*, or *originating source*, in its most extensive sense. It is with the latter that we are principally concerned."—"Grammar of New Testament," by M. Stuart, p. 161.

MR. DITZLER'S SECOND REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My good Brother Wilkes thinks any thing from the schools would not be appropriate here. I think it very appropriate. I once went to a teacher who acted upon this principle. When there was great doubt as to who was the offender he would whip all the school, in order to get at the right one. I find so many of their men guilty that I think it safest to whip a little all round, so as to be sure of whipping the right one. Then, there is not a liek amiss.

My brother objects to the idea that baptism is the central idea of their system. Now, mind you, aside from what you have heard read, I have this large volume of theirs, "The Living Pulpit," setting forth professedly and teaching their doctrines. It is *all* doctrinal. While traveling once, with no other book to read, I sketched out the sermons in this book. In this book there are not more than three or four sermons that do not, more or less, discuss the question of baptism, and a number of them are devoted almost entirely to discussing baptism, as to the mode, design, or something of the kind. As to Jesus Christ being their idea, you would never arrive at that from their teaching in their writings. Their most important idea is that of baptism. You may take up the average books of our church, and you will find that baptism is rarely named or discussed. Christ and the fundamental principles of religion are the topics presented. Baptism is not slighted or treated with contempt, but the mind is constantly pointed to Christ. But in their sermons, as published in that book, and in all their writings, you will find from five to eight pages devoted to baptism to every half page or page devoted to any thing concerning the merits of Christ. But what I meant to say was this, that baptism for the remission of sins is the great central idea or doctrine taught by their church, and believed by its people. My brother now denies that there was any "*Christian baptism*" before the days of Christ. Before, he simply stated that baptism did not exist, and did not say any thing

about "Christian baptism," that I heard. Now he says they only had it in a *generic* sense. For instance, he illustrates it by saying that if he puts a rock under the water it is immersed; that is, baptized, and refers to the classics. Now, my friends, to those of you who are versed in religious literature that is simply preposterous. I hope he will stand to his position. He denied that baptism, as used in the Bible, existed. Of course we are not discussing the question whether or not classic baptism was for the remission of sins. Paul uses the term in the religious sense when he says "our fathers were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea" (1 Cor. x: 1, 2). Paul uses it in the ninth of Hebrews, *verse ten*, as ordained of God. Would he use it simply in the sense of a rock lying at the bottom of the river? It is well known that it occurs in classic literature in that way, but my friend knows that there is not a place in all the Bible where Paul, or any of the inspired writers, uses the word *baptizo* for a rock lying in the river, or any thing like it. We are discussing baptism as a religious ordinance, and he now slips in the word Christian. I have shown you that the people were used to baptism in a religious sense for the preceding *fourteen hundred years* before Christ, and never dreamed that it was for the remission of sins.

He butchered his case terribly in his comments on John i: 12, "But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God." He reads that and assumes the position that to them was given power to become sons of God, but that the relation of sons existed prior to the bestowal of this power; that there was a condition at least in making use of this term. Now, let us repeat, "But as many as received him, to them gave he power [the term is here used in a *spiritual* sense] to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name." Now, were they sons before they had this authority? Who received this power? *Those who believed on his name*: "which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." You see they were not sons *before* they were *born*, but they *thereby became* "the children (*τέκνα*) of God," every one that believed. They were born of God, and thereby became the sons of God. He says where there is no law there is no transgression, and then takes up Mark xvi: 15, to show that in the cases of infants and idiots they can not believe, and, therefore, they must be damned. He does not say it includes them, but if it does, they must be damned. Now, even supposing that this text was in the Bible originally—which I can not admit, for it bears

on its face the very stamp of forgery—but, granting, I say, that it was inspired—it does not apply to infants in the way he said at all; for they can not be said “not to believe.” “And he that believeth not shall be damned.” Such a thing can not be affirmed of either infants or idiots. It can not be said that they either believe or do not believe. Hence, the whole point falls through.

But Satan preached disobedience, he says. Well, he seems to know more about what *Satan* preached than the rest of mankind. I have read Genesis iii, but have never found his idea in it. I have out little “respect for his burning throne,” and I leave him to my good brother. In the future I will come to consider 1 Corinthians i: 14–17, to show you the real value that Paul placed upon baptism. Gal. iii: 27, we “are baptized into Christ.” Does that refer to water baptism, or is it spiritual baptism? We are put into Jesus Christ, but he can not say it is by water. In the next place he tells us that *eis* is such a power, it must put a man into Jesus Christ, and, in connection with *baptizo*, it baptizes him into Jesus Christ. The same word is constantly attached to Jesus Christ—believe, *eu* (*eis*), into him—yet here he repudiates its meaning. Matt. xviii: 6, πιστεῦντων εἰς ἐμέ, believe into me. Mark ix: 42; John ii: 11; iii: 16–18—πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων εἰς (*eis*) αὐτόν, whosoever believeth into him—eighteenth, same. So iv: 39; vi: 35, etc.; Acts x: 43; Rom. x: 14, etc. Thus, a word joined to baptize with him means far more than when attached to faith. How he can twist! But on the philosophy and reason of faith! How he did dwell upon that! I now examine their efforts to philosophise on their dogma, for they feel compelled to try to show *some* reason for such a system of faith. I quote from Longan, the best effort we have ever seen from them in that direction, “Living Pulpit,” pp. 203–5: “When the sinner believes in Jesus, and is deeply penitent for his sins; when his understanding is enlightened and his heart is changed, *what then?* Why, then, ‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.’ . . . But *why* be baptized? Jesus commands; is not that enough? Nay, but is not the *commandment* wise? and may not its wisdom be vindicated? I answer, *yes*. My faith is as firm that there is a *divine reason* lying beneath this divine commandment as that God is all wise. Let us reverently attempt to look into it.” “First, then, I confess that if there were no *universe* beyond God and the single offending sinner . . . I can see no reason why baptism should be enjoined.” He here admits all is accomplished before baptism necessary for the purity, goodness,

and adoption for heaven, so far as the man and his God are concerned. He is pure. "If, however, God and the single sinner were the whole universe, all that would be necessary to put the sinner within the reach of divine clemency, seems to be gained when the sinner believes and repents. His understanding is then right, *and his heart is right*. . . . Human reason, it seems to me, in such a case, fails to discover a necessity for any thing more." So say I. But, "The sinner, in point of fact, is only one among millions equally guilty. . . . In forgiving a sinner, God must take into account *the moral influence of the act throughout all ranks* of created beings under law to him. *The point at which he proposes to forgive the sinner*, must be the one that all right-thinking subjects of the divine government will recognize at once as the proper one. . . . In all the universe, the penitent sinner's *status*, until developed *in an overt act*, is known only to himself and to God." He then urges others have seen his sins. He must, therefore, before men and angels, confess his guilt, avow repentance, and pledge himself to fidelity. He adds: "His faith and repentance must be embodied in an overt act [baptism], that men and angels can see. Surely this is clear beyond cavil. [Yes, clear as Egyptian darkness.] . . . God has established an institution, and made it the line of separation between his kingdom and that of the opposing power. This institution is *Christian baptism*. In this overt act you *externalize* your faith and repentance. . . . [106] It is not the value of the thing done. It is not that it has saving merit in it." So Hopson reasons, more briefly: "A proof of faith in Christ," as we read from him in our opening address. In substance, then, here is their system: But for the influence an overt act has on other equally guilty sinners, baptism would not exist. It is not for the benefit of the baptized at all. He is fit for heaven when he believes and repents. God and angels could see no need of more fitness for heaven. Yet God suspends his salvation on an act to be performed for benefit of others, who are equally responsible with him, when, 1st. There is no *merit* in the act, no efficacy. 2d. An act that often only the officiating baptizer witnesses, and so it utterly fails to be a test before men. 3d. If a thousand saw him, he may be removed thousands of miles in a few days, and so it is no test at all. The sinners who have seen his guiltiness do not see him baptized. In most cases only a few people, any way, witness it. 4th. *Especialy*, it is no test of loyalty to God, or of faith. As to *God*, he looks at the heart—knows his sincerity, if sincere. As to man, it is no test,

since the vilest wretch can undergo the mere act of immersion with as much outward show of sincerity as the best of men. 5th. Is not every sinner equally responsible with this one, and is it not their duty to repent and believe? Is he to be made a *scapegoat* for their benefit because he repented? 6th. If sick, in prison, in a desert, on a cross, he can not embody his faith, etc., in such overt act. What then? It is on such shallow pretenses that we are to believe God has suspended the souls of men. What a monster of ignorance they make him! My brother attempts philosophy, and we will examine his effort now.

In another place Dr. Hopson says the same thing with Longan. Taking all together, what they have said, and what my brother said in his opening speech this morning—you have the case, the *system*, made out—Brother Wilkes and A. Campbell urge we must *know* we are pardoned. In his Lexington speech my brother made this clearer than I had ever before heard it; and I admire it. He does not dwell so long upon it now. We must know we are pardoned, and to this end there must be an *overt act*, such as Longan and Hopson speak of, by which to gain this knowledge. Now, baptism, he says, is that *act*. Now, here is the philosophy they are compelled to try to develop. Let us see if there is any philosophy in it. First, They say they will not immerse a person unless he is a penitent believer; and, unless he is a penitent believer he is not pardoned, and does not come into the enjoyment of the merits of the blood of the Son of God. Does not this destroy his own argument? for, does it not make the *act of penitence and faith* the test of their acceptance to God? The man must be a believer. As Alexander Campbell has it, he must *feel and know* that he is a believer; he must *know* he is penitent before they will receive him. Then belief and penitence become the real test; and they say without this it is not Christian baptism. This, then, destroys their favorite idea. Aside from that, you see it is devoid of philosophy and reason, and the whole system is wrong. Second, No such act can be a test of loyalty to God in the sight of men. The most wicked hypocrite in the world, or the vilest wretch on earth, can perform that act, so far as the *outward form* is concerned, and though we may deny that it is Christian baptism, he can *perform it* as an act before men in as impressive a manner as the most humble and lowly man in all the land. And if there is no line of distinction between the two, how can this act be the test of a man's fidelity to his God? It can be so only to his own conscience at the extreme, and not then,

unless he has faith and repentance, on which it all turns at once. Thus, you see, the whole system is devoid of philosophy, even when they try to show philosophic reason in it.

Now, then, we turn to Mark i: 4, which he regards as the Gibraltar of his position. Is baptism in consequence of *existing repentance*, as he argues, or does it *look to or obligate to repentance*? If the first be true, there is some show of reason for his position, so far as John's baptism goes; but if the reverse be true, it has not a shadow of support. We affirm it is the latter, and not the former, and proceed with the proofs.

I will read from Jelf, his great authority, who is clearly with me on this point. Vol. ii, p. 200, § 542 c.: "*Genitive of the object toward which the principle notion is directed*: 1. Object of feelings: *ἔρωσ τῆς γυναικός* [love of woman—i. e., love toward—directed to—that has woman as its object; baptism of repentance—that has repentance as its object]. . . τὸ παυσανίου μίσος [the hatred of Pausanias—hatred toward him—that had Pausanias as its object]. Δημοσθένους Φιλία Ἀθηναίων εἰννοία—σο, φόβος Ἰουδαίων—G. Test. [fear of the Jews—that had the Jews as object of fear—had repentance as the object of baptism]. . . . 3. of an action. . . C. *Characteristic, or constituting genitive*. When a notion is characterized or particularized by being identified with, or constituted by, some other notion, or by being distinguished by something which gives it a peculiar nature, property, or character, etc., it is viewed as belonging or appertaining thereto, and is followed by the possessive genitive: *ἀστυ Ἀθηναίων*, . . . σοφίας διδασχῆ, the teaching proper to wisdom—i. e., that has wisdom as its object [the baptism that has repentance as its object]. So of 'Attributive Genitive,' which defines quality—*οἰκία τριῶν ἡμερῶν*—provisions of three days—their object three days' supply." P. 183, § 521: You see he sustains, beyond controversy, my position. Then his treatment of *εἰς* (*eis*) makes it absolutely clear. "2. *εἰς* 1. Local—an actual motion toward and into an actual object, *in, into* . . . to the house of Medis," etc. 2. Temporal. 3. *Causal*. a. The destination, aim, object, intention, purpose, function, result, for, on, to, as *ἐχρήσατο τῷ χρημασιν εἰς τὴν πόλιν*, II. i: 102, *εἰπὲν εἰς ἀγαθόν*—for good: so *εἰς τί—for what?*"—ii: 298. So Acts xix: 2, *εἰς τί;* for what?—what was the "aim, object, intention, purpose," or "result" of your baptism? For what were ye baptized? So Luke v: 4, "Let down your nets (*εἰς ἄβυσσον*) for a draught." 2 Cor. ii: 12, "I came to Troas . . . *εἰς ἀντὶ τοῦτο*—for this very purpose." 298: "So baptism (*εἰς*) for repentance—obligating to repentance," bbs. "3. c. The state, sphere, position, OBLIGATIONS, or privileges, into which per-

sons or things enter, or are to enter," etc. 299: Now, under the above head, "Causal," and "observations," or "C." of the "state," "obligations," etc. Jelf gives, along with Acts ii: 38, Matt. xxviii: 19, Matt. iii: 11, βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς εἰς μετάνοιαν (I baptize you into the obligation of repentance—bind, obligate you to it—of John's baptism), p. 299, § 625. He gives Acts xix: 2—into, or for what were ye baptized as the "aim," "object," purpose, where Paul says John baptized εἰς μετάνοιαν—*eis metanoian*—unto—into—looking to it as a "result."

He praises Winer as a great authority. The world so esteems him—one of the greatest. I quote from edition, 1840, translated by Agnew and Ebbecke, p. 153, § 30, "b. Internal relations yet more remote are expressed by the genitive, etc., ἀναστασις ζωῆς, the resurrection of life (compare genitive of design, etc.), Mark i: 4, βάπτισμα μετάνοιας, baptism of repentance, i. e., WHICH OBLIGATES TO REPENTANCE." Here Winer gives his law of the genitive, its applications, and selects the very text my brother relies on as his main proof-text, as a clear refutation of that view, and exactly as I have contended. So Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebraicæ* iii, 266, "Baptism obliged to repentance." Koenael's Latin Commentary—*Cæterum Johannes baptismo obstringebat Judæos, τῇ μετάνοιᾳ*—"Certainly John, by baptism, obligated the Jews to repentance."—Tomus i: 26.

Their baptism, then, does not grow out of a consciousness of having already repented, but it obligates them to repentance. But the brother argues that they could not come to religious baptism unless they were repentant. Would these people, who were so given to carnal ordinances, have a proper idea of repentance? Such a thing is not to be supposed. They believed only in fleshly ordinances, and turned the temple of God into a public shamble for selling doves, pigeons, etc. They were so ecremonious that they would baptize themselves when they came from market, baptize their couches upon which they sat at meals, and baptize their furniture. *Baptidzo* is the word used, Mark vii: 4, 8. That these people would have proper ideas of religious worship, is not to be presumed.

Once more I quote an authority—one of the highest—Wahl's Greek Clavis. Under βαπτίζω he says, "b. addita obstringendi notione—with the additional idea of binding, obligating . . . obstringo aliquem—I obligate any one. εἰς τὸ (for any thing, into it), ut convertum animum ejus ad aliquid—that I may convert his mind to any thing. Sic ut εἰς (eis) FINEM indicit, quo spectat illa immersio, brevius immergendo abstringo, aliquem ad faciendum aliquid. Matt. iii: 11, Mark i: 4,

Acts xix: 4, βαπτίζω ὑμᾶς . . . εἰς μετάνοιαν—so that εἰς (*eis*) indicates the end—object—to which the immersion looks; briefly, by immersing any one, I obligate—bind them to do a certain thing—I baptize you unto—looking to—repentance.” You see they all sustain me.

Dr. Robinson, in his Greek Lexicon, says, Acts xix: 4, “John baptized a baptism of repentance, *i. e.*, by which those who received it acknowledged the duty of repentance.”

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKES' THIRD ARGUMENT.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My friend gives a happy, and rather a witty turn to what I said concerning the boy at school. I have only to reply, with regard to what he said about his crusty old teacher that whipped all the boys, I will venture to assert that he never missed *him*! My friend thinks that the book of sermons called "The Living Pulpit," is very full of baptism. Well, that would be positive proof that *he* had not much to do with it. If it had originated with him or his friends, it could not consistently have had *any* thing about baptism in it. Why does it happen, will you ask, that the writings of my brethren have so much on this subject? My friend, Mr. Ditzler, has been going, like a comet, all over this country, trying to demonstrate to the people, that they not only need not be baptized at all, but especially that they need not be *immersed*; and he has made himself quite a champion for that doctrine. He is not the first or the last man who has done this.

The Bible talks of baptism, and we want the people to know what it says. We do not regard it as more important than other things. Jesus Christ is *our* Savior and King, the head and the foundation of the Church; the "all in all," both of the Old Testament and the New. But that does not prove that a man who is commanded to be baptized, ought not to be baptized. The cause of our speaking on this subject is, that my friend, and such as he, are everlastingly in the way of the truth, and we can not, without effort, make the people see it; *that* is why we have to talk about baptism so much. If my friend would have me to cease talking about baptism, let him first cease. I make the proposition now, that whenever the objectors cease their war against baptism, we will have very little reason for talking about it any more than the apostles did; but they never preached a sermon without saying *something* about it. In some cases it may not be *mentioned*, but the probability is, that in all cases the apostles either formally mentioned it, or, at least, implied it, in every sermon to sinners.

My friend raised the question whether there was baptism before the birth of Christ. He says yes, Bible baptism. He will not say *Christian* baptism. I ask, was there ever a time, before Christ announced the gospel and the promised salvation, at which he said, "Go, preach the gospel to every creature; he that believes and is baptized shall be saved," or, as in Matthew, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them?" Before *that* time, was it ever a man's duty, by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ, to be "baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit?" That is the only baptism we are speaking of. Was *it* ever practiced? Was *it* ever required by men or angels, or God, before that time? No, never. Will that suffice to satisfy my friend?

He says I have a rule on the first chapter of first Corinthians, seventeenth verse, which conflicts somewhat with what I have taught here on the subject of the importance of baptism, and then he attempted to give you *the* rule. He *staggered* on in it for a little while, but he soon abandoned the attempt, and left you knowing nothing about the rule. I will present the rule my-self when I get to it.

My brother said something which I did not catch distinctly, but I wish to notice all that he said. It was in respect to baptism being a test of something to the infidel. He said faith addresses itself to the consciousness of a man; that is, I suppose, that a man may be conscious that he believes, but that baptism is a test or sign, only, as to the outer world. He said something further with regard to an infidel's giving that test, which I did not understand. I answer, that an infidel can not be baptized. He may be baptized in the classic sense. But an infidel, a man that does not have unstaggering faith in his Savior, who does not repent of his sins, and does not come to baptism with the faith in his soul that he gives himself to God; who does not feel that the *authority of God* requires it at his hands, *can not be baptized*. He gives no test, or, certainly, a false test, if any, on the subject, if he come otherwise. As this will be my closing address this evening, and, as my friend has made something of an effort (you will be the judges) to reply to what I said in regard to the construction of the Greek sentence in Mark i: 4, I propose to reply, and still further to press my argument. I am willing that my name shall go to the statement I make in regard to the Greek construction of that sentence. I, then, propound this question: How shall we decide what the construction ought to be in this case? I answer: We should take rules in their ordinary application, making no strained use of them. We

should not be allowed to make a strained or unusual application of them, unless overmastering and important necessities compel it. Just as we should be blamed, if we did not, in the use of words, take them in their ordinary and current sense, so in regard to our translations and constructions. If my friend objects to this rule, let him say so.

I think, all good scholars know, that the ordinary rule is, that the genitive, limiting and qualifying a noun, and following it, is the case of origin; the source or whence case. If that be true, the baptism of repentance is the baptism which grows out of repentance, the source. What reason has my friend given for departing from that rule? *For that is the rule.* He has given none, and *he can give none.*

I now present you with some other authorities on the same subject. I read from Harrison, "Greek Prepositions," "the case of nouns," etc., page 15:

"The simplest case, apparently, at least, of the use of the genitive, in Greek, is that in which, corresponding to the English 'of,' it is employed to qualify the meaning of the preceding noun, and to show in what more definite sense it is to be taken."

Here we have that case. We have a noun followed by the genitive; and that genitive is used to limit and qualify that noun, to show in what more definite sense that preceding noun is to be taken. "Repentance" here limits and qualifies the noun baptism, showing that it is not every man that can be baptized, but that a man must have repentance before he is baptized, and having it, is, *therefore*, led to be baptized.

I now read from a work second to none on the continent, "Jelf's Greek Grammar," second volume, page 155:

"The genitive expresses the *antecedent notion*, that notion which precedes the principal verbal notion in the series which forms the whole thought."

On page 199, of the same volume, and section 542, he says:

"When two substantives are so joined together that the one seems to depend upon and derive its force and meaning from the other, in any one of the relations given above, that substantive on which the one depends is in the genitive, as being in some respects antecedent to the proper conception of its state or nature, and hence arises the rule that when two substantives are joined together, the one that explains and more accurately defines the other is in the genitive, as it is the expression of some notion whence the notion of the other substantive sprung."

So deposes Dr Jelf That is just the case we have I will read from one other authority—Dr Moses Stuart, “Grammar of the New Testament,” page 164:

“All these and the like genitives may be considered in the simple light of **ATTRIBUTIVES**, *i e*, they all attribute to the preceding noun some modification which is occasioned by them, which they designate or of which they are the source or cause”

Also, from the same page:

“The general principles developed in § 96 respecting the nature of the genitive may, for the most part, be obviously applied to the case now before us. Yet custom has extended the use of the genitive so far that it is difficult, in some cases, to make the application of the theory plain and palpable. A few exceptions, however, if they are indeed such, would not set aside general principles that are plain”

“The general idea of *proceeding from*, *depending on*, and as intimately connected with this, *the ground*, *source*, *reason*, *cause*, or *occasion*, of the action, etc, expressed by a verb, is designated by the genitive. In a word, wherever the verb needs something to define the nature, cause, source, occasion, etc, of the action which it expresses, the genitive may make that explanation”

I now present my case thus. It is as plain a construction as there is in the Greek language. We have here a verb followed by a noun, and that by a genitive noun, limiting the preceding noun, indicating that out of which the former of the two nouns grew. This, again, is followed by *eis*, and *eis* is followed by the phrase “forgiveness of sins,” which is the object of *eis*. The word *eis* is a preposition, and connects the verbal notion on the left with the substantive notion on the right. *Eis* connects *baptisma*, as modified, on the one hand, with *aphesin amartion* on the other. I say it connects *thus*, not otherwise. This is the rule of such constructions. The genitive, *metanias*, is not connected, on the one side, with *aphesin amartion* on the other. The thing which John preached was baptism, qualified by repentance, and growing out of it. Baptism grew out of repentance, and is that to which a man is brought on account of repentance, and to which, *if honest*, he would not come without repentance. Unless he has repentance, and sincerely desires to serve God, he could not, rationally, come to baptism. That kind of baptism which is thus qualified is the baptism which John preached for the remission of sins. If that sentence is not plain—if it is not unmistakably plain—I know no sentence that can not be misunderstood.

But where are my authorities? he asks. Bless you! if there is authority for any thing, I have it for this. I have Moses Stuart; I have Harrison, a late work, and regarded as second to none; I have Winer; I have Buttman; I have Schaaf; and I have many others. But what authority has my friend? He read from a little table of *small items*, under one of the subdivisions in Jelf (a book which I loaned him, he said), something I did not understand what, precisely, nor what point he intended to make. I am perfectly willing for you to attribute this to a want of perception in me. I do not, *now*, understand what he said, or the *precise point* he wished to make; nor could I find the things he read on the page which he cited. I do not deny that they may be good authority, however; but I can not find them. He says we have the very phrase, the very *Greek passage*, in Winer, on Mark, first chapter and fourth verse, and that he translates it, "Baptism obligating to repentance, and that *he* ought to understand his own grammar." In my own opinion, Winer explains it a little differently. But the difference in the two editions of Winer is not material.

Let us now examine *this matter a little further*. Do you believe that Winer means, that John preached to the people, and told them that if they would come forward and be baptized, that they would, thereby, take upon themselves an obligation to repent afterward? Do you believe that? Does it seem, on the face of it, to be the meaning which Winer gives? I do not believe he ever thought any thing of the kind. It is a contradiction on the face of it. It is as much as to say, "I promise to do a given thing which will oblige me to repent *afterward*." That is nonsense. That feeling which would induce me to promise to repent at some future time presupposes repentance already. I come, a great sinner, to John the Baptist, and say: "John, I wish you to baptize me; but I do not repent; I have no repentance now. I do not care for God, angels, or men. But, John, if you will baptize me I promise to repent in the future." Do you believe that a man, without repentance, without any faith or changed feelings toward God, would or could come to John the Baptist and honestly desire to be baptized? Certain parties tried it once. They came to John, without repentance, and wished to be baptized; but he did it not. If you will turn to the third chapter of Matthew, you will read there the account of those men who tried the experiment; and you will find a lesson on this subject, taught by John the Baptist, that forever settles this controversy of baptism which

"obligates" to a repentance that has never taken place. I admit that baptism obligates to repentance, to a *life* of repentance; that baptism obligates us to a life of *piety* and devotion to God. My friend does so believe; but he surely does *not* believe that a man may be baptized without repentance, or faith, or piety, or love of God! Though he believes that baptism obligates to a life of service or devotion to God, at the same time he does not believe that a man ought to be baptized without piety, faith, etc., all preceding. That is precisely the view Winer takes. I believe I have said that John the Baptist explains this matter. So he does. "But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to him, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?"

"Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet for repentance." What does he mean by this language? He would, himself, I suppose, reply about as follows: "You are coming to me to be baptized. You need not come, unless you come with 'fruits meet for repentance.'" These words I take as evidence that John did not invite persons to baptism unless they had repented. Therefore, he did not baptize them without repentance, nor simply "obligating to repentance." He shows, by this passage, that they need not come to him for baptism, without giving evidence of repentance, or, at least, without *saying* that their application for baptism grew out of the fact that they had repented.

They placed their claim to baptism on the ground that pedobaptists, in some cases, rest their claim. They claim it for infant children, because of the faith of their parents. Those persons came and desired to be baptized of John on the ground that they were Abraham's seed. They supposed that they would not be required to repent, on the ground of the promise made to Abraham on account of *his* faith; being descended from Abraham, they thought they would be entitled to that baptism on that ground. What does John say to them? "I say unto you, God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham. And now, also, the ax is laid at the root of the trees; therefore, every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire."

"I, indeed, baptize you with water unto repentance"—in the *Greek* it is, *into* repentance. The object of baptism is to bring into a *state* of repentance. Does this prove that repentance had not gone before? No; in reason it does not. From Mr. D.'s own *observation* and mine

it does not. Honest men *do* and *must* always repent before they are baptized. Do we not, when we baptize persons, obligate them to a *life* of penitence? And do they not feel themselves obligated, in view of baptism, to lead a life of repentance and faith? Are they not obligated also, every time they sin, to repentance? John says he baptized them into repentance; but did he baptize them *without* repentance, therefore? No; he did not. The verses preceding show that he stopped them on their first approach, on the ground that they had not repented; on the ground that they must first bring forth fruits meet for repentance, and not claim the privilege of baptism without. He did not baptize them without repentance; and he taught them that they must repent in order to be baptized. He says, in substance, that "baptism requires you to pledge yourselves to a life of repentance." *That* is baptism into repentance. You are to be baptized into a state or condition in which it will be obligatory upon you, in all cases of sin, to repent, and to live a life in harmony with the life of a penitent man. This the sense of the passage. But the idea that John the Baptist, or that any body would require a man to be baptized, pledging himself when he was baptized, to repent would be very much out of harmony with all my ideas of the actions and conduct of sensible and accountable men. Assume an obligation to-day to repent to-morrow! The idea is inconceivably irrational. It can not be done. They did not do it. John required them to repent before he baptized them, and certified them that, when he baptized them, they would be brought into a state or condition in which they would be required to continue to repent, and continue to manifest in their lives and conversation the same penitence. This is the meaning of the passage.

There are two or three other places where this same form of speech occurs; but the same reasoning will apply to all of them, and I am, therefore, saved from referring at length to them.

I rely upon these passages as proof positive and conclusive of *my* proposition, subjected to all the rigid investigation and close scrutiny possible on the part of any one. I regard them as conclusive of the proposition, that "baptism is for the remission of sins."

I now refer to John, third chapter, fifth verse. He says, that no one, responsible, of course, for the obedience of law, can enter into the kingdom of God who is not born of water and the Spirit. I showed that "born of water" meant baptism. If it be true that a man can not enter into the kingdom of God without being baptized and born

of the Spirit, baptism lies between him and entering that kingdom, and, therefore, lies between him and the remission of his sins; therefore, "baptism is for the remission of sins."

I now call your attention to the commission, as given by Mark. I hope my friend will learn not to be so opposed to baptism and to water. I know he is opposed to them to the extent of hydrophobia, almost; but I hope it will not grow upon him and incline him to infidelity on the latter part of Mark's gospel. I know pretty well, I think, all that has been said with regard to the sixteenth chapter of Mark. But my friend told me, if I do not forget, that *he* believed it to be authentic; that he believed it to be genuine, and from Mark. At Mt. Sterling, he said he believed it to be genuine and reliable.

Let me say that, in our *ex tempore* speaking, while he has a right, and so have I, to criticise the Greek text, we ought to do so with a great deal of caution. We ought to be careful how we set aside portions of the Holy Scriptures that we have been accustomed to receive, and which are sanctified in our hearts as holy things. I say again, that he has a right, and so have I, to object to any portions he thinks proper, when he feels convinced, after *mature reflection*, that it is his duty to do so. But he has no satisfactory evidence or sufficient authority for objecting to *this* part of the Scriptures.

The Savior had been crucified; had died, and been buried. He lay in the bowels of the earth three days and nights, and rose again. He had conquered all his foes and our foes, and now stood forth before men in holy triumph. He gathered about him those few faithful men, the apostles, on the Mount of Olives, and gave them a commission: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved."

MR. DITZLER'S THIRD REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My brother comes back on me on the school-boy question. Well, I love a little spice, and it was a nice, clever hit. I suppose my teacher used to dress me up as often as any body else. One of my favorite teachers, Colonel Johnston, was here yesterday, and I hope another will be—Prof. McCann, as he wrote me he would, if possible. But he taught me most of my Greek quotations, as he uses them; and if they had basted him a little more, he would not use Greek quotations as he does. [Laughter.] He says he loaned me a book, which is true; I have loaned him several, and we get along quite pleasantly lending each other books. In his first address, he did me an injustice, though unintentionally, of course; for my brethren have done the same thing in supposing that I had *given special attention* to this subject. In the first place, I have never procured five books upon the whole subject that I did not own and had not studied five years before I had a discussion of any kind. I have not given one week's study to the subject in five years. In my second year's preaching, which was in St. Louis, Mo., and the next two in that county, and the fourth and fifth years, while stationed in St. Louis again, I did not preach on the subject at all. So it is only when my brethren have urged me into the matter that I have preached on these subjects. Ordinarily, I do not meddle with them. The cardinal truths of Christianity are the themes upon which I love to dwell.

And now I come again to the text on which he says he is going to make the entire battle: "Baptism of repentance for remission of sins." Now, had Winer supported his case, *Winer himself* ought to have known it. But while discussing the fundamental law of the use of the genitive, he himself gives *this text* as an illustration of what he meant by the genitive: Mark i: 4, "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." "That is to say, which *obligate* to repentance." In another place,

Winer says, pp. 316, 317, speaking of *eis*, "*Eis* transferred to *internal* relations, . . . is used of every *object, aim . . . of the state into which something passes . . . of the direction of the intellect (the thoughts) . . . of the desire . . . in reference to, in respect to.*" Hence, he gives Acts xix: 3, *into what, looking to what, in respect to what were ye baptized?*

Here he brings up another text about John's baptism, and shows that John baptized them unto repentance, that is, into the profession and obligation that they should repent. But I will now read from Stockius, whom my friend says I have made notorious in this country. He says: "*Ita legitur (1) de baptismo Johannis Baptistæ, quem jussu divino administrabat, Matt. iii: 7, quique dicitur baptismus pœnitentiæ quia debebat esse conjunctus pœnitentiæ, adeoque erat commonefactio, testificatio, & professio, opus esse pœnitentiæ & eos, qui baptismum illum recipiebant, talem agere & habere pœnitentiæ, qualem Johannes poscebat, Marc. 4, Acts xiii. i*" "It occurs thus, 1. Of the baptism of John the Baptist, which he administered by divine command (Matt. iii: 7) and which is called 'the baptism of repentance,' because it ought to be joined to repentance, and so was an earnest reminding, a testification and profession of the need of repentance, and that those who received that baptism ought to exercise and practice such a repentance as John demanded, Mark i: 4," etc.

Now, Mr. Stockius showed that those who received John's baptism thereby obligated themselves to exercise such repentance and practice it as John demanded. Schleusner teaches the same. He says, vol. i, p. 338, "*Baptismi ritu obstringo aliquem professioni religionis Christianæ.*" By the rite of baptism I bind or obligate any one to the profession of the Christian religion. This great authority stands with all the rest. He repeats it over several times as quoted—it is "to obligate one's self to do," etc.

Olshausen: "John's baptism was not itself to effect the remission, but to prepare for that remission, which was to be accompanied by Christ. It is not inappropriate, therefore, to supply *ερχομένου, to come.*"

Lange's Commentary: "'The baptism of repentance.' Baptism as not only obligating to a change of mind (*μετανοίας*), but also exhibiting and symbolizing it. Meyer: rightly ('for remission of sins') to be received from the Messiah, and not . . . assured by John's baptism."

S. Davidson: "*An engagement to believe,*" etc. (Intro. N. T. i, 93.) DeWette the same.

We quoted Jelf before, giving the same views exactly. Kühner's

"Greek Grammar," § 290, says, on "Εἰς—of a mental aim, object, or purpose, in general, to express a reference to, something in respect to."

Koenael, another learned commentator, also says, on Mark i: 4, 5, "Sese obstringerent vitæ animique emendationi; quo nanciscerentur peccatorum veniam." They obligated themselves to amend their lives and minds, that they might receive the remission of their sins. You see all the critics sustain my position.

Bengel: "Εἰς μετανοίαν, for repentance," on Matt. iii: 11, vol. 1.

Lightfoot; Hebræc., on Matt. iii, quotes Mark i: 4, and says, ii, 63: "But the baptism of John was a 'baptism of repentance,' Mark i: 4, which, being undertaken, they who were baptized professed to renounce their own legal righteousness, and . . acknowledged themselves to be obliged to repentance and faith in the Messiah to come."

Now, we have all the Greek grammars on our side. Every Greek grammar he has quoted sustains our position, and in the comments of Winer and Jelf, they both name *this very text*, giving the interpretation I have put upon it. Now, let us suppose for a moment, that there is no other light upon this point, is not the point clear enough? Mark i: 5, "And there went out unto him all the land of Judea, and they of Jerusalem, and were all baptized of him in the river of Jordan, confessing their sins." Matt. iii: 5, 6, 7, 11, "There 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. But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his baptism, he said unto them, O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? I, indeed, baptize you with water unto repentance; but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear; he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." "I, indeed, baptize you with water unto repentance." That is as Winer, Kühner, and Jelf define it, *looking unto repentance*. Now, he declared that he baptized *these very persons whom he called "a generation of vipers."* Would he have denounced them as a "generation of vipers" if they had been *penitent believers*, as my brother argues they were? Matt. xxi: 32, "For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye *believed him not*; but the publicans and harlots believed him; and ye, when ye had seen it—*ιδουτες*, *idontes*, from *εἶδω*, *εἶδο* to see, enjoy, undergo, experience; *experior*, *particeps fio*, *I experience, participate in*, Luke ii: 26, Heb. xi: 5, when they had participated in it—repented not afterward, that ye

might believe." They were baptized, they "recognized," and "became participants" in his baptism, as the Greek means. See Schleusner, Wahl, etc., on *εἰδῶ*. Yet Christ declares that they *did not believe*, neither repent.

There the point is as clear as it can be made, but we have further testimony yet. Paul met certain ones, and said unto them, as it is recorded in Acts xix: 3, 4, 5, "Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. Then said Paul, John did indeed baptize a baptism of repentance, saying unto the people, that they *should believe* on him which *should come after him*, that is, on Jesus Christ. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." The preceding verses show that they did not have a true understanding of the matter, had viewed it as an ordinance, not thinking of the Spirit at all; for when Paul asked them if they "had received the Holy Ghost," they declared that "they had not so much as heard whether there was any Holy Ghost." Yet we have seen that John expressly told them that Christ was to baptize them with the Holy Spirit when he came. They had forgotten all about it, and were looking simply to the outward ordinance, paying no attention to the inward meaning and spirit of the command. The idea of the Spirit never entered their minds.

And now I come to the canon law at Lexington, given us by Elder (President) Braden, "Debate with Hughey," p. 185, "In any law prescribing the conditions on which any thing depends, different conditions may be mentioned in different parts of the law, each part giving what it specially discusses or prescribes. 2. The thing to be obtained can not depend on less conditions than are mentioned in any particular part of the law," etc. 3. He urges we must "collate the entire law and combine all that are mentioned." 4. "The thing to be obtained *must depend on all these conditions, and be performed in their prescribed order, and it can depend on no less.*" That is to say, in every case in the Bible, at least the New Testament, wherever Christ met a sinner, or the apostles, and for various proper reasons advised them to do this or that—for reasons applying restrictively to *their then* conditions—we must bring all these as conditions of pardon: one to take up his bed, another sell all he had and give to the poor, another forsake all and follow him, some wash in Siloam, offer gifts to the priests, etc.

That is what I call the Lexington law of pardon, and it comes from headquarters. Let us test it. Luke iii: 7, 10, 16, 17, 21, John said "to the multitude that came forth to be baptized of him, O generation

of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" and commanded them "to bring forth fruits worthy of repentance." V. 10, "And the people asked him, saying, What shall we *do then?*" Now, we shall have the true conditions of pardon, the good question is asked. He will tell them, as they are true believing penitents, according to Brother Wilkes' logic, else why come to John and ask that question? and why "come forth to be baptized of him?" V. 7, 11, "He answereth and saith unto them, *He that hath two coats*, let him impart to him that hath *none*; and he that hath meat, let him do likewise." What do you think of *that?*

Now, according to the Lexington law of pardon, received by their ministers, a man can never be promised a pardon if he has two coats at home until he sells one and gives the proceeds to the poor. And, according to his theory, there is not a man in his church to-day who is pardoned, unless when he was baptized he gave one-half of his overcoats away. [Laughter.] He must give away *half the meat* out of his meat-house also. "There came, also, publicans to be baptized, and said unto him, Master, *what shall we do?*" Verse 13: "And he said unto them, Exact no more than that which is appointed unto you." Here is another law of pardon to all men, if that rule holds good. "And the soldiers likewise demanded of him, saying, And what shall we do? And he said unto them, Do violence to no man, . . . and *be content with your wages.*" Is *this* a condition of remission, not to want higher wages? Now, no man is pardoned, according to their law, unless he has divided off half his clothes to the poor, half emptied his meat boxes, been content with his wages if a soldier, etc. Verse 15: Note well now—"And as the people were in expectation (*προσδοκῶντος*, waiting), and all men mused in their hearts of JOHN, WHETHER HE WERE THE CHRIST or not"—hear that! *These* are the people John is baptizing—and they looking on him as possibly the Christ! "John answered, saying unto them ALL, *I indeed baptize you with water,*" etc. Verse 21: "Now when all the people were baptized," etc. Matt. ix: 14, "Then came unto him (Christ) the disciples of John, saying, Why do we and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy disciples fast not?" This settles the whole matter. They did not recognize themselves as united with Christ at all, but ranged themselves along with the Pharisees, as opposed to Christ. This is not all. These people were marveling in their minds, and wondering whether or not it was *the Christ* who had just told them that one mightier than he should baptize them with the Holy Ghost. Was

that faith? Will my brother baptize a man who doubts whether or not John the Baptist was the promised Messiah? Yet, he calls these men repentant and proper subjects for baptism, and believes they received the remission of sins. Did he not, in the former proposition, labor to prove that there was no remission of sins until the crucifixion? For three days he labored faithfully to prove there was no remission of sins at all in John the Baptist's day. To-day he wades elbow-deep in Greek to prove that John baptized for the remission of sins. How consistent is his system! For three long days he wandered through the mazes and intricate labyrinths of Greek to prove that there was not a soul brought into the kingdom of Jesus Christ until the day of Pentecost; and to-day he turns his back against it all, and insists that persons were then baptized for the remission of sins. He labors to show you they were true believers, and, therefore, had remission of sins. Is it not a beautiful system on which to suspend eternal life and eternal death?

Now, I turn again to the consistency of the system. Look at what Father Hayden and their writers say upon this subject: "When the heart is changed, the conscience is purged from defilement, the heart is purified of its love of sin; it *delights in holiness*. . . . The conscience is now *pure*. It longs for the *pardon* of the sins which it now mourns," etc. "We are baptized," says Campbell, "because we are *born from above, born of the Spirit*." President Braden, "Debate with Hughey," p. 188, says: "Positive ordinances serve also to distinguish all who are loyal, submissive subjects of the government, from rebels, aliens," etc. Such is his lame effort at reasoning. Are such mere outward acts tests of real character or disposition? They never are. But hear him further, pp. 244, 245: "How do we obtain *access to the blood of Christ*? In Gal. iii: 27 we read, etc. . . . Then we are baptized *into Christ*. By being in Christ we have *access to his blood*. By his blood we are cleansed or pardoned. . . . Turning to Galatians we read: 'We come into Christ by baptism.' [*Not exactly—that is Braden Scripture.*] Again: We are cleansed by *Christ's blood*. Christ's blood was shed in his *death*. How can we come into contact with the blood shed in his death? Rom. vi, reads, etc. . . . *We are then brought to the blood of Christ shed in his death in baptism.*" Now, all agree that *no one, sick or well, great or small can be saved* without the merits of Christ's blood. We can only get into contact with that blood *through baptism*. Hence he is forced to hold, *no immersion NO SALVATION*. The law is inexorable. As my

brother said, at Cynthiana and Mount Sterling, he indorsed Bro Brooks and Campbell on these same points, I will quote Brooks also. "Faith, repentance, and baptism, are conditions" of pardon. "Now, is baptism, in *this sense*, a condition as ABSOLUTELY essential as faith and repentance? I affirm IT IS; my friend denies."—"Brooks and Fitch Debate," p. 133. "Again: We can not have remission of our sins except in the blood of the Lord Jesus. The apostle says, etc. Then we can not come to his blood until, through baptism, we come into the death of our blessed Redeemer."—*Ibid*, 139. "Not until we come to baptism, then, do we put on our righteousness, or have our 'hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience' by the blood of Christ, or receive the Holy Spirit," etc.—*Ibid*, 140. No one can misunderstand this. They all agree—Campbell, Scott, Hopson, Lard, Braden, Hayden, Brooks, my worthy friend—that water stands between sinners and Christ's blood. How now can we be saved without immersion? But they have all those graces of religion without a God, without a Christ—heart and character changed without the blood of Christ reached, and we, "born from above," "begotten of God," "born of the Spirit," as Campbell says, all before we are immersed—are believers, "disciples," in the true sense, yet all without his blood. Where any need, then, of his blood? Faith must change the heart, repentance the character, and the conscience be pure before they will immerse a man. Paul declares we are cleansed by the blood of Christ, but they say "the laver is between the sinner and the blood of Christ." Paul declares that the conscience can not be pure till it reaches the blood of Christ, but here we are taught that it is purified before baptism, yet "through baptism only" can we reach the blood of Christ. The conscience is purified by the blood of Christ before baptism, yet no man can reach the blood of Christ except by baptism. Now, look at it. Just look at it. That is the foundation of their theory and their system. But it does not stop there. I quote again from one of their standard writers. Mr. Long says "His understanding is enlightened, his heart is changed," "Divine clemency seems to be gained," "his understanding is then right, and his heart is right." "Human reason fails to discover a necessity for any thing more." There are the graces enjoyed before immersion. There lies the beauty of the theory. He is to have all these before they will immerse him, yet they will send him to hell if he is not immersed. Send him to hell "begotten of God," and, therefore, a child of God, "born from above—

born of the Spirit." Send him to hell with a "*pure conscience,*" "*delighting in holiness.*"

Now, I am addressing this to you, people of Louisville. My brother says he will not immerse you until this takes place. You are a believer, you have the "soul sanctifying, soul justifying principle of religion." "Your conscience is purged, purified, clean, and you delight in holiness," says Father Hayden. Yet, if you are not immersed, says Dr. Hopson, you will be sent to hell. Though he may have all these graces, the unbaptized penitent will be sent to hell, says Dr. Hopson, in substance. Now, my friends, see how inconsistent they are; how utterly absurd, and wholly visionary is the whole system, from beginning to end. Such a strange commingling of absurdities can not be taught in the word of God. God's word is reasonable, consistent, nay, philosophical, but this system has no knowledge of philosophy; none whatever. Look now, my friends, at this case. Could the eternally pure God be the author of such a system. They say they make baptism as necessary to salvation as we make faith. Mr. Brooks says the same thing in substance. I will tell any man in Louisville who has heard the word of God, no matter if he is on a dying couch, if you do not believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and repent of your sins, you will be damned. Does my brother, then, make immersion as necessary as we make faith? Will he say if you are not immersed you will be damned? Will he hold up a system so absurd, and demand compliance with an act as the imperative command of God that can be suspended by man? Will he in such an hour make immersion essential, and thus let the absence of a minister thwart the whole work of God?

MR. WILKES' FOURTH ARGUMENT.

SATURDAY, December 17, 10 A. M.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen

In the closing speech of my friend, yesterday evening, he announced to us that, for the last five years, he had not given as much as one week's study to the subjects which we have under consideration. In the first place, I have to remark concerning that statement, that I think the fact that he has not done so is very plain and palpable. In the second place, it is scarcely complimentary to this audience for him to say that he has taken no pains to inform himself on these subjects. Yet he professes to instruct this audience in them.

He claims that Lange is on his side of our controversy, as respects Mark 1 4. According to his own reading, Lange uses the language "exhibiting and symbolizing;" that is, he thinks that baptism exhibits and symbolizes the repentance; from which I conclude that Lange believes that repentance comes before the baptism, else it could not be very well exhibited in the baptism. For, in that case, there would be an exhibition of that which did not exist at all. I claim Lange, therefore, on my side. In the next place, he claims that Winer is on his side. I have Winer, and propose to read another extract from him, in which he explains the language which my friend quotes, and on account of which he claims Winer on his own side. Winer says, in his sixth edition, p. 201, and, substantially, in the seventh edition, p. 188:

"The genitive, especially in the writings of John and Paul, denotes internal relations still more remote, as John v. 29, *ἀναστάσις ζωῆς, κρίσις*, resurrection to life, to condemnation (genitive of destination). Theodor IV, 1140, *ἰεροσύνης χειροτονία*, ordination to the priesthood, comp Rom viii 36 (Sept.), *τροβάτα σφαγῆς*, Rom v 18, *δικαιώσις ζωῆς*, justification to life, Mr 1 4, *βαπτισμα μετανοίας*, baptism engaging to repentance (*οἱ*, rather, baptism sealing repentance)" —Winer's "Grammar of the New Testament"

In Mark 1. 4, the very passage in question, he says, *βαπτισμα μετανοίας*;
(267)

that is, "baptism engaging to repentance"—the language which my friend read; and, in a parenthesis immediately following, he says, "or, rather, baptism *sealing* repentance." That is, after Winer had said that baptism "engages to repentance," he concluded that he had not said exactly what he meant, or what he should have said; and so he qualifies it by saying, in the language quoted, "baptism sealing repentance" Now, of course, here Winer takes just the view I told you yesterday he took: that, while baptism brings us into a state in which we are expected to be penitent for sin, and, therefore, baptizing is into repentance, at the same time baptism seals the repentance which is possessed already. This is harmonious with all the teachings of John the Baptist on that subject; for he refused to baptize men who did not repent. Yet Mr. D. claims Winer as being on his side! All the authorities he quoted on this passage—Winer and Lange—all of them believe what I believe in regard to baptism: that it is for the remission of sins; and whatever they may have said on this passage, suffice it to say they are on my side as to "baptism for remission of sins;" and my friend knows it.

He says, there is a "*Lexington law of pardon.*" It is as follows: The sinner must comply with *all* the terms of pardon in order to be saved. I suppose that is true. Does he deny it? He would ridicule it; but any thing can be ridiculed. There is no trouble in doing that. But I ask him, as a Christian man, does he deny that the sinner, in order to be pardoned, must comply with all the terms of pardon? If, in a given place, he does not find every term of pardon mentioned, does he not believe that the other terms, not mentioned there, are necessarily implied? That is the rule in regard to the interpretation of all law in our statutes. If we find a provision that a man must be of a certain age in order to vote, in one section, must we conclude that he may vote if he is of that age simply, without regard to other provisions of the statute? If we find other sections prescribing other qualifications, we must include them, else we do not deal fairly with the law. It is so with the law of God. If we find one term of pardon in any given place, we must regard that as one term of pardon; and we must not conclude that that is the *only* term of pardon until we have surveyed the whole ground, and found that there is no other condition of pardon. If we find any other terms, we must accept them, for the same reason that we accepted the first. The "*Lexington law of pardon*" must be correct, if the gentleman represents that law correctly. In order to ridicule that law, my friend says,

if you have two coats, and a man have need of one, you must give him one; that is, no one can be pardoned if he have two coats, until he has given somebody a coat. Well, any thing can be ridiculed, I admit. But does he deny the law? No; for no consideration would he deny it. He knows the law is correct. Then let his ridicule fall upon his own head. By scrapping the Scriptures he can prove almost any thing. Was the Savior talking about pardon when he said, "If any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also?" Is he talking there about the *conditions of pardon*? No; he is talking about something else. The Bible, I believe, says that Judas went and hung himself. The Bible also says, "Go thou and do likewise;" and it also says, "What thou doest, do quickly." Now, putting all these things together, they teach that you must go and hang yourself as quickly as possible. This is the scrapping manner in which my friend deals with the Word of God, on which the salvation of our souls depends.

My friend is very heavy on *our system*, as he calls it. But it is manifest to him even, and it is very clear to the minds of our hearers to-day, as it was yesterday, that his primo object, almost his sole object, on this proposition, is, if possible, to bring my brethren into ridicule, and thus to break their power with the people. Hence, he says that he means "to give them *all a lick*" as he goes round, and that he means to show the "rottenness," to use his own classic language, of "our system." I thought we were discussing the question whether baptism is for the remission of sins. But instead of coming up sharply to this question, and ascertaining whether it is true or not, he chooses to deal in what he is pleased to call the "rottenness of our system." Let him deal in that rottenness if he pleases, and let him injure my brethren if he can. If he deems it his duty, I will not complain. But I want my brethren to see that I am discussing the proposition that "baptism is for the remission of sins." It is manifest that he is not following me, which, as a respondent, he is in *duty* bound to do.

He represents a man as coming up to Dr. Hopson and saying, "Must I be damned if I am not baptized?" Says the doctor, "Certainly, why not?" Now, I want to ask my friend, will a man be damned if he is not baptized? What will *he* say? Will he say no, or will he say yes? I will put it a little sharper than that. Dr. Hopson had this character of a man before him: a man that was instructed in and had heard and understood his duty. He was not an idiot, nor a heathen,

nor an infant, but a man who had heard the gospel and understood it, and had no hinderance to the performance of his duty. Now, the doctor says that a man whose *duty it is to be baptized*, who *knows his duty* is to be baptized, and will not do it, will be damned. "Certainly, why not?" And I, too, say if that man is not baptized, he will be damned. "Certainly, why not?" I would not, for this right arm, say that he would not be damned if he were not baptized. What does Mr. Ditzler say to *such* a question? Does he, too, say "Certainly, why not?" I hope he will answer me on this subject.

I ask my friend to answer *this* question: In Mark i: 4, what, in the Greek, does the word *eis* connect? What does the preposition *eis* connect on both sides, in that case? Let him put himself on record on that question. I prophesy he will not answer it. If he answer it correctly, it will ruin his system, which I will not condescend to denominate a "rotten" system. If he answer incorrectly, it will ruin his reputation for scholarship, if he has any, and I presume he will hardly do that; therefore, I prophesy he will not answer at all.

Now, my friend wants to know how John baptized for the remission of sins, when the blood of Christ was not shed; or, rather, how I will harmonize my view of John's baptism for the remission of sins with what I have said in regard to the remission of sins before the crucifixion of Christ. I answer, the Bible teaches that John's baptism was for the remission of sins. It teaches also that the sacrifices and obedience to God rendered under the Mosaic economy were for the remission of sins. I said then that the remission under the law was not *actual* or in *possession*. It was prospective. That is what I believe, precisely, concerning John's baptism. But that does not prevent its being for the remission of sins. It was, under John's ministry, full obedience to God that secured God's favor as to the remission of sins. "So much on that point."

I suppose he thinks that if I am in any embarrassment in this connection his case is a good one. But he believes there was remission of sins, and he is not embarrassed with the rotten theories which he supposes I advocate here. What, then, does he believe on this point? He believes that the disciples of John, some of them at least, enjoyed remission of sins, does he not? If he says no, then he just simply shrivels into nothingness. He contradicts the Word of God. If he says yes, I ask him upon what terms, or how? He says John the Baptist baptized the people without any repentance. He says he baptized them without faith, and he was at pains and did at *some*

length attempt to prove that he did this. Now, if they had remission of sins, I should like to know how. It looks as though they had remission of sins by baptism alone, and that John taught water regeneration, which I do not believe is taught in the Bible.

I now propose to take up another point presented by my friend, and then I am through. In order to show that John did not require faith, and did not require repentance, before baptism, my friend pursues this course: He shows that many of the Jews had not faith, and that a great many had not repentance. Then he proceeds to show, or *try* to show, that *all* were baptized. He concludes that these supposed facts involve the conclusion that John baptized persons without faith and without repentance. Now, is it true that John did baptize *every body*? It is not true, by any means. In Luke, seventh chapter, thirtieth verse, it is said that the "Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of him." There the Pharisees and lawyers rejected him, and were not baptized of him. Again, to the Pharisees and Sadducees he said: "O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" There are the Pharisees and Sadducees that he would not baptize, and the chief priests and elders that he would not baptize, as you will find in the twenty-first chapter of Matthew, twenty-third verse: "And when he was come into the temple, the chief priests and elders of the people came unto him and said, By what authority doest thou these things? and who gave thee this authority?" By turning to the thirty-second verse you will read: "John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not; but the publicans and harlots believed him. And ye, when ye had seen it, repented not afterward, that ye might believe him." Now, we have these classes: Pharisees, Sadducees, lawyers, scribes, harlots, chief priests, and elders, that rejected John the Baptist, and John's murderers besides—all these rejected John the Baptist, and were not baptized with his baptism; so that, in fact, John did not baptize every body—not, perhaps, one-third, or even one-fourth—possibly not one-fifth or one-sixth of the people. It is not at all uncommon for us to use the expression "every body is here," when we mean simply large numbers of the people. The language here applies *only* to "Jerusalem and Judea, and to the region about Jordan."

I now proceed with my argument. I closed on yesterday evening with the introduction of the gospel commission according to Mark.

The Savior, as I then stated, had been crucified, had been buried, and had risen again, and had appeared to his disciples on Mount Olivet, for the purpose of giving them a commission, and authorizing them to "go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature." But, suppose they should go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature, what then? What says the Savior? "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved. He that believeth not shall be damned." How would plain men understand this? Clearly, the apostles were ambassadors sent forth to declare the terms of forgiveness to the people who were sinners. There is no dispute about that. They were instructed to say to such, "He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved." Suppose, now, that we make a present case, in order that we may bring it close to us. Here is a man who is a sinner. He desires to know what he must do to be saved. He wishes to know what is necessary for the salvation of his soul. The Savior stands before him in the presence of the apostles. The Savior, in his hearing, turns to the apostles and says to them, "Tell the man that he shall be saved if he will believe and be baptized." (The Savior commits this treasure to these earthen vessels.) The apostles then speak, authorized by Him who had all authority in heaven and on earth. One of them opens his mouth and says, "If you will believe, and be baptized, you shall be saved." "Believe what?" he might ask. Believe the gospel that we preach to you. We preach to you the gospel of Jesus Christ. We preach to you the crucified, and risen, and triumphant Lord, that was incarnated, but who is now at GOD'S own right hand, crowned both Lord and Christ. We preach to you HIM as the One who forgives sins. By HIS authority we say to you that if you will "believe, and be baptized, you will be saved." How would that man understand it? He would understand that he must believe on that Christ; that he must be baptized, and that he would then be saved. He would believe, and be baptized, in order to be saved. Now, if this be true, "baptism is for remission of sins." The thing sought was remission of sins. The things precedent thereto were believing and being baptized. Baptism, then, is clearly *declared to be for the remission of sins*. But the answer which my friend sometimes makes to that is this: The believing is in the past tense; "shall be saved" is in the future tense. I admit that is true; nay, more, I believe it is true. The very nature of the case demands that it should be true. As respects the *salvation*, looked at from *that* standpoint, the believing and the baptism

must be in the past tense, and they are in the past tense. And, as respects the faith, or belief, and the baptism, taking *that* as your standpoint, the salvation is future; so that, looked at from either direction, it is patent, it is a *necessary* conclusion, that the baptism is for the remission of sins, and the faith also.

I present, now, another passage, from 1 Cor. x: 1, 2: "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." I think I draw a legitimate conclusion from this, that baptism is for the remission of sins. It is not denied, I believe, that the slavery, or bondage, of Egypt was typical of the bondage of sin; that Moses' delivering Israel out of Egyptian bondage, was typical of Jesus' delivering sinners from their bondage; that faith in Moses, or accepting Moses as a leader, corresponds to faith in Jesus Christ; and that baptism into Moses, corresponds to baptism into Jesus Christ, as type corresponds to antitype.

Now, the question is, when was deliverance from Egyptian bondage secured? Moses leads the children of Israel out as far as the Red Sea; but are they yet delivered? I answer no. There is Pharaoh, with his hosts, close by. There is trembling and defenseless Israel almost in their grasp. They are not delivered yet. They have started with Moses; but they have not yet escaped entirely from their bondage. Moses said, "Stand still, and see the salvation of God." Then, they were not delivered yet from Egyptian bondage. The Red Sea is opened, and they are baptized into Moses, in the cloud and in the sea; and, on the other bank of that sea, they lifted up their voices in songs of triumph. "The Lord is my strength and my song, and has become my salvation," is the language in Exodus, fifteenth chapter; read verses 1-5. But where were their enemies? They turn their eyes upon that Red Sea, and they find that the wrath of God has fallen upon their enemies. The waters have overwhelmed them, and they are destroyed, and Israel is saved. Just so, at least so I believe, a sinner breaks away from his sins, by the command of Jesus Christ, the antitype of Moses, the type; and, just when that sinner is *baptized "into Christ,"* his enemies are destroyed, and he is saved from them, as Israel, when it was baptized into Moses, was saved, and its enemies were destroyed.

Again, I call your attention to the second chapter of Acts of the Apostles. Here I propose again to make a pretty careful exam-

ination. The fact is, I propose to *stand here*. It reads, in the common version, Acts, second chapter, commencing with the thirty-seventh verse: "Now, when they heard *this*, they were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter, and to the rest of the apostles, Men *and* brethren, what shall we do? Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins: and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. 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." Upon this passage I propose to comment in my next address.

MR. DITZLER'S FOURTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I must notice, at the start, a point made by my brother. He seems to think the statement I made yesterday, to the effect that I had not given a week's study to this subject in a certain specified time, not very complimentary to my audience. That is not implied. It may be presumed that my former reading had, in the estimation of my friends and myself, sufficiently qualified me to meet him with success upon this occasion, and I had too much to do to stop and devote more time to study it, especially when I felt that I had abundantly more than was necessary.

He still feels it necessary to harp on Mark i : 4, and John iii : 5 : Being born of water and of the Spirit, and "baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." To give us a true exposition of the law of pardon, he labored almost an entire day upon the two texts. He referred to but few authors, and accidentally touched upon them before he had seen that they themselves declared that at this time the law of pardon had not been promulgated. All their ministers throughout the whole country, and all their writers in the church, declare that the law under which we are now pardoned *did not then exist*; that on the day of Pentecost a new law of pardon came forth, or, as they say in the "Living Pulpit," "new principles" were introduced, p. 220. "New principles!" The principles *they* taught were not new, for John the Baptist had been preaching them for years before. They were not new, for they had been preached *hundreds of years* before, under the Jewish dispensation—under the patriarchal also—from Abel down. Elder Braden, one of their prominent ministers, and president of a college in Illinois, in his debate with Brother Hughey, a work that has been highly complimented by the press of his church, says, page 211 : "Mr. Hughey wants to know if baptism was a condition of pardon among the Jews and patriarchs. Certainly not, for the law was not then given. Has God changed the conditions of par-

don? *He has changed the positive conditions of pardon.*" He urges that God requires far more now as a condition; *what advantage then have we over the Jews?* If God has given us a new law of pardon, why does he quote the law under the old dispensation? For John, he admits, was under it. Further, he must argue that in that time there was no remission of sins; therefore Mark i: 4 will not apply; for that baptism was not a condition of pardon in that dispensation we have abundantly shown.

Now, if all the Greek both of us waded through yesterday has left any one in doubt as to what was the conditions of pardon taught by Christ and John, in expounding the texts we have quoted, we have more light on the subject. Christ for *three years* preached and instructed the people, and he habitually stated to the sinners that believed on him, "Thy faith hath made thee whole;" or, "Thy faith hath saved thee." "Go thy way, and sin no more; thy sins are all forgiven thee; thy sins are pardoned." For *three years* Christ constantly used such language. He personally pardoned sins while instructing the people in the mysteries of religion, and *in no instance did he baptize any persons.* Look at it! If baptism was a condition precedent to pardon in the days of John the Baptist and Christ, how could the Savior himself, *in every case in his three years' ministry, violate it, and NEVER give an illustration of it?* It will not do to say that these persons were afterward baptized by others, for Christ said, "Thy sins are pardoned;" "Go thy way, and sin no more." And they were not baptized. That shows what the law of pardon was.

But mark the pains with which my brother notes some matters of yesterday. He makes me say that a sinner need not conform to all the terms of pardon before he can be pardoned. I did not say that. I indorsed Mr. Campbell when he said "What is necessary in any case is necessary *in all cases.*" But my brother's argument is, that pardon can never depend upon less than all the conditions named in all the varying conditions of character that happened to meet Christ. Christ said to the young man, "Sell that which thou hast, and give to the poor;" but is that one of the conditions of pardon to sinners, why *they* were required to part with a portion of their clothing; to be content with their wages, etc.? Was John talking about a law of pardon? But the passage containing the command is something that Matthew speaks of, and Mark speaks of; and when he went to baptize them, he laid them down as conditions of baptizing *them.* And my brother would make you believe that I said all the Jews were

baptized. I said no such thing. I did not say they all went to him. I said, after quoting various passages, that the great body, or a large proportion of the people went.

But, on the genitive case, he reads from his edition of Winer the word "sealing." That word is not in my edition, which is the earliest; and I do not suppose it is in the original Latin at all. If it had been, then Agnew would have been bound to translate it. I have not examined the original copy, but I have no doubt it is *obstringo*—to bind, obligate. His translation is from the same work that mine is, and mine does not have it. I have never seen the word "sealed" put in as a meaning by any writer. But look at his argument in the genitive case. He says that where a noun governs another in the genitive, that the noun governing the genitive *originates* from that noun in the genitive; that it originates from that which is named in the genitive case. He has argued so in every debate I have had with him; and I think I have had three. As I have before asked my brother, how will he manage such a genitive as this: "I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob?" By his construction of this sentence, God originated from Abraham, i. e., Abraham made God and gave him character. He is a God of wisdom, a God of justice. That is to say, he originated out of wisdom, out of justice. You see, such a law of the genitive is preposterous. There may be some cases where it will apply; but every Greek grammar that he uses is against him, as far as I have examined, and I have examined all the prominent ones.

He again quotes Mark xvi: 15. I have read from Samuel Davidson on that text; and it is settled. He shows it a forgery. Yesterday he thought it was infidelity to raise a question on the authenticity of this text. But on the next proposition, as I have found in every debate I have had with him, he will contend that the Greek word *ἀπό* (*apo*), in the first chapter of Mark, is not in the original Greek at all. He will also argue that *βεβαμμενον* (*bebammenon*—dipped), in Revelation xix: 13, which is in every Greek text in the land, was not in the original text used by Origen and the translators of the early centuries.

This is the most remarkable position I have ever known any one to take; for upon this he bases his rejection of that text; and here he has every one of the ancient Greek copies of the Bible against him. I will now read you a part of what Davidson says on the sixteenth chapter of Mark, including the fifteenth verse: "The manner, style, and phraseology are foreign to Mark." He then urges that death

stopped Mark in his work at verse eight. He believes "the termination (from v. 8) *was added by another person after Mark's death.*"—P. 171, vol. i. Bloomfield, Michaelis, Zeller, Bolton, Thiess, Griesbach, Gratz, Bertholdt, Schulthess, Schott, Henneberg, Fritzsche, Credner, Schulz, Wiesder, Hug, Tischendorf—all reject it, as well as Alford, etc.

Mark terminated his gospel before he got to this place, and others added it on afterward. The language is foreign to Mark. Alford says, "As late as Jerome's day *it was absent from a majority of codices (Bibles);*" and he considers it was added by another "*after the apostolic period.*" And this is his way of proving that a man will be damned if he is not baptized.

And now, as to John's baptism for remission, I will read from Campbell's "Christian System," p. 266: "*All the means of salvation are means of enjoyment, not of procurement.*" (Italics his.) He illustrates: "Birth itself is not for procuring, but *enjoying* life, *the life possessed before birth.* So in the analogy: no one is to be baptized, or be buried with Christ; no one is to be put under the water of regeneration *for the purpose* of PROCURING life, but for the purpose of *enjoying* the life of which he is possessed." Here the person, Mr. Campbell tells us, *had* the spiritual life, *i. e.*, by faith, before immersed; has all he has afterward as to the new life, but lacks the *enjoyment* of it.

"Now, as faith in God is the first principle, the soul-renewing principle of religion; as it is the regenerating, justifying, sanctifying principle, without it it is impossible to be acceptable to God. With it, a man is a son of Abraham, a son of God, an heir apparent to eternal life, an everlasting kingdom."—A. Campbell's "Chris. Baptism," p. 293.

We have read his "Christian Baptist," vol. v, 439, where he teaches—see the quotation in our first reply—that, before we receive the Holy Spirit, "the heart must be purified; before the heart can be purified, guilt must be removed from the conscience;" before that, "there must be a sense, a *feeling*, or an assurance that sin is pardoned and transgression covered." This is by *immersion*—"the regenerating act itself." Here is a direct contradiction of all he elsewhere teaches. He here says baptism precedes a pure heart, pure conscience, or a feeling of removal of guilt. Over and over again he says the heart must be pure ere we are baptized. Again, as faith is a bare "conviction that what the Bible says is true," and that "faith changes the

heart," all of you are thus changed in heart—pure—and, therefore, can not be lost. And, as baptism only brings us into the *enjoyment* of what we had already by faith before baptism, we are "begotten of God," says Lard, "Living Pulpit," and so can not be lost for want of baptism. But we are not saved in our sins; so baptism can not be for remission of sins.

They hold that first we believe, and that changes the heart, then we repent, and that changes the character. That is their order of the graces, in every document of theirs that I have seen. Their leading men, including brothers Wilkes and Hopson, agree that we have faith first, then repentance, then baptism, and finally the reception of the Holy Spirit. In the Bible it is always *just the reverse*. They can not find a place in the Bible of God where the graces are named in this order. On the contrary, Mark i: 15, "Repent and believe the gospel;" Matt. xxi: 32, "Ye believed him not; and when ye had seen it, ye repented not afterward *that ye might believe him*." Paul preached "repentance toward God *and faith* toward our Lord Jesus Christ." These passages might be multiplied, but nowhere in the Word of God is faith put before repentance, though their system always puts it there. He and their people argue, from metaphysics, can a man be supposed to repent who has no faith? This grows out of a wrong conception of the true nature of repentance and faith both. We are willing to test it by an appeal to metaphysics. We all know a man will not repent in a Scripture sense, unless he believes there is a God offended, a Christ to save, etc. But right here is where they err. The admission that there is a God who hates sin, a Christ who saves sinners, is not that reliance of the heart on the atonement that brings pardon—"the faith that works by love and purifies the heart."

Nor do we believe there are *different* kinds of faith. We hold there are very different *degrees* of faith. Here is where his church, as we think, errs most seriously indeed. Here is what they teach on this subject of faith:

A. Campbell, "Christian Baptism," 64, 65: "To admit the testimony to be true, is, in the sacred style, equivalent to believing it. . . . Faith, indeed, IS ALWAYS BUT THE CONVICTION OF THE TRUTH OF TESTIMONY."

"There is but ONE WAY of *believing any testimony*, human or divine, and that is TO ADMIT IT TO BE TRUE. . . . No believer can do more than *admit the truth of a witness*." (69.)

"The belief of ONE FACT, and that upon the best evidence in

the world, is *all* that is requisite, as far as *faith goes*, to salvation. The belief of this *one fact*, and submission to ONE INSTITUTION expressive of it, is ALL that is required of Heaven to admission into his church. A Christian . . . is one that *believes this one fact*, and has submitted to *one institution*," the deportment to follow. ("Christianity Restored," Debate with R., 781.) Now, all of you believe all he here demands as to faith in Christ.

Lard, Quarterly, July, 1867, p. 238, by a correspondent: "Now, this I hold to be the definition proper of faith. Absolutely it is *conviction*. . . . This is faith, *the conviction that a thing is true*."

Lard, the editor, says: "That faith is the simple conviction that what the Bible says is true."—Oct. Qt., 1867, 345.

Now, let us try the metaphysics of the matter. The very essence of repentance is a painful consciousness of our own self-deficiencies and helplessness as sinners, who have done evils we can not undo—committed sins we can not undo or blot out. Now, the whole idea of Bible faith is, to *rely on Christ to do that for us, blot out our sins, that we can not do ourselves—to look to the blood of Christ, in its merit, to cover our sins, to wash us from defilement*. But who would think of applying thus to another for *help, for aid, for mercy and gracious interposition, unless he felt the need of it?* Who would think of trusting in God for it unless he *felt the need of it?* But *that feeling of its need* is the essence of repentance. That is repentance. "A godly sorrow that *worketh repentance*," is the Bible idea of it.

Another peculiar dogma they hold I wish to expose. They habitually represent baptism—immersion with them—under the name of "*obedience*." They use these terms as if they were actually convertible. Obedience in their vernacular means baptism, of course the baptism of a penitent believer. They have come to use this term as a peculiar phrase for baptism. But they can not find a place in God's Word where these words sustain this relation to each other as they assume. They can not find a single passage in the Word of Almighty God where obedience is spoken of as baptism.

1. Obedience is constantly spoken of where the whole context and text exclude baptism as any part of it.

2. The word *obey* is the root-word of *faith* in Greek, *πειθω*. Acts v: 29, "Then Peter and the other apostles answered and said, We ought to *obey* God rather than men"—*πειθαρχεῖν δεῖ θεῷ*.

Acts xxvii: 21, *Πειθαρχήσαντάς μου*—"You should have obeyed [*i. e.* believed] me."

1 Pet. ii: 7, "Unto you therefore who believe he is precious: but unto them that be *disobedient* [ἀπειθεῖναι, disbelieve], the stone which the builders disallowed," etc.

Rom. ii: 8, "Do not obey the truth"—ἀπειθεῖσαι, *believe* in the truth. We have a full text of the phrase also.

"Obey the gospel" is the pet phrase for *immersion*. Rom. x: 16, is that phrase. "Ἀλλ' οὐ πάντες ἐτήκονσαν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ—But they have not all *obeyed the gospel*." Why? How is it? "Ἠσαίας γὰρ λέγει κύριε, τίς ἐπίστευσε τῇ ἀκοῇ ἡμῶν; For Esaias saith, Lord, *who hath BELIEVED* our report? So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing," etc. But Esaias said, "All day long have I stretched forth my hands unto a disobedient [ἀπειθοῦντα—UNBELIEVING, DISTRUSTING] and gainsaying people," (v. 21.) From this text it will be seen that the word disobedience is a general word expressing want of trust in God. In Greek, it is the word for distrust and di-belief. Therefore, the Bible does not sustain them in this idea, and baptism is never spoken of in that way.

MR. WILKES' FIFTH ARGUMENT.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

A day or two since I promised to give you a passage from Stockius' Lexicon, under the word "baptisma," in regard to the passage in Mark, first chapter, fourth verse. I intended to do it at the time, but will do so now. It is in Latin, and as follows:

"Ita legitur (I) de *baptismo Johannis Baptistæ* quem jussu divino administrabat, Matt. iii: 7, quique dicitur *baptismus* pœnitentiæ, quia debebat esse conjunctus pœnitentiæ."—"Stockius' Greek Lexicon," p. 184.

I translate it as follows: "It is read, or spoken, concerning the baptism of John, which he administered by divine authority. It is called the baptism of repentance, because it ought to be joined to repentance." That is what Stockius says. The work is before my friend, and if he disputes the translation I will have it submitted to scholars. On that same passage I remark now, in regard to the two editions of Winer: My friend says he read from the fourth edition of Winer, in which Winer explains *baptisma metanoias*, to be "baptism obligating to repentance." But I read from the sixth edition of Winer, in which, *after* having written that language, he says, in parenthesis and to explain it, "or rather baptism sealing repentance," modifying thus his original language, and explaining it to mean that baptism seals a man's repentance, and obligates him to continue a penitent man after he is baptized. Therefore, the two together explain the passage as I explained it before he presented his quotation from Winer.

You will observe that my friend was very particular in his last speech to argue the order of the graces, faith, repentance, etc., and the character of faith, whether it be assent, consent, or belief. Now, I advise my dear brother to save all that for another occasion. We are now talking about baptism for the remission of sins, and he owes it to me, and to this audience, to confine himself to the discussion of *this* question.

Suppose Brother Lard is as heretical as Arius himself, in regard to the Trinity, or faith, what does that amount to? Is Mr. Ditzler authorized, therefore, to say that baptism is *not* for the remission of sins? Suppose brothers Coleman, Pendleton, Hopson, and others, have, inadvertently, unadvisedly, and unscholarly, placed faith before repentance, as all the *masters of metaphysics* do and must do—suppose they all made a mistake in this respect—does it follow, therefore, that because my friend is right in respect to the order of these graces, that baptism is *not* for the remission of sins? Is that the sharpness and brilliancy of his logic? If so, let it remain, and let it be recorded. I envy him not such talents, such a success, and such honor.

Again: My friend says that we place faith first, then repentance, and then baptism; and he avers that the very reverse of this is the order in the Bible.

Now, Mark says, "He that believeth [it is the Savior's language] and is baptized, shall be saved." That is not exactly the reverse! And Peter says, "Repent and be baptized." That is not the reverse, for which he contends, is it? In the former instance we have the law of pardon, and in the latter we have the application of that law to actual cases. I presume that his view is just the reverse of the truth. I might give you a number of other instances, but these must suffice for the present.

After telling us that our system is *rotten*, my brother honors us with another classic phrase, or word. He says that our system is in *disorder*. Now, that may be, but I shall deny that he is the man to bring order out of the confusion. I shall insist that if it be in disorder, he will make "confusion worse confounded," if he can.

Again: He says that sins were *actually* remitted during Christ's personal ministry and that of John the Baptist. On what conditions, I ask? He says the people were not required to have any faith or repentance as conditions of baptism. I suppose, then, their forgiveness was conditioned upon baptism alone. But, whether that be true or not, I take the position (and am willing to stand the consequences)—whether right or not, *I do not insist upon it*—that sins were not *actually* and *finally* remitted during the ministry of John the Baptist. I will give you my reasons.

Paul says that "a testament is of force after men are dead, otherwise it is of no strength at all while the testator liveth;" and he applies that language to Jesus, the testator of the New Testament. Now, the blood of Christ seals the covenant that remits sins. No

blood, since the world began, ever remitted a man's sin, except the blood of Jesus Christ. Now, surely, since that blood is the blood that cleanses from sin, no other blood but that "of the new covenant, shed for many for the remission of sins," can save the soul. And, since that is true, I shall deny, and do deny, because I do not believe it, that any other blood ever cleansed from sin. I do not believe that, until that blood was shed, sins were ever finally forgiven. Under the old covenant such remission as was enjoyed was secured by the blood of bulls and goats, which could not take away sins. This I consider a complete answer to the position of my friend. He quotes Blackstone, but I will make short work of that by saying I believe it.

My friend quotes Mark i: 4, "John did baptize in the wilderness, and preach the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins;" and Luke iii: 3, "And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." He does not believe the law of pardon was there given. I quote them to show you that the preparatory and preliminary baptism of John the Baptist was for the remission of sins, and either passage raises a *presumption* in my favor—that baptism is *now* for remission of sins.

So far as John iii: 5 is concerned, that is the law of pardon now. It is not the law *itself*, but is an allusion to the law, as I stated under the first proposition we discussed. Nicodemus desired to know of the Savior, upon what terms he would be permitted to enter the approaching kingdom. Nicodemus was already in the Jewish Church; but as the Savior was about to establish a new kingdom or church, Nicodemus felt an anxiety to know whether or not he would have a place in that new church—for he recognized Christ as a prophet from God. Says the Savior, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." That is all. The allusion is to be explained by the law, when we come to it.

I object to the manner in which my friend is conducting this discussion, in another respect. I made that passage plain, I think, and my friend thought the people felt the force of it. But he sees fit to just waive all notice of it till another day. His reply to what I say not coming in close pursuance of mine, the sharpness of my reasoning, if there was any in it, passed from the minds of our hearers; *then* he comes in on the *next day* with a reply. That is scarcely correct, especially as he had time to go so far out of his way to chide us

about the *rotundness* of our system, and its falling into *disorder*. Why not come up and answer promptly what is presented?

Again, upon the commission by Mark, xvi: 9-20, I am bound to say a few words, though I wish my friend had brought it in sooner. Let me read deliberately the reasons for believing that from the ninth to the twentieth verses of the last chapter of Mark are genuine. I read from Lange, p. 158, as follows:

"The reasons for assuming that verses 9-20 are an original portion of Mark's Gospel much outweigh those to the contrary. 1. They are found in the Uncial Codd. A., C., D., X., Δ., F., G., H., K., M., S., U., V., as well as in 33, 69, and the rest of the cursive MSS. which have been collated. They are in copies of the old Latin, in the Vulgate, Curetonian Syriac, Peshito, Jerusalem Syriac, Memphitic, Gothic, and Æthiopic. 2. Irenæus recognizes their existence; as do also Hippolytus, Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose, Augustine, Nestorius. Scholz also claims that Clement of Rome, Justin Martyr, and Clement of Alexandria, sanction the passage; but Tregelles regards this as an error. The chief argument against the genuineness of this section is found in the fact that it was wanting in some of the early copies of Mark's Gospel. This is attested by Eusebius, Gregory Nyssa, Victor of Antioch, and Jerome. But this is certainly an insufficient reason for affirming its spuriousness, in the face of the strong testimonies upon the other side. See Tregelles on the printed text of the Greek Testament, p. 246 *seq.* Its genuineness is affirmed by Simon, Mill, Bengel, Matthiæ, Eichhorn, Koenigl, Hug, Schulz, Guericke, Olshausen, Ebrard, Lachmann; is denied by Griesbach, Rosenmüller, Schulz, Fritzsche, Paulus, Wieseler, Ewald, Meyer, Tischendorf."

I take the following extract from the introduction to the "Tauchnitz Edition of the New Testament," edited by Tischendorf, p. 13:

"The ordinary conclusion to the Gospel of St. Mark, namely: xvi: 9-20, is found in more than five hundred Greek manuscripts, in the whole of the Syriac and Coptic, and most of the Latin manuscripts, and even in the Gothic version. But by Eusebius and Jerome (the former of whom died in the year 340), it is stated expressly that in nearly all of the trustworthy copies of their time the gospel ended with the eighth verse; and, with this, of all existing known Greek manuscripts, only the Vatican and the Sinaitic now agree."

I would remark that, from the time of the Elzevir editions, or collations, 1624, to the present time, so far as my observation on this subject has enabled me to know, there has not been a collation of the text made, in which this passage was not put in the body of the text, and regarded as part of it. I know very well there are some who believe that the conclusion of the testimony of Mark was not

from his hand—and they are high authority at that—but even those parties themselves regarded it as having been penned under divine sanction. Alford himself, the highest authority my friend has read, or can read on his side, says it is “an *authentic* fragment.” Tregelles has it in his text; Alford has it; Thomas Sheldon Green has it, and all the collators have it, and have had for the last 300 years without a single exception, so far as I have observed. It is genuine, and I shall not be turned away from the solid question to the discussion of collations of Greek texts, for which neither of us has the qualifications or means.

My friend is making a great mistake. He tells us that the translators of the old Peshito-Syriac, the oldest version, made right under the shadow of the apostles, and by their own disciples, very likely, ought to have known all about it; and yet his own Peshito-Syriac has it; so has the old Italic, so has Jerome's Vulgate. Justin Martyr approved it. Some doubt this, I know; but it is just as I have told you. I hope my friend will let that question rest, and let us discuss *the* question before us; or, if he so desires, I will discuss this question also, after I have examined some other passages.

I will now take up the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, to which I referred at the conclusion of my last address. The day of Pentecost was fully come, and the apostles, as they were told to be, were all in one place, were sitting in an upper room, probably, they and one hundred and twenty others; when suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty wind, which filled all the house where they were sitting; and they were all filled with the Holy Spirit. And cloven tongues, as of fire, sat upon each of them, and they began to speak in other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. This was noised abroad, and the people came together; they thought it was something singular or miraculous, and so it was. There were many persons in Jerusalem at that time, from all parts of the world (for it was a Jewish festival), gathered from sixteen or eighteen different countries. They ran together, inquiring what this meant. Some held one view, some another. In the midst of this anxiety to know the truth, the Apostle Peter, the one to whom the Lord had given the keys of the kingdom, arose, and preached to them. He taught them, in substance, that this was the fulfillment of one of the prophecies of Joel: “In the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men

shall dream dreams," etc. This, in substance, is the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy, and it all had reference to Christ. Peter continued: "You remember that, a few days since, you, with wicked hands, took and crucified the Lord of glory; now, him God has raised up from the dead, and made both Lord and Christ; and he now sits at God's own right hand. He that was so murderously crucified is now your Lord; and before him you will have to stand in the judgment." From their prophets and from their own observations, these truths converged upon their hearts with awful force, and they "were cut to the heart;" so the record tells us. By the force of these truths they were cut to the heart; and, in that state, they would naturally inquire, "What must we do?" Do for what? What was their state or condition? They were sinners, condemned murderers of the Son of God. What was their condition? They were under condemnation; they feared the wrath of God; the sword of HIS vengeance hung suspended over them. Under the tremendous pressure of the truths brought to bear upon their hearts, they cried out: "What shall we *do*?" Do for what? "That we may be forgiven this great wrong." This is the only rational explanation that can be given to this question. Peter said, "Repent." They were all cut to the heart; they had already seen their error; were already brought to believe in Christ. The truths that Peter preached had pierced their hearts, awakened their sensibilities; and their intellects being convinced, they said, What must we do? Do for what? To be forgiven. Peter said, "Repent, and be baptized." That is all he told them to *do*. What is the baptism for? Suppose I go no further at present, but were to stop here, what would you understand that the baptizing was for? Just the same that repentance is for. I would paraphrase it thus: If you, condemned sinners; if you, murderers of Jesus, desire to be saved; if you desire the approbation of the one whom you have crucified, the sentence of God is—and we are authorized to so speak—that you must "repent, and be baptized."

Now, what are repentance and baptism for? They wished to know what they must do; and they were told, they must repent and be baptized. There never was, in this world, any thing plainer than that baptism is here for the remission of sins. It is a palpable, plain, simple truth; it is a truth which every common, plain man would catch at a glance. At the first notice he could not help accepting it. Repent, and be baptized, every one of you. But that is not all Peter

said. "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins."

Now, just as in many other cases, we have here some clauses thrown in this passage which have their appropriate force and meaning. Peter says, "Repent, and be baptized." This is what is commanded. "You" is then modified; Peter added, "Every one of you." What does that mean? That clause is thrown in to show that they were *all* included in the privilege of repenting and being baptized. That is what that clause is for; and when we have ascertained that, we have ascertained *the* force and purpose of it.

There is another clause—"in the name of Jesus Christ." What is that for? They had all been told what to do, and they were told what the effect would be if they would do it. They knew what they were inquiring for; and Peter promised that blessing and boon to them if they would do what he told them. But he lets them know that they must do it "in the name of Jesus Christ." If you will repent, and be baptized every one of you, and do it "in the name of Jesus Christ," you shall receive remission of sins. Now, I will read the passage: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ." You must do this. It will be "for the remission of sins; and you shall receive God's Holy Spirit."

I have sometimes dealt with this passage thus, and I do not intend that my friend shall misrepresent me in this case as he has done. I have said that, in analyzing a passage, we are at liberty to separate its parts to see what the syntactical connections are, as far as all the bearings of the parts on each other are concerned. Every body knows that is right. I have said that if we look at that phrase—"every one of you"—and see that it was placed in that sentence to show that *all* the people were included, we should get the force of it; and, having ascertained this, we should have no further use for the phrase.

I take the other phrase, "in the name of Jesus Christ,"—*epi to onomati Jesu Christou*, which is to show that the things commanded must be done on the authority, or in the name of Jesus Christ. Now, knowing on what authority the command must be obeyed, and that all were included, they were ready to act. Suppose those hearers were established *already* in the belief that whatever they did they must do by the authority of Jesus Christ; do it recognizing it as from Jesus Christ, and that in doing it they were obeying Jesus Christ, then we have the force of these clauses.

Suppose I were to omit the former clause—(and I hope my friend

will not be so discourteous as to say that I am tearing the Bible to pieces. I am only separating the parts, so that we may see their force (the better)—and to show the meaning of this command I will just omit it for a moment, and only for a moment. Then in answer to the question, "What shall we do?" we have "Repent, and be baptized, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Suppose, now, having learned that *all* were included in Peter's command—and, hence we have omitted the phrase "every one of you"—that we conclude that the phrase, in the name of Jesus Christ, signifies by the authority of, or relying on, the name of Jesus Christ, we may then omit this second phrase, or suspend it, for a moment, that we may bring together that which was to be done and that for which it was to be done. The passage would then read: Repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins. What is my proposition? "Baptism is for the remission of sins." Now subject this passage to the test of criticism, to the test of all analyses, grammars, and lexicons, I care not what they may be, nor from what man they may come, baptism is here taught to be for the remission of sins. This the world will be compelled to accept.

However, if I am wrong, I am not dogmatically wrong, I am respectfully wrong. But my friend tells us that a system that teaches this "is rotten." I deny it. He tells us that a system that teaches that baptism is for the remission of sins is "disorderly." I deny it. Will he just allow me to talk a moment, as Nathan did to David, and say: "Thou art the man" who art in disorder. So I think. But further on that subject I say not, for I have not come here to abuse my Methodist brother; I came to abuse nobody; to hold up nobody to ridicule; I came here, single-handed and alone, to present the word of God, the *teachings* of the word of God to the people; I wish them to understand what God has said to them; and I would, had I the opportunity, exhort them to receive that word; but, for the present, I am here only as an arguist and debater, and, therefore, I attempt to *explain* these passages.

Now, who is in disorder? The great men of Europe are Lange, Winer, Hug, Thomas Sheldon Green, Tischendorf, Alford, and the like, while in this country we have distinguished names also; and I assert that from the day of Pentecost, when Peter preached, till, I believe, the sixteenth century—and, if I am wrong, my friend will correct me—except in one or two heresies, there never was any one,

claiming to be religious, that did not believe in baptism for the remission of sins.

So far from my being alone, my brother and his friends are so isolated that I wonder they do not feel their loneliness, and especially are they alone in respect to the companionship of scholars and the scholarly.

Who, even since the sixteenth century, have not taught it? Luther taught it; Calvin taught it. The lights in the Reformation of the sixteenth century all taught it; the English Church taught it and teaches it yet. Go to your rector in this city—I do not know who he is, but I presume he is a scholarly gentleman—go to him, and he will laugh in your face if you tell him that baptism is not for the remission of sins. I think, however, that he carries it too far. I do not believe that the infant that is baptized is thereby regenerated; that is, by baptism itself. I carefully noted at the beginning of this discussion that I do not believe in baptism by it-self; indeed, I deny that there is such a thing as baptism by itself.

That baptism is for the remission of sins, and is so held by the scholars of Europe and America, I shall show you still farther. To that end I desire to read to you a few passages on the subject :

“The apostle *promises* to those who repent and receive baptism (1) the remission of sins, and (2) the gift of the Holy Ghost.”—Lange’s Commentary on Acts ii, p. 52.

“This ἀφεσις ἁμαρτων is unquestionably connected more intimately and directly than the gift of the Holy Ghost with the baptismal act; the former, [ἀφεσις] namely, is indicated by the word εἰς [for the remission, etc.] as the immediate purpose of baptism, and as the promise inseparably connected with it, while general terms are all that now succeed, viz: ‘And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.’ But these terms do not by any means imply that the apostles’ hearers should at once receive the Holy Ghost in and with baptism itself.”—Lange’s Commentary on Acts ii, p. 53.

MR. DITZLER'S FIFTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

The brother seems to be out of humor to-day, from beginning to end. Indeed, he charges me with using rough language yesterday, which I think I did not use. I can not say, however, that I did not use the word "rotten," for I do not recollect. I may have used it, but I feel sure I did not. Brethren tell me I did not. So does my phonographer. The report of the debate will show whether I did or not. He forgets how to quote. He says all the scholars of reputation agree with him that baptism is for the remission of sins, though some of them carry it entirely too far for him. Now, on the contrary, I assert that *not a single one of the whole body* of scholars agrees with him. What do they teach? and what did any one of the fathers teach? The very ones he would name as indorsing his position, Justin Martyr and Luther, say we are "justified by *faith alone*." The very fathers that he says agree with him on the design of baptism use the word, from the second to the sixteenth century, "justified by faith alone." Why do not the Greek and Latin fathers so use it? I can give you every one of them if you want me to turn to them. Now, then, these German and English writers to whom he refers, teach that the essence of baptism is the grace of God; that the Spirit of God operates in baptism. The Episcopalians, to whom he refers—the Low Church especially—teach that it is the Spirit of God that works regeneration and sanctification, and thus they look upon baptism as relating to remission of sins. But my brother will not believe a word of that, nor does his church; so that not one of the whole line of illustrious names referred to agrees with him. Of Stoekius he did not read enough. So far as he read it was correct, but I was in hopes he would read and translate the following sentence. I leave him to translate it, and we will see how he will do it, for the sentence completely destroys his doctrine and refutes his interpretation.

Mr. Wilkes—Read it.

Mr. Ditzler—I want first to hear *you* read it, and then I will read it, for I have an honorable motive in it. He would make you believe that his edition of Winer was an improved one. This may be so, but we have no proof of it. We have Winer himself rendering the word in *that very place* as I have rendered it, which destroys his other rendering, if he renders it as my friend says he does. If he gives the word “seal,” he contradicts himself. His “seal” is not in the original, but he will jump at conclusions. He can not see how I bring in faith and repentance. I will show him directly. He still reads Lange on Mark, where he says “He that believeth and is baptized,” etc. Alford rejects it from the text. So does Tischendorf.

Then, again, I hold in my hand the oldest copy of the Greek Testament known in the whole world. I refer to the “Codex Vaticanus,” the best copy in the whole world. That text is not in it at all. The next oldest and best copy is the “Sinaiticus,” of Tischendorf, and it has not got it. Then, the two oldest copies of the Greek Bible in the known world has nothing of it; so that text is not a safe guide. Who can risk his faith on such a text? In his first speech he told you that he was going to make his battle on Mark i: 4, and in a former discussion he said he would risk every thing—stake his whole argument on that passage. But now he has partly abandoned it. They say that faith is a consent that what the Bible teaches is true. That is their doctrine, and all their preachers preach it. They demand a belief that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. They demand that on the testimony of the Bible, and a consent that it is true, is the ground upon which they administer baptism: “Do you believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God?” They have made the phrase, and that is the way they state it. Now, all the people in the city of Louisville, with the exception of a few infidels, and they are very few, and perhaps a few Turner Germans, believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. I believe that there has not been a half dozen persons of our congregation of yesterday and to-day who do not believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. Now, they teach that believing this truth changes the heart, and that, therefore, we are possessed of “the soul-renewing, soul-sanctifying principle of religion.” “The *regenerating*, sanctifying principle,” says Mr. Campbell. Then, according to their view, nearly every person in the city possesses “the soul-renewing, soul-sanctifying principle of religion,” and yet you live under the gospel age, and are responsible to God;

therefore you come under the rule which says the laver of baptism stands between all of you and the blood of Christ; therefore, the whole of this people here to-day are possessed of this "soul-renewing, soul-sanctifying principle of religion," and yet my brother says, if you are responsible and have had a chance to know your duty, you will be damned, and ought to be damned, if you are not baptized. He gives us to understand that baptism is immersion, and tells us we will all be damned if we are not immersed. By their teaching the whole body of you are possessed of "the soul-renewing, soul-sanctifying principle of religion," your "characters are changed," your "hearts purified," "born from above," and yet every one of you will be damned if you are not immersed! Now, who believes that the great mass of the people are thus changed in heart? Do you believe you are changed in heart? No. No, my friends, you do not, unless you have believed in a different sense than a bare assent of mind that Jesus Christ is the true Son of God.

He goes to Acts ii: 22. The point he says I will not answer I did not catch, but hope I will yet get it. But he is very anxious about the thirty-eighth verse: "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." My brother was a little more guarded than he has generally been in analyzing this famous text. At Mount Sterling, and other places, he proceeded thus: Let us take out the word "repent," then take out "every one of you," then "in the name of Jesus Christ," and we have the terms of my proposition—"Baptism for remission of sins." To which I replied, Yes; take out every one, and no one would be left to be baptized; take out "Jesus Christ" and "repent," and there would be nothing left but—*the water*. But, in the phrase "*in the name of Jesus Christ*," you have the key to the proper understanding of this text—the very part always overlooked. It is here we find the explanation of this famous passage. To understand this important passage of Scripture we must notice closely the language used, the burden of the discourse, and the people addressed. As my brother's church has made more capital out of this verse than out of all other texts in the Bible on this subject, it is the more necessary that we examine it carefully.

The burden of Peter's discourse is that *this is the Christ* of prophecy, the Savior of sinners, through faith in his name. In verse twenty-one, after quoting the promise of the pouring out of the Spirit on all flesh in Messiah's day, he says: "And it shall come to pass

that whosoever shall *call on the name of the Lord shall be saved.*" All Jews understood the fact that men did not "call on him in whom they did not believe."—Rom. x: 13. Hence, the key to this text is in the very words Mr. Campbell and his followers nearly always *throw out*, by omitting to quote it as unimportant, and which Brother Wilkes boldly takes out of the text. They are the words "in the name," etc. I quote the text: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, (*epi to onomati Iesou Christou eis aphesin hamartion*) ON (not *in*, or *eis*, as Mr. Campbell thought from his comment, but *epi*, upon, on) the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of your sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit." My brother can not, and *will not* deny that the words ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι κ. τ. λ. implies *reliance upon Jesus Christ for remission of sins*. I had the honor to be the first that ever called attention to this, the only true exposition of this passage, years ago, when a beardless boy, studying the Greek text. Now, I find my position sustained by all the Greek authorities of recent date. In all my debates I have forced every opponent to admit its force. On the force of ἐπι with the notion as it here occurs, I will quote W. E. Jelf's Greek Grammar, second volume, p. 320, § 634, 3d ed.: "(d.) The ground of any mental affection [repent is such]. (e.) The condition or *ground* of any thing—*on these terms*—the TERMS being CONSIDERED AS THE FOUNDATION ON WHICH THE WHOLE RESTS. . . . On these terms Greek Testament βαπτίζεν ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ. So in the Greek Testament with words expressing *trust* or *confidence*, as Mark x: 24, τοῖς πεποθέτας ἐπι τοῖς χόημασι, the ἐπι brings out the notion of *resting on*."—(Italics his.)

Kühner's "Greek Gram.," p. 639, § 296, 11, says the same, in substance. "Ἐπι, . . . with the Dative (1) in a local relation: (a.) to denote the *tarrying* or *resting upon* . . . *dependence*." Now, they were either to rely on the *baptism*—the *baptismal act*—for remission, or on Jesus Christ. If *baptism* be for remission, then they *rely on, trust to it* for remission. If the blood of Christ be for, shed for, remission, then they had to *trust in that* for remission. *Whatever* provision Christ has made for remission, ἐπι here points to *that* directly. But all admit Christ alone procured remission "*through faith in his blood for the remission of sins*." And my opponent admits the ἐπι κ. τ. λ. implies trust in, reliance upon Jesus Christ for remission. Here, then, they are to repent as a proper condition of mind and heart precedent to feeling the need of reliance in the blood of Christ. Be baptized,

ye murderers of the blessed One. They had sanctioned his death. Peter accuses them of his murder, v. 23: "Him . . . ye have taken, and, by wicked hands, have crucified and slain." As they had publicly murdered, and so rejected him, he demands a public recognition of him by these men. Hence, this is the only place where such a demand was made in the Acts of the Apostles. This is the only passage where baptism is urged in any sermon in the New Testament, owing to the peculiar sins of the characters. No; neither repentance nor baptism is for remission, but conditions precedent to doing that which is for remission. The repentance would as much be for remission as baptism, since they are coupled with *καὶ*—and "repent and be baptized." But it is never for remission of sins. Whatever is for remission, of necessity brings remission. Faith does this—repentance never. The repentance here, as usual, precedes faith. Repentance is to put the mind in a condition precedent to faith—to trust in Jesus Christ; and so baptism was properly demanded here as a public declaration, on their part, that their repentance was sincere—they accept the Messiah they had crucified. They repented, not for remission of sins; they were not baptized for remission of sins. "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, trusting or relying on the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." That is the preaching of all the apostles. It is, *trust in Christ*, not in *baptism*. That is for the remission of sins. Now, Peter, in the third chapter of Acts, also shows that this is the meaning. "Then Peter said, Silver and gold have I none; but such as I have give I thee: *In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk.* And as the lame man which was healed held Peter and John, all the people ran together unto them in the porch that is called Solomon's, greatly wondering." Then Peter said, v. 16, "And his name, through faith in his name, hath made this man strong, whom ye see and know: yea, the faith which is by him hath given him this perfect soundness in the presence of you all."—Acts iii: 6–16.

In the following chapter, Peter says: "If we this day be examined of the good deed done to the impotent man, by which means he is made whole: be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that by the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even by him doth this man stand here whole. This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there *salvation in any other*: for there is none other name under heaven given among

men, *whereby we must be saved.*" Thus, you see, Peter says, *on the name and in the name of Jesus Christ, and faith in him, are one and the same thing, and that salvation is in that name only, i. e., "by faith in it"* Peter and Christ say the same thing: "Whatsoever ye ask in my name;" or, as it is in another place, "Whatsoever ye ask, *believing.*" So it is not baptism that is for the remission of sins, but believing on Jesus Christ that secures the remission of sins; and so it is universally expressed in the Word of God. Peter says, in this same sermon, "And it shall come to pass that whosoever shall call *on the name* of the Lord shall be saved." Now, what becomes of baptism for the remission of sins? It is not found in the Word of Almighty God.

And now I come to the metaphysics again. Yes; I have met scores of metaphysicians who put faith before repentance. Of course, we all admit that a man must believe that Christ is the Son of God before he can be presumed to desire salvation. He must believe the leading truths of the Bible, if not all of them. How many men believe all the truths of the Bible, and yet do not feel a conviction of sin, or the need of a personal Savior, and go forward and trust him for salvation? Why, millions upon millions. A consciousness of man's wants and his sinfulness must precede his efforts in seeking for salvation. A consciousness of one's own want of a Savior, which induces repentance, necessarily precedes that trust in Christ that brings salvation. Therefore, a man must feel conscious of the want of salvation before he will apply to the Savior to have his sins washed away. Thus, you see, metaphysics are on our side. How is it, then, that these men could have believed before Peter told them to repent? These men whom Peter there declared murderers—"who, with wicked hands," slew him—were *they* believers, *true believers* of course, with *hearts changed*—*these bloody-handed murderers*, whom Peter thus charged with having consented to the Savior's death? No; stung with the rebuke of Peter, they cried out to know if there was hope. "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Did they venture to trust Christ for salvation before they were assured that Christ would be merciful? No. They might, as Jews, have theoretically understood that justification was by faith, or not, accordingly as they had studied the Bible; but when they were *murderers*, certainly they were not *believers* in the Lord Jesus Christ. No; they were to be saved only by that "faith that works by love and purifies the heart."

Now, I have read before you the views of the leading ministers of

my brother's church on this subject; and I now read from 1 Peter iii: 21, where the apostle says in so many words that baptism "is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh." By the word filth he means sin—moral pollution. Isaiah iv: 4: "When the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Jerusalem," etc. The Greek is there *ρυτος*, the same as in Peter iii: 21; so the Septuagint, which the apostles used. Job xiv: 4 reads, "τις γὰρ καθαρὸς ἔσται ἄ-θ ρυτου; ἀλλ' οὐθεὶς εὐν καὶ μία ἡμέρα ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς." For who is free from pollution? Not one, though his life be but one day upon the earth." So in Revelation xxii: 11, the verb *ρυνθῶ*, to be filthy—"He that is filthy, let him be filthy still." This is its only occurrence in the New Testament as a verb, and the other in Peter—its only occurrence as a noun. Peter says baptism is not *ἀπὸθέσις*, putting away sin—moral pollution. My brother, in defining his position, says it is. Here he contradicts the Apostle Peter.

Now, look into these things, and examine them carefully. If baptism had been for the remission of sins, the Savior, most assuredly, would have taught it; yea, and in unmistakable terms. Like justification, it would have occupied a prominent place there; but it is nowhere there. If they could find *one single place in the Bible* that taught that baptism was for the remission of sins, it would be enough. The ordinance of baptism had been known for hundreds of years, and no one thought of claiming that it was for the remission of sins. If it had come to be so used, it would have been so stated in the clear terms in which the cardinal doctrines of religion are stated. They are all clearly taught and brought out in historical illustrations. But this is nowhere taught from the beginning of Genesis to the end of Revelation. Will you trust your salvation on that which is nowhere taught in the Word of Almighty God?

His Greek rule on the genitive I will turn against him, and will refute his position by his own rule on the law of the genitive.

MR. WILKES' SIXTH ARGUMENT.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

It will be remembered that this morning Mr. Ditzler referred to the reading of Stockius on the subject of "baptism of repentance," which I had already introduced, and he informed the audience that if I had read the balance of the sentence it would have made a very different showing. Now I propose to read it all, and to this reading I invite the particular attention of my hearers:

"Ita legitur (1) de baptismo Johannis baptistæ, quem jussu divino administrabat, Matt. iii: 7, quique dicitur baptismus pœnitentiæ, quia debebat esse conjunctus pœnitentiæ, adeoque erat commonefactio, testificatio & professio, opus esse pœnitentiæ, & eos, qui baptismum illum recipiebant, talem agere & habere pœnitentiã, qualem Johannes posebat."—Stockius, "Clavis Lingvæ Sanctæ Novi Testamenti," p. 184.

Which I translate :

"Thus it is said concerning the baptism of John the Baptist, which he administered by divine authority, Matt. iii: 7, and which is called baptism of repentance, because it ought to be joined to repentance, and moreover it was a remembering, a testifying, and a professing, that there was need of penitence, and that those who received this baptism, exercised, and had such penitence as John demanded."

The latter part, you see: "That they who received this baptism acted, or exercised, and had such penitence as John demanded," is the balance of Stockius, which my friend thought would be much against me; it seems to be quite otherwise.

I now call your attention to some other thoughts presented in the last speech. My friend says, "Whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved" (Acts ii: 21). I remark, that it is a very different thing to *call the name* and to *call upon the name* of the Lord. But my friend raises the question, "Could they be believers in, and at the same time the murderers of the Son of God?" referring to the converts on the day of Pentecost. I do not see any difficulty

in that, unless my friend holds the position that a murderer may not repent, and may not believe, may not be baptized, and may not be saved. Peter said to those very persons, that they were the betrayers and murderers of Jesus Christ, and yet it is said that "they were cut to the heart." They did repent, were baptized, and were saved.

In regard to the impotent man, Mr. D. said "He was saved by the name of the Lord" (Acts iv: 10). Now, I was supposing that all salvations were by the name of the Lord. But my friend read *this* passage to show that *epi to onomati Jesu Christou*, in Acts ii, means that salvation is by the name of Jesus Christ. Though I do not deny it, I deny that his passage is in point, for in Acts iv we have *not* the *epi to*, etc. It is *en to onomati*, a very different phrase.

In the latter part of my friend's speech, about the time he thought it would be good to make an exhortation, he told you that the great body of our hearers, on my theory, must be immersed or they would be damned! He has a peculiar way of enumerating the Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Lutherans, etc., and of asserting that they *must* be immersed or they will all be damned! Suppose it is true that they must be immersed or they will be damned, does he therefore think that "baptism is" *not* "for the remission of sins?" I believe a great many persons will be damned; I believe thousands of persons will be damned, simply because they do not believe upon and obey Jesus Christ. Now, if it should happen that some of these will be among them, I do not see that therefore my proposition is false, and yet the allusion is introduced for this purpose, or just for buncombe, and for creating public opinion against me.

I now call attention to a matter which I hold very sacred and dear. My friend says that "such a faith as they have"—referring to my brethren—"is simply giving assent to the truth, just a consent, which is a defective faith." I state to him that I have a number of intelligent brethren around me, and they are all "representative" men, and I venture to say that not one of them ever said or believed that a *mere* assent or consent of the mind is all the faith that is necessary to salvation. Never! I call this public audience to witness the truth of this statement. If you have ever seen persons unite with the Christian Church, you have seen and heard this; you have seen the uniting party come forward and give his hand at the proper time; you have heard the question asked him, "Do you believe with *all your heart* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God?" Never, in all my observation or during all of my ministry, have I ever known that to fail. Each candi-

date for reception in the church is required to say that he believes "with all his heart." If he did it not, he deceived us. We demand not only faith, a confession of faith, but a confession of faith that includes the *whole heart*, before any one is allowed to be received into the Christian Church. Yet in the face of this notorious fact, my friend here tries to make you believe that we demand *just a cold, heartless, formal assent to the truth!* "and then we dip them, and that is all!" Is it so? The history of forty years in your midst, demonstrating the contrary, is certainly a sufficient reply, and my friend ought to have learned it. When talking about it, he knew the practice of this church—which is spreading over this country, and at this time numbers, in Ky., about 70,000 souls. He knew, also, that we demand of every candidate that comes to the church, faith with the whole heart, or we would not receive him. But he left out that part! Is that honest?

My friend states another thing that I would have preferred he had not stated. He says that, at the first of this discussion, I held that "baptism is for the remission of sins, but that *now* I assert that it is *presumptively*, only, for the remission of sins, or that it is partially, or possibly, for remission." That is very wide of any thing I have said. I said, and I say without qualification, that the baptism of John was for the remission of sins; that there is no "presumptuousness" in it, no "possible" in it. It was "for the remission of sins." But I did say that it is *probable* that the remission enjoyed at that time was not *actual*, but *prospective*; that the blood of Christ, which cleanses from sin, had not then been shed, and that *possibly* their sins were not *actually* remitted. I hope he understands me, for it is not profitable to misunderstand each other.

My friend says that not one of the scholars I read from was with me, or that they did not *exactly* agree with me. They agree with me thus far, that is, as far as I go; they agree that "baptism is for the remission of sins," every one of them, and if my brother possessed the candor he ought to have, he would so have told you. They are with me as far as we go; so I have the weight of their authority and learning, as far as I go, on my side, although I must say that some of them go too far; they hold that baptism, *by itself*, will suffice, which I must, in candor, say I do not believe.

But I shall not be surprised if, before I have done, I find that the Methodist Church goes as far as I do; we will see; time will develop.

I purpose now to take up Acts ii, and examine it more fully. My friend objects to my analyzing the passage. He thinks that I "tear

it all to pieces;” that I am treating rudely and improperly the Word of God, when, as he expresses it, I “tear it all to pieces.” I tell you, sir, that I tear not the Word of God to pieces. I simply analyze it. Does my brother object to that? He does object when he calls analyzing “tearing a passage of the Word of God all to pieces!” Now, I thought that an analysis of a passage was absolutely necessary to the understanding of it; and that all scholars, when they would see the relative bearing of the parts of a passage, or the syntactical relation of the parts, would analyze it for that purpose. If I am wrong in this, of course I suffer in your presence for it; but if I am right in this, my friend suffers severely. Am I right or wrong? When I attempt to examine a passage, especially one that has clauses and phrases, I analyze or separate, according to my conception, the leading parts from the modifying clauses, or parts. I look at the force of the modifying parts, and then, in conception, I exclude them and allow the leading parts of the sentence to stand, in my conception, near together. Thus I am enabled to see the relation existing between those leading parts more plainly. In other words, I parse the sentence, and I thus bring out and exhibit the agreement and the government of the several parts with each other, and exhibit them to my hearers. And yet, to mar the force of what I say, my friend has the temerity to reply that I tear the Word of God to pieces! What for? He may tell you his reasons for doing so; I might misrepresent him.

He says *epi to onomati Jesu Christou* means relying upon the Word of God, or, relying upon the name of Jesus Christ; and that “*relying upon the name of Jesus Christ*” is for the remission of sins. My brother is fond of authorities. I would like to have one for this position, besides the Rev. Jacob Ditzler. Let him here and now jeopardize or risk his reputation as a scholar by making that statement if he chuses. I deny that there is any other respectable authority for it. I deny that *eis* connects *epi to onomati Jesu Christou*, on the one hand, with *aphesin amartionon* on the other. I deny that the *eis*—a preposition—connects “the name of Jesus Christ,” on the one hand, with “remission of sins,” on the other. And in that denial, I deny that the name of Jesus Christ is the thing there stated to be for the remission of sins.

I ask my friend now, as I did in reference to Mark i: 4, to tell me the connections of *eis* in this passage, on the one hand and on the other. As regards the former passage, he would not say a

word, he was as dumb as an oyster. And he will not speak now, for this simple reason: he knows that all the grammatical authority is on my side, and that on his there is none.

I will now examine this passage further. First, however, allow me to read a letter, received from Dr. Albert Barnes, a Presbyterian, in regard to the connection that *eis* makes in this passage—that is, as to the things joined together by *eis*—showing that the relation is between repent and be baptized on the one hand, and “for the remission of sins” on the other:

“PHILADELPHIA, August 18, 1870.

“REV. J. B. BIRNEY:

“*My Dear Sir*—I received your favor this morning.

“My knowledge of Greek is very imperfect, and no great value should be attached to my opinion on a question of Greek criticism. But it seems to me the word *eis*, in the passage referred to (Acts ii: 38), relates to the *entire previous sentence*. ‘Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ’—*eis—unto, or in order to, or with reference to*—the remission of sins, etc. That *is*, the repentance and baptism *both* have reference to the remission of sins; or the *entire process*, so to speak, in the divine arrangement for the remission of sins, *embraces* this, or this is the *complete process* appointed by God *in connection with* the pardon of sin. Whether a man can be saved *without* baptism is a question not connected with the exegesis of the passage; but the design of Peter, as I understand it, is to state what is the *complete divine arrangement* in order to the forgiveness of sins. (Comp. Mark xvi: 16.)

“I regret that I have not a copy of the Syriac Bible to answer your other question. I sold my library, and of the few books that I have, I have no Syriac books among them. I am, very truly, yours,

“ALBERT BARNES.”

We have here the statement of Dr. Barnes—whose learning is eminent, but whose modesty led him to say that his knowledge of Greek is imperfect—that the connection *eis* makes in this case is between “repent and be baptized” on the one hand, and “remission of sins” on the other.

I now call your attention to an authority, perhaps second to none in the United States—Dr. Hackett, a distinguished Baptist translator and author. On page 69 of his “Commentary on Acts of the Apostles,” he says:

———“*εις ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, in order to the forgiveness of sins* (Matt. xxvi: 28; Luke iii: 3), we connect, naturally, with both the preceding verbs. This clause states the motive or object which should induce them to repent and be baptized. It enforces the entire exhortation, not one part of it to the exclusion of the other.”

I will next read from Lange:

"This ἀφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν is unquestionably connected more intimately and directly than the gift of the Holy Ghost with the baptismal act; the former [ἀφεσις] namely, is indicated by the word *eis* [for the remission, etc.], as the immediate purpose of baptism, and as the purpose inseparably connected with it, while general terms are all that now succeed, viz.: 'And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.' But these terms do not by any means imply that the apostles' hearers should at once receive the Holy Ghost in and with baptism itself."—"Commentary on the Holy Scriptures," by Dr. Lange, p. 53, Acts.

Again, I read:

"He at the same time called upon his hearers to repent and be baptized, in the name of Jesus, as the founder and head of the heavenly kingdom, that even they, though they had crucified the Lord of Glory, might receive forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost, whose wonderful workings they saw in the disciples."—"History of the Christian Church," by Philip Schaff, D. D., p. 61.

I will next read as follows:

"It is thus that we see how St. Peter preserves the correspondence between the act of Noah in preparing the ark as an act of faith by which he was justified, and the act of submitting to Christian baptism, which is also obviously an act of faith, in order to the remission of sins, or the obtaining a good conscience before God."—"Theological Institutes," by Richard Watson, vol. ii, p. 624.

I now propose to show that the preposition *eis*, in thus showing the relation between the acts of repentance and baptism on the one hand, and the result, forgiveness, on the other, expressed the same relation as *en* (*in*), except that it has the notion of direction, *whither*, while *en* (*in*) has the notion of rest, *where*. Of *eis*, Dr. Jelf says:

"It expresses the same relations as *en* (*in*), except that it has the notion of a direction, *whither*, while *en* has the notion of rest, *where*. It is used to express the direction or motion of an action—*into* an object, or *up* to an object—into immediate contact with it; especially to express the reaching some definite point."—"Grammar of the Greek Language," by W. F. Jelf, D. D., vol. ii, p. 296.

I quote that passage from Jelf, and *that only*, because every other authority agrees with it, and, for the still better reason in this case, that my friend agrees with it. I declare that *eis* never connects any thing in the world except some verbal notion, something indicating motion or tendency, which is not found in the phrase *epi to onomati*, in Acts ii, which my friend contends is the left hand clause connected

by *eis* with remission of sins. It always indicates a verbal notion of tendency, and points out the object to which it tends.

The Pentecostians were asked to repent and be baptized, every one, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. Now they were to *do* the things commanded, *epi to onomati*, etc., which always means "resting upon," as that book rests upon this table, and, in mental things, standing upon or resting one upon another. They were commanded to *do* these things, resting for the efficacy upon the name of Jesus Christ. While thus resting upon the name of Jesus Christ they were to repent and be baptized for remission of sins.

To make my position on Mark i: 4 still more clear, I call your attention to Winer, who says, in regard to the *genitive*, in that very passage:

"The genitive, especially in the writings of John and Paul, denotes internal relations still more remote, as John v: 29, ἀνάστασις ζωῆς κλήσεως—*resurrection to life, resurrection to condemnation* (genitive of destination. Theodor iv: 1140), ἱεροσύνῃς χειροτονία ordination to the priesthood: comp. Rom. viii: 36, (Sept.) προβάτα σφαγῆς; Rom. v: 18, δικαιοσύνη ζωῆς, *justification to life*; Mark i: 4, βάπτισμα μετανοίας, *baptism engaging to repentance* (or, rather, baptism sealing repentance).—Winer's Grammar of the New Test. Diction., p. 201, sixth edition.

After this short digression I return to still further consider our question in the light of Acts ii: 38.

Baptism, then, is founded upon the name of Jesus Christ; it rests for its authority and its efficiency upon the name of Jesus Christ. A baptism that rests upon the name or authority of Jesus Christ for its efficiency and validity, I say "is for remission of sins." So the Apostle Peter states. I could give you an abundance of authority to still farther show that baptism is for remission of sins, and will in due time.

In concluding this address I *deliberately*, and very *calmly*, and respectfully ask my friend to be *generous* enough to just state what the connections of *eis* in this case are. Will he say that *eis* connects *epi to onomati*, etc., on the one hand, with *aphesin amartionon* on the other? There is more in this than our hearers, not accustomed to such matters, might suppose.

If *eis* does connect that which he has undertaken to, but will not show that it does, I am wrong, I grant, and my cause is gone. On the other hand, if my friend grants that Hackett, Barnes, and all other scholars that ever said any thing on the subject are correct in saying that *eis* connects "repent and be baptized," on the left, with

aphesin amartion on the right, then his cause is gone and my cause is established, that "baptism is for the remission of sins."

I call your attention to another passage in the twenty-second chapter of Acts of the Apostles. Not quoting the whole, it is said to Paul: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Saul had been to Jerusalem, and was at that time a persecutor of Jesus Christ, on his way down to Damascus, for the purpose of arresting and bringing to punishment all whom he could find calling upon that name. He was exceedingly mad against the Savior and his disciples, breathing threatenings and slaughter against them. But suddenly a light shone round about him, above the brightness of the sun, and, having heard a voice, saying, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" he asked, "Who art thou, Lord?" And he said unto him: "I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest." Saul then asked: "Lord, what wouldest thou have me to do?" And the Lord said: "Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do." He went. Ananias there came to him and said: "Brother Saul, the Lord that appeared to you on the way has sent me for the purpose that you may receive your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit; now, why tarry? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

MR. DITZLER'S SIXTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

At least once or twice my good brother has remarked that he is fighting "*single handed.*" He made that remark this morning, whereas I thought he was surrounded by a sanhedrim of very intelligent gentlemen.

And now it turns out that, since I stirred him up on the Syriac, they have been writing to Dr. Barnes with a view of finding out "if these things be true;" writing to find out whether the Peshito-Syriac story is true or not. Well, I am glad that letter of Dr. Barnes has come out; for, what Dr. Barnes says, as far as I caught it from the reading, at least, I have no objection to his ideas as to *sic*. So I need not say any thing more in that direction. No doubt that they have written to many other men; and the fact shows that, while they have affected indifference in their papers, they felt, as all informed men knew they felt, a great deal of trouble on the revelations I had made on the Syriac. Also, that they can not refute or meet those facts. He has three copies of Winer, and I suppose he can prove almost any thing. I have examined that sixth edition, brought down to the seventh by a recent publication, and find that the word "*scaling*" is not in it. So there is deception somewhere in the authorities. Winer never used the word he uses at all. But I had a motive in the case of Stockius. He always gives them trouble. I wanted to see how he would render that entire sentence in Stockius. The point is to prove that these persons were penitent when they came to the baptism of John. Stockius' language is very plain. It was "a remembering, a testifying, etc., of the need of repentance." "And that those who received that baptism ought [*debat*—understood; it was incumbent upon them] to exercise and practice such a repentance as John demanded." The point at variance is, that he translates it so as to make it appear that these persons *had* exercised that repentance that John demanded. Mr. Pendleton, President of Bethany College, ren-

ders it, in substance, the same way. "Thus we read (1) of the 'baptism of John the Baptist,' which he administered by divine command (Matt. iii: 7), and which is called 'the baptism of repentance,' because it ought to be joined with repentance; and so it was an admonition, a witness, and a profession that there was necessity for repentance; and that they who received that baptism *exercised and had* such repentance as John demanded." Such is Pendleton's rendering, "Mil. Harbinger," Dec. 1869, p. 667.

Now, we will see whether this is in *Stockius* or not. Pendleton and my friend render two *infinitives*, which are preceded by an accusative *eos*, as the subject, governed by *debebat*—ought—it behooved, became—was the duty of, by the indicative mood—past (preterite) time; whereas it is impossible to so render it. "And (et eos—debebat—that those) it was the duty of those who received that baptism, to exercise and practice such a repentance as John demanded." Thus, you see, it simply devolved upon them that they should exercise that repentance, which, of course, was a thing of the future. Oh, they do criticize finely when they have no books to support them! So *Stockius* is on our side.

And now, again, I take up the second chapter of Acts. In the first place, I suppose my brother referred to the baptism of the fathers in the cloud and in the sea, when he attempted to show it was for the remission of sins. Mr. Campbell himself never thought of that as any argument for the remission of sins by baptism. There was no remission—a mere temporal deliverance from the pursuing Egyptians.

It will be necessary, now, for my brother to define faith in the true sense of that word. His criticism on the preposition *εἰς* is the best he ever made, if he did get it from myself. *Εἰς* is *always prospective*, and *never retrospective*. He never said a better thing in his life, or put a criticism in a better form. The Baptists are all wrong on *εἰς*—making it retrospective—"in consequence of." Hence, looking forward as it does, as I have abundantly shown, it can not be said that they *have* repentance, when their baptism is prospective in Mark i: 4. But on the language of Mark he makes it *retrospective*.

Mr. Wilkes.—I say it yet; [*i. e.*, prospective.]

Mr. Ditzler.—That destroys his criticism on Mark i: 4; for, if it is prospective, as just shown, and, as he says, he says it yet, why then the baptism of John was *εἰς*—unto—looking forward, prospectively, to repentance. Hence it was not, and did not secure remission.

We will now defue the word *faith*. We have seen their defini-

tions—we must now see it as it is in the Bible. As it was a word in use from the beginning, in Hebrew, the language of the Bible, the basis of all Bible language also, we must go to that language. Our Savior and the apostles spoke in Hebrew, that is, Syriac, a branch or modified form of the Hebrew. Nearly all their Greek words have Hebrew meanings, and this one especially. Peter preached in this language on Pentecost. The Hebrew word is אָמַן *āmān*: “to prop, stay, support, specially *with the arm*; to bear up or carry, as a child.” Num. xi: 12; Lam. iv: 5. To stay one’s self, be stayed upon, supported. Arabic, *amana*, to lean upon, trust in, be founded, affirm, REST UPON, LEAN UPON—*fulcivit, sustentavit, nutrit, aluit*, etc.—*Thesaurus of Gesenius*, 113, 114. *Buxtorf*: “to prop up, to support, to stay upon, build upon. Is. xxviii: 16. To *nourish, support, sustain*. Hence, Is. xlix: 23, ‘Nursing fathers,’” etc. 2 *Furstio*: “To *sustain, to nourish, to bear or carry as a nurse*.” The fundamental idea is that of “*leaning on*” for support. Arabic and Syriac same: *wā-’ā-lai l’ lāhi fal-za-wak-ka-li l’ mu-ni-nū-na*. “And upon God let the faithful RELY.”—*Al Koran*, lxiv: 13. Hence—“The arms of Jehovah are round about his saints.” “Devolve your care upon Jehovah.” “Trust in the name of Jehovah, and stay upon him.” “Cast all your care upon him.” “The Lord upholdeth”—“he raiseth up them that are bowed down.” “The Lord lifteth up the meek; he healeth the broken in heart, and bindeth their wounds.” “Uphold me with thy free Spirit.”—Ps. lxii: 8; Is. liv: 1; 1 Peter v: 7; Is. xxviii: 16; xii, etc.

Heb. xi: 1, is no definition—it is the *office* of faith, and corresponds to the above. Hence, Christ is he “on whom if a man LEANS—*trusts*—he shall not be confounded.” הַמֵּאֲמִין לֵא יֵחִישׁ, “*cui qui ORIN-TUR non confugiet*.”—*Gesenius, hammāmin lo yāchish*.

“In that day shall this song be sung: . . . “We have a strong city; salvation will God appoint for walls and bulwarks. . . . Thou wilt keep him in perfect peace, whose mind is stayed UPON thee; for in the Lord Jehovah is everlasting strength.”—Is. xxvi. “Let him trust in the name of the Lord, and STAY UPON his God.”—Is. iv: 10. And Paul’s idea—Heb. xi—“Out of weakness were made strong,” etc., confirms the above—the nourishing power of faith. Hence *children, tekva*, tenderly nourished; different from *écor*, son.

Now, with this definition of faith, in the language in which the word was used, in which every Jew who was present on the day of Pentecost would understand it, and as he himself admits that the

language of Peter on the day of Pentecost meant "reliance upon," or to "rest upon," we have the Apostle Peter saying, "Repent," but not for the remission of sins; "Repent and be baptized," but not for the remission of sins, but "repent and be baptized, *relying upon* or *trusting in Jesus Christ* for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Now, I want to extend this investigation farther, and will examine Peter farther; for he still throws more and more light upon this subject. We follow him, therefore, in his next sermon, and he preaches in the third of Acts. Now, if there are any new principles of the law of pardon introduced Peter will most assuredly make them plain, for these men to whom he preaches, Acts iii and iv, are the most wicked of men. They are charged with the blood of Christ. If baptism is for the remission of sins, it will now be the burthen of his discourse. But no, *baptism is not named*. The apostle insists upon faith and repentance in every sermon that we have any note of, but not a word is said about baptism. Then, Peter goes forth to the Gentile world. He was preaching on the day of Pentecost to the *Jews* who had crucified the Savior, whom he told to be baptized, using the words "*on the name of Jesus Christ*," which *they* understood to mean relying on the Lord Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins. But the Gentiles might not so perfectly understand these terms. He has gone to the house of Cornelius by command of the Lord, and preached to them, thus opening the kingdom of heaven to the Gentile world. He is the first man that ever thus preached to them, therefore it is certainly important that he should tell them the whole plan of salvation, and clearly state the law or condition of pardon. What does he say? Not a word about baptism, unless it is the merest incidental allusion to the "baptism which John preached," and remission is not mentioned in this connection at all. But he says: "To him gave all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." So, you see, here were persons receiving the Holy Spirit before they were baptized with water. Mr. Campbell and all their writers tell us that we can not receive the Holy Spirit until after baptism, and in the act of baptism our sins are pardoned. Here they received the Holy Spirit before baptism; therefore, their sins were remitted before baptism.

In the next place, Peter does not name baptism in connection with pardon, but makes it depend entirely upon faith in the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. They received pardon before they were ordered to be baptized, and that at the opening of the gospel to the Gentile

world when it devolved upon Peter to lay clearly before them the plan of salvation. The following facts, therefore, are to be noted here:

As Cornelius received the Spirit, implying remission of sins preceding, as they all teach it does, baptism can not be for remission of sins. But it is often urged that this was only a *miraculous* outpouring of the Spirit to *convince* Peter that God had accepted the Gentiles. So Braden, and Brooks, Debate, 255, following the others, say. So says my opponent in his debates with me. That it does not imply pardon—that “wicked Jonas, Caiaphas, Sàul, Balaam received it.” Now—

1. Peter had been *miraculously* visited already to *convince* him of the reception of the Gentiles, Acts x: 1–33. Peter says of it, Acts xi: 5, he “saw a vision,” and, verse 12, “the Spirit bade me go, *nothing doubting.*”

2. Peter acknowledged he *was* convinced *before* the Spirit fell on them. In his sermon, x: 34, 35: “Then Peter said, Of a truth I perceive that God is *no respecter of persons*; but *in every nation* he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is **ACCEPTED** of him.” So, verse 43, “*Whosoever* (*i. e.*, τῶν παντῶν ἐθνῶν, of all the nations) believeth shall receive remission,” etc.

3. Peter testified that it was the gift of the Spirit promised generally for the work of *salvation*. xi: 16: “*Then* remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said John indeed baptized *with water*, but *ye shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit.*”

4. He says it was the same as *theirs*, and not as that given to Balaam and saul. Acts xi: 15: “And as I began to speak the Holy Spirit fell on *them*, AS ON US *at the beginning.*” V. 17: “Forasmuch, then, as God gave *them the like gift* as he did unto us, what was I that I should withstand God?”

5. This was for *salvation*, connected with *faith in Christ*. V. 17: “As he did unto us *who believed* on the Lord Jesus Christ.”

6. The apostles all understood the gift of the Spirit to be unto *salvation*. V. 18: “When they heard *these things* they glorified God, saying, Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted *repentance unto life.*”

7. Peter grounds *their right* to baptism on the *reception of the Spirit*. Acts x: 47, “Can any man forbid water, that *these* should not be *baptized*, which **HAVE RECEIVED THE HOLY (Spirit) GHOST** as well as we?” Would Peter have regarded the Spirit’s action on Balaam, Caiaphas, etc., as thus entitling *them* to “Christian baptism?”

Would Brother Wilkes baptize such persons in consequence of such a spiritual action? No, no. Why, then, should *Peter*?

8. If the Spirit which the apostles received, Acts ii, and on other occasions, is held as merely miraculous, then why does Peter say it is that promised in Joel ii: 28, that was to be poured "on ALL FLESH"—all mankind—which was the same promised to the *three thousand*, who surely were converted? And was not the Spirit promised to them—"you, and to your children (posterity), and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call?" Was not this in connection (v. 21) with "whosoever shall call on the name of the Lord shall be saved?"

Peter seems to appear only once more on the tapis. In Acts xv: 9, he says: God "put no difference between us and them, purifying their hearts by faith." He put no difference between the Gentiles and us Jews, pardoning their sins as he did ours. And that *faith* by which their hearts were purified was "to believe on the Lord Jesus Christ," as he showed in the case of Cornelius.

Now, we find in the thirteenth of Acts, that Paul preached at Antioch, the capital of Syria. He was preaching the gospel of the grace of God, and if "*new principles*" were introduced, surely the Apostle Paul was the man to explain. But he is perfectly silent on the subject of baptism any way. He says, Acts xiii: 38, 39, "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." He explained the plan of salvation, without naming baptism, in the capital of Syria, where they knew not the terms of salvation, and could not have understood its great principles.

Acts xvi: 33, the jailer becomes all penitent, falls down, trembles, cries out, "What must I do to be saved?" "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved," was the reply. Baptism is not named—hinted. He was then baptized.

Acts xvii: 3-5, is a sermon—Christ is preached—baptism is not mentioned—"some . . . believed."

Acts xix has already been noticed—the baptized ones had never been pardoned or received the Spirit.

xxiv. Paul preaches a long sermon to a heathen audience—never names baptism.

xxvi: 17, 18. Christ gives Paul his commission, and does not

name baptism. Paul preaches a long sermon to a heathen audience, and does not name baptism. Then, we have other briefer sermons, in which baptism is not named. In *three-fourths of all the sermons reported in the Acts of the Apostles*, baptism is not named at all. If it was a condition of pardon; if it was that upon which eternal life and eternal death were suspended, how could these men travel all over the land and never even *refer* to it, when faith and repentance were so constantly insisted upon? My friends, it can not be. We have the apostle preaching before King Agrippa, and he is particularly impressive in urging faith in our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, but not a word about baptism. He says himself, of his ministry, he preached "repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." I have an analysis of the Acts of the Apostles, in which every case of conversion is named, and only ten times in the Acts of the Apostles is it represented that persons were baptized, so far as I have found in a particularly careful examination. From the beginning of the gospels there are recorded only about fifteen baptisms, laying aside Jewish baptisms, which are not in controversy here. If it be possible that baptism is for the remission of sins, why is it that such a term is nowhere found in the Word of God? Again, in only two or three passages, reported by each one of the evangelists, is it mentioned in connection with faith and repentance, and we find that the apostles record only about ten incidents of baptism in the whole history of their apostolic proceedings, whereas believers are often named, and we often find such expressions as this: "They were added to the Lord," "many believed," "some believed."

Now, if my friend can find *one clear passage* where persons were "baptized for the remission of sins," it will be greatly in his favor; but such a passage is not to be found, and he can not find it.

Peter says, "Baptism is not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience." Now, if his law of the genitive be correct, this disposes of his whole doctrine; for he says the noun governing the genitive derives its character or nature *from the noun in the genitive*; that is, it *originates* from that noun. Baptism of repentance, in consequence of repentance. "Baptism is the answer of a good conscience." Then, according to his law, there must be a good conscience preceding that—baptism *is in consequence of having a good conscience*. But he will not admit that it is procured until the person is baptized. Hence his rule destroys his interpreta-

tion, and reduces it to self-contradiction. If his rule is true it turns this text and others against him. If untrue, Mark i: 4 is lost to him from his own standpoint. The truth is—not one supports him. And so of another, Titus iii: 5, 6, which he has not yet quoted, and which, in deference to him, I will not yet quote.

Now, if baptism had been for the remission of sins, would the apostles have treated it as they did? Would Paul have said what he did when he wrote a letter to the Corinthians, saying that he had baptized only two or three households in all his life. He says, 1 Cor. i: 14-17, "I was not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel," and he thanked God that he had baptized only a few persons. He says, in so many words, "I was not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel." If baptism was an essential condition of pardon, how could Paul use such language as that? Take these things and examine them carefully, and in doing that you will see that all the learning of the Greek is on our side, the teachings of the New Testament are on our side, and the fathers are on our side. Therefore, his comments have fallen, and, having fallen, he is totally bankrupt; for he has no foundation in the world for relying upon the idea that baptism is for the remission of sins.

MR. WILKES' SEVENTH ARGUMENT.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I shall notice, in the first place, the allusions that my friend made in his last speech, or perhaps the one before, to Dr. Winer and his grammar. He had no confidence that the work from which I read was Winer's. I, therefore, wish to read, and call his attention to the following facts. I read now from the seventh edition: "Winer's foreboding that the sixth edition would be the last revision from his hand, has, unfortunately, been realized."—Preface to the seventh edition to "Winer's Grammar," p. 8. That passage shows that Winer is the author of the sixth edition. Now, the sixth edition I have, and it says that "βαπτισμα μετανοίας" means "baptism engaging to repentance (or rather, baptism sealing repentance)." So that I have demonstrated that *parenthetical clause* to be from Winer.

I now direct attention to some points in my friend's last speech. He says he does not know what my position will be on 1 Peter iii: 21. It would have been wise in him not to attempt to reply until he knew; he ought to have waited till I had said something about 1 Peter in regard to baptism and the answer of a good conscience toward God, before attempting any reply. He acknowledged that he did not know what I would say, therefore any thing he did say was not a reply to any thing I may say. He says there are only ten or twelve cases of baptism recorded in the Scriptures. Is that true? The Jews were baptized, three thousand of them in one day; and that is a pretty strong evidence that the apostles were accustomed to baptize penitent believers. Then the Samaritans, "when they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, were baptized, both men and women;" "many of the Corinthians hearing and believing were baptized." Paul says, in writing to the Romans, "We were buried with him, by baptism, into death." Then the Romans were baptized. The jailer at Philippi was baptized; Lydia, Crispus, and Gaius were baptized.

It was then, as you see, the habit or custom of the apostles invariably to baptize. I presume that is enough to satisfy the demands of my friend on that subject for the present.

I now call attention to what my friend said on Acts xv: 7-9, "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." Peter teaches here that the Gentiles were to "receive the word of God and believe, and that God put no difference between the Gentiles and us [the Jews], purifying their hearts by faith." Now, says my friend, "there is not a particle of baptism there." Is he sure of it? Of course not. "Purifying their hearts by faith." I tell my friend that that reading is not strictly correct. So he is slightly mistaken in his conclusion. It does not say "purifying their hearts by faith," but it says purifying their hearts by *the* faith; which phrase, the faith, as my friend will learn, and has learned, no doubt, means the gospel. The hearts of the Gentiles were, then, to be purified by *the* faith, which is the gospel of Jesus Christ. If you examine the gospel, you will see that it requires faith, repentance, and baptism, as I have demonstrated.

Again, he says, in speaking of Acts x, that the Holy Spirit fell on Cornelius and his household before they were baptized, and that therefore they were pardoned before they were baptized; therefore baptism is not for the remission of sins. That is his argument. I do not know whether he put it precisely that way or not, but one thing is certain. he did not put it stronger than that. That was his argument.

How does he know that they were pardoned before they were baptized? Because the Holy Ghost fell on them? How does he know that the falling of the Holy Ghost is for the pardoning of sins? Is that true? Is there any evidence, any proof of it anywhere? None in the world! There is not even a particle. The Holy Ghost sometimes fell on parties already pardoned, that were already disciples of Jesus Christ, as on Pentecost. It fell on good men. The falling, miraculously, of the Holy Ghost on persons was not for the purpose of pardoning the sins of those on whom it fell, nor of showing that those on whom it fell were already pardoned. It had a *special* purpose in every case. For what did it fall on the house of Cornelius?

For the purpose of showing Peter and other Jews, prejudiced against the Gentiles, that God made no difference between Jews and Gentiles, "purifying the hearts" of both by *the faith* or gospel of Jesus Christ, bringing them upon a common level, and receiving both on the same terms.

It fell upon the apostles on the day of Pentecost. What was that for? It was to fill them with the Holy Spirit; it was to endue them with power from on high, to enable them to speak in all the languages and known dialects of earth the unsearchable riches of Christ. But, says my friend, "*his* brethren believe that the Holy Ghost is not received until *after* baptism." Let us see. Peter says, "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins;" and then, *after that*, "you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." The gift of the Holy Ghost there mentioned, we hold, comes *after* baptism. We all know and believe that. Therefore, when certain disciples of John were found at Ephesus, and they were asked whether they had received the Holy Ghost since they believed, they said they had not "so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Then said Paul, "Unto what then were ye baptized?" showing clearly that if they had been baptized rightly they would have had the Holy Ghost. John's baptism was then out of date; it had passed away ten or fifteen years before that. Then they "were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." (Acts xix: 1-5.)

But there is *another* gift of the Holy Ghost. The Bible speaks of the miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost that can be "seen and heard," and that caused men to speak with tongues, as on the day of Pentecost, and as at the house of Cornelius. When my friend has received the Holy Ghost, as at the house of Cornelius, he will be able to speak with tongues and magnify God. When a man has the Holy Ghost in that measure, when he has that miraculous gift of the Holy Ghost, then he can speak with tongues and perform miracles.

Let us look further at the conversions at the house of Cornelius. When Peter was at Joppa, Cornelius saw an angel, who said to him, "Your prayers are heard," not you are saved, but "Your prayers are heard, and your alms have come up as a memorial before God." Now, said the angel, "Send to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter; he lodges with one Simon a tanner, whose house is by the sea-side; and when he is come, he will tell you what you *must do*." There was something this man was expected and would be required to *do*. Do for what? We read in the next chapter that

“when he is come he will tell you words whereby you and your house shall be saved.” Both those truths are stated in the Bible; put them together, and it amounts to this: When he comes, he will tell you what you must do to be saved. When Peter came, he preached to Cornelius and to those of his house. What did he tell *them to do to be saved?* He told them to be baptized, and they were baptized. He commanded them to be baptized. They were baptized, and they were saved. Baptism, then, is for the remission of sins. So my friend’s passage, instead of proving any thing he desired to prove by it, is respectfully claimed by me.

But I have now to notice the strangest position that my friend has yet taken. After he had spoken of Acts ii, where baptism is mentioned, he said: “Turn to the next or third chapter, where we have an account of the miraculous healing of the lame man, and of the saving of his soul. Turn to that passage,” he says, “and you will find there is not a word about baptism in it.” Now, that is delightful. In one place, where we have the remission of sins predicated of repentance and baptism, it is an *obscure* passage to my friend; but when he turns over to the next page, and finds that a man is made strong through faith in the name of Jesus Christ; that he gains his strength from Jesus Christ (not saves his soul), but where baptism is not named, he thinks that passage is full of light. More than that, suppose it had been a case of the salvation of the *soul*, and there had been nothing said about baptism, I want to know something of my friend’s rules of exegesis. Does he mean to say that, because baptism is not named in a given place, where we have an account of men being saved or pardoned, that there was no baptism for the remission of sins in that case? It would be a terrible thing to so decide. It would destroy my Bible and my hopes, my God, and my soul, if he were to take that position, and it were true.

Where baptism is not *named*, it is supposed not to be necessary, and not to be present at all! That is my friend’s argument—if argument it may be called. Turn to the second chapter of Acts. Those stricken ones, pierced to the heart, said, “What must we do to be saved?” (I claim it means that.) What did Peter say to those trembling, anxious murderers of Jesus Christ, *full* of anxiety, *full* of desire, who asked, “What must we do?” Peter said, “Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins; and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” God will be merciful to you, and save you, if you will do

as he commands. They did repent, and were baptized, and, I suppose, they were saved; for, as many as received that word gladly, who desired to escape from "that untoward generation," and from the bondage of sin, into the marvelous light and liberty of God's dear children, were baptized; and, on the same day, there were added to them about three thousand souls. I now ask my friend, Is there any thing said about *faith* there? No. What is his logic? That when there is no *faith mentioned* in a given case, *faith* is not necessary in order to be saved. Let us go further. Ananias said to Saul, "Brother Saul, why tarry you? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away your sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." Brother Ditzler knows that nothing is said about *faith* there; and he ought to say, on his theory, when *faith* is not *mentioned*, it is not *necessary*. Well, there was nothing said about *faith* in this case. Nothing was said about *repentance* either; and his theory is that, when nothing is *said* about *repentance*, it is not necessary. Nothing is specifically commanded except baptism, "Then," says Mr. Ditzler, "I must be consistent, and say that baptism was the *only* thing necessary to salvation in that case." Baptismal regeneration is, then, true. I believe he will denounce that conclusion. Will he, then, renounce his whole theory? If not, *repentance* is gone; *faith* is gone; and our hope is gone; and we are all lost—without God, and without hope in the world! Will you allow me to say, Shame upon such "tearing asunder the Word of God!" I apprehend that, when God says a man must believe in order that he may be saved, the statement is true; whether expressed in every given place or not, it is still true. I apprehend that, when God says the sinner must repent or he will perish, it is true also, whether specified or not in every place. It is not necessary that God should be always repeating his will in order that he may be believed. I suppose that, when God speaks *once*, it stands fast, beyond dispute, in spite of any imperfect logic any of us may have. I suppose that, if God says a man must be baptized, in connection with *faith* and *repentance*, whether recorded in every place or not, it is still *true* that he must be baptized, because God has said so.

Once more: My friend says that he "will now define *faith*." "Of course," says he, "it is to be defined by referring to the Hebrew." I always thought, when a man said "of course," that, logically, he meant to draw a conclusion from premises either admitted or established. I should like to know from what premises he draws

the conclusion that, in order to define "faith," he must "go to the Hebrew?" The hearer is expected to take the word "faith" as an English word; but he *may* go back to the Greek; he need not go further. But Mr. Ditzler takes him to the Hebrew; then he goes around by the Syriac; then through the Arabic; then he passes, perhaps, through the Coptic, the Latin, and so swings clear round the circle and comes back to the English. This is the way to make it plain! Here is what God says, plainly, in this Greek Testament. Why not say *pistis* means faith, or belief, and save all that circuit, which tends to bewilder and confuse rather than to edify? Why go careering through all the dead and living languages to make plain that which might be brought to us direct, by one step, from the Greek to the English? I think the "of course" is not so very "of course," after all.

I asked Mr. Ditzler respectfully—and if I had been more cultivated, I should have been able, perhaps, to ask still more politely—what that little word *eis* connects. He would not tell you. Said he: "I told my friend that *eis*, in Mark i: 4, means *whither*, and indicates motion *into*;" and he gave me a little credit for learning that from Winer. Well, I learned it from Winer, and Jelf, and Robinson, and other lexicons and grammars. Instead, however, of answering my question, he told you that *eis* meant *whither*, *direction*, and indicated motion, or tendency. I did not ask him any such thing; I asked him what the *connections* of *eis* were in Acts ii: 38—whether *eis* connects, on the left hand, as it were, *epi to onomati Jesu Christou* with *aphesin amartionon* on the right? Whether, on the left, "the name of Jesus Christ" is connected by *eis* with "remission of sins," on the right. He will not answer the question. But he *must answer* it right here, else he is a ruined man. Will he answer it? Never, till the judgment; and then God will make him answer what he is not willing, or is afraid, to answer here.

I was discussing the twenty-second chapter of Acts, sixteenth verse, where Ananias said to Saul: "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Saul was, at that time, either pardoned or he was not. He was not pardoned, because he was commanded to arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins; whereas, if he had been pardoned he would not have been a sinner and would have had no sins to wash away. But my friend may say there are two classes of sinners. I agree to that. Will he say there are sins a man may commit *up* to the time he is first pardoned, and that after

that time he may commit sins against his Father's will? I agree to that. Will he say that baptism is for the remission of the former class of sins? Then my position is right. Will he say, on the other hand, that baptism is for the remission of the sins that a man may commit after he becomes a Christian? That is too strong. I believe it is for remission of sins, but I can not go that far. If I believed *that*, when I saw a child of God commit a sin I would have to baptize him for the remission of that sin. But I do not believe that, nor does he, nor do any persons that I know of. Then we have but one alternative; we have but one horn of the dilemma, which either of us *can* take, and that is, that baptism is for the remission of the sins that have passed through the forbearance of God up to the time we are baptized. "Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," is a text *conclusive* of my proposition.

I present still another passage. You will remember that Paul tells us in the sixth chapter of Romans that we are buried with Christ by baptism into death. I will read it; third verse: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore we were buried with him by baptism into death." From this passage I shall attempt to demonstrate that baptism is for the remission of sins. Now, the death of Christ is not a receptacle into which, literally, a man may be placed in baptism or be buried; that is scarcely true; and yet when a man is baptized he is baptized into the death of Christ, says Paul, both in English and Greek. I ask, then, into what, literally—for certainly this language is figurative—are we buried when we are baptized? Paul says into the death of Christ. But that language must be used figuratively. The death of Christ to us is a blessing, and among the blessings given or vouchsafed to us by, or through, or in the death of Christ, is the remission of sins. We are *baptized* into the blessings of the death of Christ, or we come into the enjoyment of the blessings by baptism.

What are the blessings of Christ's death? The remission of sins, the privilege of becoming a child of God, belonging to the church of God, the reception of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of adoption, of calling God our Father, etc. We enjoy these privileges and blessings by coming into the death of Jesus Christ. But we come into his death by baptism, says Paul. Then baptism brings us into the remission of sins, or, "baptism is for the remission of sins."

Again, I call your attention to Galatians iii: 27, where we are said

to be "baptized into Christ." Of course, out of Christ we are not saved, and, of course, in Christ we are saved; but since we are "baptized into Christ" we are out of Christ till baptized, and in Christ when we are baptized. Therefore baptism is for the remission of sins.

The Apostle Paul says, in Ephesians i: 7, "In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins," that is, the "forgiveness of sins" or "redemption," which is the same thing as forgiveness of sins, we have in Jesus Christ. But, then, Paul tells us, in Galatians iii: 27, that we are baptized into Jesus Christ, so that we are baptized into the forgiveness of sins; or the enjoyment of the forgiveness which we have through the death of Christ, as we are taught in the sixth chapter of Romans, is by baptism.

Macknight, the great Presbyterian commentator, takes the same view of that passage.

I call your attention to Ephesians v: 26, which reads as follows: "That he might sanctify and cleanse it [the church] with the washing of water by the word." Dr. Clarke says the washing of water is baptism; Macknight, a Presbyterian, says it is baptism; Mr. Wesley says it is baptism; the Methodist Discipline says it is baptism; Dr. Bengel, a Lutheran, says it is baptism; Dr. Stuart, a Congregationalist, says it is baptism. I believe there is but little difference of opinion among scholars that the washing of water here means baptism. My friend, however, among the distinguished scholars with whom I am somewhat acquainted, takes a different view of it. He thinks that baptism is the same thing as the renewing of the Holy Ghost. I ask him to show that, or give us a reason for that opinion. I suggest that the renewing of the Holy Ghost is a specification by itself. The washing of water is one thing, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost is another thing, named by itself. The washing of water is baptism, and the renewing of God's Holy Spirit corresponds with our teaching on this subject.

My time having expired, I warn my friend against exhortation in this his last speech on this the last day of the week.

MR. DITZLER'S SEVENTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

While Brother Wilkes was in the heat of his discourse I was looking around, in my imagination, and thought I saw a vast multitude of men and women on skates, sailing around like lightning, over a wide field of *ice*, and about every fifty yards some one would get a tremendous fall, and I imagined myself asking, "Why in the world is he making such flourishes on *ice*?" And now he wants to get me out on *ice* (*eis*), so I can fall a little on *eis*. [Merriment.]

Mr. Wilkes—Yes; that is just what I want, exactly.

Mr. Ditzler—And, perhaps he will let me fall down and bruise myself, as he did on *eis*. My good brother seems to think that my theory is, that unless, in every instance, baptism, faith, and repentance are named, they are non-essential. Ah! he does not like the position I took. His argument is that baptism is for the remission of sins, and my proposition is this: That since we nowhere find baptism for the remission of sins in the Bible, it can not be so. For, if it can, it would not only be named, but taught in *unmistakably clear terms* by the apostles, and held out *prominently* by them, and especially when they went among the Gentile people, who had never before heard the gospel. But we find them going among the Gentiles and preaching gospel sermons without naming baptism, and, therefore, my brother's proposition is not supported by scriptural testimony.

My brother argues that this miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the house of Cornelius was *in order to convince Peter* of his duty, and God's will to extend the gospel to the *Gentile* world. But had not God already let down a vision to Peter to convince him? Did He not tell him to "go with them, *doubting nothing*, for I have sent thee?"—Acts x: 20. Did not Peter preach when he went there, and say: "I perceive of a truth that God is no respecter of persons, but in *every nation* he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is

accepted with him?" And yet my brother takes the position that this miraculous outpouring of the Holy Spirit was to convince Peter that God would save the Gentile world. Peter testifies that it was the gift of the Holy Ghost, and shows that it was connected with salvation by a belief on the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. It was poured out upon "them that believed on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ." They believed in order to salvation, therefore it was poured out in connection with belief unto salvation. But my brother tries to make an impression as to what I said wholly contrary to what I did say. My argument was that his church held that the Holy Spirit was not received, and could not be received, until after baptism for the remission of sins. But here (Acts x) remission of sins occurred before baptism, because they received the Holy Spirit before baptism. They contend that you can not be pardoned before you are baptized. Here they were saved before they were baptized. As to the last text quoted (Eph. v: 26), it destroys his theory, for he contends that you are baptized into the church at once, and that no person is baptized after he is in the church. It is of the church Paul speaks. He says that the church may receive this washing, but he does not believe that those now in the church can be baptized. Eph. v: 23, 24, 25, he names the church as his theme: "As the church is subject to Christ"—v. 32 he adds, "But I speak concerning Christ and the CHURCH." Hence, v. 25, 26, he says: "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." The Greek is ἁγίαση τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥήματι—"sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of the water (contained) IN THE WORD." It is the clearest allusion to the general custom, universal among Hebrews and Greeks—well known at Ephesus—of the bride cleansing and adorning herself in the most chaste and elegant style to meet her husband. They often besprinkled themselves with pure water, in token of their virginity—purity. Hence, at the last day the church, as such, is to be pure and chaste, as a bride to meet her husband. It is no allusion to baptism any way at all.

Again: You all hold that there was no pardon till after the crucifixion of Christ. Then—

1. Does Jewish baptism put us into Christ? If not, how could it be for remission of sins? Was not John a Jew, and so recognized by the Jewish Church? Or—

2. Did John's baptism put them into Christ? If so, then it was

necessary to be in Christ under the "old dispensation." Infants were members, then, till Pentecost, at least. Also, if it put them into Christ, where does it differ from Christian baptism? But—

3. If *not*, how did the apostles and one hundred and twenty disciples ever get *into* him? "Out of Christ is no salvation."

4. Were those *re-baptized* in Acts xix: 1-5, *re-baptized* for remission of sins or not? If they were rebaptized for remission, then they were twice baptized for it? If they were rebaptized, but *not* for remission, then Christian baptism is not for remission. Paul holds these up as a fair average sample of those baptized by John the Baptist.

Again, my brother and his church hold with us that a Christian may backslide, may fall away, and sin, and be lost. We both hold with Paul, Heb. vi: 4-7, that "it is impossible for those who were once enlightened," etc. V. 6, "*Καί παραπεσόντας, and have fallen away,*" etc. In the Greek there is no *if*. It is *kai, and*; while they have fallen away is in the past tense, not a *future*, as our Calvinistic translators put it.

Now, they immerse people for remission of sins. Those persons live twenty years afterward, having early fallen away. They live for years in sin. What will he do with these men? Here are two men. They are "baptized for remission of their sins." Suppose they are pardoned. One of them backslides, and for twenty years swears, lies, cheats, gambles, and commits the most grievous sins. He repents, comes back—wants pardon. Baptism, he urges, is for "*remission of sins.*" His are *sins*—he wants *remission*. What will he do? He will not baptize him. The other has gambled for forty years—drank whisky most beastly for thirty years—swears, sins generally—repents, comes to my brother—what will he do with him? Now, such cases are abundant, common. He has *no* remedy. Some quote 1 John ii: 1, "If *any man* sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus," etc. But, 1st. This is not spoken of backsliders, as such, but of *all men*—"if *any man* sin." 2d. Is there *one* remedy for one class of sins and sinners, and one means of pardon for them, another for other classes? Do not all sins need the same remedy? Where has the Bible shown the difference? 3d. The next verse shows it is not applied to backsliders. It is, "*For* he is the *propitiation for our sins*, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the *whole world.*" It is the provision made in the atonement for all sins.

4th. It has been urged by them often, and by my brother in our debates, that we are *baptized into* Christ; hence, applying this text, we

pray, and being in him, he hears our prayers and forgives. But is that drunken, gambling, lying backslider in *Christ* all that time? *He* teaches not. He is the vilest of sinners. Now, they all teach it is only in baptism—in *water*—we meet with, come into the benefit of Christ's blood. That blood is necessary to cleanse these backsliders. How are they to get into it without *rebaptizing* them? Yet they do not do it.

Then only in the water can we get to the blood of Christ. His theory makes no other provision, and utterly fails to meet the wants of sinners from God's stand-point. And then these brethren are not always the most consistent people in the world. The very founder of their system would not trust to this plan for salvation. In "Richardson's Memoirs of Alexander Campbell," published by themselves, on page 23, vol. i, they give an account of the commission of Thomas Campbell, whom in the "Living Pulpit" they credit as a leader in this reform, as they called it. Richardson, their own writer, says, following Campbell's own account of it. "While in this state, and when his mental distress had reached its highest point, he was one day walking alone *in the fields*, when, in the midst of his prayerful anxieties and longings, *he felt a divine peace* [this is "right down old-fashioned conversion"] *suddenly diffuse* itself throughout his soul, and the love of God seemed to be shed abroad in his heart as he had never before realized it. His doubts, anxieties, and fears were at once dissipated, as if by enchantment. He was enabled to see and to *trust in the merits* of a crucified Christ, and to *enjoy a divine sense of reconciliation* that filled him with rapture, and seemed to determine his destiny forever. From this moment he recognized himself as consecrated to God, and thought only how he might best appropriate his time and his abilities to his service." How different that experience to what they teach now! But here is Mr. A. Campbell's account, *given by himself*, of his own conversion, recorded in the same volume, p. 49:

"From the time that I could read the *Scriptures* I became convinced that *Jesus was the Son of God*. I was also fully persuaded that I was a sinner, and must obtain pardon through the merits of Christ or be lost forever. This caused me *great distress of soul* [how Methodistic this!], and I had much exercise of mind under the *awakenings of a guilty conscience*. Finally, after many *strugglings*, I was enabled to *put my trust in the Saviour*, and to *feel my reliance* on him as the *only Saviour* of sinners. From the moment I was able to *feel this reliance* on the Lord Jesus Christ, I obtained and enjoyed peace of mind. It never entered into my head to investigate the subject of baptism or the doctrines of the creed."

Now, look at that. Mr. A. Campbell believed he was a sinner, that such would be lost, "that Jesus was the Son of God," yet did not *trust* in him for salvation. All would not do. After believing all these things, and that Christ was the Savior of sinners, he yet trusted not in him. It was after his prayerful "strugglings," "awakenings," and "exercise of mind," etc., he was enabled to trust in Christ and feel a divine peace, when baptism was *no part of the whole experience*. You see Mr. Campbell did not trust *his* salvation to any system of baptism for remission of sins. I advise his admirers to follow his example in this respect.

[Mr. Hopson here interrupted the speaker with a remark which the reporter understood to be, "We would if we were Presbyterians."—*Reporter.*]

Mr. Ditzler.—Are you discussing with me, doctor?

Mr. Hopson.—Are you advising me?

Mr. Ditzler.—O, I don't object; I would like first rate to have a round with the doctor. [Applause and laughter.]

Now they say that the laver is between the Savior and the sinner. You residents of this city are responsible to God. You have heard the gospel and know your duty. The question is not whether we will have regeneration through Christ, nor does it turn upon the question of baptism. Our ministers would fall short of their duty not to tell persons to be baptized if circumstances permitted it to be done. But the question is, is immersion a condition without which a man can not be saved? Their position is, and my brother himself has stated it over and over again, that *those whose duty it is to be baptized will be damned if they are not baptized*, by which he means *immersed*. Now every person in the city of Louisville, except a few infidels, believe more or less that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and my brother's church teaches that they are possessed of "the soul-renewing, soul-regenerating, and soul-sanctifying principle of religion;" therefore you go down to hell with your souls possessed of this living principle. Elden Hayden himself speaks in the same direction in language just as strong as it can be made. We have quoted it several times—"heart is *changed*—conscience *purged from defilement*; the heart is *purified* of its love of sin—delights in holiness"—is reconciled—"conscience pure"—yet all before baptism—all before pardon—nay, "it longs for the sins it now mourns," though thus blest. They say the heart is changed and purified, and yet they send millions and millions of persons down to hell, "begotten of God," with "conscience

purged from defilement," and "heart purified of its love of sin!" He tells you that you descend into the pit of hell, "believing on the Son of God." But, say you, "I am a child of God," "begotten of God." I am "possessed of the soul-renewing principle of religion," my "heart and character are changed." He tells you it makes no difference. You have not been immersed. You may "be a child of God," "begotten of God." "Your heart is pure," "your conscience is pure," and your character is pure, but you have failed to go into the water, "where *only* the blood of Christ can be found," and you are lost to all eternity. He says to you who know your hearts are changed, you will be damned, not only damned, but damned as "begotten of God," with "pure hearts" and "characters." Campbell says: "He is *born from above—born of the Spirit,*" before they will immerse them—only immersed to "enjoy the life they had before immersed." This is their doctrine, and they all teach that there are no exceptions, no, not one do they give. But, thank God, salvation is never suspended upon the will of third parties, though my brother's theory would make it so. If immersion is necessary, it is a divine order upon which salvation is suspended under the will of others, for the dying man may be where no water is near, and in times past ministers have been denied this privilege. Invading armies, revolutions, sieges, and kingly decrees have suspended the ordinances of the church, and thus the salvation of men has been suspended upon the caprice or wickedness of mortal men. If his doctrine be true, this is so. Mr. Campbell tries to become very emphatic on this question. "The question, then, is, Where shall we find him? Where shall we meet him? Nowhere on earth, but in immersion." "*There ONLY can he be found.*" I have read it all before. Page 60, "Harbinger," 1830, extra, he adds, after urging that water cleanses: God has "given the efficacy of blood to water." He then says: "What a gracious institution! God has opened a fountain for sin, for moral pollution. He has given it an extension *far and wide as sin has spread, far and wide as*"—how far has sin spread? *Only where water flows?* Farther than that. Sin reigns where water never falls, where rivers never flow, where fountains never sparkle. Far and wide—magnanimous Mr. Campbell, how far and wide does the remedy extend? Tell me, says the dying sinner, whose heart pants for the water of life. Tell me, says that emaciated wretch, immersed in granite walls and loathsome cells by tyrant's minions because he refused to do their wicked bidding—does it extend to *my* lonely cell? Tell me, speaks that victim, dying on a

cross of rugged wood, does it extend to *me*—how far? And we, cry a thousand sufferers on the burning sands of a desert, where no drop of water slakes their raging thirst nor sparkling fountain gladdens their eyes—does it extend to us?—“far and wide AS WATER FLOWS! Wherever WATER,” faith, and the name of the Trinity can be found, “there will be found the efficacy of the blood of Christ.”

Mr. Campbell was an eloquent man, a commander of beautiful language, who loved to dwell upon the magnanimity of God. But will he save them, and save them without the blood of Christ? He says the laver is between the sinner and the blood of Christ, and how will he get them into Christ? Is there a kind of divine power in sinners that answers for the water? Does God change his system for the sick man? And if the sick person gets well, is he sent back to his sins? Will God pardon him conditionally? How many questions can be raised on that point? Go upon the battle-field; there are twenty or thirty thousand men weltering in blood. Suppose a thousand of them to be deeply penitent, but none of them immersed. They cry aloud for salvation. *Bethany* answers in thunder tones—wherever WATER, faith, and the name of the Trinity can be found—*there* is salvation—there “ONLY.” LEXINGTON repeats, in louder tones, you can not get into the blood of Christ except by water; and LOUISVILLE echoes, in shriller, louder tones yet, “Will I be damned if I am not baptized?” “Certainly,” says Dr. Hopson, “why not?” Why should I be damned? Is it as necessary that I should be immersed as that I should be a believer in the Lord and Savior Jesus Christ? No, my friend; if you can be baptized you should be, but it holds not the “*necessary*” relation that *faith* does; for faith brings the soul into blessed communion with God, and baptism does not. It is an ordinance that should be performed wherever it can be, but salvation is not suspended upon it. Through all the dark regions of the damned, to-day there is not *one soul* that went there *because* he could not be put under the water. Through all the regions of the damned, this solemn evening, there is not the wail of one sinner in regret that he did not sink down in the waters of immersion. Not one cry of anguish reverberates through the chambers of perdition because a sinner failed to go into the water; but millions upon millions cry out because they believed not upon the Son of God. Millions cry out because their souls never drank of the water of life flowing from a fountain of infinite purity; and they are condemned forever, because they “believed not in the only-begotten Son of God.”

My friends, the doctrine of Bible is true. "*Whosoever believeth shall not perish,*" "shall not come into the condemnation;" "whosoever believeth, is not condemned, but has passed from death unto life." Thousands in the Presbyterian, Baptist, and Methodist churches have died upon the couch of suffering, died peacefully, trusting in the merits of Christ's blood, looking forward to a glorious immortality by faith, while their hearts have expanded with the fullness, and leaped with joy at the contemplation of the blissful scenes that gathered to the eye of faith upon the heaven-lit shores of eternal day. We preach a religion that demands, alike as death itself demands, the same from the purple-enrobed king as from the shivering beggar by the way. The same from sceptred majesty and mitred royalty as from the peasant in his hovel, or the mendicant in his rags. It presents the same cup of blessings and chalice of redemption to the lips of the dying beggar on his bed of straw, and to the glorious conqueror and enthroned monarch. It meets the wants of all alike, and holds the balance in an even hand. Its conditions are such that all alike responsible can meet them. Wherever want is—wherever a hungry soul is—there is the bread of life. Wherever a withered arm is, there is given the life-giving command of faith—reach forth thy arm and be healed. Wherever a bleeding heart is, the faith of the gospel brings the touch of the Redeemer's garment. Oh, sirs, it is *this* gospel that lifts the heart of the world from prostration and sin, and bids ruined, wrecked, bankrupt, palsied humanity to raise the feeble hand of faith to the cross, and sends the pulsations of eternal life in thrilling power upon the heart, and pours the tide of love full warm upon the weary soul.

God is not a shadow or uncertain being, subject to change and shifting like the wind and waves—one system of pardon in Abel's day, yet another in Abraham's, another in Moses', yet still another in John the Baptist's, and still another after Pentecost, as my brother teaches. Such a God could not command our worship.

Mr. Wilkes says faith is not named in Acts ii. What does he mean? He admits *ἐπί τῷ ὄ*, etc., implies trust in. Does not v. 44 say, "All that *believed*?" etc. But the point is, he contends that *now, for the FIRST time, a new doctrine* came into the church. Faith had always been taught as the condition of pardon. If a *new law* of pardon came in, it should be *clearly stated—pointedly made*. It is nowhere stated at all. So in the case of Saul, calling on the name of the Lord *implied* faith: "How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed?"

MR. WILKES' EIGHTH ARGUMENT.

MONDAY, December 19, 10 A. M.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

There is a little matter of scholarship between myself and my friend, Mr. Ditzler, to which I propose first to give attention this morning. It will be remembered that I read, in regard to Mark i: 4, on the force of the genitive in that case, from the Lexicon of Stockius, a part of a sentence, which I deemed sufficient on that point. My friend, in reply, demanded that I should read the whole of it, asserting that the balance of it would ruin my position. In the next speech I read it all, and translated it, claiming that the latter part of the sentence greatly strengthened my position. My friend, in his reply, read it differently. He charged that my translation was not correct, and insisted that *debebat* was understood before *agere* and *habere*.

I will read it again :

“Ita legitur (1) de baptismo Johannis Baptistæ, quem jussu divino administrabat, Matt. iii: 7, quique dicitur baptismus pœnitentiæ, quia debebat esse conjunctus pœnitentiæ, adeoque erat commonefactio testificatio & professio, opus esse pœnitentiæ, & eos, qui baptismum illum recipiebant, talem agere & habere pœnitentiam, qualem Johannes poscebat.”—Stockius’ “Clavis Lingvæ Sanctæ Novi Testamenti,” p. 184.

Which I translate :

“Therefore, it is said concerning the baptism of John, which he administered by divine authority, Matt. iii: 7, and which is called the baptism of repentance, because it ought to be joined to repentance; and, moreover, it was a remembering, a testifying, and a professing that there was need of penitence, and that those who received that baptism exercised and had such repentance as John demanded.”

Now, my friend says that *agere* and *habere* must have *debebat* understood before them. I deny that the sentence can be parsed accord-

ing to grammatical rules if he inserts it. It destroys the Latin construction of the sentence to insert "*debebat*" there. It makes *eos* the nominative to the verb *debebat*, which it can not be, and leaves us entirely without any thing to govern "*agere and habere.*" I assert that my friend's scholarship is at fault; and if there is any further controversy on this question, I will refer it to scholars, who will decide who is right.

I have another matter to refer to before I proceed with my regular argument. My friend thinks that the position which I take in regard to baptism, as to its value or design, is very *rotten*, and destructive of good to the cause of Christ. I think not. I assert that Mr. Wesley took the same view, whatever he may have said at any given time in the latter part of his life. Dr. Clark did the same thing. I will now read from Mr. Wesley's "Doctrinal Tracts," p. 251:

"As to the grounds of it: if infants are guilty of original sin, then they are proper subjects of baptism; seeing, in the ordinary way, they can not 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. It is true, the second Adam has found a remedy for the disease which came upon all by the offense of the first."—"Collection of Tracts on Scriptural Doctrine," p. 251.

Now, Mr. Wesley says that, to baptism for remission of sins, "God has tied us" in his law; and that is true. He contends "he may not have tied himself." But he does not say that he has not; neither do I. But he says that, though God *may* remit a man's sins without baptism, it is not proved that *we* (so far as we are concerned in investigating the law of God on this subject) are not tied to that law of baptism for the remission of sins. He says, where baptism can not be had, he thinks the case may be different; and that is my opinion. If, therefore, I am rotten, I am, at least, in good company, and in scholarly society—if there has ever been such a thing, except in the presence and person of my friend.

On Saturday, you will remember my friend said, facetiously—for it is all a joke with him—that I would like to get him out on the ice (*eis*). Then he drew a picture of "a man sailing round and round on the ice" (*eis*), and laughed. "The fact is," said he, "my friend has himself been out on the ice (*eis*), and he has had a fall; so he would like me to have one too." But I ask him, as a scholar and a Christian gentleman, to look at Mark i: 4, and Acts ii: 38, and tell

me what the connection of the preposition *eis* is in these texts. I told him I would stake every thing on the correctness of my position, which is, that *eis* connects *baptisma* (baptism), in the former passage, with *aphesin amartion* (remission of sins); and, in the latter, as Lange says, in substance, *eis* connects "repent and be baptized," on the one hand, with "remission of sins," on the other. That is, baptism is for the remission of sins. If I am wrong in this position, then baptism is *not* for the remission of sins. But if I am right, it is. My friend intimates, but he will not distinctly say, that, in Acts ii: 38, *eis* connects *ἐπι τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (upon the name of Jesus Christ) with *ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* (remission of sins). I say it does not; and there is no Greek authority in the world that would so connect. The thing is absolutely impossible. If so, my friend is wrong, and I am right. I want him to take position, but he will not; for he would certainly "slip up;" and that, I suspicion, is the *reason* why he will not. If that is gentlemanly and Christian conduct in the discussion of these matters, I do not know it.

If baptism is not for the remission of sins, it ought not to be so clearly taught as it is. When the Bible says baptism is for the remission of sins, in the language "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins," my friend can not see it so! But, on the subject of infant baptism, on which the Bible is as silent as the grave, he sees it every-where. He can see what is not named or alluded to in the Bible, but he can not see what is said. And why not? I presume it is because he is under the influence of an over-mastering false theology.

Now, as to the disputed passage in Winer. My friend first read from the fourth edition, and gave that as a reason for insisting that that contained just what Winer *himself* said—not what his translator or reviser said; and he insisted that if he had the Latin, the word which Winer employed would be found to be *obstringere*. In the first place, Winer did not write in Latin, and would not, therefore, have used the word *obstringere*. Besides, the edition from which I read was the sixth, the last and finishing work of Winer. Then, in the closing part of his speech, he said he read from the seventh edition of Winer, which was a *revised* edition, and was made *after Winer had died*.

He says, in regard to the tenth of Acts, and the falling of the "Holy Ghost" on the house of Cornelius, that that was not for the purpose of convincing Peter. I will tell you what Peter said about

receiving the Gentiles into the church. "As" Peter "began" preaching to them, and of course before he had spoken any thing to give them faith, "the Holy Ghost fell on them as on us at the beginning." "And what," asked Peter, "was I, that I could withstand God?" He took it as a final consummating proof that the time had come for speaking to the Gentiles, and that they ought to be received into the church. And the Jewish brethren that were with him were *convinced* by the same outpouring of the Holy Ghost, which was not for the forgiveness of sins. My friend says "it was *connected* with their salvation." But it was to convince Peter, those Jewish brethren, and the whole church at Jerusalem, that the blessings of the kingdom of God were for the Gentiles, that the Holy Ghost fell on the house of Cornelius, who "spake with tongues and magnified God." They received the Holy Ghost in its miraculous manifestation, but it is *after* baptism, as Peter says in Acts ii: 38, "You shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit," as a guest.

Again: My friend says that if a backslider has backslidden so far as to get out of the church, and to have been out forty years; to have been a drunkard, a perjurer, a swearer, and a murderer, surely, says he, that man is out of the church; and, since baptism is for remission of sins, and the man is as great a sinner as he can be, how will you get *him* back? Will you baptize him back, or will you make for him a special law? I answer, God has made the law, that if a man will confess his sins, having repented, he will be accepted. This is spoken with reference to just such a man as he describes. (See 1 John i: 9.) I might ask how *he* will get him back? "People who live in glass houses should not throw stones." My friend is in the same house in which I am. I ask, how does he get him back? Suppose a man in his church is guilty of lying, drunkenness, murder, and all the long dark catalogue of crimes which would put a man out of his church. He is now, we will suppose, out; how will he get him back into the church? I want him to tell you. Will he say, as his Discipline, on page 188, says, I would *baptize* him "into Christ's Holy Church?" He knows he would not. When he finds a way, then, to get him back into the church, I will find a way also, and *I* will find the way given us in the Word of God.

He tells us that old Father Thomas Campbell got religion, and that Alexander Campbell was renewed or converted long before they heard any thing about baptism, and that they tell it themselves. That is nearly or quite true. These men, he says, were not willing

to risk their own salvation on their theories of salvation, though they would teach them to others. What does he mean by that? Does he mean, what I hoped his self-respect and respect for this occasion would forbid him to say, that these two men were altogether hypocritical; were willing, for the sake of building up a party, to send the souls of all their brethren to hell, though they would not risk it for themselves? Does he mean that? Does he mean that these men, who served God in spirit and in truth, were willing to send other men to hell? The very statement is a contradiction. If they were the bad men he intimates they were, they never had the experience spoken of; or, if they had, they were all the worse for having it. But I hope his self-respect will not allow him to touch the characters of these distinguished men, who were so far out of the reach of common small men. The facts in regard to their exercises in their youth, when they were in the Presbyterian community, are given as matters of history simply, by Dr. Richardson, and further than that we are not concerned about them. If these men approved of these exercises, who shall object? I do not object to men loving God with all their hearts, and with an earnest devotion. But they taught in addition to that, in after life, when they had learned more, that *baptism* is for remission of sins. And, as this is a question of fact, why not go to the Bible and see whether it is there so taught or not, and leave all these objections "to the moles and to the bats?"

My friend says that a man's salvation is never suspended on the action of second and third parties. Now, I presume to say that sometimes it is. Turn with me to Romans x, commencing with the thirteenth verse: "For whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved. 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? and how shall they preach except they be sent? As it is written, How beautiful are the feet of them that preach the gospel of peace, and bring glad tidings of good things! But they have not all obeyed the gospel. For Esaias saith, Lord, who hath believed our report? So, then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God."

Our bearing the Word of God, then, depends on second and third parties; our having faith and our salvation depend on second and third parties. The salvation of our friends here, and the salvation of my friend himself, depend on second and third persons. This my

friend knows. What is my dilemma, then, is his; and if there is objection against it, it tells against me only as it does against him.

I wish now to call your attention to some comments on Acts xxii: 16. Lange says that baptism was "the medium through which" sins were purged away. Wesley says, in substance, salvation is not bestowed except through this means, God having tied us to that, except when the means can not be had. On this subject I wish to read from Mr. Alford, the great commentator. On Mark xvi: 16, he says:

"There is no *και μη βαπτ*—[and is not baptized]—in the second clause here. Unbelief—by which is meant the rejection of the gospel in heart and life, not weakness or doubt as in verse 14—shall condemn a man, *whether baptized or UNBAPTIZED*. And, conversely, it follows that our Lord does not set forth here the *absolute*, but only the *general necessity* of baptism to salvation; as the Church of England also teaches. But that general necessity extends to all to whom baptism is ACCESSIBLE—and it was well said 'Non privatio baptismi, sed contentus, damnat.'"—"*Greek Test.*" by Henry Alford, p. 395.

Here Alford says that the passage, Mark xvi: 16, declares the *general necessity* of baptism, and that its necessity extends simply to those who can be baptized, not to those who can not. This is precisely what I said in my first speech, and what I have contended for all through. God does not make a law for a man, which he *can not* obey: so he made the law of baptism for every man to whom that law may apply, or who may have the opportunity of being baptized, but for no others.

Now, he brings up the battle-field argument. I must confess, I think there is a great deal of weakness in his mode of proceeding, which is shown by his catching at straws, as if he were a drowning man. He tells us, there *might* be a battle-field. I have heard of such things—and there *might* be twenty thousand men lying wounded on that battle-field—which *might* possibly also be true—and that my brother Hopson *might* be there talking to the dying, and telling them that unless they were baptized they would be damned—which *might* also be true, with this explanation: If, in their circumstances, they could believe and be baptized, they must obey the law of God, which says, believe and be baptized or be damned. But if, in their circumstances, they are unable to believe and be baptized, and if they have not brought that inability upon themselves, they are not responsible for not believing and not being baptized. I suppose my friend will concede, that upon no other rule of law is it possible to see how the infant, or idiot, or heathen can be saved, who may never have heard

the word of God, and are not in a condition to obey the gospel of his Son.

Dr. Hackett, on Acts xxii: 16, says: "Submit to the rite, in order to be forgiven." Murdock, in his translation of the same passage from the Syriac, says, "to be cleansed from thy sins." Bloomfield, commenting on the same passage, says, "the method appointed by Christ for remitting sins." I quote these authorities, not because they are very necessary, but to show my friend, our hearers, and readers, that in this position I am not by myself, that I have the scholarship and the ablest commentators on my side.

I now proceed with my advance argument. I call your attention to Ephesians v: 26, already quoted. Dr. Clark says, that the washing of water, there, means baptism. Macknight, Bengel, and Stuart say the same thing. My friend says that the washing there "*might*" signify "*cleansing*" it, that is, the church. He says that my application of it to the sinner is not proper, that it was the *church* which was washed and cleansed. Now the members of the church are the church, and the Savior here says through this apostle, that he sanctified and cleansed it by the washing of water, by the Word. The same passage tells us that "he gave himself for" the church. The church was *not in existence then*, but, nevertheless, he gave himself for it; he died for the church, and suffered for the church before it was, and he suffered for me, though I was not then in existence; he suffered for the sins of the world, though large portions of the inhabitants of the world were then dead, and many were not then born. He "gave himself for" the church "that he might sanctify and cleanse it by the washing of water by the Word." Let me illustrate. A gentleman is married. Of his wife, who is by his side, he says: "When my wife was young, she was poor and she was not educated. I saw her when I was a boy, and liked her, and paid for her schooling. I educated my wife." Now, she was not his wife *then*, but being his wife now, he speaks of her as his wife when she was not so at the time; or, he refers to what he did for her, as his wife, before she was his wife. So the Savior sanctified and cleansed the church by the washing of water by the Word, before it was his church, or, in making it his church.

Now, if this washing of water means baptism, it means either that baptism is for the church, or it is for the world. If Mr. D. says it is for the church, he carries it too far; if it is for the world, or the sinner, then my position is right, that baptism is for remission of sins.

We read in Titus iii: 5, "Not by works of righteousness which we

have done, but according to his mercy, he saved us; by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost." Dr. Clark says, that undoubtedly means baptism; Macknight says it is "through baptism;" Mr. Wesley says it is baptism; Dr. Bengel says "it is for baptism into Christ;" M. Stuart, on page 88, says it is baptism; Bloomfield, Alford, and the Bible Dictionary, by Dr. Wm. Smith, say that the washing of regeneration is simply baptism. Well, then, what of it? The apostle says that Christ *saved* us by the washing of regeneration; and saving a man is pardoning him, taking his sins away. Now, God pardons sinners, HE saves them by the washing of regeneration. But the washing of regeneration means baptism, so say all these distinguished authorities; therefore, it comes to this, that HE pardons them by or through baptism. Is not "baptism, then, for the remission of sins"? The point is made out. My proposition is established. He saved them by the washing of regeneration; the washing of regeneration means baptism; therefore, he pardoned their sins by baptism. Then, "baptism is for the remission of sins."

Once more. I call the attention of my friend to 1 Peter iii: 21, "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Here the apostle tells us—

Moderator.—Time is up.

MR. DITZLER'S EIGHTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My brother seems in a world of trouble this morning. I confess that I am a little surprised at some things he has said. For instance, there is such a thing as retreating in order and giving up the question. Then there is such a thing as this proverb :

“ He that fights and runs away,
May live to fight another day.”

On Saturday my brother got into a pretty severe hand-to-hand fight on certain Latin words, but fled to the rear, leaving his pathway strewn with the debris of defeat. He, however, marshals his forces again to-day over Stokius, and comes back to the attack. I was surprised at his courage, though it was not of the highest order. Now, take this Latin of Stokius and deny what he denies, and how will you make common sense of it? He renders two infinitives by the past tense of the *indicative* mood. “*Eos*,” those, is accusative, and, therefore, governed by either a preposition, or verb, or participle. There is no preposition, no participle—what *does* govern it but *debebat*?

Mr. Wilkes.—*Erat* controls the construction.

Mr. Ditzler.—Well, well; *erat*—the verb *sum* govern an *accusative*! It takes the same case after it as before it—it takes the genitive of possession, and *est* governs the dative, signifying a duty or possession, as *edendum est mihi*—eating is to me—I must eat. But who ever heard of the verb *sum* governing the accusative? It can not be *opus*—it governs the ablative, and can not connect with *eos* following, as the subject of the infinitive, *agere* and *habere*. Here are the infinitives: the subject of such is put in the accusative—*eos*—that they should exercise repentance—*debebat*, it was their duty—they were bound—obligated—owed it—to repent. Sallust is one of the most elegant, chaste, and concise of all Latin writers. I will, from memory, quote a sentence from him, though I have not read him for many years, but if I can remember it, I will quote, that you may see the force of the sentence in Stokius: “*Omnes hominés, qui sese student*

præstare ceteris animalibus, summa ope *niti* decet, ne vitam silentio transeant," etc. *Decet*—it becomes all men, who study to place themselves before the rest of animals, to *strive* with all their might, lest they spend their life in silence, etc. Now, *decet* governs *hominês* in the accusative, and *hominês*, the accusative, is the subject of the infinitive *niti*, "to strive." "It becomes all *men* to strive," etc. Hence, in like manner here: "It ought (*debebat*) to be joined to repentance, and as it was an earnest reminding, a testification, or declaration, and profession of the need—*opus*—necessity of repentance—here you see it was something *yet needed*—looked forward to—of repentance, and—*et eos*—that those who received that baptism—it behooved—was incumbent on them—to exercise and practice such a repentance as John demanded." Now, Mr. Wilkes' rendering of Stokius is almost verbatim that of Pendleton, and he renders it, they "exercised and *had* such a repentance as John demanded." But the sentence does not correspond to that, and the brother can not so render it.

Mr. Wilkes.—I have already rendered it over and over again, and it has gone to record. I have consulted my brethren, and they all say I am right.

Mr. Ditzler.—Well, I have no sanhedrim around me.

Mr. Wilkes.—You ought to have.

Mr. Ditzler.—Keep cool, brother, keep cool. Now, this volume had the last touches of Winer, and it does not have the word "seal" in this connection, but it is just like mine; therefore, Winer stands with me.

Mr. Wilkes.—Winer never saw this edition. It was issued after he died.

Mr. Ditzler.—Mine came from under his own hand, from the original, which in this place corresponded to the fourth edition, which I first quoted.

[The Moderators here requested the debatants not to interrupt each other, and to confine their replies to their own speeches.—*Reporter.*]

Now, I will take up Wesley's tract. In our former debates my brother did not seem hard enough pushed to bring that up. He had a better sense of propriety. He now quotes from a tract which he calls Wesley's, and which he ought to know is not Wesley's. Wesley never wrote a line of it, and my brother ought to have known it. Here is what Wesley does say: "How, and on what terms, then,

.....

I could read a great deal more to the same effect, but you see by this that Mr. Wesley completely refutes this point. And that tract they

have been quoting for thirty years past, though not a word of it was written by Mr. Wesley. It was only published in his volume. Having many things to do, he had not time to extract this from the papers in the hasty make-up of his work. The Southern church never has published it, though the Northern church has. Says Dr. Thomas Jackson, the greatest of Methodist historians of England, London standard edition of Wesley's works, vol. i, page 13: "Two papers, one on baptism, and another on the immortality of the soul, were not written by Mr. Wesley." That settles that question. How basely that tract has been used!

But how will he do with the backslider? How very artfully he turns that question into the church! I said not one word about being out of the church, etc., as he pretends. He then pretends that we are in the same difficulty. What candor! They contend that no man can be in Christ's church without immersion; that no man can be in Christ Jesus without immersion. That the means that bring a man into the church bring him into Christ. We deny that this is so. We believe the backslider is brought back into Christ through repentance and faith in the manner that he first obtained pardon of sins. We both agree that nothing but the blood of Christ can effect or procure the pardon of sin. Only by the blood of Christ are men pardoned, and whenever they trust in Christ Jesus they obtain the merits of his blood. As the backslider is now out of Christ, how is he to get back unless re-immersed, as the laver is between him and Christ?

The brother is still fighting on *eis* in Acts ii: 38. He has harped on that so much that I thought I would give him a bit of humor on Saturday. I have always told him that I rendered that word just as he does, and he knows it, though I have never raised a question about this sentence. He now tries to make the audience believe there is something in this admission, and that I am afraid to deny certain things in connection with Barnes' letter. Does he believe and teach that baptism and repentance obtain remission of sins without trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ? And does *eis*, therefore, obligate to and bring remission without the blood of Christ? He himself teaches the contrary. The only difference between us is this: He eliminates Christ and faith from the text. I leave them there. He says that sentence is subordinate—a subordinate member. I show he himself can not so treat it, since he admits they will not obtain remission unless they trust on the name of Christ, and not in baptism. He binds on remission to baptism, without Christ, yet denies it can be so. Now *eis* does connect

the verbal idea with remission. But *what* is the verbal idea connected? To *what* is remission pledged? To *trust in Christ*. *Εἰς* then connects remission—*ἀφεσις*, etc.,—with, and binds it to *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*—“*trusting on the name of the Lord Jesus Christ for the remission of your sins.*” Thus you see I meet all the grammatical issues perfectly, and am consistent with myself and all our teaching and *his*, that *only the blood of Christ* secures remission of sins. But *he* has to bring an algebraic elimination, take out the very support on which we are to lean—“on the name of Jesus Christ”—as a subordinate clause, and says: “Repent, and be baptized every one of you, *for* the remission of sins.” *Εἰς*, then, by his grammatical construction, brings men into the remission of sins *without the blood of Christ*, a thing he himself does not believe. If the blood of Christ is shed *for* (*εἰς*) the remission of sins, it is *to it* we are to look, *on it rely*. for remission. Hence, trust “on Jesus Christ,” instead of being a subordinate, is *the* vital point in the text and burden of the context. Hence, put in the words “on Jesus Christ,” which means relying on Jesus Christ, the sense is complete: “Repent, and be baptized every one of you, *trusting on Jesus Christ* for the remission of sins, and you shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost.” I have thus disposed of the point he sought to make.

When I quoted from the third of Acts on Saturday, he replied that salvation and pardon were not there. Hear the nineteenth verse: “*Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.*” Were not salvation and pardon contemplated in that sermon? And yet, in explaining that they ought to repent and turn to the Lord, Peter does not name baptism; whereas, if it was a condition of pardon, he was bound to do so. Their system necessarily develops the doctrine of church penance. And this is the dilemma he is in. How are men pardoned of sins committed *after* baptism? Tertullian and others held that baptism was for the remission of sin—that when a man was baptized his sins were pardoned. But how are they to get rid of sins committed after baptism? To meet this, voluntary penance was introduced, and then secret confession. So my friend’s doctrine developed the whole system of *priestly* remission, purgatory, penance, and confession. They, my friend’s church, contend that *only* in the water do we get into the blood of Christ. Therefore, from my brother’s stand-point, the backslider must be re-baptized to get into the blood of Christ. There is no evasion of this matter.

Again, my friend contends that those persons who were covered on

the day of Pentecost were *believers before* they were told to repent and be baptized. These *murderers* of Jesus *believers!* with "heart changed!" then, of course, "possessed of the soul-renewing, sanctifying, regenerating principle of religion;" "born of the Spirit;" "begotten of God;" "hearts pure;" "*delighting* in holiness!" Yet Peter said of them, "But ye denied the Holy One, and desired a *murderer* to be granted unto you."—Acts iii: 14, 15. "By wicked hands ye have crucified and slain him."—Acts ii: 23. How could they be presumed to believe on Christ for salvation, until both convinced that he was Christ, and that he would grant *them*, murderers as they were, "repentance unto life!"

He contends that *faith* purifies the heart, and that it comes before repentance; but he can not make the Scriptures and the supposed metaphysicians sustain him on it. Let us look at it. If repentance is not required until after faith, and faith changes the heart, then all the inhabitants of this city and every part of the United States, except a few infidels, are changed in heart, purified in heart, and yet are not penitent. For there are thousands of murderers who, in their hearts, believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and also believe that they will be damned if they do not turn from their wickedness. Yet, according to my brother's system, they are *all* changed in heart, and feel no need of repentance; have had no remorse, no regret, no reform, no repentance whatever. How can we suppose that a man can live in crime who has thus been changed in heart? They contend that faith changes the heart, and that afterward we repent, and that changes the character. That is to say, a man may be a believer, and have his heart changed, purified, etc., while his *character* is not changed. Does a man's heart in nowise affect his *character*? You see what a system my brother has to sustain. Thus, you might have a changed heart for twenty years, and have no remission of sins; for you would be unrepentant. If you would be free from your sins, you must rely upon Jesus, that he may pardon your sins; but you will not rely upon Jesus for pardon unless you *feel* *conscious* that you need pardon. Thus, you see, in metaphysics repentance precedes that genuine faith that "works by love and purifies the heart."

And now I will notice another train of his argument on the word "*wash*," which he applies as a proof of his proposition, where, Acts xxii: 16, Ananias says, "Be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling—or by calling on, in faith—the Lord Jesus Christ." Also Eph.

v: 26, Titus iii: 5, have wash, which we have explained. Now, the word *wash* occurs *constantly*, as connected with pardon, remission, moral cleansing, in the Old Testament, where he admits there was no baptism for remission, *many* more times than he can possibly find in the New, and far oftener, and in far stronger terms. It also often so occurs in the New Testament, where it has no such meaning, even in his estimation. If, then, I find it in constant use as simply meaning inward washing, where the language is so much stronger than in any text he can quote, it utterly destroys his proposition. The apostles, "being Jews," were used to this habit of language. "Wash you, make you clean." "O Jerusalem, *wash thy HEART from wickedness.*" Any thing that strong of baptism? Paul was told to "wash away his sins by calling on the name of the Lord." "Cleanse first that which is *within.*" "Let us cleanse ourselves from all filthiness of the flesh." This cleanse and wash interchange constantly, see Ps. li, Heb. ix, x, and xii: 24. "Cleanse your hands [how is *that* doue?] ye sinners; and *purify your hearts, ye double-minded.*" "I will put my law in their *inward parts*, and write it in their hearts: . . . for I will forgive them their *iniquities*, and I will remember their sin *no more.*" This utterly refutes the presumption that "change of heart," "regeneration," "new birth," and pardon are all different things, as claimed by these people. . . . "I will pour water on him that is thirsty." "As the hart panteth after the water-brook, so panteth my soul," etc. "My soul *thirsteth*; my heart and my flesh cry out for the living God." "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean: from all your filthiness will I cleanse you. A *new heart* also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you"—"the new creation," "born of God," "pass from death," etc., noticed. . . . Paul: "He hath saved us by a *washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ." "*Wash me thoroughly* from mine iniquities, and cleanse me from my sin. . . . Purge—sprinkle me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." Is not this stronger than "wash away thy sins by calling on the name of the Lord?"

Again: This "wash" is turned into—exchanged (v. 10)—for "create in me a *clean heart.*" "Renew a right spirit"—this for "deliverance" from his sin.—V. 14. etc. "I *washed thee with water*; yea, I *thoroughly washed* away thy blood from thee."—Ezek. xvi: 9. In Paul's case *water* is not named. Is. iv: 4: "When the Lord shall

have washed away the filth—*βρωτον*—of the daughters of Zion, and purged the blood," etc. (Is. i: 16; Jer. iv: 14; 2 Cor. vii: 1; James iv: 8; Jer. xxxi: 33, 34; Is. xlv: 3; Ezek. xxxvi: 25-27; Titus iii: 5, 6; Ps. li: 7-14; Is. iv: 4.)

Paul: "Christ also loved the church; . . . that he might sanctify it and cleanse it by the *washing of the water in the Word*." "In that day shall be a *fountain* opened (*מקור*)—a spring, rill, as of water ("spring"—Is. li: 36)—to the house of David and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, for *sin* and *uncleanness*." Hence, Christ "*washed us in his own blood*." "We *washed our robes* and made them *white in the blood of the Lamb*." Hence, with thee is the "*fountain of living waters*," while men's schemes are "broken cisterns that contain no water." We "drink of the river of his pleasures." "They shall be abundantly satisfied (Heb., *watered*) with the fatness or fullness of thy house. For with thee is the *fountain* of life." "For in the wilderness shall rivers break out, and streams in the desert." "Come ye to the waters." "Take the water of life freely." "If any man drink of the water that I give him, it shall be a well of water in him." "Let him that *thirsteth*, come." "Ho, every one that *thirsteth*, come ye to the waters." Paul: "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*." As they urge we reach "the blood of sprinkling" *in immersion*, this can not be baptism that comes *after* we reached the blood. Also, A. Campbell says the "clean water" (*ιδιαι καθαρω*) does not mean any save the water prepared by the ashes of the red heifer. The washing was also of Christian people here—not sinners. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into *one body*, . . . and have been all made to *drink into one Spirit*." "But ye are washed . . . by the Spirit of our God." Here "wash," "sanctify," "justify," are all one. Just as properly could the Pharisees—the "whited sepulchers," who "made clean the outside;" "a generation of vipers," ready to spring on all who were not as long-faced and ceremonial as themselves—"hypocrites;" "blind leaders of the blind;" "full of uncleanness;" "of hypocrisy," "iniquity," "devouring widows' houses,"—claim to be pure and holy, from all these passages of both Testaments, as can any now, by saying they had obeyed; had washed—haptized—washed thoroughly. They have far more abundant—more forcible texts—far the most. And Paul kept up "the purifying of the Jews."—Acts xxiv: 18. (Eph. v: 26, 27; Zech. xiii: 1; Rev. i: 5; vii: 14; Jer. ii: 13;

Ps. xxxvi: 8, 9; Jer. ii: 22; xvii: 13; xviii: 14; John iv: 18; Rev. xxii: 1, 17; Job xx: 17; Is. xxxiii: 21; xxxv: 6, 7; lv: 1; Ps. xxiii; xlix: 10; xxxv; 1 Cor. vii: 11; Heb. x: 22; ix: 21-23; 1 Cor. xii: 13; vi: 11; Mark vii: 1-8; Luke xi: 38, 39.)

These all refer to inward washing. The apostles were used to such language. Yet my brother would read this to prove that baptism is for the remission of sins.

As I have before said, his law of the genitive destroys his own theory. It destroys his interpretation of 1 Peter iii: 21: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Here you see, from his use of the genitive, baptism would be the result of having a good conscience already procured. So, also, of the washing of regeneration in Titus iii: 5, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, *by the washing of regeneration*, and renewing of the Holy Spirit." He says the noun governing the genitive *originates* from it, and gives character to it. "Baptism of repentance," is baptism originating in repentance—that is, baptism administered *in consequence* of previous repentance. He has vowed there is no exception. It is always so, as he said at Lexington, Missouri—"Semper et ubique"—always and every-where. Here, then, washing governs regeneration, in the genitive. He hath saved us—*διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας*—through "*a washing of regeneration*"—that is, by my friend's law, the washing is in consequence of *previous* "*regeneration and renewing of the Holy Spirit.*" This destroys their whole system—utterly annihilates it. Their doctrine is, we can not be regenerated without baptism. Nay, Campbell says "they are *one and the same.*" So his own doctrine destroys his rule of the genitive, and his rule destroys all his proof-texts. They all turn against each other. Every rule he gives for one text utterly destroys his interpretation of the next text, and all others. He may take which horn of the dilemma he pleases, it is disaster. If he is right as to the genitive on Mark i: 4, yet it does him no good, since it was a law, he teaches, that was done away, and applies not now, while it destroys nearly every other text he quotes, such as 1 Peter iii: 21, Titus iii: 5, while another rule of his destroys their use of Eph. v: 26, 27. I have already explained *wash*, etc., as used in such places.

I now offer one more offsetting argument that refutes their way of explaining the Word of God. Circumcision was an ordinance of

the flesh, as well as baptism. It was named by Paul as among carnal ordinances, where baptism holds the like place. (Heb. ix: 10.) It was "a sign," "a seal," a token, Paul tells us (Rom. iv: 11; Gen. xvii: 11.) Mr. A. Campbell says, "Christian Baptism," p. 99, edition of 1853: "But circumcision became a type of what? *The circumcision of the heart.*" (Italics his.) He then says: "The circumcision of the heart by the Holy Spirit came in room of the circumcision of the flesh by the knife, etc. Circumcision is now 'that of the heart,' etc. President Milligan, of Lexington, Kentucky, "Scheme of Redemption," 1870, p. 81, says of circumcision: "II. It had, also, a purely religious meaning. *It was made typical of the cutting off of the body of sin from the soul, and the subsequent sealing of it by the Holy Spirit.* [Italics his.] This is clearly proved by the following passages, Romans ii: 28, 29: 'For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is *that of the heart*, in the spirit, and not in the letter,' etc. Phil. iii: 3; Col. ii: 9-12, he adds that in its being "a type" thus "consisted its chief value."—p. 82.

Now, no one contends that *circumcision* was for, or equivalent to, or necessarily connected with the remission of sins, or that it in anywise renovated, affected, or cleansed the heart. Yet such is the universal custom of all writers of all nations, especially the Jews and apostolic Jewish Christians, of interchanging the type, the outward ordinance of the flesh and *the thing signified* by it, especially if any strong point of analogy be found; such is the necessary freedom of language in figures, and illustration, and analogy, that this "sign" is far oftener, and in *ininitely* stronger terms, confounded with the pardon of sin, renovation of the heart, regeneration, purity, etc., than ever water is, and especially water baptism, both in the Old and New Testaments. Even in the New, when, at least among the Gentiles where it was entirely *abolished*, it was used constantly by Paul, the most *spiritual* of all the writers, for the *inward* renewing of our hearts, and pardon of sin. It constantly represents *all the work* of regeneration—of religion, in principle and effect. If, then, *circumcision*, not half so apt to be confounded with pardon and cleansing as water that washes from physical defilement, not so expressive a sign, was made a convertible term with regeneration and pardon of sin, yet we know it was only by a usage well understood, how *utterly* unsafe it is to give such forced interpretations to the few

passages where wash and baptism occur, when the connection is not one hundredth part as strong—the language far less forcible?

“Circumcise the foreskin of your HEARTS.” “He is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that CIRCUMCISION which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew who is one inwardly, and circumcision is that of THE HEART, in the spirit.” “That which is born of the Spirit is spirit.”

“We are the circumcision who worship God in spirit.” “In whom 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.” (Col. ii: 11.)

“The Lord God will circumcise thine heart . . . to love the Lord,” etc. “Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your hearts” “And the Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,” etc.

The wicked were “the uncircumcised in heart.” “All these nations [Egypt, Judah, Edom, etc.] are *uncircumcised*, and all the house of Israel are *uncircumcised in the heart*.” “If then their uncircumcised hearts be humble,” etc. “Circumcise yourselves to the Lord, and take away the foreskin of your hearts, ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem.” Ezekiel declares Israel to be “uncircumcised in heart and uncircumcised in flesh.” These repeated declarations that it was not circumcision only when it reached the heart, shows Paul's meaning of “one baptism.”

Stephen: “Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always resist the Holy Ghost.” Ewald on Jer. ix: 25, 26, renders it: “Behold, the days come, that I will visit all the *uncircumcised* ones; . . . for all the heathen are uncircumcised, and so is all the house of Israel uncircumcised in their heart.” (Rom. ii: 28, 29; Phil. iii: 3; Col. ii: 11; Deut. x: 16; Jer. ix: 26; iv: 4; Lev. xxvi: 41; Ezek. xlv: 8-10; Acts vii: 51; Jer. ix: 25, 26.)

Yet it was not for the remission of sins. Here the very act of taking away sins is called circumcision, but nowhere in all the Bible can he find that putting away sins, or “cutting off the body of the sins of the flesh,” is expressed by the word baptism. If he could, what a triumph he would have! Here is circumcision called a “putting away of the body of the sins”—it is immediately called “*forgiving of all trespasses*,” and “blotting out,” etc. (v. 13, 14). O, if he could find baptism so used, it would be heralded throughout the nation. Now, would it not be safer to interpret these things by their

use in the Bible? Is it safe to violate all rules of language, especially where so much is involved?

He has quoted over and over again John iii: 5, to which I have replied. It refers to that which the Jews ought to have understood, for Christ said to Nicodemus, "Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" How could he upbraid him for not understanding these things, unless they were a part of the law of God, of which Nicodemus was an expounder, as a Jewish rabbi?

My brother does not believe that, under the old dispensation, baptism was for the remission of sins. They all expressly say it was not. Yet from this language we see that every Jew ought to know what John iii: 5, meant. Yet he *could not* know it to mean baptism for remission, since it was not taught in the Bible, as my opponent admits. How, then, can a text that was an embodiment of what the Old Testament taught mean just the reverse of what it *did* teach?

Nicodemus ought to have understood that verse; as a Jew understanding the Old Testament, Christ lets him know. It is something *taught there plainly*. Yet baptism for remission, *all admit, was not taught there*. Therefore, John iii: 5, whatever it may or may not mean, *can not mean* baptism for remission of sins.

I will now again take up Ephesians v: 22-27.

[Time expired.]

MR. WILKES' NINTH ARGUMENT.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My friend, Mr. Ditzler, tells us that he had the very last and best edition of *Winer* in his hand, namely, the seventh, from which he read. I tried to save him from that error, by assuring him at the time that it was a mistake; but it was ruled out of order by the Moderator. I will now read from page 9, in the preface to the seventh edition of *Winer*: "*Winer's* foreboding that the sixth would be the last revision from his hand, has unfortunately been realized." That is to say, *Winer* did not prepare the seventh edition. My friend says that he read from the seventh, the final, and, therefore, the best work of *Winer*. I have nothing more to say about that.

I have something to say with regard to the note which I read from Mr. Wesley. I do not suppose that the Methodist Church believes the statement I read from Wesley. Justice requires me to say that I did not think they did when I read it. They repudiate it, I believe. I read it as from Mr. Wesley, for the sake of Mr. Wesley's name, and the influence it should have in this controversy. I claim that he is or was with me. But he carried the doctrine too far, and so did the church in which he lived and in which he finally died; that is, the English Episcopal Church. Mr. D. says that Mr. Wesley did not use the language which I read; that he was not the *author* of that language; and he read from a work to show that Wesley was not the author of that language. I ask the hearer to note carefully whether he read that *Wesley* was not the *author* of that language. No. He read and *showed* that Wesley was not the author of a *certain* tract, but he did not show, nor can he show that Mr. Wesley was not the author of the tract from which I read. Now, I propose to show clearly and conclusively that his authority does not conflict with my statement. His authority was written, or rather it was published, in 1831. *At that time* Mr. Wesley's tract on baptism was *not in* the collection of tracts. That is true, but Mr. Edwards' tract was. After that book from

which Mr. Ditzler read was written, the General Conference in the United States (before the division of the Methodist Church, I believe it was) took Mr. Edwards' tract out of that collection, and put Mr. Wesley's in; and the tract from which I read was Mr. Wesley's that was put into the collection of tracts *after* Mr. Edwards' was taken out. If you want proof of this, you will find it in the book itself, from which I now read :

"Several new tracts are included in this volume, and Mr. Wesley's 'Short Treatise on Baptism' is substituted in the place of the extract from Mr. Edwards on that subject. In these tracts the reader will find the doctrines of Predestination, Election, Reprobation, Final Perseverance, Imputed Righteousness, and Christian Perfection stated and illustrated in a perspicuous and forcible manner, according to the scriptural account of these subjects, concerning which the Christian world has been so much divided."—"Tracts on Scripture Doctrine;" ADVERTISEMENT. New York, July 5, 1832.

From page 249 I read :

"That Mr. Wesley, as a clergyman of the Church of England, was originally a *high churchman*, in the fullest sense, is well known. When he wrote this treatise in the year 1756, he seems still to have used some expressions, in relation to the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which we, at this day, should not prefer. Some such, in the judgment of the reader, may perhaps be found under this second head. This last sentence, however, contains a guarded corrective. It explains also the sense in which we believe Mr. Wesley intended much of what goes before to be understood."—"Note to 'Tracts on Scripture Doctrine or Doctrinal Tracts,' etc., p. 249.

Now, remember, I read this passage, not to make a "fling" at the Methodist Church, for I do not think you believe they hold that doctrine; but I read it that I might have Mr. Wesley's individual authority; for I knew very well that in the last Conference of the Methodist Church the question was raised whether the works of Wesley, Clark, and Watson ought to be recommended by Methodist preachers in their schools, and I *think* the proposition was referred to the bishops for their decision. I do not know whether the proposition was passed or not. I have made the point that Mr. Wesley is the author of the language I read. I have made the point that my friend's reply does not prove I was wrong; that he read from a work published a year or two before this tract was published in the collection of tracts. I made the point, also, that, at the time my friend's book was written, it was Mr. Edwards' tract that was in the collection, and not Wesley's, but that a year or two after *his* book was published, Mr. Edwards' tract

was taken out of the collection, and Wesley's put in. I read from that collection in which Wesley's was, and from which Edwards' had been taken out. *I read from Wesley's tract.* Mr. Wesley used the *very language* quoted by me, and it had the sanction of the entire Conference of his church at the time.

My friend thinks that quoting Wesley rather misrepresents the Methodist Church. I rather think it does, myself. I have, however, another book, which I do not think misrepresents the Methodist Church. It is a *small* book, called "Methodist Discipline." It was gotten up, or revised, at Memphis, I think, during the present year, and published at St. Louis, by the publishing house of the church, and is dated 1870. The gentlemanly editor presented it to me as the very last revision of their faith and practice—or rather their *practice*, for I do not think they revise their faith so much. They are expected, when about to baptize a child, to pray as follows:

"Almighty and everlasting God, 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. Amen."— "Methodist Discipline," p. 189.

Now, I have two uses for this passage. In the first place, the congregation are taught to pray, when an infant is to be baptized, that it may be delivered from God's wrath. That is carrying the doctrine a little too far; yet my Methodist brethren say they can explain it. When this language was first uttered, it was believed that baptism washed away the original sin of the child, and delivered it from the wrath of God; but our Methodist brethren *now* explain it as having reference to the coming years of the child, when it will be delivered from God's wrath; but the explanation is wholly puerile and indefensible.

In the second place, I use this passage because my friend says he disposes of my remarks on Ephesians v: 26, and Titus iii: 5, by showing that the washing has nothing to do with baptism. But the Discipline uses the word "wash" in regard to baptism; "wash him and sanctify him with the Holy Ghost." They regard washing, in this case, as connected with the baptism. Besides that, the Methodist Discipline quotes John iii: 5, and holds that the birth of water is baptism. It also quotes Titus iii: 5, and says that the washing of

regeneration is baptism, and so do nearly all the churches' symbols, disciplines, and confessions of faith. The English Church, the American Episcopal, and the Presbyterian, all regard this text as applying to Christian baptism. Why should my opponent, to use his own classic style of language, when in a close place, "slip up?" Why he should "slip up" on interpretations of God's Word, if not to get out of a difficulty, I do not know.

More than that, he professes to believe that the apostles did not refer, in these texts, to baptism. Nay, he so urges this point that, by implication, he confesses that, if they did, I would be right; and, therefore, he feels the necessity upon him of showing that they did not. Let me tell him that I am willing to rest the case here, leaving the question with intelligent people to decide with regard to the application or interpretation of these texts which I make.

That the washing of regeneration is baptism, Mr. Wesley and all the writers of his own church clearly tell him; so do *all* the great lights of other churches, also, tell him that it means baptism. If he is afraid to leave it there, I am not.

I will now take up another point in my friend's speech. First, in regard to Stockius: I have nothing particularly to say about Stockius, except that my friend can not find an *authority* for his construction of that Latin sentence, to save his life. He tries to give us something from memory from Sallust, a very excellent Latin author, and, if I quote it right, it is as follows:—"Omnes hominés, qui sese student præstare ceteris animalibus summâ ope niti decet, ne vitam silentio transeant," etc. Am I right? [No objection.] He says, *this* is a case in which the accusative comes *after* the verb and is governed by it, and also that it is the accusative *before* the infinitive that follows it. Now, I deny that. I deny that *omnés*, etc., in that case, is the accusative after "decet." It is an impersonal verb, and does not govern the accusative *in this case*. The accusative, here, is before the infinitive, precisely as it is in Stockius. Now, if my friend is not satisfied with that, he may plant himself there and *talk* and *career* around it, about it, over it, and through it, as much as he pleases. I deny that he has a respectable authority on this earth for his translation of Stockius. More than that, he can not find one, if it would save him from the purgatory to which he thinks my doctrine leads. He can not parse that sentence according to his construction of it. There is no authority or rule for it. The Latin authorities are strangers to his learning. Let me tell him that this presumption and grimace over

what *he* knows and thinks is right, is all gammon with me. I do not want to talk this way if my friend will allow me not to do so, but I will permit no self-conceit and presumption to pass on this subject. I tell him he is *wrong* and *unscholarly* in this attempt.

I asked my friend what the grammars and lexicons said on *eis* in the second of Acts. I thought he was really going to tell us what *eis* does connect on the one hand, and on the other. *But he will not.* I will tell you the reason. He would have you believe by *intimations*, that *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (*upon the name of Jesus Christ*), is connected by *eis*, with *ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* (*remission of sins*). I say to him that, in that case, he would connect a preposition, or a prepositional phrase, on the one hand, with a noun, or its equivalent, on the other, a thing that was never done. Here, again, his scholarship is at fault. His scholarship, though *wide*, I think, must be very thin, like the ice (*eis*) he talks about. But as it is the best the Methodist Church, in the State of Kentucky, can do, I suppose we must be satisfied with it. But even had he a riper scholarship—no matter, indeed, what his scholarship might be—he could not do any better than he has done, for his case.

My doctrine, he says, leads to the doctrine of purgatory and the confessional. I would like to know how? I believe I will deny that. I just want to see my friend air himself on that subject. I believe in baptism for the remission of sins; that is the proposition I am trying to sustain from the Scriptures. But how does that lead to the doctrine of purgatory and the confessional? Is it because the confession of sins was held to be for the remission of sins, and thus persons were led into the doctrine of the confessional, and into the belief that there was a purgatory? I hope this will not raise too great a debate in his "sanhedrim!" According to this method of reasoning, I could prove that the shedding of the blood of Jesus Christ, and faith in it for salvation, would lead to the doctrines of purgatory and the confessional!

My friend says that all the murderers in the town and country, according to my view, have changed hearts and are believers. I must say, respectfully, that I do not believe that, and I never taught any thing of that kind. They would not *deny*, it may be, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God. But the faith I have and teach, and that I require and my brethren require of a man in order to join the church, is *faith* including a change of heart. I told my friend that before. Why does he speak of this again? I hold no such doctrine as that which

he charges upon me. Then he said something in regard to repentance coming before faith. He may have all that to himself, for, if he could prove that repentance comes before faith, it does not follow that I am wrong on baptism. He may, therefore, work on it, and at it, and fix it up as much as he pleases.

He is just now attempting to answer what I presented on the first day of this discussion, and in the very first speech I made; and even now, he, in *his last* speech, has *barely alluded to it*. I would like to know when he will come up to the work. There are now only three more speeches for him and two for me, and yet he stands here unwilling to meet me on the points involved in John iii: 5, introduced in my first speech. That does not look like *Christian* conduct, especially after his remarks on my not noticing what he said on Stockius. He says he is going to call the sanhedrim together, and come forward armed and equipped for another battle over it. Three days ago I demonstrated baptism for the remission of sins from John iii: 5, and now, after three days thinking over it, with the assistance of his sanhedrim, he tells us that he has *something to say on John iii: 5!* Why has he not said it before? But what he now says is as far from being a reply to what I said as it could possibly be. If he could have refuted my arguments, he would have brought his reply *close to what I said*, instead of putting it as far as possible from it, that it might have a lonely existence.

I wish now to develop what I have to say on 1 Pet. iii: commencing at the nineteenth verse, "By which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison; which sometime were disobedient, when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls, were saved by water. The like figure, whereunto even baptism doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ."

Peter here says that baptism saves us. No explanation of this passage must deny this statement: "Baptism doth also now save us." Noah was saved by the ark; he was brought in safely from an old world, a world of wickedness, through the waters, into a new world, in which he and his family exclusively, being righteous, were saved. Passing from the old and condemned world into a new world, they passed through the waters. Now, says Peter, this is a figure of our baptism's saving us. Just as Noah and his family were saved from the waters of the flood, and beyond the waters were delivered into a world

of righteousness, so, says Peter, baptism doth now save us. But lest perchance some might think that baptism had for its object the cleansing, ceremonially, of persons, as immersions, under the old covenant, had for their object ceremonial cleansing, Peter says, "Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God." That is, it is the seeking of a good conscience, or, more particularly, the inquiring for a good conscience toward God; or, a man must be convinced that Jesus Christ is his Savior, that he himself is a sinner, and that to have a good conscience and be saved he must be baptized. The apostle tells us here that there is a seeking or an inquiring for "a good conscience toward God" in baptism. How can that be? The answer is, if a man feels that he is condemned, and if he is instructed in the Scriptures, and finds, as he will, that until he complies with the law of the Savior—"He that believes and is baptized shall be saved"—he is still condemned, he will seek baptism that he may have a good conscience, which he can not have while he has a sense of guilt resting upon him.

Thus Peter teaches that baptism is for the remission of sins—not in so many words, I grant, but he teaches it by necessary implication; it as necessarily follows as the order of the seasons themselves, that "baptism saves us." Now, does baptism save us? The Apostle Peter says so. In what sense? By cleansing us ceremonially, or cleansing as from literal filth? No, not that. Then, in what sense, or how does baptism save us? Why, as all the authorities on this point tell us, substantially, it saves us from *sin*. From what else are we to be saved? Noah's salvation was a salvation from destruction by the waters of the flood. He was brought in safety through the waters, and on the other side he enjoyed salvation. That was a *temporal* deliverance, and was *figurative* of the salvation from the dominion of sin into the liberty of God's dear children, in a world of righteousness.

In conclusion, I wish my friend to notice the fact that there never was a single man reported as being saved without the presence of second parties. There is not a single reported case in the Scriptures of any person's having been saved, or having "got religion" *by himself*, not one. Nor is there a case reported, since Pentecost, of a man's being saved *but not baptized*.

MR. DITZLER'S NINTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My brother still appears to be a great deal excited, and, generally, I do not wonder at it, for he is in a great deal of trouble. He is in trouble on Latin, in trouble on Greek, in trouble when he is in the water, and in trouble when he is on ice (*eis*). He has already gotten down into the water, and is "buried," head and ears, before we get to the question of immersion. He follows me, and I follow him, but to go farther with that criticism would be simply to waste precious time. He himself has admitted over and again that if we take away what he calls the subordinate clause—that is, *Jesus Christ*—in it, that baptism and repentance will not bring remission. Therefore, he is bound to admit that *eis* (*eis*) can not bind or connect the remission to baptism, but it binds it to the blood of Christ, and connects remission, therefore, with the verbal idea of *trusting in Christ* for remission. This is its grammatical form, and this alone is Biblical. They repent and are baptized, not for the remission of sins, but they repent and are baptized, trusting in Christ (*eis*) for the remission of sins.

But he talks with a flourish about scholarship on the sentence from Sallust, and denies that *decet* governs the accusative in that case: "Decet omnes homines," etc. It becomes all men, etc., to strive—*niti*. How else is *homines* governed than by *decet*—it becomes? Will he tell us? A child should know that. Did he ever see an infinitive governed by the accusative without a governing verb or preposition? I have no Latin grammar with me or I would present the rule governing the case where *decet* is expressly named.

Mr. Wilkes.—Read it.

Mr. Ditzler.—Of course I have no time to hunt it up now, but I will bring it up in due time. You will never have time to bring up a Latin grammar to sustain you.

He refers again to Wesley's tract, though I have shown you that it never was written by Wesley at all. He says it was recommended

by the General Conference. Well, suppose it was. They were simply business men, and that was a business act. They could in no wise express the sense of such a man as Wesley, and their action could not bind him. Jackson, who knew Wesley personally, tells us that he never wrote the tract at all. But my brother reads from another man, who knew only enough to do the great historian a wrong. Thus it is he would prove his point.

I will read from Wesley's sermon, published in the maturity of his scholarship and convictions, where he most carefully presents his own views: "Surely the difficulty of assenting to the proposition that faith is the *only* condition of justification must arise from not understanding it. We mean thereby thus much, that it is the *ONLY* thing without which no one is justified; the *only* thing that is *immediately*, indispensably, absolutely requisite in order to pardon. As on the one hand, though a man should have every thing else without faith, yet he can not be justified; so on the other, though he be supposed to want *every* thing else, yet, if he hath *faith*, he can not but be justified. For, suppose a sinner of any kind or degree, in a full sense of his total ungodliness, of his utter inability to think, speak, or do good, and his absolute meetness for hell fire; suppose, I say, this sinner, helpless and hopeless, casts himself wholly on the mercy of God in Christ (which, indeed, he can not do but by the grace of God), who can doubt but he is forgiven *in that moment?*" There is Wesley's doctrine. It is our doctrine to-day.

He tried to show you that the washings he referred to meant immersion, when it is plain that they refer to spiritual baptism. In the sacrament of the Lord's Supper we use language of the same kind. When about to break the bread and give the wine to the people, we say: "That our sinful souls may be *washed*," etc.

We habitually use these terms referring to inward washings. That some of our commentaries believe that wash refers to baptism, we admit; but he will not contend that their opinion binds us.

His law of the genitive, as over and again we have shown, defeats his end. His interpretation of this text is wholly wrong, even if his law of the genitive were correct. He says 1 Peter iii: 21 teaches baptism saves us. Yet when we make these points, they deny that baptism itself can save. I have never charged them with holding that baptism is salvation, for they believe that at last they must rely upon Jesus Christ to be saved; but listen to what they teach. He quotes these texts to show that *baptism saves us*, and then turns

right around and teaches that it is the *blood of Christ* that saves us, and utterly denies that baptism does. Nay, they cry persecution if we charge them with it. Take the case of Noah. Was he saved from his sins at this time? Noah had been a preacher of righteousness for more than a hundred years. There was no remission in the type, and none in the antitype. It was a typical salvation only. As there was no remission in the original, there is no remission in that which exactly corresponds to it in a spiritual sense. But he puts in this saving clause. He says: "The like figure whereunto even baptism doth also now save us;" but for fear he might be misunderstood he says, "not the putting away (*σαρκῶς ῥύπου*) of the *pollution of the flesh.*" *σάρξ* is "man's *carnal nature*, fallen, corrupt—man's *carnal nature* as an active principle of corruption and sin. Rom. viii: 1-5; vii: 5, 18, 25; viii: 3; Gal. v: 13, 16, 17," etc., Robinson's Greek Lexicon. We have seen from Job xiv: 4, Septuagint, and Is. iv: 4, that *ῥύπος* means moral pollution, sin in its deeper, inward power. Hence Peter says: "Baptism is not the putting away of the sins of the flesh, but—(simply) *ἐπερώτημα* a promise which was laid down *in advance*—the promise of a good conscience toward God." It was a *pledge*, a stipulation, a promise given in advance.

He attempts to evade the force of my argument where I show that his system suspends the salvation of man on the will of other parties, and puts it into the power of the minister, or parent, or guardian, physician, ruler, general, etc., to say whether or not I shall be put into the merits of the blood of Christ. That such a system was far, very far behind the Jewish system, ceremonious as it was.

On Saturday he argued thus: That we can have *no gospel* without *second parties*, without ministers to bring it to us, and now he puts in a condition. Even Dr. Hopson, in his sermon, had to except the heathen as *not being responsible*, by virtue of *not hearing*, and Mr. Wilkes took the position that "where there was no law there was no responsibility," and, consequently, "no transgression." Now, can he prove that the heathen who have not heard the gospel are lost? I do not believe he will argue it. If he does, he can not demonstrate it, and, until he can make that out, the foundation on which he rests his objection utterly fails. He can not show that we would be lost were we left without the Bible and the ministry—in heathenism. Hence he can not show that *any body's* salvation is suspended on such parties. We do not hold it. But in this country, where we have the gospel, we *will* be damned unless we comply with

God's law of pardon. In this land of Bibles he makes our salvation depend upon the will of second, third, and even tenth parties, in a land where we are responsible. Mr. Campbell reports that at Bowling Green, or somewhere in that country, persons came seeking for baptism, but the weather was so intensely cold, even in that latitude, that it was *deferred* several days. There the will of man arrested the will of God. Cold weather, hot deserts, invading armies, imprisonment, the request of physicians, all arrest God's plan of salvation. All these parties can arrest God's moral government. Is not the sick man, who is unable to be immersed, as much in need of salvation as any other? My brother wishes it distinctly understood that he will save him. Save him without the blood of Christ? No, never. He says that "to all those who understaud, baptism is for the remission of sins." Then to the sick person it is for the remission of sins, but how is he to get him into the water? He must reach the merit of the blood of Christ to be saved, we all teach, and this we find *only in the water*, they tell us. How can he be saved, then?

The phrase, "born of God" and "born of the Spirit," occurs fourteen times in the New Testament, and is never named in connection with baptism. The term, "born of God," occurs in the gospel of John i: 13, where it applies to all the ancients who were saved, when, as our opponents admit, there was no formal baptism as we now have it, nor connected, necessarily, with remission—many of them never lived in a day of ablutions or baptisms. Yet they were *ἐκ θεοῦ γεννηθήσαν*—born of God. The *ἐκ* adds force, implying the essential connection with God—the source of the birth—we as "begotten." Born does not express the Greek any where. The idea is, God is the source whence our spiritual childhood or sonship originates. This, too, thoroughly refutes the idea that it is connected with or dependent on water. John intends those seventeen verses to be the keynote—summary of all he records of Christ. This is his doctrine; and i: 13 is developed in iii: 5–17. Now, John uses these phrases *repeatedly*, yet never names water. 1 John ii: 29; iii: 9; iv: 7; v: 1, 4, 18. 1 Peter i: 23, 24, *once*—"born of him" (*ἐξ αὐτοῦ γεγέννηται*); "born of God" (*ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται*. Πᾶς ὄντων γεγέννημένος ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ (twice in verse nine); iv: 7; *ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται*—v. 1, twice—and its source and agency declared (*πᾶς ὀπιστέων ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ χριστὸς ἐκ τοῦ θεοῦ γεγέννηται*)—whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God; and whosoever loveth him (*τὸν γενησαντα*) that begat, loveth also him that is begotten of him (*γεγέννημενον ἐξ αὐτου*). The next verse calls us (*τεκνα*)

children in view of this. V. 4 connects it again with faith. Whoever, or "every one ($\pi\alpha\upsilon\ \tau\theta$) that is born of God overcometh the world, and faith is the victory that overcometh," etc. V. 18, it occurs twice—"horn of God." In John's writings it occurs *eleven* times, and water is never hinted—baptism never named.

All this Christ expressed in being "*born from ABOVE.*"

To show the very subordinate nature of baptism, while Christ, in the most solemn manner, attends the Paschal supper, and himself administers it before his death, yet he *never did BAPTIZE any body* (John iv: 2). Nor did the apostles generally, but commanded them to be baptized, as already noticed. The apostles themselves, so far as we know, were never baptized. We have no account of it in any work. Certain it is, they never received "*Christian baptism;*" for, as "*Jesus himself did not baptize,*" no one else could bestow it. Undoubtedly, such an event as their baptism would have been named. But they had been Jews, and circumcised, etc., and Christ never had them baptized. Strange would it be that the *cardinal* feature of the plan, the indispensable means, should be so treated! But never is faith, "*without which no one can please God,*" thus ignored. Now, then, let us sum up, comprehensively, what was the teaching of the apostles and Christ generally, especially the great luminaries of the New Testament; not in individual and isolated cases, where the state of religious feeling and experience modifies and gauges the instruction, and renders it useless to lay down *all* the doctrines of salvation, but where *all is given* comprehensively. And we are going to leave out the epistles where Paul so elaborately sustains what we shall prove.

John the Baptist says, in full terms and generally, "*He that believeth on the Son HATH everlasting life.*"—John iii: 36. This is unlimited.

John the apostle: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, *is born of God.* This is the victory that *overcometh* the world, even our faith. He that *overcometh* will I give to eat of the tree of life," etc.

Peter: "Put no difference between *us* and *them*, *purifying* their hearts by *faith.*"

Christ: John xi: 25, 26: Christ said to Martha, "He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and *whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.*"

Christ: "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up: that whosoever believeth in him

should not perish, but have eternal life. For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. . . . He that believeth on him *is not condemned.*" (John iii: 14-18.) "Then said they unto him, *What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?* Jesus answered and said unto them, *This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.*" (John vi: 28, 29.) John vi: 40, "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one that seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." "The Spirit, that they who believe shall receive." (John vii: 39.) John vi: 47, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

"He that heareth my word, and *believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from death unto life.*" How clear, general, *universal*, and forcible! Millions believe, are sincere, in deep earnest, and *have* believed, and never were baptized, and more still by millions, who were never *immersed.* Jesus says constantly, in the simplest form, unambiguously, intelligibly, beautifully—"they *shall not* come into condemnation!" "They are passed from death unto life!" Jesus connects the healing of all—the saving of all—with their faith, *never* with their baptism—*never!* "He that believeth," says John, "*hath the witness in himself.*" (1 John v: 10.) It is a self evident principle.

Paul. Here we come to the great apostle, the prince of the apostolic army. He was called and *commissioned* to preach the gospel—"a debtor to the Jew and the Greek, to the wise and unwise" (Rom. i: 14-16); sent to *build* and *found* churches; was "a wise *master-builder*" (1 Cor. iii: 1-13); "a chosen vessel," "apostle to the Gentiles," "who labored above them all," and to whom this expressive and powerful language was addressed from the lips of Jehovah himself: "Unto whom *I send thee*, to open their eyes, to turn them from darkness to light, from the power of Satan unto God; that they may *receive forgiveness of sins*, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith which is in me." And how does he acquit himself? He testifies himself, as well as all others, with his work. "I kept **NOTHING** from you that would be *profitable* unto you, and taught you publicly, and from house to house; wherefore I take you to record this day, that *I am clear from* the blood of ALL men. For I have not *shunned* to declare unto you **ALL THE COUNSEL** of God, testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, *repentance* toward God, and *faith* toward our Lord Jesus Christ."—Acts xx: 17-27.

This was his theme, his whole theme, and filled with the power of its truth he exclaims: "I determined to know nothing among you save Jesus Christ and *him* crucified!" "God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." But he does not stop here. He emphatically excludes baptism from the very pale of essential gospel idea, and subordinates it forever. "*I was not sent to baptize, but to PREACH THE GOSPEL!*" "Besides Crispus, Gaius, and the household of Stephanas, I know not whether I baptized any other. For I was not sent to baptize, but to preach the gospel." (1 Cor. i: 17.) He pays so little attention to it, that it does not even occur to his mind that he ever did baptize over two or three times in his life. Many modern preachers might exactly reverse the apostle's language, and say: "Besides to Crispus, Gaius, and the household of Stephanas, I know not that I ever preached the gospel. For I was not sent to preach the gospel, but to *immerse!*" A vast difference, to be sure.

To all these I add all the ancient teachers who prophesied of the coming Messiah. I shall not wade through their writings; I have quoted them abundantly already, especially in the "Discourses on the Two Dispensations," which see. One text will suffice for all. Acts x: 42, "*To him give ALL the prophets witness, that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life.*" That will do. It is enough. It is overwhelming. And would it be a religion worthy of God were it otherwise? A religion based on a mere rite performed once, that is in no way impressive, instructive, or benefiting in itself, but only as it may illustrate and enforce other truths that *are* so—that has no connection with the seat and origin of thought, disposition, purpose, or passion, but only symbolic, is of all things most absurd.

In its place, with its true design, baptism is significant and worthy. As long as it is used and not abused, it is pleasing and right. But certainly it has nothing in it to implant a germ of affection, of life, of grace, and principle, in the heart. It is not based upon a principle. But how different is *faith!* God is independent, all-powerful, and rich in glory. He needs not my gifts. But the confidence of his creatures is acceptable above all else. Religion is based on the principle of seeking to become *like* God, pure and holy, kind and affectionate. Besides, what else would be adapted to the fallen and helpless sons of ruin? Faith is always possible to a responsible, penitent being. It is the very thing, therefore, from this point of view, as well as others argued.

My friends, whether in polar snows, Alpine rocks, in desert sands,

“he that believeth hath everlasting life.” Thy salvation hangs on no ceremony, depends on no man’s will. “The water of life is taken *freely*.” God would not make my salvation to depend on such conditions and men’s wills. I might be penitent as Paul, as sincere as Cornelius, as bumble as the jailer, as contrite as David, and “believe with all my heart,” yet no minister be in reach, no, not even a layman, nor even a mortal being; or my physician, or father, or mother, or husband, might forbid such a thing. My disease or situation might not admit of the ceremony. Am I to perish? No! no! My Bible tells me, “An humble and contrite heart, O God, *thou wilt not despise*.” Thou sayest: “Look unto me, all ye ends of the earth; believe, and be ye saved!” “Come unto me, all ye that labor, and are heavy laden; and I will give you rest!” “Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters. . . Buy wine and milk without money and without price!” Yes, I might be wrecked at sea, lost in a desert, sent into exile, shut up in a tower, locked in a dungeon, all of which things often happen to the children of men. There I might repent, read God’s Word, or call up the vivid impressions of youth, the lessons that fell from a mother’s lips, seek after God, all which such circumstances tend to inspire, and believe with all my heart, and pray as earnestly as Jacob, but I must wrestle on. No salvation unless in immersion. Are such to be lost? Was Luther lost? Did he blow the gospel trumpet till the earth shook beneath the tread of its summoned hosts, and then sink to eternal perdition? Did Wickliffe breast the monster and rouse the lethargy of the dark ages, only to go down to eternal burnings? Did Wesley traverse sea and land, face the mob, and endure reproach and persecution, to no purpose? Was the saintly Fletcher lost? He whose mind was more like an angel’s than a man’s—was *he* lost? Was the pious Doddridge, the eloquent Chalmers, the peaceful Melancthon, the firm Calvin, the learned and conscientious Clarke? Was Abraham, who “believed in the Lord,” and “sought a city which had foundations, whose maker and builder is God?” Was Elijah, was Enoch, was Moses, all three of whom were with Christ on Taber thousands of years after the exit of the one, and over a thousand after the departure of the other two from earth? No, sayeth the Spirit; they rest from their labors, and their works do follow them. Let me die the death of these righteous, and let my last days be like theirs. Give me a religion founded on principle and eternal truth, that tends to draw out the nobler feelings, and that inspires the soul with sublimer emotions than cold forms and

lifeless rites can do. Let there be divinity about it—a heart, a soul, a power. A religion of dogmas tends to irritate and divide, to bigotry and persecution. Give me one that cements all together with the strong chords of sympathy and love, whose unity is the Spirit, and whose bond is affection.

We have John the Baptist, all the apostles, and the blessed Savior, with all the prophets from the prophetic age down, declaring that whosoever believeth shall “not come into condemnation, but has passed from death unto life,” “hath life everlasting.” This exactly meets the wants of mankind, for, wherever a person may be, if he is held responsible by God, he can then repent, though he may not be able to go in search of water.

But, according to my brother's argument, all of them must necessarily be damned, though penitent as Cornelius, and earnest as Saul of Tarsus. I repeat my former question: *Can any man go down to hell who trusts in the Lord Jesus Christ for salvation and truly repents of his sins?* Here we bring them to the square issue. Are all the people in the Presbyterian, Methodist, and other churches, who do not believe with my brother upon this point, lost for want of immersion? Suppose that nine-tenths of them are baptized by affusion, are they, according to his theory, baptized? They are not, and, according to his position, they will be damned. You are penitent believers, your hearts are changed, you are “begotten of God,” because Mr. Lard says so in his sermon from the “Living Pulpit” and in his Quarterly,—you are begotten of God, you are believers in the Lord Jesus Christ, you are changed in heart and in character, your conscience is pure, but you have not Christ within you because you are not immersed, and you must go down to hell, for you are responsible. If you are not immersed you will be damned, and all these Episcopalians, Methodists, and Presbyterians must, then, go to hell. They go down to hell with hearts changed, character changed, conscience cleansed from defilement, “begotten of God,” “possessed of the soul-renewing, soul-sanctifying, soul-regenerating, and soul-justifying principle of religion.” Mr. Campbell says: “The baptism of John the Baptist put nobody into Jesus Christ.” Mr. Campbell also says that out of Christ there is no salvation. I quote him from his maturest works. Then, “out of Christ there is no salvation.” John the Baptist baptized nobody into Christ. The twelve apostles were never baptized with “Christian baptism,” as they call it, and, therefore, the twelve apostles are now in the depths of hell. My brother does not

believe it. He will not accept the conclusion to which his doctrine drives him. You see the importance of this point that I have so often called attention to, that a sincere penitent, believing in Christ, according to their system, can be lost in hell. If they can not be lost in hell his whole system is gone. And we see also that the very texts he quotes to support his position contradict him.

To give force to Mark i: 4, he has to construct a law of the genitive which refutes him on every other text. We are washed—baptized—*after* regeneration. If his law of the genitive is correct, we are washed in consequence of the regeneration, and so that text in 1 Peter iii: 21 turns against him. It says, by his rule, we are regenerated before we receive baptism, that it is the answer of a good conscience. The conscience is in the genitive case, therefore it had been made good with the removal of our sins in believing. My friend would baptize a man to give him a good conscience. Either his doctrine or his law of the genitive must go down. His whole system is so wrong that he gets confused on the most simple laws that little school-boys ought to understand. Is it safe to risk your salvation upon such constructions of law?

The various phrases of Scripture expressing our condition and relationship after this work has been wrought, show its origin, nature, and effects in us: "Except ye be *born* again." "Except ye be *converted, reproduced,*" etc. "If any man be in Christ Jesus, he is a new creature." "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision, but a *new creature*"—*καὴν κτίσις* (*kainē ktisis*). Hence, it is "*Christ in you, the hope of glory.*"—Col. i: 27. By such a generating power we necessarily partake of the character of the *Father* who begat, and hence we partake of the *nature and image* of our *Father*. "*We are partakers of the divine nature.*" "*We are changed* into the same image of him who created us"—"*transformed by the renewing* of our minds"—"*renewed* in the *INNER man*" (heart)—"*created anew* in Christ Jesus"—"*renewed* in knowledge after the image of him who created us." (a) And being "*born of GOD,*" we are called "*children* (*τὲκνα θεοῦ*) of God," "*sons* (*υἱοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ*) of God"—"*begotten of God,*" etc. Could language be more explicit and full, in determining the nature of our change? And "*because ye are sons, God hath sent forth his Spirit into your hearts, crying Abba, Father,*" thereby arousing the consciousness of sonship in the heart, whereupon we pray, "*Our Father, who art in heaven!*" The results of this relation are expressed in John xv: 1-6, where we

are in essential *relationship* with God, "*in him,*" and drawing *from him* all our support and spiritual life.

But these expressions never have any connection with baptism. Now, if baptism is for the remission of sins, is it not strange that we find thirteen or fourteen such cases where water is not named, while he has only introduced five or six passages *in all* to prove his points, irrelevant as they are? Thus we find new creation "*new creatures,*" "*made new in Christ Jesus,*" etc., but nowhere do they have any connection with baptism. Again, we find that the Old Testament writers were habituated to the use of the terms wash, washing with water, washing the body, washing of things generally, but never for the remission of sins. But when any of my brother's church finds in the New Testament such language as that, though used just as in the Old Testament, they at once think it means baptism for the remission of sins, though they can find ten times as much, and language ten times stronger, in the Old Testament, where they do not give it such an interpretation. They dare not say circumcision was for the remission of sins, though it occurs in ten times as strong form in connection with remission.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKES' TENTH ARGUMENT.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

A friend of my opponent, during his last speech, handed me "Andrews and Stoddard's Latin Grammar," in order that I might see the rule for the accusative before the infinitive. I will read what he pointed out to me on page 288 of that work, sec. 272 :

"The infinitive with a subject accusative follows verbs of *saying, thinking, knowing, perceiving,* and the like."

I knew that rule before. I will abide by that rule. On page 289, under Remark 4, we have this rule :

"A present infinitive corresponds to the imperfect indicative, when with an accusative it follows a preterite tense; as, '*Dixit Cæsarem venire,*' *He said that Cæsar was coming.*—*Cæs.* In like manner the perfect infinitive with an accusative, after a preterite tense, corresponds to the pluperfect indicative; as '*Dixit Cæsarem venisse.*' *He said that Cæsar had come.*—*Cic.*"

You will observe here that *venire* is the present infinitive; you will observe also, that it follows a preterite tense; it is necessary, therefore, to translate *venire* not *is coming*, but *was coming*; that is, as a past tense.

Our case in Stockius is just that. We have *agere* and *habere* following a past tense, and the rule is that they shall be translated as past tenses. It is stated that, in baptism, "There *was* [past time] a remembering, a professing, and a testifying, that there *was* need of repentance, and that those who *received* that baptism, *exercised* [past tense] and *possessed* such a penitence as John demanded."

The Latin construction demands that repentance should have occurred before baptism; and that the exercising of repentance—the having or possessing repentance, was before the professing, testifying, and remembering of it. You can not testify to that which never existed. You can not remember that which has not taken place. The rule demands that the infinitive, preceded by a past tense, designate

an act or state that precedes it, and on which it depends in construction. If my friend denies this, I demand that he shall designate a scholar, and I will also; and we will submit the question to them to decide what the correct translation of that passage is.

In regard to Mr. Wesley's tract from which I read, my friend says that it is the custom of the Methodist Conference sometimes to select men to publish their books that can not even parse an English sentence. If that is the best apology he can make for that book, I am willing to leave it in his hands, and in the hands of such of his brethren as can not parse an English sentence.

He says I argued that the blood of Christ saves us, and that baptism also saves. I suppose the Apostle Peter made no mistake, when he says, "Baptism also now saves us." But I will present other difficulties for my friend's consideration in the same connection. Paul says, "We are saved by hope;" and there are other expressions of like import in the Bible, viz.: God saves us, Christ saves us, the blood of Christ saves us, hope saves us, baptism saves us, etc. Now, does he mean to say, because the *blood of Christ* saves us, that the other statements are not true? If he does not, he must admit that it may be true that the blood of Christ saves us, and that baptism also saves us, as Peter declares.

"But," says my friend, on 1 Peter iii: 21, "the Apostle Peter reasons from the typical character of the salvation of Noah and his family from *destruction by the flood*. Nothing is said about a salvation from *sin*. Noah's salvation was not a salvation from sin; and, as a type and its antitype must correspond *exactly*, therefore the Apostle Peter does not speak of a salvation from sin."

Does he mean to say that a type and its antitype must correspond in *every* particular? I submit to him that the lamb from the flock, under the Old Testament dispensation, was a type of Christ. Does he mean to say that Christ, the antitype, must correspond in *every* particular to the lamb?

Again: Isaac, I believe, by the consent of all, when he was offered on the altar on Mount Moriah, was a type of Christ. Does he mean to say that Christ, the antitype, must correspond in every particular with Isaac? I should think hardly that; yet *that* is the force of his argument, if it have any force, and if it be an argument. Again: Christ was led as a sheep to the slaughter. Not only a lamb, but a sheep, is employed as a type of Christ. But does he hold that the antitype, Christ, must correspond with a sheep in every particular?

He knows better than that. The fact is, if the type and its antitype correspond in every particular, then we should, and could, have no type, but should have the thing itself. This my friend ought to know. In figures, types, parables, similes, metaphors, and tropes, there is always a difference between the things compared, else they could not be compared; they would be the same thing.

My friend says that in "our church" we sometimes baptize a man when he is nearly dead, who may be very anxious about it; and, he adds, we "baptize him in a t-r-o-u-g-h." I wish I could make the gestures that accompanied his pronounciation of that word, but I can not, and if I could, they could not go on record. He meant to emphasize, by his gesture, that we "baptize the sick in a t-r-o-u-g-h." I would like to ask him how long ago it was since, in Millersburg, Kentucky, a man, who was about to die, and who afterward did die, was not only baptized, but *immersed*, and in a t-r-o-u-g-h, at that?

It was not very long since. Therefore, if *my* brethren are to be blamed because they sometimes baptize a man in the house, just before he dies, his Millersburg brother, who did precisely the same thing, is to be censured also. I have the story on good authority. He said, with evident signs of gladness, that he has "never immersed any body in his life." He is, in this respect, very unlike the Apostle Paul. He said, also, that "no apostle ever baptized any body:" I believe, however, he bethought himself in time to take it back. He had gathered so much momentum that in striking for Babylon he ran quite beyond Jerusalem. I think he said, *afterward*, that Paul did baptize a *few persons*; at least the Bible says so, and he *ought* to believe it.

He read Acts x: 43, "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." There, said he, we have faith for the remission of sins, taught by *all the prophets*, and, of course, by all the apostles. My friend, I suppose, believes what he says—it would be unparliamentary to say he does not—but that is not what the text means. The text declares that, *through his name*, "Whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." It means that whoever believes on him shall receive, *through his name*, remission of sins. It means that, and nothing more. *How* the believer on him "shall receive remission of sins," *through his name*, is not here stated. If you want to know, turn to the commission which is given in his name, and you

will learn that the man who complies with it—*complies* “in his name”—shall, in complying, receive remission of sins.

Again: My friend asks, Will a sincere, penitent believer, one who has the regenerating principle, and is penitent for his sins, if not baptized, be lost? I answer, a sincere, penitent believer, that has an opportunity to be baptized, and will not be (if that could be), will be damned. A sincere, penitent believer, who *can not* be baptized, will not, in my opinion, be damned, though he is not baptized; and here I include Mr. Ditzler himself, and all like him. My friend says that I construct a law of the genitive of my own. Now, I gave no construction of my own. The law which I read, and upon which I rely, is given us by the great Winer, and Jelf, and Buttman, and Stuart, and other great grammarians, who all hold the same views that I do. I construct no new law, but read the law out of the best authorities of Europe or America. *It is no new law*; it is a law of the language.

But, says my friend, it is stated many times in the Bible, that Christians are new creatures, where nothing is said about baptism. I admit that. The Apostle Paul says, in 2 Corinthians v: 17, “If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature,” and baptism is not named in that passage. But, the question arises, who is in Christ? My friend does not answer; but the Bible says something about those who, being “baptized into Jesus Christ, have put on Christ.”—Gal. iii: 27. Nothing about Christian baptism; nor is there any thing *here* said about faith or repentance. The new creature is the one that is baptized into Christ. It is a baptized man that the Bible talks about when it speaks of a new creature, or creation.

It is coming near the time, in our debate, when my friend will give you such an exhibition of exhortatory powers as you have never had. When he stood on this platform on Saturday last, I doubt not but that you all thought you were listening to a fine exhortation. I told him, beforehand, to be careful about that exhortation. I knew he would make it. You thought it was a good one, but you have had only a “drop in the bucket,” compared with what he intends to do in that way. He will tell you of the *millions* and MILLIONS and MILLIONS that will go to hell, if my doctrine be true! No, indeed, you have heard but little as yet! At a previous time, when he and I had a pleasant discussion of these matters in public, my friend gathered momentum as he came to the millions and millions and millions, so that he got, after awhile, into the *billions* and BILL-

IONS and BILLIONS, whereas there are, as you know, only about one and a quarter billions of human beings in the world. But he would bring in his billions and billions and billions, and all for what? Simply this: to induce the Presbyterians, the Methodists, and, perhaps, the Episcopalians, to sympathize with him, and to curry favor with the public generally. I do not need to do this. I do not wish honors so doubtful. My cause does not demand such strategy. Suppose my friend's doctrine be not true, and many others be found in error? better that, than that God and his Word be made false. If he and they desire to avoid the consequences, let them go and be "buried with Christ in baptism," as the Apostle Paul teaches they should be; then they will have divine ground to rest upon. My friend is very fond of the battle-field, with its hundreds and thousands of dying soldiers. In his imagination, the number soon grows to millions, and from this to *billions* and BILLIONS and BILLIONS!!!

Mr. Ditzler says that the Apostle Paul thanked God that he did not baptize any body. But Paul hardly said that. Paul said, "I thank God I baptized none of you." He said he did baptize "Crispus and Gaius," and the "household of Stephanas; besides, I know not whether I baptized any other." He gives plainly the reason why;—not why he did not baptize any body,—but, why he was glad that he did not baptize any *more of them*, "lest any should say that I baptized in mine own name." There was controversy in the church at Corinth; there was strife and alienation; some said, I am for Paul; others, I am for Cephas; others, I am for Apollos; others, I am for Christ. Paul says, "Is Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you? or were you baptized in the name of Paul?" Then Paul says, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, . . . lest any should say I baptized in my own name." In view of their controversies, and the spirit of division that was there, he was glad that he had baptized none of them, save those named.

I raise the question, is it true that Paul was not sent to baptize? I answer, it is not true, in an unqualified sense. It is true only in a qualified sense. He was not sent only to baptize, nor chiefly; but I argue that he was sent to baptize, from the fact that *he did baptize*; for he would not have baptized unless he had been sent to baptize, and, consequently, as he did baptize, he was *sent* to baptize. I conclude, in the second place, that Paul was sent to baptize, from the fact that he acted under the same commission as did the other apostles. The commission said, "Go, teach the nations, baptiz-

ing them." Paul acted under that commission, and was authorized by it to baptize. If he acted under *another* commission, we have two commissions; we have two sets of apostles, and the ground laid broad and deep for divisions in the body of Christ, against which the Savior preached, and the apostles taught.

There were not two commissions, but they all acted under the same commission, which authorized them to baptize; and Paul, at least, did baptize, and, therefore, I argue he was sent to baptize. The question recurs, what is the meaning of the language, or what is the rule for its interpretation? I answer, when two things are compared, and one of them is preferred before the other, the preferred one is affirmed and the other is denied. It is an idiom of the language differing from our idioms. I will give you an example. Paul says: "I was not sent to baptize." The Apostle John says: "Love not in word nor in tongue, but in deed and in truth." What does that mean? Are we not to love in tongue, not to use our tongues in love, not to speak words of love to our brothers, friends, and neighbors? The language can not mean that, but it compares this thing of loving in word and in tongue, with loving in *deed*; and loving in *deed* being much more important than loving in *words*, the one is *affirmed* and the other is *denied*. The same is true in reference to other passages. Paul says to Timothy: "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and for thine often infirmities." Did Paul mean that Timothy was never again to drink water? Of course not. Yet that is what he says. He means, simply, and virtually says to Timothy: "In your circumstances, in your particular condition, a *little* wine is more beneficial than water." The importance of drinking these two fluids is thus compared, and the more important one is affirmed and the other is denied. So in 1 Peter iii: 3, it is said: "Let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair and of wearing of gold or of putting on of apparel." Here the inward adorning is compared with the outward, and the inward adorning is regarded by the apostle as so much more important than the outward, that it is affirmed and the outward adorning is denied. Once more on the same point, and I think the principle will be understood: "He that hates not his father and mother, and wife and children, and even life itself, can not be my disciple." The importance of being the Savior's disciple is here compared with the importance of observing the wishes and desires of father, or mother, or wife, or child, and the care we have for even life itself, and as it is more important to be the

Savior's disciple than to have the regard of father, mother, wife, child, or even to have life itself, it is said, if a man *hate not his father*, etc., "he can not be my disciple." Now, I hope we understand the apostle's language, that he "was not sent to baptize." The importance of baptism and preaching the gospel are not the things here compared. The importance of *Paul's* preaching the gospel is compared with the importance of *his* baptizing *them*, or, in this comparison, it is taught that it is more important that he should preach the gospel than that he should baptize them; hence he said, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel."

I said, in a previous speech, substantially, that no one ever *got religion*, or was converted, or became a Christian, so far as the Bible states, before he was baptized; nor did any one ever "rejoice" in the assurance of sins forgiven before his baptism—I mean after Pentecost. I call your attention to the fact that we have accounts of a great many conversions in the Scriptures, accounts of very large meetings, and of very many persons being added to the church, but not in a single case, that I can remember, have we the record of any one's rejoicing in the belief of his sins being forgiven till he was baptized.

Again: all the washings under the old dispensation were typical in form and purpose. They were immersions and for ceremonial cleansing; and the washing, or immersion, under the Christian dispensation, is for that of which the former were typical, namely, the forgiveness of sins. The fathers, the historians, the church, eastern and western, heterodox as well as orthodox, for fifteen hundred years after the apostles' day, believed in "baptism for remission of sins." Find any party of any note, or find any man of advanced opinion, if you can, for fifteen hundred years, who believed otherwise than that "baptism is for the remission of sins." In the Reformation of the sixteenth century all the leading minds, as Luther, Calvin, and Melancthon, believed in baptism for the remission of sins. The Church of England yet believes it. I fear my opponent's faith is fast oozing through his fingers' ends, for Wesley himself taught almost the same thing, and, as I explain it, he taught the same thing.

MR. DITZLER'S TENTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

The brother begins to take a great deal of pains to tell the people what I am likely to do, and is quite good at anticipating my arguments. I admit that. He labored in one of his speeches to impress it upon your mind that the tract put in from Edwards was the one that Jackson meant that *Wesley* did not write. To tell us that Wesley did not write a tract that was written thirty or forty years after Wesley wrote his Tracts, and written twenty-four years after the so-called tract had been in print, would be news indeed. The tract he speaks of was written by Edwards in 1795, *twenty-four years after Wesley's* works were published. Edwards' tract was bound up in 1832, he says. Now, the facts are these: 1. Wesley never put any tract in the Discipline; it was the American bishops. 2. Dr. Thomas Jackson, the great English historian of Methodism and editor of Wesley's works, 1831, reviewed all his works, and expressly says Wesley never wrote the tract under dispute. 3. Wesley's works were published 1771-1774, and of these works Jackson says the tract was not written by Wesley, whereas Mr. Wilkes pretends that Jackson refers to a tract written in 1795!

Jackson says of the edition of Wesley, "This edition contains a large number of tracts which were not written by Mr. Wesley." Then, "Preface to London Edition of Wesley's Works," 1831, p. 13, Dr. Jackson says:

"Respecting this edition, it may be observed that the printer overlooked Mr. Wesley's table of *errata*, that the original arrangement of the Sermons was altered, those which were intended by the author to constitute the standard doctrines of Methodism being mixed up with others, apparently for the sake of variety; that two papers, one on baptism (vol. xiii, p. 412), and another on the immortality of the soul (vol. xv, p. 343), were not written by Mr. Wesley."

Thus, you see, Wesley never wrote one word of that tract. Num-
(374)

bers of others not written by him are in his works, and noted as such by the English editor. *Wesley marked it as not his.*

Now, the General Conference in the United States issued their Discipline, and *bound up Edwards* tract on baptism with it, and other tracts. The General Conference of 1812 ordered these tracts to be published in a *separate volume*, long after Wesley was dead. In it they inserted this *so-called Wesley's* tract on baptism, instead of the extract from Edwards. I must say that it was a strange proceeding, but Wesley is not responsible for the folly of such men. And now, though Wesley never wrote that foolish tract, yet they have proclaimed it over all the land as Wesley's, and as proof that he taught baptismal regeneration.

As to Winer's work that we have had up so long in this debate, I have compared the gentleman's edition from which he would not read, and as he has fought so desperately over it, I have borrowed one of his copies of Winer, and will read from the preface, and settle this whole matter :

"A Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament, by Dr. George Benedict Winer, *seventh* edition, enlarged and improved by Dr. Gottlieb Lunemann, 1870." I read now from preface to the *sixth* edition in this, p. 8: "The present edition [the sixth] will show again, on every page, that I have spared no effort to arrive at truth. Deeply, however, do I regret that in the midst of my labors I was overtaken by a nervous affection of the eyes, which has brought me to the verge of total blindness . . . May *this new revision*, THE LAST the world will ever receive from me," etc. So speaks Winer in the *sixth* edition.

"Preface to the *Seventh Edition*," by Lunemann: "Winer's forebodings that the sixth edition would be the *last* revision from his hand has unfortunately been realized. But even while sensible of his approaching death, the indefatigable man took an incessant interest in his grammar, and labored to the very end of his life to perfect it. Without altering the general distribution of matter as it appeared in the *sixth* edition, he constantly improved the book in details by additions of greater or less extent in more than *three and forty* places, erasures and reconstructions, by the multiplication of parallel passages," etc. (1866, Dr. Lunemann.)

In the American editor's preface, he tells us he has given "a faithful reproduction of the original. A faithful translation, he believes, should not only be free from *intentional* addition, omission, or alteration," etc. (11, 12.)

Now, here we have the last work of Winer, with his last touches, and it is exactly the same as mine, and has not the language he has read from a spurious work. It is thus proved that my opinion was correct; it is a false work, interpolated, altered, doubtless by some Baptist translator, to break the force of this criticism.

P. 188 of this great work reads—the original translated by some “engage,” by some “obligate”—the same as mine, word for word: “Baptism of repentance—that is, baptism *engaging* to repentance”—only in mine rendered “which *obligates* to repentance.” I do not know whether it was originally written in Latin or German.

Thus you see the brother has tried to impress you with the idea that Winer gives the word “*sealing*,” when it is a forgery, and was never written by Winer. I do not charge my brother with the forgery, but that book he has is a false translation, and not faithful to the original. *This one he would not read!*

Then the brother takes the position that *decet* does not govern *omnes homines* in the accusative, in the quotation I gave from Sallust. Had I known the man would have made this assertion, I would have brought my Latin grammars with me, but little did I think that any man would make such an assertion. Stoddard’s “Latin Grammar,” p. 203—REM. 7: “*Juvat, delectat, fallit, præterit, and DECET with its compounds take an accusative of the person.*” So Bullion—as I knew they did, but brought no Latin grammars to such a debate as this should be. Of a like nature is *δεῖ μὲ βαπτίζειν ανθρώπους*—it becomes me, I must baptize men; *δεῖ ὑμᾶς γεννηθῆναι ἀνωθεν*—it behooves, becomes you, you must be born from above. John iii: 7, *δεῖ μὲ πίνειν*—I must drink—*πρέπει*—the latter also governs dative—*πάντες ἄνθρωπους μετανοεῖν*, it becomes all men to repent. In all these you see *δεῖ*, or *πρέπει*, like *decet* in Latin, same rule, governs the accusative of the person with the infinitive. I am utterly amazed that a man of his character should question such a well-known rule of the Latin and Greek languages. Pendleton renders it “and so it *was* an admonition,” etc. How could it be so *until undergone*? How could it be “a *witness* and a *profession*” until undergone? Now, you *can not* put it *eos* unless a preceding verb govern it, as it is in the accusative, and no one will question that. The way he and Pendleton render it, the Latin should be “*et ut illi qui baptismum illum recipiebant, talem agerunt et habuerunt pœnitentiam,*” etc. But it is not thus: *et* (*debebat* understood) “it behoved those (*eos*) *who received that baptism—after they received it—to exercise (agere) or aim at (et habere) and practice such repentance*

as John demanded." I deeply regret to have lost so much time on a point so simple.

Now, I am willing to let it go to a committee of Greek and Latin scholars, or I am ready to select a man, and let him select one, to decide the matter. In a number of cases my brother misrepresented me from beginning to end. For instance, he said that I stated that Paul did not baptize at all, whereas, I took particular pains to say he only baptized certain persons, and that beside these there were no cases on record. I then referred to it again, for fear of being misunderstood.

I object to his doctrine, *because it imparts to mortal man the power of administering remission of sins.* They felt themselves that it implies that. Hence, Walter Scott says, "In the beginning they used the term 'I administer to you remission of sins,'" etc. Here is mortal man administering remission of sins. If he can not reach the blood of Christ, through the water, he will be damned; and if I am the only person present to immerse him, I hold his salvation in my hands. I, therefore, hold in my hands a power that a Catholic priest will hardly claim. But how is the dying person to be saved? How is this man to be brought into the blood of Christ? Will he change the economy of God? or will God change his own economy now? This man has been a sinner for forty years. Is he now to be saved by *special favor*, because he has neglected his duty and trampled upon the mercies of God? The man is dying; he can not reach the water of immersion. He is convinced that he must be immersed, and is as responsible as I am. Will God save him because he is about to die, and condemn me because I won't die? I have to die some time, and if God saves this man, why can not he save me when I come to die? But they say I have a chance to be immersed. So had he for forty years. You see what a strange god they construct. I say *construct*, because there is *no such god*. Let us suppose a case of two ladies who are expected to die. Both are alike in character. Both believe, and repent, and are pardoned by exception. Mrs. A. dies and is saved. Mrs. B. gradually recovers. Is she pardoned, or does God suspend the act upon the skill of her physician? Does he hold the decision in abeyance to see if she will recover? Will she be saved or damned? Must she afterward be immersed when her sins have already been remitted? Or is one saved for *dying*, and the other lost for getting well? I say this is the kind of a god their system constructs—a god that changes his laws to suit every whim.

Again: Why accept a death-bed case, or one in prison or on a cross? Has he not had *all* the chances, opportunities, and motives that we and *all* have? Have not your would-be philosophical expounders held that the sinner is damned because he failed to embody his *faith*, even in an *overt act* that *others* might see it? Is it less offensive to slight *all* God's offers? Is he less excusable; nay, to be commended and specially favored for willfully sinning away all opportunities till on a death-bed, cross, desert, etc., while the one who sincerely believes, repents, and believes he has been baptized in Christ's name in infancy, or is sprinkled in baptism, is lost?

Is it less harm to refuse throughout a whole life *all* God's offers—violate all his commands—than to fail to comprehend the exact *mode* or *intent* of one single command?

Again: As heart and character are changed before baptism—we are “begotten of God,” “born from above,” etc.—all persons baptized by sprinkling, pouring, in infancy, etc., *are lost*, or *are not*, for want of immersion or profession of faith. If they are *not lost*, then *no one can be lost*—no one unpardoned for not being baptized. So it is not for remission—is not a condition of salvation. So the whole system is a monstrous and ridiculous failure, since God ignores his own law in *all cases*. If they are *lost*, then millions on multiplied millions are damned who are “begotten of God,” “born of the Spirit,” “changed in heart,” “in character,” “reconciled to God,” “quickened into new life,” “regenerated,” possessed of the “soul-sanctifying, regenerating, justifying principle of religion,” “delight in holiness,” “heart pure,” “conscience purged,” etc.

1. GRAHAM, “Living Pulpit,” p. 214: We “maintain that when the word is received by faith into a good and honest heart, that heart is *quickened into new life*.” That the Spirit of God is *always* with his Word “in regeneration.” “Our spirits are regenerated by this incorruptible seed”—“Word of God.”—Graham, p. 214, 215.

2. Yet A. Campbell and they all teach that the Spirit is *not* received till *after* immersion. How will they reconcile that also?

3. In the above, Graham quotes 1 Peter i: 22, 23: “Ye have *purified* your souls . . . through the Spirit unto unfeigned love of the brethren, see that ye love one another *with a pure heart* fervently: being *born again*, not of corruptible seed, but incorruptible, by the word of God.” All this contradicts all the rest.

4. LARD, 250, 251, “Living Pulpit: “To be begotten (here) and to believe are identical. I conclude that to be ‘born of water’ is sim-

ply to be immersed, and to be begotten of the Spirit (is) to believe in Jesus Christ."

Here, 1. We believe *before* baptism. 2. Born of the Spirit before baptism. That is "the change."—p. 250.

"The Holy Spirit begets the human, or, more strictly, begets a *change* in it. . . . The Holy Spirit . . . merely acts on the human spirit—changing it. . . . Being begotten of the Holy Spirit is the *FIRST PART* of the *whole process* of being born again. It consequently *antecedes the other part*—being born of water."—p. 244.

One man is sick, intended to be baptized on recovering, but never thinks of *mode*, would probably be baptized by affusion, on examining these matters; another sick, believes affusion to be the mode; the third sick—all believe, repent equally—he believes in immersion—would be immersed if he recovered. All die unbaptized. Are all saved? If all saved, then—*is the will to do a thing better and more acceptable than BOTH the WILL AND THE DEED?* But he was remitted—saved, on the will to be *sprinkled*, the other might have been—had no thought on that vital question. Does God suspend action on his thoughtlessness on that point? And does God only take the will for the deed when the will has looked and decided—aye, and *accurately* decided—on all those issues on which it will never live to act?

You believe in degrees of faith—in "Living Pulpit," p. 158, speak of "*half-converted* souls in the church." If the person baptized has not the faith of the heart—partially deceived, etc.—has not the degree you own is necessary, is not, therefore, changed in heart—is he in the church, made so, and regenerated, though baptized! You say *not*. Then baptism does not bring him into the church. So say you. He is not a true believer. Suppose after baptism he gradually becomes a genuine believer, yet knows not the day or week he became so, now how do you get him into the church? How does he become pardoned?

Suppose he was deceived as to being a believer with all his heart—by degrees becomes a confirmed believer, and his heart changed, yet he does not discover the fact of the process, how does *he* get into the church, or obtain pardon?

If I understand my brother to-day, he will save all those penitent Methodists. If so, will it be with the blood of Christ, or without it? and, if without it, upon what ground? But, again: Suppose we have in this city ten thousand sick persons. They are all penitent believers. Mr. Brooks says, in his debate, that repentance and im-

mersion are alike necessary. In his first speech he says: "I affirm that" "baptism is . . . as absolutely essential as faith and repentance." He has already been fully quoted, over and again, saying *only* in baptism can we come into the blood of Christ. Mr. Wilkes says he indorses him. Mr. Campbell says the same thing as Brooks over and again. Mr. Braden takes the same position in the debate already quoted. Now, here we find these gentlemen taking this position, and my friend, indorsing them, declares that immersion is just as necessary as faith; that is, not to the heathen world, nor to infants, but to you, my friends, or, as Dr. Hop-on defines it, to all who have heard the gospel. He says that to all of you immersion is as necessary as faith. Then, says my brother, every one of you will be damned if you are not immersed. What will he do? There is but one remedy, and that is to deny his whole doctrine; for they make immersion as necessary as faith, and the Bible says "without faith it is impossible to please God." Such must be the necessary result if we accept the teaching of my brother. Again: I say this doctrine was borrowed from the Roman Catholic Church, and it was borrowed from the heathen by the Catholics. I could quote from Diogenes, Plutarch, and other like writers, to show you this. I will quote from Tertullian, "*De Baptismo*," vol. 1, p. 236, chapter v. He tells us before that: "All waters, therefore, in virtue of the pristine privilege of their origin, do, after invocation of God, attain the sacramental power of sanctification; for the Spirit immediately supervenes from the heavens, and rests over the waters, sanctifying them from himself, and being thus sanctified, *they imbibe at the same time* the power of sanctifying." He considers them thus "endued with medical virtue." Again: "How mighty is the grace of water!" "For washing is the channel through which they are initiated into some sacred rites—of some notorious Isis or Mithras; the gods themselves likewise they honor by washings. Moreover, by carrying water around, and sprinkling it, they every-where expiate country-seats (villas), houses, temples, and whole cities. Certainly they are baptized (tinguntur) at the Apollinarian and Eleusinian games; and they say that the effect of their doing that is *their regeneration*, and the *remission of the penalties* due to their perjuries. Among the ancients, again, whoever had defiled himself with murder, was wont to go in quest of *purifying water*. . . . We recognize here, also, the zeal of the devil rivaling the things of God, while we find him, too, practicing *baptism* on his subjects." So I could quote Justin Martyr,

Virgil, Ovid, Herodotus, Porphyry, to show you that the Egyptians, Grecians, Romans, Indians, all used water in sacred rites, believing it purged from moral pollution, and remitted sins and all crimes. Their language is: "*Omnis ejusmodi PERTURBATIO animi placatione abluitur*—all disorder of the soul is washed away by purification of this kind." Now, when they saw in the Bible so many allusions to water, baptism, purifying, etc., they conceived it was just the system they had always held, with some other improvements. Hence, the great transfer of their idolatrous ideas of the virtue of mere creatures into the bosom of the church. They came into the Christian Church and brought their notions with them; becoming priests and ministers at the altar of God, they originated this doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, and adopted it as a true interpretation of the New Testament. Hence, we see so many of the fathers of the third and fourth centuries regarding it so, though it was borrowed from the heathens. Likewise the Hindoos carry jugs of water for bathing, believing that if a man but touch that water, or have it sprinkled upon him, he will be cleansed from sin and go straight to heaven. Mr. Thompson, a Baptist missionary, who was among them, says they believe that by immersion in water, or sprinkling themselves in water, they are cleansed from sin. Thus originated baptism for remission of sins.

Now, look carefully at these things, and tell me if any of the texts my brother has quoted sustain his cases. Not one.

And now I come to the washing in Ephesians v: 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 the water [contained] in the Word." This refers to the ancient practice of wives adorning themselves to meet their husbands. When a wife was preparing to meet her betrothed husband, she would wash, sprinkle herself, and put on clean garments, and this allusion of the apostles to the church showed that the church should, like the bride, be presented on the last day without spot or blemish, pure and holy in the Lord. It does not refer to baptism at all, but the inward purity which the church must have when she comes to be presented to the Lord in that great day of eternity. My brother does not believe that any person who is a church member is baptized at all, but he baptizes them to bring them into the church; it is *the church* that is washed here; therefore, that text is wrenched from its proper meaning and sense to support him, when it does not support

him for one moment, but has an entirely different meaning. The other texts are, also, wholly against him, from beginning to end. Therefore, having no texts on his side, he can not find in the Bible any authority for baptizing a man, or immersing him, for the remission of sins. He has reached the question of immersion before we get to it.

He says I exhort. Well, I will not exhort you now, but leave these things to your calm consideration. Is it safe for a man to risk his salvation on a doctrine that finds not one word of support in the Word of Almighty God?

MR. WILKES' ELEVENTH ARGUMENT.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

A few words only in answer to my friend's last speech, and then I will present you with as full a summary as I can of the positions I have taken, and my reasons for holding them.

My friend says I introduced the subject of immersion beforehand. He is very much mistaken, as he had the question of immersion up three or four days ago, when he was trying to excite a little prejudice against my position on the question of baptism. This he knows is true. He said that you Presbyterians have not been immersed, and that, therefore, according to my position, you will be damned. But my friend shall have his satisfaction on immersion before we are through.

He says we borrowed the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins from the heathen, and that he can prove it. He did not say he had proved it, but could, if he had tried. He read a few scraps of history, yesterday, on that subject, but as to their being proof that baptism for the remission of sins came from the heathen, not one word of such proof is in them.

Now, I say to my brother that baptism for the remission of sins came from Jesus Christ and the apostles; we get it from the Bible. If he wishes, I can show him when "baptism for the remission of sins" went to the heathen from the church, and how *sprinkling* was practiced by the heathen, and how that practice came to the church. No! no! baptism for the remission of sins did not come from the heathen; it came from Christ and the apostles; for it is said "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." He says, suppose there are ten thousand sick or wounded men on a battle-field. They can not be baptized. Must they all be lost? He is one of the most benevolent men in the world. He is resolved to go to the battle-field, to the north pole, or to the sick room, every-where but to the Bible for arguments. He asks these questions only to excite sympathy; that is all.

“Suppose there are ten thousand people sick,” said he! I am supposed to say to them, “If you do not believe, and be baptized, you will be damned;” and then, to make it emphatic, he repeats my supposed language, and comes down with some of those gestures of his that are perfectly inimitable, and, therefore, I do not *pretend* to imitate them. He says, “*Unless you are immersed you will all be damned!*” How does he know that that would be my answer? What is the use of forever going the rounds upon this subject? He knows what I will say in reply. Why not say what he believes, and let it go? The question is *plain* enough. But it is better, he thinks, to ring the changes upon it, to *exhort*, and to get up some *partisan feeling*, it may be, on his own side. There is, of course, no *argument* in it. Let me look at this matter a little. Suppose my friend should go into a sick room; and suppose that, for any sufficient reason, the sick one is in a condition that he can not *believe*. Would he say, “If you do not believe, you will be damned?” He knows he would not. But *why* would he not? He would answer, if he is a scholar and a Christian, that “a man would not be damned for not believing, *if he could not believe;*” for, as we before laid down the doctrine, a man is not responsible for not doing that which he *can not* do. I would say the same thing exactly, and that is an end of the controversy, and he might have ended it long since. My friend, in two or three previous discussions, had two sick women before us, and I was in hopes that he was through with the two sick women. He seems to have an immense amount of sickness in his diocese, and especially sick women, and more especially two sick women. Of these two, one gets well every time, and each time one of them dies. One died at Cynthiana, one died at Mt. Sterling, and one died at Lexington, Mo.; I would like to know which died this time? I should expect that both are *certainly* dead *now*.

But here is the gravest objection my friend has yet made to my theory: “It puts the power of remitting sins, he says, *into the hands of mortals.*” Now, that is wonderful, is it not? Suppose the *Bible* says that this is true? Mark you, the keen edge and the sharp point of the objection is, that the power to remit sins is put into the hands of mortals. Let me read to my friend John xx: 22, 23: “And when he had said this, he breathed on *them*, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained.” The Savior is here talking to mortals, and he tells them that if *they* remit or

retain the sins of other mortals they are remitted or retained. The Savior says, in another place, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven." "But," says my friend, "Lord, you are mistaken about that; that is a *great* mistake; you got that heresy from the heathen. The heathen practice ablution for the remission of sins, and you have borrowed it from them. I have the *greatest* objection," says he, "to your theory. It gives *mortals* the power to remit and retain sins."

Again, in regard to the language of 1 Peter iii: 21. The apostle says that he is talking about the filth of the *flesh*. My friend says, Peter was talking about another kind of filth altogether. Peter says he was not only talking about *filth*, but filth of a certain kind, namely, the filth of the *flesh*. *Rupos*, the Greek word for filth, *may* mean sins; sometimes it does stand, metaphorically, for sins. But when the apostle brings in another word to qualify *Rupos*, he shows that he is not talking about sin, but "of the filth of the FLESH." If Peter does not mean *flesh* when he says *flesh*, I wish to know what he does mean? If Mr. D. will not believe Peter when he says "filth of the *flesh*," I can well understand why he will not believe Peter when he says baptism is for the remission of sins, or baptism saves us.

My friend says I am beginning to be a little scared about his forthcoming exhortation. I confess I feel a little that way, for, the fact is, I think you never heard any thing like it. When he comes down, for the fiftieth time, on the *billions* and billions, you will almost suppose that the world is coming to an end. I insist, beforehand, however, that if there should be millions of people lost, that does not prove—if I have studied Hamilton or Whately to any purpose—that baptism is not for the remission of sins. But my friend is *determined* to make his exhortation, and *make it he will*, simply because he has nothing else to say. He will not examine John iii: 5, or Mark i: 4, or Mark xvi: 16, or Acts ii: 38, or Romans vi: 3, 4. He will enter into no criticism of these passages, but relies on his wonderful exhortation. I intended to have had, or, I might have had, my exhorter along with me. I should have brought, as I once told him, a Universalist, and when my friend came to the exhortation part, which he is sure not to omit, my Universalist would have told him: "You send entirely too many to hell! Is it possible that all these *decent* people must go to hell to be fried, burnt, tormented, and forever damned? Do you believe that an infinitely wise and benevolent God could send millions and billions of people to hell?" My Universalist friend would exhort

to such an extent, so wonderfully, that my brother's hair would almost stand upon his head.

I now proceed with a recapitulation of the remarks that I have thought proper to introduce during this discussion. I announced my proposition, and stated and defined its terms. I explained that I meant that baptism is for remission of sins to that man for whom baptism is intended, and that it is not for any body else; also that I make no exceptions to the law of baptism, so far as that law applies to any body. Where it does not apply it is for nothing; it is not at all; where it does apply it is for the remission of sins. The answer my friend makes to that is, that those two sick women might be in such a condition that they could not very well be baptized; that if one of them should die she would be saved, and the other, if she got well, would be *damned*.

I argued from Mark i: 4, that John came preaching *baptism* of repentance for the remission of sins. I stated that John did not preach baptism *by itself*, but he preached baptism qualified by, or growing out of, repentance. That the word for repentance, in the Greek, is in the genitive case, that the thing John preached was baptism, qualified by repentance, for remission of sins. A controversy arose about *eis*. The question was: What does *eis*, in this passage, connect? He said that *eis* connects, in this passage, *μετανοίας* (of repentance) on the one hand, with *ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* (remission of sins) on the other. Now I say, for that opinion there is no reputable Greek authority. I asserted, also, that *eis*, in Acts ii: 38, connects *Μετανοήσατε, καὶ βαπτισθήτω*, limited by the phrases that follow, on the one hand, with *ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* on the other. In support of my opinion on these passages I quoted Jelf, Winer, Stuart, Buttman, Robinson, and Stockius. Then I quoted Matt. iii: 15, where it is said that certain Jews rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of him, that is, of John. There must have been something, then, in baptism. If they had accepted baptism they would have been accepted, but as they rejected baptism they were rejected, and they rejected the whole counsel of God in not being baptized with the baptism of John. I suggested that the mere fact that John refused to baptize the Savior, and the reasons he gave for refusing, intimated that John understood himself to be baptizing for the remission of sins, as he told the people he was doing.

The people were baptized, *confessing their sins*; this must never be forgotten. I called his attention to John iii: 5, where the Savior

says: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." It will be seen that my friend's position keeps a man out of the kingdom of God. I tell him that baptism is essential to entering it, and he has not, *absolutely*, denied it. Dr. Wall says, "born of water" is baptism. Alford, Bengel, Stuart, Barnes, the Methodist Discipline, the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, the Episcopal Prayer Book, Wesley himself, Bloomfield, etc., all say that "born of water" means baptism. As all these distinguished men say, that unless a man is baptized—in allusion to his initiation into the kingdom of God—and as the Savior says "if a man is not baptized, he can not enter the kingdom of God," I conclude that baptism must be for the remission of sins; and I claim this on the ground of *necessary* implication.

I then called your attention to the commission as given by Mark. The Savior commissioned the disciples to go and preach the gospel. But it might be asked, when sinners are brought to believe, what must they do? The Savior says to his ministers, acting for and in behalf of his kingdom, he himself being king, say to condemned sinners, "Whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved." The sinner comes and wants to be saved. What shall he do? The Lord says, "If you would be saved, believe and be baptized." What, I ask, would the sinner understand by this? He would say, "The Lord says, if I would be saved, I must believe, and I must repent and be baptized; now, as I want to be saved, I will believe and repent, and I will be baptized, and then I shall have the Word of God, that lives and abides forever, that I am a saved man. I rest my hopes of salvation here; I rest my case on my Savior."

I next called attention to 1 Cor. x: 2, and to the fact that the baptism into Moses was, as I understand it, typical of our baptism into Christ; and that as baptism into Moses delivered Israel from their enemies, so baptism into Christ delivers the sinner from the enemies and oppressors under whom he is in bondage. The sinner is in bondage to sin, as Israel was in bondage to the Egyptians; and as Israel's baptism took them out of bondage to the Egyptians, so our baptism into Christ takes us out of our bondage to sin, and translates us out of bondage to sin into the kingdom of God's dear Son.

On this subject I have with me Lange, who says, in substance, baptism is for remission of sins; Bengel says the same thing; Hackett says "it is in order to remission of sins;" Barnes says it is for remis-

sion of sins; Schaaf, Bloomfield, Watson, and others equally learned, all teach the same thing.

I then introduced Acts xxii: 16. "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name [*having called upon the name*] of the Lord."

How do the masters understand this? Lange says it is the "medium through which sins are purged away." Wesley says salvation is "not bestowed except through this means." Dr. Hackett says "submit to the rite in order to be forgiven." Dr. Murdock says it is in order to "be cleansed from thy sins." Bloomfield says it is "the method appointed by Christ for remitting sins." But, says my friend, "This is a great mistake, Messrs. Wesley, Clark, Murdock, Barnes, and all you splendid array of worthies, critics, and men of renown, it was gotten from the heathen." They did not understand it so by any means. It came from Christ and his apostles. It is in the great Magna Charta of our Christian privileges. It is in the *new covenant*, or constitution.

In Romans it is said "we are baptized into Christ's death," not strictly and literally, as in a receptacle, but baptized into the *benefits, blessings, or privileges* of Christ's death; into the enjoyment of such blessings as accrue to us from the death of Christ we come by baptism; and what are they? They certainly include the remission of sins. Therefore, I conclude that "baptism is for the remission of sins."

Again, in Galatians, we are said to be "baptized into Christ." Turn also to Ephesians i: 7, where it is said, "In whom [in Christ] we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins;" that is, we have forgiveness in Christ. But how do we get into Christ, and obtain remission of sins? The Apostle Paul says, "We are baptized into Christ." It is thus we come into or put on Christ, and obtain remission of sins.

Again, we are told in Ephesians: "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." (Chap. v: 25, 26.) Dr. Clark says that the washing of water, here, is baptism; so do Macknight, Wesley, Bengel, Stuart, etc. Does my friend believe it? I have the best authority in the world for believing that it means baptism; and if so, then it would read, **He** sanctified and cleansed it by baptism. Hence, baptism is for remission of sins.

Then, again, in Titus iii: 5, "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." The washing of regeneration, in this case, *preceded* the renewing of the Spirit; for we have an account of the Spirit's influence and operation as *after* the washing of regeneration. It is the washing of regeneration *and* the renewing of the Holy Spirit. What is the washing of regeneration? All the authorities I have named, and I may add Dr. Wm. Smith's Bible Dictionary, say that it is baptism. But, notwithstanding these renowned names that stand with me on this doctrine, my friend says it is a doctrine that came from the heathen. *It did not; it could not have come from the heathen.*

In reference to 1 Peter iii: 21, Macknight and Wesley say that it is by baptism that we are saved from sin. Bengel says "baptism now saves *you*;" Murdock says we are "made alive by baptism." Dr. Watson says, which is also Paul's view, that "it is also, obviously, an act of faith in order to remission of sins." Now, all these authorities are with me; Wesley, Murdock, Hackett, Bloomfield, Watson, Schaaf, Bengel, Barnes, Lange, Alford, the Methodist Discipline, etc., all say, substantially, as I say, and as I believe I am right in saying, that baptism is for remission of sins.

My friend will have it that it comes from the heathen. He also charges that we get our doctrine from the Catholic Church. I will say, *once for all*, that I can see the print of the fingers—*not exactly that*—but the *foot-prints and nails* of the *beast* on my friend Mr. Ditzler, *now*, so *directly*, in my opinion, has he drawn many of the errors in his teaching from the "man of sin" and from the "beast." If he pushes and forces these matters on me, I must be permitted to say something in return; if he forces me to say what I believe to be true in regard to his relation to the Catholic Church, I have as brave a heart as he has, and shall be quite as ready to speak my mind as he his.

I now leave this subject with the audience. I rest my case upon the Bible, relying upon the intelligence of the hearers and readers. I shall especially rely upon my case as presented, because it is the *plain* teaching of the Scriptures, and has been the teaching of the church of all past ages, orthodox and heterodox, since the Christian era till *almost* the present time; and now only a few, a mere handful of people, take a different view; at least, so I believe and so I declare.

No one ever "got religion," *by himself, after Pentecost.* No one ever

rejoiced in the assurance of sins forgiven before baptism, since then. The purifications under the Law were typical of "baptism for remission of sins."

The commentators, the church-historians, the "fathers," the church, Eastern and Western, all parties, orthodox and heterodox, for fifteen hundred years, held that baptism is for remission of sins. Drs. Clark, Wesley, Macknight, Murdock, Bloomfield, Watson, Schaaf, Bengel, Barnes, Lange, Alford, the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, Episcopal Prayer Book, Methodist Discipline, South, etc., etc., hold "baptism for remission of sins."

MR. DITZLER'S ELEVENTH REPLY.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Of that long list of names which my good brother has read under so much excitement, not one believes with him. Not one of them holds with him; not one of them believes that baptism is for the remission of sins. He has tried to use Jelf and Winer on the law of the genitive, and I have shown you that he was wrong. Now, here, he takes an author, who gives this very text, Mark i: 4, to show that it *does not* imply forgiveness of sins at all, but that they were simply obligated by their baptism to repent and trust in the Messiah "who was to come." All these authors state this as their meaning of the genitive, and give this and other corresponding passages as illustrations of it. Jelf, Winer, and all of them do this, Winer selecting this very text—Mark i: 4. A man who can do this, can read that list of names as supporting his cause, and can quote from a tract which he called Wesley's, when I showed you that Wesley never wrote one single word of it; and tell you over and over again that these writers say these things.

Mr. Wilkes.—I did not quote from his tract, but from his comments on the twenty-second of Acts.

Mr. Ditzler.—It was from the tract, if I understand you rightly.

Mr. Wilkes.—I will read it, if you say so.

Mr. Ditzler.—Well, bring it on. Let us see if it is on the twenty-second of Acts. [See page 393.]

I now go on with reference to the gentleman's position. He started out with an argument on Mark i: 4, which I showed you, from Stockius, from Dr. Ed. Robinson, from Lange, from Jelf, from Winer, Schleusner, Olshausen, and all the great critics, simply "bound them to repentance;" that there was no remission of sins, but a looking forward to the time when the Messiah should come. I also took up the third of Matthew, first of Mark, third of Luke, from the fifth to the twenty-first verse, and showed you that John told

them, "I baptize you with water (*eis*) unto repentance." All the commentators he quoted show that these men were told to look forward to the coming of the Messiah, and were taught to believe that they would receive, through faith in his blood, remission of sins. To show the moral force of this, I quoted from Luke, showing that the publicans also came to John's baptism, and that he called them a generation of vipers; yet, hoping to induce them to repent, he baptized all of them. He urges that they would not have come to John's baptism, had they not been impelled to do so by a sincere penitence. If they were sincere believers, with hearts and characters changed, as he teaches, how could John denounce them as a generation of vipers? I showed you that these very persons whom he baptized could not have had faith, because they were in doubt. They marveled as they looked, and wondered whether or not *John was the Christ* (Luke iii: 15). I ask the gentleman if he would immerse persons for the remission of sins who were in doubt as to whether or not John the Baptist was the Messiah? These persons, he tells us, were true penitents, true believers, and yet they regarded John the Baptist as the Messiah. *They ranged themselves with the bigoted Pharisees, as opposed to Christ's followers* (Matt. ix: 14). Would my brother baptize them for the remission of sins? This they did after being baptized—were "*John's disciples*." He would not. Yet these are the kind of arguments he would bring forward to sustain so important a proposition. He makes his main fight on that text; and if it is gone he is gone. In truth, the second of Acts is the Gibraltar of their faith. His case falls there as completely as it can fall. I showed that faith in Syriac, Christ's, and Peter's language—same as the Hebrew—God's language always with his people—meant *rely, lean upon, trusting on*; that *ἐν τῷ ἰσχυρῷ* meant trusting in—relying on Jesus Christ for remission; that neither repentance, nor baptism, nor both together, without trusting in Christ for remission, secured it, and he acknowledged it. Then they *are not* for remission. Faith in Christ alone is to secure it. That this alone comported with the true Bible doctrine—trust in Christ "*whom God hath set for a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past.*"—Rom. iii: 25. Thus it is secured to "*all who believe.*" Hence, "*Repent*"—not for remission, but as precedent to believing with a desiring heart; be baptized; publicly acknowledge you have done wrong in crucifying the Innocent One; and now confess him and your wrong (but that brings

no remission); having done these rightful things, do them, "trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Spirit." Hence, we see this stronghold, as they regarded it always, swept away, and it is one of the strongest supports of justification, *only* upon the principle of trust in Christ.

I next took up John iii: 5 as his next strongest hold, as esteemed by themselves, and showed you that, according to all their authors and himself, that was the Jewish baptism; for Christian baptism was not yet instituted. So his church holds unanimously. That could not have been for the remission of sins; for Elder Braden says the law of pardon was different from what it is now, and Mr. Wilkes takes the position that there was no remission of sins until after the crucifixion. Therefore, this occurring before the crucifixion, it belonged to the Jewish economy. My brother does not believe that the Jewish baptism was for the remission of sins; therefore, he can not claim that John iii: 5 teaches that "baptism is for the remission of sins."

[Mr. Wilkes here announced himself ready to read the disputed passage from Wesley, referred to in the opening of Mr. Ditzler's argument, and Mr. Ditzler giving way to him, Mr. Wilkes read from Wesley's "Comments on Acts xxii: 16:" "And now why tarriest thou? arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Wesley says, "Baptism, administered to real penitents, is both a means and a seal of pardon. Nor did God ordinarily in the primitive church bestow this on any, unless through these means."—*Reporter.*]

Mr. Ditzler—Wesley's "Comment" does not sustain him. But that is not what he read before; I knew it was not in Wesley's "Comment." What does Wesley mean? He tells us that without God's Spirit there is no baptism, but water baptism for the remission of sins Wesley did not teach. On the contrary, it was the spiritual baptism which is spoken of in 1 Cor. xii: 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 all been made to drink into one Spirit." No water baptism is mentioned, yet my brother quotes from John to prove that mortal man has power to administer the remission of sins! If that is not a broad Roman Catholic view I do not know what is. Mortal man has power to administer the remission of sins! Nowhere do the Scriptures *read* that way, but he *interprets* them that way. Mortal man forgiving sins! Look at it. How can he or any other man

forgive another's sins unless he can at least read his heart, to say nothing more? It necessarily implies infallibility, for he admits that unless a man is a truly penitent believer, his sins can not be forgiven. I, as a minister, then, have to be infallible, with power to read his heart, and know for myself that he is *indeed* a true, penitent believer, before I can administer remission of sins in baptism. If baptism is for the remission of sins to the truly penitent believer, I must know that he is such a person. Therefore, my brother's doctrine carries the popish dogma of infallibility with it.

The washing referred to in Eph. v: 26, 27, is not baptism, but the purifying power of the grace of God—"that he may *sanctify* and cleanse (*καθαρίδας*) it—τῷ λουτρῷ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐν ῥηματι—with the washing of the water [contained] in the word." It refers to the purified condition of the church when it meets the Lord in the last day. We showed, also, that his people do not believe that *the church* or any church member is baptized at all. Hence, this text is *against* him, and it illustrates the views we advanced of the use made of water as a figure.

"The washing of regeneration," spoken of in Titus iii: 5, can not mean "baptism for the remission of sins," because his own law of the genitive destroys that inference. For here his law would make them washed because they *had been* regenerated; and he believes that a person is regenerated in the act of immersion; that it is not before baptism and can not be. Therefore, from his own statement, that text does not teach that baptism is for the remission of sins.

The same may be said of 1 Peter iii: 21. He believes that *rupos* refers only to any physical stain or dirt that attaches to our flesh, when every Bible scholar knows that this language is constantly used in reference to sin, to inward depravity and corruption. The idea that Peter should seriously tell them that baptism was not designed to wash *dirt* or a *stain* from the hand or flesh would be rich indeed.

I have gone over every text, except perhaps some minor ones, that he quotes to support his theory, and you see that it is not taught in a single one of them. In the first place, I have shown you that his doctrine is untrue from his own stand-points. I have shown you that they teach that faith is the consent of the mind to the truth of the gospel; that they hold that faith changes the heart and repentance changes the character. I have shown you that the great mass of the people throughout this enlightened country do believe in their hearts that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, and therefore they *teach*

that all these people are changed in heart and purified by faith. But do the mass of the people who believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God believe that they themselves are changed in heart?

The next absurdity I showed you was that they teach that we get to the blood of Christ only by water baptism, that our hearts and characters are changed before we get to the blood of Christ, before we meet with God in Christ; therefore, our hearts and characters are changed without God and without Christ. I have shown you, in the next place, that they *dare not damn any one* on the question of baptism, because they will not immerse any one until he is a penitent believer. He does not carry out his doctrine, because it will damn all these people who are purified in heart, changed in character, and the love of God shed abroad in their hearts. Will he damn such souls? He dare not do it; yet his system does, for they make immersion as necessary to salvation as we make faith, and we say they will be damned if they do not believe.

I have further shown you that the word wash is one that the Jews were familiar with for hundreds of years. They used it habitually, in connection with renovation: "Wash me thoroughly from my iniquity;" "Wash your heart from wickedness," etc. These, and kindred expressions, occur constantly in the Old Testament, yet they did not teach baptism for the remission of sins, and my brother will admit that they do not, though they are ten times as strong as any of the quotations he makes from the New Testament. I have shown you that much stronger language occurs in reference to circumcision, Colossians ii: 13, 14, "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses; blotting out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us, which was contrary to us, and took it out of the way, nailing it to the cross." Again we have it in the eleventh verse of the same chapter: "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." Here it is declared that our sins are taken away by circumcisiou. And in the thirteenth and fourteenth verses the words "blotting out" occur. It is said that we are circumcised for the blotting out of sins. This language is ten times as strong as any thing he has introduced to show that water baptism is for the remission of sins; yet he and I do not believe, and the Bible does not teach, that outward circumcision

was for the remission of sins. It is preposterous not to interpret Scripture by Scripture.

I have shown you that my brother's church confounds the term "*obedience*" with baptism; that in their vernacular they use the word "*obey*" for baptism, and apply it to persons who have been baptized. The sacred writers never use it in this way at all. But my brother's church has a vernacular of its own, in which *baptism* means "*obey*," and "*obey*" means baptism, in utter defiance of the Word of God. Again, I showed you that their system made salvation depend upon the will of third parties. Here, in this enlightened country, all the people are certainly responsible. Here, if anywhere, must immersion be necessary for the remission of sins, and yet I showed you that he dare not enforce what his logic drives him to. It makes salvation depend upon the will of second and third parties. He says we teach the same thing. We do not. We say that all persons in this enlightened land are alike responsible to God, in proportion to their talents, etc. We hold that all men are responsible to Almighty God, that it is their duty to repent and be saved through faith in our Lord Jesus Christ. If he has had twenty, thirty, forty, or fifty years to repent in, it is still his duty. The fact that he is sick or dying will not remove this obligation. We say to such, You must repent and believe, or you will be damned. Mr. Campbell says they make immersion as necessary as we make faith. We make faith absolutely necessary in every such case. Mr. Brooks, whom Mr. Wilkes indorses, says immersion is just as necessary as faith. Faith is absolutely necessary; therefore, they teach that all persons who are not immersed are damned, and the worst of it is they damn them as children begotten of God. I read from Elder Hayden, in the "*Living Pulpit*," page 507: "Here a distinction of great importance may be mentioned *between the change of heart and the forgiveness of sins* When the heart is changed the conscience is *purified* from defilement; the heart is *purified* of its love of sin; *it delights in holiness*, and in its RECONCILIATION it cries out, with Saul, 'Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?' The *conscience* is now *pure*. It longs for the pardon of the sins which it now mourns." Graham, "*Living Pulpit*," p. 225, tells us "the Word received into the heart of the *sinner*, dead in trespasses and sins, is the seed, etc., and of it he is begotten, AND OF IT ONLY." Page 227 he says: "We have a *regenerated character*"—i. e., before baptism—"a *regenerated state*" after baptism. Longan says: "Divine clemency seems to be gained when the sinner

believes and repents." Here the man has a pure conscience. Suppose he is not immersed for forty years. He "delights in holiness"—is "reconciled" to God—has a "regenerated character"—is "born from above of the Spirit," says Mr. Campbell. During all these forty years he has a pure heart and character, but he is not immersed, and if he dies he is damned, though a child of God, begotten, born of God. Mr. Campbell says we "are baptized . . . because we are *born from above—born of the Spirit.*" "Faith . . . is the first principle—the *soul-renewing* principle of religion, as it is the justifying, sanctifying principle," says Mr. Campbell. He says: "No one is put under the water . . . for the purpose of *PROCURING* life, but for the purpose of *enjoying* the life of which he is possessed."—"Christian Baptism," p. 266. "*Whatever is essential to regeneration in ANY case, is essential to it in ALL cases.*"—"Christian Baptism," p. 296. So says their greatest light. What is proposed in baptism? Simply to possess him of the "*enjoyment*" of what in reality, power, principle, and fact, he already possessed before baptism. He is no better, no holier, loves God and man no better, has no principle that he did not possess before baptism, yet is *damned* for not "*enjoying*" what he *possessed*! Great God! is *this Christianity*? I do not take the position my brother would have me take with Universalists, but I do protest against the wholesale damning of men on *such* grounds. To send millions on millions—aye, my brother winces here, you must take it—yes, billions on billions through the ages and centuries must thus perish, with hearts pure, characters pure, begotten of God, children of God, born of the Spirit! *That* is the point. He talks as if all these billions were in one age or year. Christianity extends through centuries, and will he contend that from the beginning to the final end of time billions will not have existed?

Mind you, they all teach that *only* in water can sinners come into the merit of Christ's blood. All *must* perish, we all admit, without that merit. Then all unimmersed Methodists, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Episcopalians—all, all *must be damned*; but he admits, we believe—are penitent—are children—disciples—have pure hearts—and yet all damned. If we are not for want of immersion, nobody can be. Either horn of the dilemma is utter ruin to his system. Without the application of Christ's blood is no remission of sins, we all admit. Suppose there were forty thousand wounded soldiers on a battle-field. Suppose they are all penitent believers.

We would say, Look and live; believe on Christ and you shall be saved. With the Master we would say, "*Only believe.*" But my brother's missionaries come upon the field. But the hoarse cry is heard, No water, no salvation. Only in water can we meet with the blood of Christ. Winchester cries out in the person of Brother Brooks: Nowhere but in water can we meet with Christ. Lexington's heavy voice swells the chorus: All the named conditions in any or all cases must be met in each individual case; only in his blood can we be saved; that blood is only found in water. Bethany thunders in mightier tones, and Mr. Campbell grows eloquent and warm on the subject. Look, Mr. Campbell, at these dying souls. They long for salvation. Heart, character, conscience, faith, repentance—all is right there. What does he say? Oh what a chance for salvation, if I *only* had the water. I could save the last one of these sinners if I had but a hogshead of water. A hundred gallons of water would be worth forty thousand souls. Never was water so precious. Only where there is water can we offer salvation. "But where shall we meet him? . . . *No where on earth*"—but in water! "*There ONLY can he be found.*" Death, death, *eternal* death to these souls—to millions and billions of our fallen race for no other want than water in which to be immersed! Thus it is hell is filled with the children of God possessed of pure hearts and pure consciences.

[*Time expired.*]

MR. DITZLER'S FIRST ARGUMENT.

THIRD PROPOSITION.

"THE SPRINKLING OR POURING OF WATER UPON A PROPER SUBJECT, BY A PROPER ADMINISTRATOR, IS CHRISTIAN BAPTISM."

TUESDAY, December 20, 1871.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

The proposition now before us is one in which the most of the people of a portion of Kentucky and Missouri have manifested a deep interest, and one that has excited a great deal of attention throughout the whole country. Therefore we owe it to this community to be exceedingly careful in our investigation. I had expected, before the propositions for the debate were arranged, that my brother would affirm, as his church has usually affirmed, that immersion alone, or only immersion, was Christian baptism; but he refused to affirm that, on the score that it was affirming a *negative*. In my proposition to him I proposed four different forms of the affirmative proper, which were about as follows, as near as I can quote from memory: That if he would affirm that immersion was the *action* of Christian baptism, I would deny; if he would affirm that immersion was necessary to Christian baptism, I would deny; if he would affirm that it was the mode of baptism, I would deny; and one other form. These are, in substance, the propositions I offered. He refused or declined to so affirm. Hence I appear before you affirming a part of our practice, as we baptize by sprinkling, pouring, and immersion.

There are many reasons why my brother and I should be careful in our investigation of this subject. He has been selected by the unani-

mous voice of his church to represent them. We have both been indorsed by our churches, as far as churches can indorse the exponents of their doctrines; and as our debate is to be published, and the book go forth to the world, it may be expected of us to present an exhaustive analysis of the subject from our respective positions. It is more important, because many of the books that have been put forth by various authors are full of errors, and in many cases the authors have not been candid or sincere. Many of our writers have copied from other writers without examining the original text, giving a compilation which was unreliable and full of misrepresentations. Others who have had an opportunity to examine the original works, and should have given true compilations of those writers, have failed to be candid or sincere in copying the original works, and have thus imposed upon the mass of the people who have not had access to them. Therefore my brother must not get angry if I attack his authors and standards. The private character, or the domestic and social character of those authors, we have nothing to do with; but when they assume to become instructors of the public, and these men have figured prominently as authors, criticizing the works of others, they must not complain if they are handled in the same way. I proceed, therefore, in what I consider the philosophic way of unfolding this subject. I shall bring in many things in this discussion not only against authors and standards, but many facts that as yet my eyes have never fallen upon in the books published upon this subject. Indeed, from my stand-point I could afford to give to my opponent all that I have ever seen written upon both sides of this question, and yet sustain my proposition.

I to-day affirm that sprinkling and pouring are proper actions in Christian baptism. The conversion of the heathen philosophers introduced into the Christian Church the idea of merit in water as early as the days of Tertullian. Hence we find three immersions in water alluded to in patristic literature. They conceived the idea that God's Spirit breathed upon the waters, and that imparted a divine efficacy to the water. Therefore, early in the history of the Catholic Church, they adopted the rule of putting persons in the water up to the waist even when they were baptized by affusion, that is, either by sprinkling or pouring, and in many cases they completely submerged persons under water. The fathers, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, seeing this style of language, jumped to the conclusion, as did

Moses Stuart, that the early, *i. e.*, *patristic* church practiced immersion almost altogether.

In Europe as well as in the United States this question of the mode of baptism for many years never seriously agitated the church. Learned men in Europe have paid but little attention to the subject any way. Almost any man in Kentucky may have learned ten times as much on this subject as the most learned man in Europe. The lexicographers and authors, who favor immersion as the apostolic mode of baptism, never argue it from a scientific or philosophic stand-point at all. They *assumed* that Rom. vi: 1-4, "buried by baptism," etc., and the patristic usage in the third and fourth centuries, settled it, and thus proceeded against all the laws and rules known to scientific and philosophic investigation. They never discussed it from the true philological stand-point at all, and they never carefully investigated the later historic facts.

The line of argument I shall pursue shall be that pursued by all the eminent scholars of the immersion school. I hold in my hand the work of T. J. Conant, of New York, the most learned immersionist now living in Europe or America. His book, called "*Baptizein*," has been put in the hands of all immersion ministers, I suppose, throughout the country. I will read to you, from its table of contents, how he argues in favor of immersion, for the whole book is devoted to that subject:

CONTENTS.

The course of argument, in this treatise, may be seen at a glance in the following sketch of its plan:

	PAGE
SECTION I. Usage of Greek writers; including the Church Fathers, when they do not speak of the Christian rite.....	1-82
§ 1. In the literal, physical sense.....	1-42
1. Absolutely, with the engulfing element implied	1-27
2. Construed with some case of the engulfing element	28-42
§ 2. In the tropical or figurative sense.....	43-72
1. To plunge, to immerse (as in engulfing floods) in calamities, etc.....	43-67
2. To overwhelm (figuratively) with an intoxicating liquor, etc	68-72
§ 3. Use in composition with a preposition.....	73-82
SECTION II. Usage of the Greek versions of the Old Testament.....	83-86
SECTION III. Summary of lexical and grammatical uses.....	87-96
1. Lexical use.....	87-91
2. Grammatical construction.....	91-96

	PAGE
SECTION IV. Application to the New Testament.....	97-101
SECTION V. Usage of the Church Fathers.....	102-133
1. Where they use the word of the Christian rite, or describe the rite in other words.....	102-121
2. Where the rite (or what is implied in it) is variously ap- plied for illustration or comparison.....	122-133
SECTION VI. Requirements and practices of the Christian Church.....	134-141
1. Of the Eastern or Greek Church.....	134, 135
2. Of the Western or Latin Church.....	136, 137
3. Of the Anglican Church.....	138-141
SECTION VII. Usage of the versions.....	142-149
1. Of the old Latin versions.....	142-144
2. Of the ancient Oriental versions.....	144
3. Of the Teutonic versions.....	144-146
4. Of modern versions for the learned.....	146-149
SECTION VIII. Views of scholars of different communions.....	150-157
SECTION IX. Obligation to translate the word.....	158-163

You see what course of argument Dr. Conant, their great light, pursues. Mr. Alexander Campbell's book, called "Christian Baptism," the most important, I suppose, that he ever wrote, heads an argument on the mode of baptism thus:

BOOK II.

ACTION OF BAPTISM.

	PAGE
CHAP. I.— <i>Bapto</i> —The root of baptizo.....	116
II.— <i>Baptizo</i> —Greek Lexicographers.....	122
III.—Ancient versions.....	134
IV.—English translations.....	139
V.—Reformers, Annotators, Paraphrasts, and Critics.....	144
VI.—English Lexicographers, Encyclopedias, and Reviewers of the Pedobaptist School.....	149
VII.—Words used in construction with <i>Baptizo</i> , <i>Raino</i> , <i>Rantizo</i> , <i>Cheo</i> , and <i>Louo</i> , such as <i>epi</i> , <i>en</i> , <i>cis</i> , <i>ek</i> , <i>apo</i>	153
VIII.—The places where Baptism was anciently administered.....	157
IX.—Apostolic allusions to Baptism.....	161
X.—Passages urged against Immersion from the use of <i>Baptizo</i> and <i>Baptismos</i> in certain places.....	166
XI.—Legal Sprinklings.....	171
XII.—Convertible terms.....	178
XIII.—History of Immersion and Sprinkling.....	181

Carson follows the same course to prove that immersion is the only action of baptism. I shall, therefore, have these illustrious examples

in following the same mode of reasoning, the same train of arguments, so far as authorities and facts are concerned, though I may not reason upon these facts exactly as they do, but I shall show good reasons why I should not. To show you the importance they attach to this mode of argument, and especially the importance of ancient translations in deciding this whole question, as decisive beyond all others, I may name the fact that, in Mr. A. Campbell's "Christian Baptism" there are only *ten and a half lines* from the *whole Bible* devoted to the action of baptism. While he has ten and a half lines—about one-third of a page—devoted to the *Bible* argument, he has *five and a half pages* on *Greek lexicons*, *ten pages* on the *Syriac* and other translations, several pages on authors, and nearly four pages on the Greek prepositions *epi*, *eis*, and *apo*. While he can devote four pages to the discussion of these Greek prepositions to prove immersion, he can state all of his *Bible* arguments in *ten lines*. Mr. Conant, out of one hundred and sixty-two large pages of the size I have held up before you, has only *sixteen and a half lines*, or *one hundred and forty-seven words* from the New Testament as arguments and illustrations to prove immersion. From the Old Testament he has only *three lines*, or *thirty-one words* in all—pages 93, 94. There are one hundred and seventy-seven pages in the book on immersion, and yet only a *half solid page* is from the Bible, as such. The Bible records in all furnish *one three hundred and fifty-fourth part of his proof*, the remainder being from the original languages, translations, commentaries, etc. This shows the importance they attach to the original languages on this subject.

The Old Testament was written, all of it, in the Hebrew language, except one verse of Jeremiah, a few verses in Ezra, and from ch. ii: 4 to vii: 28 in Daniel. These were written in *Chaldee*, which was almost the same as the Syriac. The New Testament was written in Greek, except Matthew. It is generally conceded by the most learned scholars that Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Syriac language. It was then translated into Greek, perhaps by Matthew himself. Davidson exhausts this argument, I suppose, more than any other man. Now, it is given to us in the Greek. The Savior and his apostles preached in the Syriac language. That their discourses were, as a rule, delivered in that language, no scholar will question. We have them in the Greek. Of course, they selected that Greek word that would convey most perfectly what was spoken by them in the Syriac language. If the brother sees fit to dispute any of these points, I will be able to offer abundant proof of their truth.

The Greek used in the *New Testament* is not the classic Greek. There is the greatest possible difference, as all learned and fair-minded scholars agree. If my brother questions this, or resorts to the heathen Greek classics, where βαπτίζω is applied to sinking (immersion) of ships, cattle, people, etc., where the consequence was *drowning*, I will then adduce abundant proof of my position. All interested can consult Hävernicks "Introduction to the Old Testament," p. 385; Fairbairn's "Hermeneutical Manual," p. 93; Robinson's "Introduction" to his "Greek New Testament Lexicon," v, vi, vii: his article in "Biblical Repository," April, 1841; Geo. Campbell's "Preliminary Discourse," vol. 1, i: 30—great immersionist authority; "Walton on Syr. Ver. Prolegomena Bib. Polyg.," p. 92; Liddell & Scott's "Introduction, Greek Lexicon," xx, xxii; M. Stuart, "Biblical Repository," April, 1833; Winer's "Idioms," pp. 26–29 sq. These greatest of all authors on these questions, settle that question, which no scholar of candor doubts.

While I shall aim to give all the fundamental facts that throw light upon this subject, I am willing to rely wholly on the facts that the learned immersionists solely rely on to prove immersion. For example: 1st. *The original words for baptism*; or, 2d. *The lexicons on these words*; 3d. *The translations of the first fourteen hundred years of the Christian era*, especially those of the first four centuries; 4th. *The Greek and Latin Fathers*; 5th. *The English Scriptures of King James' translation*. Or, I am willing to rely exclusively on any one of these sources of light, while at the same time I shall bring all these matters before the audience. I repeat it, that I would be willing now, so far as my proposition is concerned, to take that source of proof to which Mr. Campbell attaches so much importance, *the lexicons*; or the highest of all authority on the question, *the ancient translations*, to which he, Conant, and Carson, appeal with so much earnestness. Or I will take any other one of the records upon which they rely, and I can prove that sprinkling and pouring are proper actions in Christian baptism.

In order that you may see what kind of authorities should be used to decide this question, I will read from "Blackstone's Commentaries," which all deem of the highest authority, vol. i, pp. 59–61:

"To interpret a law, we must inquire after the *will* of the maker; which may be collected either from the words, the context, the subject matter, the effects and consequences, or the spirit and reason of the law. (1.) Words are generally to be understood in their usual and most known signification; not so much regard-

ing the propriety of grammar as their general and popular use. . . (2.) If words happen to be *still dubious*, we may establish their meaning from the context, etc.; of the same nature and use is the comparison of a law *with laws that are made by the same legislator, that have SOME AFFINITY with the subject, or that EXPRESSLY relate to the same point.*"

Now, not one of the twelve apostles, being Jews, ever learned Greek, or read Greek in the classic authorities, *i. e.*, heathen Greek. Paul seems to have given some attention to classic Greek, but no scholar will contend that any of the twelve apostles ever learned Greek from the classics. Yet I am free to go to the Greek classics whenever my brother desires it. The Greek they used was a different dialect altogether. Many of the words used in the New Testament are not found in the classic Greek at all. I will state the following brief facts, which he will not question. No man will.

1. In classic Greek, by which we mean the Greek works of such heathens as Homer, Aristotle, Strabo, Plato, and Plutarch, etc., βαπτίζω (*baptidzo*) never occurs as applied to a religious rite, to any ordinance, or sacrament, or holy purpose. It is never used religiously by them.

2. Nowhere is it, or its nouns, βάπτισμα and βαπτισμὸς (*baptisma* and *baptismos*)—baptism—applied to washing as an effect of any process or action.

3. Βάπτισμα (*baptism*) never occurs in any Greek work in the world till it appears in the New Testament. Now, as the Greeks had immersions of ships, and the word occurs thousands of times, why was βάπτισμα never so applied, if it was the proper word, and used in that sense in the New Testament. On the contrary—

4. While βαπτίζω (*baptidzo*), *baptisma* and *baptismos*, the words applied to baptism in the Bible, are never used in classic Greek for a religious purpose, or in a religious sense, they are never used in the Bible and Apocrypha, nor in the Septuagint Greek (*Greek of the Old Testament*), in any but a strictly religious sense.

5. Nowhere in all the Bible, Septuagint or Apocrypha, do they leave a subject UNDER ANY ELEMENT. In classic Greek βαπτίζω ALWAYS leaves them under it, if they go under at all.

6. Again: In classic Greek βαπτίζω means, and by Conant, A. Campbell, Gale, and Carson, the great lights of immersion for the last hundred years, is rendered *drench, sink, overwhelm, whelm, INTOXICATE, DROWN, MAKE DRUNK*, yet it never has such meaning in the Bible, Apocryphā, etc.

7. These ideas and expressions often occur in the Bible, as you will see in Psalms cxxiv: 4; lxix: 2, 15; Exodus xv: 4, 5, 10; 1 Tim. vi: 9; Luke v: 7; Matt. xviii: 6; xiv: 30; 2 Maccabees xii: 4; but are never expressed by βαπτίζω (*baptidzo*), but by βιθίζω, καταδύω, καταποντίζω, which mean immerse, submerge, merge—immergo, submergo—sink.

On the contrary *baptidzo*, in the classic Greek, means “to make drunk,” “to intoxicate,” “to sink” the ship—that is, it goes to the bottom, and βαπτίζω puts it there, and there leaves it, and this is its ordinary meaning in the classic Greek. Since no man will contend that *baptidzo*, in the Bible, has this meaning—to intoxicate, to make drunk, or to sink, that is, to the bottom—you will see at once that the classic use of the term has nothing to do with its use in the Bible.

Again, our immersion friends have fallen into error in regard to the *tropical* uses of words. They use the word *tropical* as changing the meaning and action of words, when it merely changes its *application*. It must still retain a sufficiency of the original force or intent of that word, or a new word will have to be coined. A different or tropical application of a word, where its original and true meaning is retained, they pretend and make believe, is a change of *meaning*. To show you that in its “*figurative* use” they render it just as in its literal, I will quote from A. Campbell’s “Christian Baptism,” 1853, p. 130. Here, on one page, he renders it, “overwhelm” nine times, and “baptized or sunk” once, baptized several times. Conant, the greatest scholar among the immersionists in Europe or America, in his “*Baptizein*,” from page 43 to 72, gives sixty-five (65) instances where βαπτίζω and βάπτισμα occur under “the tropical or figurative sense,” in which he renders it just as under the heading: “In the *Literal* or *Physical* Sense,” p. 1 to 42, by “whelm,” “overwhelm,” “immerge,” “plunge,” three times “plunge” on one page, 58; “immerse,” three times “immerse” on one page, 62; “imbathed,” etc. I wish to expose all these sophistries thoroughly, hence my pains in these matters.

And now a few words in relation to ordinances. Ordinances in the Bible, and especially in the New Testament, are often expressed by words, the *action* or mode of which the *word itself* gives no clue to at all, because the persons among whom these ordinances were used understood all about the mode or process, and, therefore, it was sufficient to give them words conveying to their mind a clear idea of the

duty without using terms implying the action. In order that you may see this, I will give you some examples:

1. Even in the Hebrew, the word מול (mul) מולה (mulah), circumcision, does not express the idea of circumcision at all. The Hebrew expresses only a faint idea of it, and from that word we would not know what it was without other light. In Hebrew this word meant, originally, to cut off, to cut away, and the Arabic word — (mamala) מל means “to cut off, to destroy.” Yet we would not think that the circumcision of a proselyte meant to destroy him.

2. It is never literally translated into the Greek of either the ancient versions or the New Testament from the Hebrew, even by the apostles.

3. It is never rendered in accordance with the original in any of our modern versions, but simply into a Latin word—circumcision—“cut around.” The Latin and Greek approach more nearly a part of the idea of it, but still give no idea in the world as to what it is. It is there spoken of as a rite, like baptism, and men are said περιτθην λαμβάνειν, to receive circumcision. (John vii: 22, 23; Acts viii: 8; Rom. iv: 11; Gal. v: 11.)

I name these facts about ordinances that you may see that the actions or modes of them, are not involved in the words at all.

Again: The Passover is the second rite given in the Bible פסח (pesech), from פסח (pasach,) to move away from, to move forward from, to move over, to go through, to pass through as a river, to pass over, i. e., spare. Christ and his apostles held this rite sacred, but the word conveys no idea of the action implied in the observance of it. The Greek translators of the Hebrew Scriptures understood the term and transferred it as nearly as possible. It is called πάσχα, πασέκ, pascha—pasek—just as it was in the Hebrew. And the Savior and the apostles, in their writings, retain the Hebrew word untranslated, transferring it as the Seventy did. So, likewise, the Peshito-Syriac has it, and our Bible so has it. “Christ, our passover, is slain for us.” This ordinance was commemorative or typical. First, it denoted the yearly festivity of Nison (April) or Abib, 14th. Second, the yearly festivity of Nison, 15th. Third, the whole solemnity from the 14th to the 21st of Nison. They took it reclining on a triclinium, or couch, eating unleavened bread, etc. All these facts are contained in the word pasach, and hence it was not translated, but transferred. Yet there are several Greek forms that correspond to the Hebrew word as nearly as a word can, such as υπερμάχῃσις, υπερβασία, διαβατήρια,

used by Philo and others. Had they desired to translate the word, any one of them would have given the sense as nearly as possible, but none of them would have given the idea of the original. Thus you see an ordinance may be expressed by words that do not give the *action* or *facts* of it. So of baptism.

I will now give you a word from the Old Testament, which is of frequent occurrence in the New: *Purification* (καθάρσιμος, *katharismos*, καθάριζω, *katharidzo*), cleansing, purification (John ii: 6; iii: 25), to make clean, to purify. Now, this is important. καθάριζω (*katharidzo*) NEVER means to *sprinkle*. Yet ninety-nine times out of every hundred, if not always, it could not be performed without sprinkling. *Katharismos* never means sprinkled, yet it *can not be performed without sprinkling*. So, if my brother could prove from the Bible records that the true meaning of *baptidzo* was immerse, he could not prove that it was so used in the Bible for the religious ordinance.

The canon used by the immersionists of my brother's school is found in Campbell's "Christian Baptism," pp. 147-149: "The force of this argument recognizes only a concession which *no man can refuse*, namely, that *baptizo once* signifies to dip or immerse. This point conceded, and, according to the law in such cases, it must ALWAYS signify to dip." "If, then, *baptizo once* means to dip, it *never can mean sprinkle, pour, or purify*, unless these actions are *identically the same*." Of course no man will contend that they are the same, therefore Campbell concludes that if he can once show it means to dip, it never can imply sprinkling or pouring. That is the argument they make more capital out of than any other except Rom. vi: 1-4.

Now, let us test this canon on which the immersion school risks so much. I will take the word *raino* (ραίνω), which Mr. Wilkes will tell you is the word for sprinkle. It is defined by Pickering "to sprinkle, pass. *to be submerged*." I do not say that the rendering is correct, but the lexicons render it both sprinkle and submerge. *χέω* (*cheo*) means to shed forth or pour. Pickering says it may also mean "to bury," "inter," and gives Homer's "Iliad" as a reference. I will now give you the Hebrew word that means immerse. טבַע (*tabha*) is rendered by the Hebrew lexicons thus: "*figi, infigi, immergi, demergi, figere, eudere monetam, to press, to press or infix, thrust in, sink, to be sunk under, to impress (as a seal), to coin monee*." Now, the word immerse in the Hebrew language means to press, to infix. Hence, the same word means to immerse that means to coin money, because they *press* the stamp upon the material.

I will give you another Hebrew word more to the point. שטף (*shataph*) is defined by Buxtorff, the most thorough Hebrew scholar in the world until Fürst, thus: "*Exundavit, preceps ruit, inundavit, immersit, immergendo abluit.* Leviticus xv: 11, non immersit in aquas, . . . immergitor in aquam. Lev. xv: 12; vi: 21. Buxtorff's Hebrew Lexicon. To overflow, especially to rush upon, overwhelm, inundate, to immerse, to wash by immersing. Lev. xv: 11. Did not immerse in the waters. I am immersed in water. Lev. xv: 12; vi: 21."

Gesenius: "To gush or pour out, to flow abundantly, a POURING RAIN. 2. To overflow, to overwhelm, as a stream, to overflow, to inundate; stronger, to overwhelm and swallow up. Ps. lxxix: 3: The floods overwhelm me, swallow me up (v. 6), . . . to wash, to rinse, i. e., copiously. Now, שטף (*sheteph*), a gushing, outpouring, e. g., of rain."

Fürst's Hebrew Lexicon: "*Sheteph, שטף*, an outpouring, rain-gust."

Gesenius' Thesaurus: "1. Effudit, 'largiter fluxit.' 2. Inundavit, to pour out, flow abundantly. 3. Overflow. Noun: *effusio*, pouring out." (vol. vi, 1395.) Yet he defines it to *bury, overflow, cover up—above*, etc. Furstianus defines it by all these meanings, and by immerse, submerge—sink, sink in and under, "*vi immergendi*"—"with the force of *immersing* and washing" (et *abluendi*), and shows that the radical idea of the root is to let drop, fall, shed forth. By the Septuagint it is rendered wash, ἵκνω, flow, sweat, sink, Lat. *immergo*—κατα-ορ-ιζο επι-κα-α and συ-κλιζω, ριπτω, απο-ιπτω, pour upon, sprinkle upon, etc. And Fürst says of it, *proprie de aquis super ripas effusio*, properly (it is spoken) of the pouring of waters over the banks, as a noun.

But there is a higher authority than the lexicons, the Word of God, and to it we appeal. Ezek. xliii: 13, "And there shall be an overflowing shower" שטף גשם (geshem shataph) . . . "great hailstones," etc. Gesenius: "A pouring rain." Ezek. xxxviii: 22, "And I will rain upon him, וגשפתי (wegishphatetti), and upon his bands, etc., שוטף an overwhelming rain [Gesenius, "a pouring rain"], and great hailstones," etc. 1 Kings xxii: 38, "And one washed the chariot ברנת על וישטף (vagishtoph al Prænath) at the pond [or pool] of Samaria."

The same word is here used as in the other places. They never immersed the chariot to wash it. Nor his armor, which they washed. I need not comment to show you how perfectly these facts destroy all the laws and so-called *canons* of the immersionists. The same word that means pour means also to immerse here.

As I wish to show how general is this fact, and how utterly devoid of any truth is this great rule by which they have always sought to sustain their theory of immersion, I will quote from other languages also. In the Arabic we have "*khadabha*, tinxit manum, crines aut ungues cypro aliave re veruit arber," etc. "To stain the hand, the hair, or the nails of the finger with oil of cyprus; veruit arber, to grow green, as a tree," etc. Yet this is the word, "tinxit," that they render "dip, plunge, immerse." Freytag, in his great Arabic Lexicon, also renders *gharika*, "(1.) Immersus et submersus fuit in aquam. (2.) Bibit haustum, to be immersed and submerged. (3.) To drink." Yet he renders (*gharkala*) the same word. "(4.) *Super caput effudit semel aquam.*" "*Simply to POUR WATER UPON ONE'S HEAD.*"

The Syriac word כחל (*kechal*) is thus rendered by the greatest of all Syriac lexicons—Schaaf's: "Stibio pinxit, tinxit, intinxit, ASPERGIT." "To paint with antimony, to stain, to dip, to SPRINKLE." Tinxit immersionists all render dip, plunge, immerse. Intinxit they render "dip in," immerse, etc.

Thus, you see, the *foundation* on which their whole theory is built is swept away irretrievably before we begin our argument. The organic root of the word that *always* means to sprinkle, wherever it occurs in the Bible, found so often in Lev. vi: 20; x: 6, 17; v: 9; xiv: 7, 16, 27, 51; xvi: 14, 15, 19; Numb. xix: 4, 18, 19, 21; Is. lxiii: 3, חִזַּח, (*nazah*) umf. יִזַּח, (*yizzeh*) radically means *to be wet*, fluid, whence we have the word *juice* also—rigare, irrigare, inspergere, adspargere, imbueri; Greek LXX, βαπτίζω, ἐπιρροαρίζω, to moisten, to irrigate, to sprinkle upon, besprinkle." Greek sense, Furstianus.

Such are the facts, yet these ridiculous canons have been palmed off for years upon the people to sustain the dogma of immersion, as the exclusive action contemplated by the βαπτίζω of the New Testament. We are taking this pains to make this matter thorough, and to show you the utter untenableness of their position.

[Time expired.]

MR. WILKES' FIRST REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I will, if you please, introduce the discussion on the negative of this question, by offering a few general reflections on the speech to which we have just listened.

I may announce to the audience that we shall spend to-day and half of to-morrow, if not more, before any ordinary hearer or reader will know any thing about what we are saying; and that it is probable my learned friend intends to remain in the jungles of Hebrew, Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic for about two days; and as he would lose his health and reputation if he did not, we must not complain of him for so doing.

He says that he tried in vain to get me to affirm immersion *alone*; that is, exclusive immersion; or that immersion is essential to apostolic baptism. He did try to get me to argue *two* questions in one, I admit. He tried to have me affirm that immersion is baptism, and to *affirm* the negative, that sprinkling is not baptism, both. I apprehend that a very few moments' attention to this point will suffice. It is palpable that when two men debate, they ought to discuss that thing about which they differ, and not that thing about which they agree. They ought to have a *single point*, and that point ought to be one of *difference*, and the parties ought to assume, with reference to that point, the positions which they respectively occupy.

Now, in regard to immersion for baptism, my friend agrees with me, that when a man is immersed, other things being equal, he is baptized; so, where was the necessity for me to affirm immersion? I answered him affirmatively. I will affirm that immersion is baptism, is Christian baptism. No, said he, I will not deny that; I do not deny that. Then, where is the point of *difference* between us? Clearly it is this: For baptism, he sprinkles and pours, and I do not. Here is our only difference. But he complains, in this case, that he is affirming *only a part* of his doctrine. I think he is affirming as much as he

will find it convenient to prove; and he is affirming only that part of his faith on which he and I differ. I propose to have no controversy concerning that part about which we do not differ. Nay, more, it would have pleased me better if he had not affirmed quite so much as he has. I believe this congregation, and those who may perchance read our discussion, will agree with me that my friend ought to have taken his choice between sprinkling and pouring, so that we might have narrowed our field of discussion, and come into closer quarters. I tried to induce him to do that. I tried to induce him to affirm that *the sprinkling* of water upon a proper subject, by a properly authorized person, is Christian baptism; but he would not. "Then," said I, "affirm that the *pouring* of water upon a proper subject, by a proper administrator, is Christian baptism." He would not do that. He must have *two* things, so that if he became pressed on one proposition, he might say, "I was talking about *sprinkling*;" and when pressed on the other, he might say, "I was talking about pouring." Thus he will obscure and weaken both points, whereas, if he had taken but one, he *might* have made it plain. It would, I contend, have been easier, at least, to prove *one* than *both* propositions. But he would have two. I think he was wrong. *I* would have acted differently; but that does not concern our hearers on this occasion.

He said he would follow Campbell, Carson, and Conant, his illustrious predecessors, in their mode of discussing this question. If he, in fact, did so, I did not notice it. I know he *said* he would; and he read two of their tables of contents, showing their order of investigation; but if he did follow their order, I did not notice it. He may have done so, however. So far as Dr. Carson is concerned, he does not follow the order of Dr. Conant, nor does Mr. Campbell follow the order of Conant. The difference is, however, immaterial.

He says that Campbell, in his large work of about four hundred and fifty pages, employs only about ten and a half lines in his *Bible* argument on immersion, whereas I thought he employed about four hundred and fifty pages to demonstrate immersion, so far as immersion was his subject; and so I think in regard to Dr. Conant's work, occupying some two hundred pages.

Again, he said he would rely upon the lexicons; that he would rest his cause that the sprinkling and pouring of water upon a proper subject, by a properly appointed administrator, is Christian baptism upon them. So will I. In the second place, he said he would rely upon ancient and modern versions to prove that sprinkling or pouring,

etc., is Christian baptism. So will I that it is not. *I intend* to rely upon the versions; and I intend, by the blessing of God, to make this audience think that my friend is pressed, as in a wine-press, to find any comfort in the *lexicons* or *versions*, or any evidence in them, the very feeblest or slightest, which shows or intimates that there ever was any sprinkling or pouring for baptism taught in the Bible. I hope you will notice the words I use, for I mean just that.

Then, he said he would rely upon "the fathers" for several of the first centuries of the Christian era; that they wrote much upon the subject of Christian baptism, and that he would rely upon them for light upon this subject. So will I.

He says that words are used in the classics in a different sense from that in which they are used in the Scriptures. I wish to state in regard to that point, that it is partly true, and partly not true. It is true that *some* Greek words, in the Greek New Testament, are used in a different sense from that in which they are used in classic Greek. But, suppose my friend should say *katharizo* is used, in New Testament Greek, in a different sense from that in which it is used in the classics, would he not have to prove it? And, in default thereof, would you not assume that it is used, in the Scriptures, in the classic sense? I am not, however, concerned about that word very much.

Now, in regard to *baptizo*; suppose my friend should assert that *this* word is used in a different sense, in the New Testament Greek, from that in which it is used in classic Greek, would it not be incumbent on him to show it? Were I to show that in current Greek literature *baptizo* was used in the sense of submergence, or that it necessarily involved that idea, would not my friend, to support his theory of sprinkling for baptism, have to show that the word, in passing into sacred Greek literature, obtained another sense? So he will either have to deny that *baptizo* is used in classic Greek in the sense of submerge; or, admitting it, he must contend that *its* sense was changed on coming into sacred use. Which will he do? Will he say that, in classic Greek, it is not used in the sense of submerge? If he does, he has no scholarship—none in the world—and he ought not to be talking Syriac, Hebrew, and Coptic; he had better leave these and come to the mature study of the Greek, that he may be able to throw some light upon this subject. Again: Does he say that the word, in passing into sacred Greek, took on a different sense? If so, I shall deny it; and I challenge him to give the first scintillation of proof upon the subject. This, I assert, he can not do. It

will not do to present a long summary or catalogue of words that have changed their meanings a little, in passing out of classic Greek into Hellenistic Greek, and then *assume* that this is true of *baptizo*. That will not do. He must *prove* that this is true of *baptizo*. I will protest, with all the earnestness of a Christian man, against Mr. Ditzler's right to deal in vague generalities; to assert that several words are changed in meaning, and that, therefore, *baptizo*, in sacred Greek, means something different from what it did in classic Greek. He says that certain words were used in classic Greek to designate religious ordinances. But my friend is greatly mistaken if he thinks that the *ablutions* practiced by the Greeks were used as *religious ordinances*. I know there was a time when they had *purifications* among them, but they had no *religious ordinances*, in any proper sense of the term. But, even were it true, it is a singular circumstance that the Savior selected another word when he chose to designate the ordinance of baptism, one that did not mean their kind of lustrations or purifications. He meant another thing, altogether another thing, as we shall see.

My friend says that words have tropical meanings, that are not different in sense from their literal sense, but different in *application*. Now, I am not sure that I understand what he means by that. As I understand the sentence, I believe it. I will state what I mean more fully. The sense of a word, when used tropically, is based upon its literal sense; if not, the tropical use has no sense in it. In order to interpret a figure we must always go back to the fact. Understanding the fact, we may easily understand the figurative sense. The Savior called Herod a fox. That is metaphorical language. What would the hearer understand by that? If he knew nothing of the habits and nature of the fox he would not understand the language; but if he knows that the fox is a cunning, crafty, and very deceitful animal, he will readily understand why Herod is called a fox. I repeat: to understand the figurative meaning of a word, or passage, we must first know the literal meaning upon which the figurative is based. This all scholars know, except my respected friend.

Again he says, "Ordinances are presented to us in words which signify nothing about the ordinances." That is light, indeed, provided it is not darkness! It is *new* at least. When it was said in the Scriptures that there is "nothing new under the sun," we ought to remember that Mr. Ditzler had not just then delivered his first

speech on the action of baptism, else those words could scarcely have come from an infallible source. An ordinance is not to be understood by the word employed to designate it! That is, a word does not designate an ordinance! He gave us a long, nay, a very long dissertation on the Hebrew, in order to show it. I scarcely thought he did show it; and as it has so little bearing upon our question under investigation, I will respectfully pass it by, unless my friend *insists* that the allusions to, and dissertations on, *circumcision have a bearing on our present controversy*. If he does, I will examine the subject. For the present, I call his attention to the Greek use of the word designating that ordinance, or that thing.

If I am not mistaken—and if I misrepresent him I am sorry—he said that the Latin word comes nearer describing the thing to be done than any word in any other language. I will now read an authority upon this subject:

“Peritome,” from a verb of concurrent meaning, signifies “*a cutting all around*.” He gives this as the *first* meaning; and “*circumcision*” as the second meaning. That is all Liddell & Scott, in their “Greek and English Lexicon,” give as the meanings of that word. It pretty well *describes the thing that was done*. A very little additional thought would designate and describe the thing done so well that a man could not easily misunderstand it; and that very little additional circumstance is furnished in the connection.

My friend says *katharizo* never means to sprinkle, but that there was *always sprinkling* where *katharizo* is used. Now, he is slightly mistaken in that. While I admit there were *sometimes* sprinklings, I deny there were *always*, or even commonly, sprinklings, in the cases of cleansing or purifying. This point is immaterial, I grant you, but I think it well to refer to a *few* of these *a-b-c* matters before proceeding with my graver investigations.

My friend went largely into the discussion of *táhvál* and *sevá*. I understood him to say that *táhvál*, especially, was the Hebrew word for baptism, and that its radical meaning is “to moisten, to sprinkle.” That, I suggest, is a mistake, and I am not afraid to put myself on the record on this point. But whether it be a mistake or not, that *táhvál* *always* means to sink down, as in the water, or, to immerse, which is the *current* meaning; if it ever had any other meaning, it is not the one we ought to accept when we are seeking to understand an ordinance of God. Besides, it is not the word *always* used in Hebrew to designate what we call baptism. Though, in the

translations of the New Testament into the Hebrew language, *táhval* is used for translating *baptisma*, *baptismos*, etc., as my friend will find; Parkhurst and Schleusner tell him so; and all the authorities—I do not care where he goes for authority—tell him the same thing. He is wrong, also, in supposing that *táhval*, which is the word that represents baptism in the Hebrew, means to sprinkle. *Perhaps* there may be a few exceptions to this, but they are few.

I now proceed with my opening reply.

The word *bapto* is not in this controversy. It will be much more convenient for my respected friend to discuss *bapto* than *baptizo*. I here announce—and it will be shown in proof after awhile—that the word *bapto*, with its inflections, is not so much as once used in a noun or verb form, or in any form, to designate Christian baptism. There is some reason, and the Divine Spirit had a reason for never using the word *bapto*, nor any of its cognates, as applied to the ordinance of baptism. On the contrary, the Lord, the apostles, and the Spirit of God used *baptizo*, a derivative of *bapto*, to describe or designate the ordinance of Christian baptism. Now, the Savior had some reason for excluding the word *bapto*, or for not employing it to designate the ordinance; and as HE excluded it, and the Holy Spirit did so, likewise, from the controversy, I feel authorized to exclude it, and to confine myself to the investigation of the only word the Savior employed. I think my friend will allow that this narrows the field of investigation, and that it is fair.

The word *bapto*, in some of its forms, occurs five times, or oftener, in the New Testament, and was, by our English translators, rendered *dip*, every time.

When the Savior said, “Go, teach all nations, baptizing them,” etc., that is, when he instituted the ordinance of Christian baptism, he had before him a number of words, any one of which he might have used to designate the thing he would have the apostles to do. He had before him the word *nipto*, which he used seventeen times in the New Testament, and it is rendered, properly, *wash*, every time, as the hands or feet, etc. He had the word *pluno* before him, which means *to wash*; it is used only once in the New Testament, and is translated *wash*, as clothes. He had the word *louo* before him, which the Holy Spirit used six times, but never in reference to baptism. It is translated “wash” all the time, and is applied, more particularly, to the washing

of the body. He also had the words *raino* and *rantizo* before him. The word *rantizo* is used four times in the New Testament, and is rendered "sprinkle" every time. The Savior had all these words before him. If he meant to command his apostles to *sprinkle*, he would have just said so. If he had intended them to *pour* the people, he would have said so, and would have used the word *keo*, which means "to pour." But instead of employing any one of these words, he used the word *baptizo*. He also had the word *brecho* before him, which means "to wet," or "moisten." Why did he not use that word? If he wanted to avoid indicating the mode—and the word baptize, never, for a thousand years before the Christian era, failed to indicate the mode—if the Savior intended to avoid every thing of that sort, he might have used a word in the Greek which would have signified the "application of water in any way." But he did not do that, and the very fact he did not must be accepted as evidence conclusive that he meant something *definite*, or to indicate some definite thing.

The Savior used the word *baptizo*. What did he mean? My friend says that, according to his authorities, when HE said *baptizo* he meant sprinkle. But, as he had a word for sprinkle before him, if he had meant sprinkle, why did he not use the word for it? My friend says it also means to *pour*. He had a word which meant *pour*, and frequently used it. Why did he not use it in this connection? But he used the word *baptizo*, with its family of words, to indicate the ordinance.

My friend says he adopts Dr. Conant's mode of investigating this subject; that he looks at its classic use. Dr. Conant's first method is to examine its classic use, sometimes with and sometimes without prepositions, in combination. So will I, in my examination.

But, before doing that, let me insist, it is important that we should have this question settled, as far as we can settle it, for my friend and I are wasting time in discussing it that ought to be better employed. If it be possible to know what the Savior meant when he said, "Go, baptize," it is well that we should know it. We should then avoid much trouble and confusion. Sometimes we become fretful and alienated, because we can not, or do not, or will not, agree on this question. It is important to settle it. Do you suppose we can understand what the Savior meant when he said, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them," till this question is settled?

I will now proceed more regularly and directly in the investigation. "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them," is the language of

Jesus. "Repent, and be baptized," is the language of Peter. In the former quotation the apostles are commanded to do something called "baptizing them." In the latter, others than the apostles are commanded to suffer or submit to something called baptism. What is that thing which the apostles were to do and certain others were to have done for them? Evidently, the Savior and Peter expected those whom they addressed to understand them. This, however, they could not have done unless the words they used had a current meaning at the time, and were used by them in that current sense. This is so obviously correct, that, to demonstrate, illustrate, or elaborate it, is wholly unnecessary. It is conceded by all intelligent and thinking men. It is, then, assumed as undeniable that the word *baptizo* had, in the lips of the Savior, and the apostles, a current and well-understood meaning. It is further assumed, as a proposition not to be questioned, that, in giving a revelation to man for the salvation of his soul, the Lord (Messiah) did actually employ the word *baptizo* in its usual signification, unless he gave notice of a different sense. And, since it is a fact that there is no intimation in the Scriptures of a sense being given to the word different from the usual one, it was, beyond doubt, so used. We are left, then, with a necessity upon us of understanding this word, as all other words, in its ordinary sense. What, then, was the current meaning of this word at the time the Savior and the apostles used it? This we must learn from its history. Just as we do not determine a man's character from any single act of his life, so we may not safely infer the meaning of this word from any *one* of its occurrences. I will, therefore, give many of them. I select those, mainly, which bring us near to the time of the Savior's personal ministry, as being more pertinent and forcible in this discussion. I select my examples mostly from the excellent work of Dr. Conant, entitled "Baptizein, its Meaning and Use." I introduce, first, Pindar, the great lyric poet of Thebes, born 522 B. C. Ex. 62. Comparing himself to a cork of the fisher's net, floating at the top, while the other parts of the fishing-tackle are doing service in the depth below, he says: "For, as when the rest of the tackle is toiling deep in the sea, I, as a cork above the net, am unbaptized in the brine." Submergence is here necessarily contemplated as in the word. Sprinkling and pouring are not possibly meant. Ex. 71. "Homeric Allegories," ch. ix, about fourth century B. C. The writer explains the ground of the allegory (as he regards it) of Neptune freeing Mars from Vulcan thus: "Since the mass of iron, drawn red hot

from the furnace, is baptized in water, and the fiery glow by its own nature quenched with water, ceases." In all time it has been the custom, in order to cool red-hot iron, to *plunge* it into water. Further comment is not necessary.

I next introduce Polybius, a Greek historian, born in Megapolis, a town of Arcadia, about two hundred and four years B. C. In his account of the sea fight at Drepanum, between the Romans and Carthagenians, he says, Ex. 1: "For, if any were hard pressed by the enemy, they retreated safely, on account of their fast sailing, into the open space; and then, with reversed course, now sailing round, and now attacking in flank the more advanced of the pursuers, while turning and embarrassed on account of the weight of the ships, and the unskillfulness of the crews, they made continued assaults and *baptized* many of the vessels." Of course the vessels were submerged. Ex. 2. The same author, describing the operations of the engines which Archimedes constructed for the defense of Syracuse, when besieged by the Romans, and with which he lifted the prows of the besieging vessels out of the water, so that they stood erect on the stern, and then let them fall, he says: "Which being done, some of the vessels fell on their side, and some were overturned; but most of them, when the prow was let fall from on high, being *baptized*, become filled with sea-water and confusion." After being lifted up high, when they fell back into the water they were submerged. This is the necessary inference. No sprinkling or pouring as baptism, in this case, is possible.

Strabo, a geographer, born at Amasea in Pontus, about 60 B. C., says, Ex. 10: "Around Agrigentum, in Sicily, are marsh-lakes, having the taste, indeed, of sea-water, but a different nature; for even those who can not swim are not *baptized*—floating like pieces of wood" The reason why baptism did not take place is here declared to be the "floating like wood." Baptism is, then, necessarily a submergence.

Polybius, born 204 B. C., Ex. 7, speaking of the passage of the Roman army, under the Consul Tiberius, through the river Tebia, which had been swollen by heavy rains, says: "They passed through with difficulty, the foot soldiers being *baptized* as far as the breasts." As far as they were under the water they were baptized, but not further. The idea of submergence, then, is in the word *baptizo*. The idea of sprinkling or pouring is excluded.

The same author, Ex. 6, in his description of the manner of taking the sword-fish (with an iron-headed spear or harpoon), says:

"And even if the spear falls into the sea it is not lost; for it is compacted of both oak and pine, so that when the oaken part is *baptized* by the weight, the rest is buoyed up, and is easily recovered." Comment here is unnecessary.

Strabo, born 60 B. C., Ex. 11, speaking of the march of Alexander's army along the narrow beach (flooded in stormy weather) between the mountain called Climax and the Pamphilian Sea, says: "Alexander happening to be there at the stormy season, and accustomed to trust, for the most part, to fortune, set forward before the swell subsided; and they marched the whole day in the water, *baptized* as far as the waist."

The same author, Ex. 12, speaking of the *asphalt* in the lake Sirbonis, which floats on the surface on account of the greater specific gravity of the water, says: "Then, floating at the top, on account of the nature of the water, by virtue of which, we said, there is no need of being a swimmer; and he who enters is *not baptized*, but is lifted out." (See also Exs. 14 and 15.)

Diodorus, a Greek historian, born at Agrinum, in Sicily, about 50 B. C., lived in the time of Julius and Augustus Cæsar, and traveled in Asia and Europe. He made a long stay at Rome, collecting materials for his great work, which was thirty years in being prepared. His language was the colloquial Greek of his time, but partaking a little more of the character of the pure Attic. In his account of Temolean's defeat of the Carthaginian army on the banks of the river Crimissus, in Sicily, many of the fugitives perishing in the stream swollen by a violent storm, he says, Ex. 13: "The river, rushing down with a current increased in violence, *baptized* many, and destroyed them attempting to swim through with their armor." While swimming, they were not baptized; but many of them attempting to swim with heavy armor on, were unable to do so, but were *baptized*. It is impossible to misunderstand the meaning of the word here.

We have now given ten examples of the use of the word *baptizo*, as we find it in Greek literature for five hundred years before the Christian era. We have brought its history to within fifty years of the birth of the Savior. Instead of ten, we could give ten times ten with the same unvarying result. "From the preceding examples" (and others not here given) "it appears that the grand idea expressed by this word is" entire submergence, including, of course, the acts necessary to the end. We conclude that this "is always expressed in the literal application of the word, and is the basis of its

metaphorical uses." "These examples [Dr. Conant says] are drawn from writers in almost every department of literature and science, from poets, rhetoricians, philosophers, critics, historians, geographers," etc. Not an instance is found "in which it signifies to make a partial application of water by affusion, or *sprinkling*, or to cleanse, to purify apart from" a literal submergence, "as the means of purifying or cleansing." In many of the examples only a *part* of the persons or things is said to be baptized. In all such cases the part of the body baptized is designated, and the other part of the same body is, either expressly or by necessary implication, excepted.

Now, with this history of the word before the apostles, what must they have understood the Lord to mean when he said: "Go, teach all the nations, baptizing them," or the Pentecostians, Peter, when he said, "Be baptized," etc.? Clearly they understood that they were to immerse unless the Savior notified them that he meant a different thing, which he did not do. Or, if he did tell the apostles that he employed the word in some unusual sense, it is, nevertheless, necessary that *we* should understand by it immersion, unless he or the apostles have so explained to *us*, which is not done. We are not only compelled to suppose that the Savior intended immersion, but it is as unreasonable as any thing can possibly be, that he used the word in a sense so different from immersion as sprinkling or pouring is. We, then, go into the New Testament, compelled to understand and to take this word in this, its usual current sense, unless some fact or circumstance in the connection *absolutely forbids it*.

At this point I wish to introduce a quotation from the debate of Campbell and Rice. Professor Charles Anthon was addressed by Dr. Parmly, of New York, on this proposition.

Dr. Parmly's letter, with Dr. C. Anthon's reply, is as follows:

"No. 1 BOND STREET, NEW YORK, March 23, 1843.

"PROFESSOR CHARLES ANTHON:—In conversation with Dr. Spring, last evening, he stated that in the original the word baptism, which we find in the New Testament, has no definite or distinct meaning; that it means to immerse, sprinkle, pour, and has a variety of other meanings—as much the one as the other—and that every scholar knows it; that it was the only word that could have been selected by our Savior, having such a variety as to suit every one's views and purposes. May I ask you if your knowledge of the language, from which the word was taken, has led you to the same conclusion? And may I beg of you to let the deep interest I take in the subject plead my apology.

"I have the honor to be, with great respect, most respectfully yours,

"E. PARMLY."

"COLUMBIA COLLEGE, March 27, 1843.

"DR. PARMLY,—*My Dear Sir*:—There is no authority whatever for the singular remark, made by the Rev. Dr. Spring, relative to the force of *baptizo*. The primary meaning of the word is to dip or immerse, and its secondary meaning, *if ever it had any*, all refer, in some way or other, to the same leading idea. Sprinkling, etc., are entirely out of the question.

"I have delayed answering your letter in the hope that you would call and favor me with a visit, when we might talk the matter over at our leisure. I presume, however, that what I have here written will answer your purpose.

"Yours truly,

CHARLES ANTHON."

("Debate between Campbell and Rice," pp. 171, 172.)

Dr. Charles Anthon, an author so peculiarly distinguished on the American continent, needs no introduction to this audience. His statement, therefore, that there is *no authority whatever* for the assertion of Dr. Spring, ought to have weight in this controversy.

I now desire to call your attention to a statement or two from Dr. Moses Stuart, whom Mr. Campbell at one time not very appropriately called his apostle of learning on the American continent. Mr. Stuart is *now* dead. He says:

"The answer to these questions will be fully developed in the sequel. I have already intimated that βαπτίζω is distinguished from βάπτω in its meaning. I now add that it is not, like this latter word, used to designate the idea of coloring or dyeing; while in some other respects it seems, in classical use, to be nearly or quite synonymous with βάπτω. In the New Testament, however, there is one other marked distinction between the use of these verbs. βαπτίζω and its derivatives are exclusively employed, when the rite of baptism is to be designated in any form whatever; and, in this case, βάπτω seems to be purposely, as well as habitually, excluded.

"Let us come, now, for the fuller development of this matter, to the more important part of our inquiry under the first head, viz.: *What are the classical meanings of βάπτω and βαπτίζω?* In some measure I have been obliged to anticipate the answer to this inquiry, in the statements which I have already made; but I come now to the exhibition of the grounds on which we must rest the positions that have been advanced, and others, also, which are still to be advanced.

"1. βάπτω and βαπτίζω mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into any thing liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this."—"Christian Baptism," by M. Stuart, p. 51.

Again, says Dr. Stuart:

"But enough. 'It is,' says Augusti (Denkw. vii., p. 216), 'a thing made out,' viz., the ancient practice of immersion. So, indeed, all the writers who have thoroughly investigated this subject conclude. I know of no one usage of ancient

times which seems to be more clearly made out. I can not see how it is possible for any candid man who examines the subject to deny this. . . .

"If the testimony already adduced should not be sufficient to satisfy any reasonable person, he may consider one circumstance more, which must be decisive. This is, that all candidates for baptism, men, women, and infants, were completely divested of all their garments in order to be baptized. Revolting as this custom was, yet it is as certain as testimony can make it."—Pp. 149, 150.

I read still from the same author, 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."—P. 151.

I also quote from the same page :

"The members of this church (Greek Church) are accustomed to call the members of the western churches, *sprinkled Christians*, by way of ridicule and contempt."—Page 151.

I hope our hearers will not forget that I am reading from a Pedobaptist work, and this author quotes from other pedobaptist works. Thus I am presenting concessions and declarations from scholars, not prejudiced in my favor, but who were in their feelings confessedly against me. Nevertheless, their hearts, their learning, and their convictions compelled them to tell the truth. My friend says he is going to the *lexicons*, to the *fathers*, and to the *versions*. None of them are with him.

I now wish to read to you another authority, one of the highest that can be presented on this question. I read from Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," translated by Professor Torrey, and both of them, I may add, were sprinkling Baptists!

"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, of being entirely penetrated by the same. It was only with the sick, where the exigency required it, that any exception was made; and in this case baptism was administered by sprinkling. Many superstitious persons, clinging to the outward form, imagined that such baptism, by sprinkling, was not fully valid; and, hence, they distinguished those who had been so baptized by denominating them the *clinici*. The bishop

Cyprian expressed himself strongly against this delusion. 'It is otherwise,' he says; 'the breast of the believer is washed, the soul of man is cleansed by the merits of faith. In the sacraments of salvation, where necessity compels and God gives permission, the divine thing, though outwardly abridged, bestows all that it implies on the faithful.'—Vol. i, page 310.

You will notice that these writers are Pedobaptists, yet they say immersion was the practice in the days of Tertullian, and in the second, third, and fourth centuries. They *abridged* the form, as Cyprian allows. They thought the form or mode made no difference; that they could have the thing without the form, so they *abridged* it in *cases of sickness* and *where* immersion could not very well be had. Just think, my friends! My opponent, for the last three days, has had some one before you sick all the time. Why did he not sprinkle those sick ones and let them go? But sprinkling never came from God, and never had the sanction of Jesus Christ or the apostles. It is all of human origin and invention. It is an "*abridgment* of the divine thing," or, rather, baptism was changed from "the divine thing," and sprinkling was substituted in place of "the divine thing." At first it was acknowledged to be so, but it was held that God, who loved mercy more than sacrifice, would accept this "*abridgment*" of the ordinance in case persons were sick and could not be baptized. Let us, by all means, have those two sick women up again, and let us see if we can not baptize them in the "*ancient way*," and for the "*ancient*" reason!

In the next place I wish to take up the authorities that lived during the Savior's and the apostles' time, who used this word, and I will also take up the authorities that lived just afterward, and show you the sense in which they used the term and the mode in which they administered the ordinance. If there is such a thing as evidence for immersing a man at all, I notify my friend now that I expect to take part in immersing even him before this debate is over; for I have a right to do it; I have *divine authority* for the practice, his *little touches of Syriac and Arabic* to the contrary, notwithstanding.

We are to take the word employed by our Savior in its *current* sense; we are to give it no *unusual* sense; hence the mere fact that my opponent may, *peradventure*, find some *far-off, figurative* application of this word, some *possible* foundation for sprinkling or pouring, will not do to rest his hopes upon of obeying his God when he sprinkles; we must take the *current* meaning of the word, and in doing so our practice will be certainly right.

MR. DITZLER'S SECOND ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I had congratulated myself up to this morning that the presence of a *stenographer*, and the presence of this intellectual audience, would influence my brother to at least represent me fairly and candidly. He has misrepresented me before, but during this debate the presence of a *stenographer* has checked him wonderfully, until this morning, when he showed a disposition to fall back *into the old track*. In, at least, ten or twelve instances he has charged me with assertions which he, having debated with me so often, *ought* to know I never dreamed of in the world. I will give a few of them, which will, of course, consume precious time. He says he offered to affirm that "*immersion is Christian baptism!*" Now, was not that doing a great thing? He offers to affirm that which *we, as a church, believe and practice!* Of course, in a debate of that kind I would have to deny that immersion is a mode of baptism. His church affirms that immersion is the *only* mode or action of Christian baptism, yet he refuses to affirm it. He says that would be affirming a negative, and that he can not be so illogical as to affirm a negative; but he can be so illogical as to get up here and affirm that sprinkling is not baptism, and that pouring is not baptism. He is too logical to do such a thing; but he goes to work at once to do that thing; which shows that it was simply *to keep from being in the affirmative* that my good brother was so careful. If he were to prove that immersion was the only act of Christian baptism, it would not be necessary to *deny sprinkling*. If he can prove that immersion is baptism, and baptism is immersion, *i. e.*, that the two terms are synonymous, as he contends, that of itself would refute every other position, and he would be logical all the time

Now for his misrepresentations. I did not say they were *intentional*, yet I do not see how any man could have misunderstood me. He says I said Mr. Campbell brought only ten lines of his book to prove

immersion. I said ten and a half lines, as an English or "*Bible argument*," i. e., as *contradistinguished* from his appeals to the *original languages, authors, and commentaries*. Yet he makes me say that he had only ten lines in his book to prove immersion! A man who is that hard pushed must have a bad cause. He says I said that words were used in the Bible in a different sense than in classic Greek. I said no such thing. I did say, in substance, that some words were used in the Bible in a restrictively religious sense, as *contradistinguished* from their ordinary use in heathen writers. He says if καθάρισμα (*katharidzo*) is used in a different sense, I would have to prove it. To be sure; but I did not say so. I did say that *baptidzo* was, and I proved it. Again, he says he has proved that *baptidzo*, in classic Greek, meant to *submerge*, and that, when I say it does not, I had better study Greek instead of Hebrew, Arabic, etc. *He knew* that I said, in my opening speech, that, in classic Greek, it meant "submerge," "sink," and all that; that it was habitually so used; and yet he tried to make you believe I *denied* it! He thus tried to make the impression upon those who came in after the commencement of my speech, that I denied that which I took *special pains* to state. I understood him to say there was no religious ordinance in classic use before this time. Of course, I used the word religious in its popular sense. Then he goes on to argue about the figurative sense, and illustrates his point by the case of the fox.

Now, the metaphorical use of a word is the *extension* of its true and literal import to other than the literal applications. In a word, it is more the extension of its *application* than its meaning. Take their own application of this, as we did. Under the *figurative* use they all render βαπτίζω by *immerse, overwhelm*, etc. But do they not so render it under the *literal* heading? But words also change their meanings, and assume entirely different ones. And it is easy to see how βαπτίζω came to have such various applications, since the radical idea was to sprinkle, moisten, stain. The very idea of stain implies moisture also. While I have little or no use for it, since my lexicons give sprinkle, pour, shed forth, as literal meanings, I will yet quote one authority, as he speaks as Webster and all scholars on that subject.

"1. The question may arise, whether, in a given sentence, there is a rhetorical form? Now, it must be conceded that it is not always easy to answer this question. . . . The number of *radical* words in a language is comparatively few, and are chiefly applied to *PHYSICAL objects*. As men found the stock of their ideas increasing, instead of inventing new terms to describe them, they applied old

words with an EXTENDED or CHANGED meaning; or, what is the same thing, used them figuratively. In this way the *great body* of words in a language, in one stage of their history or another, has been used tropically. The word *imagination*, derived from *image*, a term applied to its sensible object, was, on its first application to a mental faculty or operation, *tropical*. But it CEASED TO BE TROPICAL when it had been used so long that its *secondary* meaning become indissolubly fixed as THE PRINCIPAL one, or, indeed, to most minds, as its ONLY ONE. IMAGINATION CAN NOT NOW BE CONSIDERED AS A FIGURATIVE TERM. It has lost its *tropical* meaning, at least to the mass of readers, if not to the scholar. What is true of imagination is true of a vast number of words."—Fowler's "History and Grammar," Eng., Lan., §612, p. 599.

This all scholars know except my learned friend; and this is a point he has heard me make over and over again; yet he would have you believe I denied it. That is candor, indeed. I did argue that the words expressing ordinances in the Bible did not convey to the mind an idea of the *action*, the *circumstances*, or the *effects* of their performance. He says I argued against circumcision and its meaning, "to cut around." It generally has that meaning in Greek, but not always. But if my brother should go among a people who knew nothing about it, and tell them they must practice "*cutting around*," does he believe they would perform what the Jews did when they circumcised their children? Would his definition of the word convey to their minds an idea of its action? Will he risk his scholarship on it? This was my argument. The word does not convey the true idea of the action.

In my former speech I showed you how a word might mean sprinkle, pour, and immerse. To illustrate the case, I gave the Hebrew word for immerse, טָבַע (*tabha*), and what does my brother say to this? Had we never met before, the want of candor might not be attributed to my opponent; but we have met over and over again on this very subject of the Hebrew word for baptize, which I did not name in my morning speech, and he tells you it is *not the word for baptizo or baptismu!* That word is טָבַל (*tabhal*), the Hebrew of baptize. I used a word which means to press, to sink, to thrust, press in, stamp, to coin money; and I said nothing about baptism. I have had to take all of this time to remove impressions he has made that I never dreamed of. So, now, I notify the good brother that I shall stop him each time that he thus misrepresents me, and it will have to be counted out of his time, in order that he may give me no trouble.

Mr. Hopson.—The Moderators will decide that question, Mr. Ditzler.

Mr. Ditzler.—I think the Moderators will be very apt to do me that justice. And now I proceed from where I left off. I showed you

there was an Arabic word that meant to immerse and also to pour water upon the head. "*Super caput effudit semel aquam.*"

I. I will now give you the lexicons on a few other words which will be in constant use in our debate. First, I take the word *tingo*. 1. AINSWORTH defines *tingo*: "1, to dye, color, or stain. 2, to sprinkle, to imbrue. 3, to wash. 4, to paint." 2. LEVERETT'S FREUND'S says "to wet, moisten, *τιγγω, βρέχω, ὑγραίω*, to moisten, to bedew. Then—bathe, wash, dip in, plunge, immerse; color, stain, tinge, tint." 3. ANDREW'S says, "to wet, to moisten, (B) to soak or color, to dye, color, tinge." The same authorities I will give, as the world's recognized standards, on the several words that will be constantly recurring in our debate.

II. LAVO.—1. FREUND'S (Leverett's), "To wash, bathe. Fig. To wash or bathe, *i. e.*, to moisten, to besprinkle, bedew." 2. ANDREW'S. "To wash, to bathe, lave, . . . (B) to wet, moisten, bedew." 3. AINSWORTH'S. "To wash, to rinse, to bathe, to besprinkle." I give you these definitions in full, just as they wrote them.

III. MADEO.—Ainsworth's. "To be wet or moist, to be besprinkled."

IV. MADEFACIO—*madere facio*.—Freund's L. "To wet, make wet, moisten."

V. INFICIO.—Ainsworth's. "To stain, dye, color."

VI. INTINGO.—1. Ainsworth's. "To dip in, to steep, to dye." 2. Andrew's. "To dip in." *Intinctio*, "a dipping in."

VII. PERFUNDERE.—1. FR'S. L'S. "To sprinkle all over, besprinkle, wet, moisten. . . Fig., wet, moisten, besprinkle." 2. AINSWORTH'S. "To pour all over, . . . besprinkle."

Perfundo and *Lavo* in use.

1. "*Certatim largos humeris infundere rores . . . stuctio lavandi.*"—Swans "striving to throw much water upon (themselves) their backs through a desire of washing themselves in vain," as the rain would do it for them.

2. "*Et lachrymis vultum lavare profusis.*"—"And washed their face with a *profusion* of tears."—Ovid's *Met.*, ix, 679.

3. "*Canitiem immudo perfusam pulvere.*"—"Sprinkling unclean dust on the head of old Latinus."—*Ænead*, xiii, 611.

4. "*Ter liquido ardentem perfudit nectare vestam.*"—"Thrice sprinkled be the burning fire with liquid nectar."—Georgics, iv, 394.

5. Stokius, *palva*, *perfuno*, *adspergo*.

6. *λουώ*, *louo* (*wash*). Galen's Greek Lexicon (written in Greek,

born, A. D. 130), defines it "to wash, . . . *pour, sprinkle.*" It is the constant rendering of רָחַץ, *rachatz*, to wash, pour, shed forth, rendered χέω, *pour*, in LXX.

It is urged that "tinxit," perfect tense of *tingo* (*tingo, tingere, tinxit, tinctum*), to stain, color, besprinkle, in the Latin fathers, Latin writers, versions, and lexicons, means immerse, dip, *i. e.*, under, plunge. That die (or dye) is but the *result* of immergence. The following quotations will refute this. I quote the old Latin Vulgate: Isaiah lxiii: 1, "*tinctis vestibus,*" dyed garments; v. 5, tells *how* they were dyed, "et ASPERSUS est sanguine eorum super vestimenta mea." "And their blood was SPRINKLED upon my garments."

Daniel iv: 12, "*et rore cœli tingatur.* And moistened with the dew of heaven." How was his body, *tingatur* (*tingo*), wet or moistened? By the dew falling on it. In same chapter the same word is rendered, v. 20, *conspargatur, sprinkled* with the 'dew of heaven, and v. 30, "*infunderis,*" sprinkled.

So Beza renders Rev. xix: 13 (Greek βάπτω), *tincta sanguine*, stained with blood. Yet he renders βάπτω and ἑμβαπτω by *intinxit*, dip, wherever it means the slightest dipping, even where submergence is out of the question. So Genesis xxxvii: 31, "But they took his tunic (outer garment) and *tinxerunt*, stained or besprinkled, it with the blood of a kid which they killed."—Vulgate. Yet wherever dip occurs properly it is *intinxit*. Koonael's Latin Commentary: Luke xvi: 24, ἑμβαψάς Lazarus that he may dip, etc., *intingit*. "*iva βαψη,* that with the end of his finger dipped in water—in *aquam intincto,*" etc. Hence, Stokius' Clavis on βάπτω, *tingo, intingo*. He then gives all the places where dip occurs in the gospels—dip in the plate—of Judas, John xiii: 26; Matt. xxvi: 23, etc., and renders them *intingo*, but Rev. xix: 13, he renders *tincta sanguine*, where nearly all other versions render it *sprinkle*—"Ex, *in, in,* and βάπτω, *tingo.*" ἑμβαπτω he gives *intingo, dip*, "from *in, in,* and βάπτω, *tingo,*" stain. Hence, through dyeing, *i. e.*, dipping. I now give a number of quotations from profane, *i. e.*, classic authors or writers nearest to and in the apostolic ages, that you may see the force of *tingo*, the word into which all Latin fathers rendered βαπτίζω when they translated it, as a rule. Their quotation of the commission reads *tingo*—"tingentes," baptizing them, etc. Messrs. Campbell and Conant say it means immersion, and can never embrace sprinkling or pouring. I will give you some examples: "*Quam si quis sanguine tinctan, Advena vidisset.*" Which, if any stranger had seen stained with blood.—Ovid. *Met.*, x, 225. Here the

blood that fell upon the altar baptized it. Immersion, dipping, or plunging, is out of the question. "By chance his hounds—*sanguine tineta suo*—led by the blood-stained track."—*Ibid*, x, 713. Here the blood of the wounded animal falls upon the ground and baptized its track, *tingo* being constantly translated from *baptizo*. "*Et calido velamina tineta cruore Dat munus raptæ*. And gives his garment stained with the warm blood as a present."—*Ibid*, ix, 132-3. Here the blood that fell upon the garment, baptized or immersed it. "*Vis aurea tinxit flumen*," the golden charm (of Midas) tinged the stream. *Ibid*, xi, 142. "*Tertius, Laestrynonis impia tinxit Ora cruore suo*." "The third stained with his own blood the mouth of the impious Laestrygonian."—*Ibid*, xiv, 237. There, immersion is out of the question. "*Et inductas aspergine tingere nubes videtur*." And seems to sprinkle with briny dew the surrounding clouds.—*Ibid*, xi, 498. Here the word *tingo* is defined by *aspergine*, to sprinkle. This victim, an ox, before receiving any strokes—"exequo tinxit subjectos sanguine cultros"—stained with scanty gore the knives applied."—*Ibid*, vii, 599. "*Tingere corpus aqua aspersa*"—wet the body with sprinkled water, or by sprinkling water.—*Ovid. Past.*, iv, 790. Here *tingere* defines the manner in which the body was baptized, but it was done—*aspersa aqua*—by sprinkling water, "*Tingo crusa musto*"—staining the legs by treading the grapes.—*Virgil Georgics*, ii, 8. "*Bisque dio lapsis Pagasaene rustice silvae Pontibus ora lavet; bis flumine corpora tingat*." And washing twice a day from streams trickling down from the top of the Pagasaean wood, and twice she dips her body in the stream.—*Ovid*, xii, 412-3. He beats the ground—"humum—scelerato sanguine tinctam"—stained with his guilty blood.—*Ibid*, v, 193. Here the blood fell upon the ground and *tingo*, stained or baptized it. I read all this to show you how this word is used in the classics, which the brother appeals to even on βαπτίζω, a purely religious word as used in the Bible. Then of the ship that was sunk, did *baptidzo* bring it up again? βαπτίζω, *baptidzo*, when it means *submerge*, never takes a person or object out of the element. *Suhmerge* means to sink the object, and it leaves it there; but does my friend sink his converts and leave them there when he immerses them? *Baptidzo* leaves the person, the rock, or the ship at the bottom of the ocean when it sinks them. Is that his idea of baptism? In the many books he reads from there are many examples where it means to intoxicate, to make drunk, to soak, etc., but does he make people drunk, soak them, and all that sort of thing? Now, the word sink or submerge occurs a number of

times in the Bible in Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, but *baptidzo* is never applied to it in the Greek. All agree that in the classic Greek, a language the apostles never knew any thing about, *baptidzo* meant to sink, and the word sink often occurs in the Bible, but our word *baptidzo* is not applied to it.

Take the passages I gave in my opening speech, and they are rendered *sink*, the English of immerse, in all the translations. Immerse is an Anglicized Latin word. It is pure Latin, compounded of *in*, put *im* for euphony, *in* and *mergo*, I sink. In Luke v: 7, 1 Tim. vi: 9, we have *βυθίζω*, to sink, to drown. Take, now, the Latin versions and writers, and we have:

1. *Vulgate*: Luke v: 7, "Ita ut pene *mergerentur*—so that they were almost sunk;" English—"began to sink." Beza is the same in Latin. Koenael: *mergerentur*, vel *mergi* inciperent—sunk, or began to sink.

1 Tim. vi: 9, "Drown men," etc. *Vulgate*—*mergunt homines*—immerse, drown, *i. e.*, sink them. Beza, "*demergunt*—" sink, *i. e.*, drown, as the result of being immersed—demersed, in questions. Matt. xviii: 6, *καταποντίζω*, sink. *Vulgate*—"demergatur;" Beza, *dermurgatur*—demersed—sink down. Matt. xiv: 30, Peter began to sink—*mergi*, to be mersed. Tertullian's "de Baptismo," ch. xii: "That Peter himself was *immersed* enough when he walked on the sea." It is rendered by all the lexicons by *mergo*, *de*, *sub*, and *immergo*. Schleusner: "*καταποντίζω*, *demergo*, *submergo*, *immergo*." Sink down, sink under, sink in.

Exodus xv: 5, "They sank into the bottom as a stone." The Hebrew is *טָבְעוּ* (*tubbeu—tabha*), were immersed. The Greek Septuagint renders it—*κατέδυσαν εις*—"were immersed—" sank; verse 4, "drowned," the Latin *Vulgate* has *submersi sunt*; verse 10, They sank as lead, etc. Greek—*έδυσαν*—immersed. *Vulgate*—*submersi sunt*. So Ps. lxxix: 2. Now, *βαπτίζω* is in no instance applied to these cases anywhere in God's Word. It shows that immersion, the Latin of *sink*, is not the Bible idea of *βαπτίζω*.

But my brother is very much afraid of *bapto*; and I will give him something about *bapto*. I read from Campbell's "*Christian Baptism*," page 119: "Derivative words legally inherit the *specific*, though not necessarily the figurative meaning of their natural progenitors, and never can so far alienate from themselves that peculiar significance as to indicate any action specifically different from that indicated in the parent stock. Indeed, all inflexions of words . . .

are but *modifications* of one and the same *specific* meaning." Again, in his debate with Rice, he says, pp. 55, 58: "*Baptizo*, confessedly a derivative from *bapto*, derives its *specific* meaning, as well as its *radical form*, from that word." And again, in his "Christian Baptism," page 120, he says: "It is incontrovertibly derived from *bapto*, and, therefore, inherits the proper meaning of *bap*, which is to dip." Mr. Campbell also quotes lexicons to show that they are one word in meaning. Gale, the great English author, indorsed and quoted by Carson, says: "I think it is plain, from these instances already mentioned, that they are *exactly the same as to signification*."—i, p. 18. Their learned immersionists say that *bapto* and *baptizo* are the same in meaning. Carsou says, "As far as respects an increase or diminution of the action of the verb, I perfectly agree with the writer, . . . that the one is more or less than the other, as to mode or frequency, is a perfectly groundless conceit."—Pp. 18, 19. I will now quote some examples from the classic Greek to show you where he stands:

1. *Classic Greek* on βαπτω: "Ταυτα δ' ὤμοσαν, σφαξαντες λαῖρον, καὶ λυκον, καὶ κάρπον, καὶ κριον, εἰς ἀσπίδα, δι μὲν Ἕλληνες βαπτοντες ξιφός, δι δε βαρβαροι λόγχην." *Anabasis*, etc. And this they swore—slaughtering a bull and a wolf, a goat and a ram, into a shield-crescent, the Greeks on the one hand dipping their sword, but the barbarians their spear or javelin.

2. βαπτω: "ἐπειδὴν ἐκιστάζη ἐπὶ τὰ ἱμάτια βάπτεται." "When it (the dyeing matter) drops upon the garments, they are *stained*," baptized. Are they *dipped*—submerged? Where is the *specific immerse*? Ælion, speaking of the old coxcomb, said, "He endeavored to conceal the hoariness of his hair by dyeing (βαφή) it." He was then called "the old man with the dyed hair (βάπτω)." Lib. iii, C. 20.

3. Arrian's Expedition of Alexander: "Nearchus relates that the Indians dyed their beards"—τοὺς δὲ πάγωνας λέγει Νεαρχὸς ὅτι βάπτονται Ἰνδοί.

4. This garment (ἐβάσθη), stained by the sword of Ægisthus, is a witness to me. (Æschylus, *Cloe*.)

5. He fell and breathed no more, and the lake (ἐβάπτετο) was tinged with blood. (Homer.)

6. Aristotle, speaking of a dyeing substance, says, "If it is pressed, it (βάπτει) colors the hand."

7. "Magnes, an old comic poet of Athens, used the Lydia music, shaved his face, and (βαπτομενος) smeared it over with tawny ashes." Where is the dip?

Kühner, in his "Greek Grammar," p. 287, § 232, R. 1, has given the law of the true relation of verbs ending in ἴω, as derivatives,

such as βαπτίζω: "Verbs in *ίζω* (*idzo*) often signify to make something into that which the *root* denotes." Now, 1. βαπτίζω and βάπτω are both the translation of the same Hebrew word טבל (*tabhal*), the same Syriac, Chaldee, and Arabic words.

2. Βάπτω is often used by the Greeks as expressing the same *action* as βαπτίζω.

3. Unquestionably the word originally meant to stain, that is, by sprinkling, affusion. From the discovery of staining by accidental contact with staining matter, the falling of it or touching of it to the person, or garments, etc., would be discovered the art of staining, coloring, dyeing. In the oldest Greek βάπτω means to stain. From seeing stains as the effect of such accidental applications, came or was discovered the art of thorough dyeing—dyeing by submergence in the dyeing matter diluted in liquid. Hence, from being done by sprinkling, it came to apply to immersions as a classic or secular word. As sprinkling with liquids moistens, washes, etc., it thus took the wide range so common in all languages. The analogy of the Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, etc., fully sustains this view.

We are pretty well through with our foundation argument, and in our next will proceed to the points you are more interested in. As to Moses Stuart, whom he wholly misrepresents and garbles, as well as others, I will bring all of them up in due time.

MR. WILKES' SECOND REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My friend, Mr. Ditzler, is mad. I heard of a little boy once, who said he had been to "the debate." When he went home he was asked, "which beat?" "Oh," said he, "that man there beat!" "How do you know?" he was asked. "Why, I never saw a man so mad as that other man was, in my life." Well, my brother Ditzler is mad. He says I have misrepresented him. The matter has all gone to record, and I am the one to suffer by it, if I have. It may be that I have not; the record will show, and there I leave it.

My friend says I would not affirm exclusive immersion; "but," said he, "you will notice that his whole speech was to prove exclusive immersion." No! no! my friend; that was a mistake of your own. If Mr. D. will not become *offended*, I will say that was *simply* a mistake. My whole speech was not to "prove exclusive immersion." It was to disprove, in a negative way, sprinkling or pouring for baptism. There are two ways of meeting an opponent's arguments: first, I *refute* his argument, if I can; secondly, I prove, affirmatively, an incompatible proposition. I *disprove* his proposition by proving the contradictory of it. That is logic, and that is what I was doing. I tried first to *refute* his speech, and secondly to disprove his speech.

Again, he says he *did* say that words are used in a different sense in the New Testament Greek from that in which they are used in the classics, and proved it. The reason he said this was because it is true; and, of course, he would tell the truth. But the necessity of his saying it is this: the *classic* argument is, in this case, on my side, and he feels the necessity of proving that the *sacred* use is different from the classical use. But did he prove it *in regard to baptizo*? He did not.

Just here would be a good place to bring in this proof. He says Mr. Campbell "quoted" only ten lines, strictly, on the Bible argument, and Dr. Conant only sixteen and a half lines. This is his pre-

cise language; or it is near enough to answer all practical purposes. We will know, when this discussion is over, how many lines on the strictly Bible argument *he* has "quoted from the Scriptures."

He has not quoted any yet, and the presumption, with me, is that he will not quote very many. When he does begin to quote from the Bible, I am going to do with him what he says he will do with Dr. Conant: I am "going to ruin him."

He confesses that the word *baptizo*, in the classical use, means "to submerge." In regard to *louo*, I said it was not used to designate *the religious* ordinance. In his first speech, he said it was. I think he is mistaken. It may have been, and doubtless was, used by the heathen to designate some kind of religious ordinance or observance, but not *the Christian* ordinance; that which both he and I mean.

My friend, in an attempt to criticise my definition of *peritomē* (circumcision), says it is *not* a "cutting all round." Now, he ought to have been very careful; you know he never misrepresents any body! Does he not know that I was reading from "Liddell & Scott," when I said "*cutting all round?*" Let me read again: "*Peritomē (peritemno)*, 'a cutting all round.—II. *Circumcision.*'—Greek-English Lexicon, by Liddell & Scott.

Still *he* never misrepresents any body! I would say to him, be a little careful on this question of misrepresenting people. I say, respectfully, that I do not misrepresent my friend; or, possibly, not more than he does me, and all this excitement on his part, all this fiery declamation, in regard to my misrepresenting him, is entirely gratuitous, wholly so; I decline to accept it. I think he is mistaken on this point. I would say more if it were parliamentary.

My friend charges me with exhibiting a want of candor! "Did you ever see such a want of candor?" said he. The spectators at this discussion know, and the readers of it will know, whether I have exhibited a very "great want of candor." I have tried to be candid; and I would say to my hearers, if I have not been candid, I have not been what I meant to be.

My brother says he is done with the "*sick women*" I am glad of it, for he has had them on his hands for six months or more; but, *now*, he says he "is going to take" *me*! Well, if he does not succeed better than he has thus far, he will not *sprinkle* me, at least. Though, if I become sick on his hands, he may attempt it; for that is the reason out of which sprinkling originated in the third century. But

I hardly think he will sprinkle me, *just for my accommodation*. I demand a "Thus saith the Lord," in such cases.

In regard to *tingo*, he says "it will cut quite a figure in this discussion;" and, therefore, he defines it very extensively. *Bapto* has two meanings. Dr. Stuart says expressly that it has, and he tells the truth. Its primary meaning is "to dip," as every lexicon on that table—where the books are open, as if we had come to the judgment—will show. *Bapto* means, first and primarily, "to dip." But, perhaps, most of them, certainly many of them, define it also, "to dye, or color." That is the secondary meaning. Now, Mr. Campbell says the derivative word carries the primary, but not *always* the secondary, meaning with it; and that is true. Mr. Stuart says the derivative word *baptizo* does not carry the secondary meaning of *bapto* with it; and that there is no place where it can be found, in Greek literature, having the secondary meaning.

But "the Fathers" and many writers after the Christian era used the word *tingo* to express their conception of baptism, says Mr. D. That is true. But my friend selects *tingo*, and then goes back to the classics, and tells us that *tingo* means "to stain." That is the radical meaning of *tingo*. But it happens that "staining" or "dyeing" was usually performed by dipping things into a dye; and the word *tingo* came to mean "to dip" on that account and in that way; just as the word *baptizo* came to mean "to wash"—as washing may be done by dipping things into water. The Fathers, therefore, on account of that secondary meaning, or in view of it, used *tingo* to designate baptism. Now, all the references my friend made were as far apart as the poles from any question of baptism. The word *tingo*, as he read it, is applied wholly to other things. If he intended, here, to prove that *tingo* meant, primarily, "to dye," before the ordinance of baptism was instituted, he was doing a work of supererogation. But when applied to *baptism* what does it mean?

I did not come prepared, *now*, for any discussion on that point; for it is a point beyond controversy that *tingo* and *intingo*, words used to describe or designate baptism, are used in the sense of *dipping* and *immersion* by the Fathers and the lexicons, as I will show you more abundantly after awhile.

For the present, I read from Stuart, p. 145. *On this page* Moses Stuart uses the word *tingo* twice—himself a sprinkler, himself a pedobaptist—and he translates it, once by "dip" and once by "immerse." What does the word *tingo* mean when we are talking about baptism?

It means, says Dr. Stuart, "dip," or "immerse." What does it mean? Ask Mr. Campbell. He says it means "to dip, to immerse." Mr. Rice, do you object to that? Not a single word of objection was made. So, if my friend *presses* this point, I now give him warning, that the proofs shall shower upon and *overwhelm*, not sprinkle him! He gives no case of *tingo* applied to baptism as yet.

But he says he "intends to ruin Dr. Conant." I hope the telegraph operator is not here; he might telegraph that information to Dr. Conant; and then how troubled the old author would *feel* when he heard that Mr. Ditzler, out here at Louisville, was "*ruining him!*" Silence is the best answer to what he said on that subject. To think of that man who stands, yea, towers and looms up, high in his grand proportions, being ruined by one whose reputation, to say the least of it, like my own, has not gone far beyond the limits of our own State! My friend will not feel hurt, I hope, and he a little "mad" again, as he was in his former speech; because I mean to try to deal candidly. On this subject I do not intend to ask for "quarter;" nor do I intend to give any.

My friend says that classic baptism leaves the candidates in the water! I deny that. It does not necessarily. Where does his baptism leave them? In the water? He says that classic baptism leaves them "in the water," or, "*at the bottom!*" I ask, Where does his baptism leave them? *He* never "goes to the water" at all to baptize. Of course, he never goes to the bottom. As he never goes into the water to baptize, I suppose he will show you *why* he does not, in baptism, put his candidates to the "bottom," in the classic sense. He says the word in the *Scriptures* has a *different* meaning. But he *can not prove it*. I have, here, on my table, the highest authority, declaring that the word has not changed—and that from a man who is not a Baptist.

I will now proceed with my regular arguments.

I now introduce Greek authors who wrote *after* the Christian era, most of whom were Christians, who, having been baptized, knew the meaning of the word.

I quote, first, from Barnabas, one of the so-called "apostolic fathers," who wrote, probably, about 140 A. D.—only about forty or fifty years after the death of John. On page 121 of the "Apostolic Fathers," published by T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1867, we have this language: "For these words imply, Blessed are they who, placing their trust in the cross, have gone down into the water," etc.

Again, same page. "This meaneth, that we, indeed, descend into the water full of sins and defilement, but come up, bearing fruit in our heart, having the fear (of God), and trust in Jesus in our spirit." That baptism is here alluded to is, I believe, not denied; and since the translation—not made by a Baptist—represents persons trusting in the cross and fearing God, going down into the water and coming up again, acts demanded on the hypothesis that they were immersed, but otherwise foolish, I conclude they were immersed.

Justin Martyr, who was a Christian, wrote about 150, having been born 114 A. D., and having suffered martyrdom at Rome about 165. On page 59, Justin says: "Then they are brought by us where there is water, and regenerated in the same manner in which we were ourselves regenerated. For, in the name of God, the Father and Lord of the Universe, and of our Savior Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, they then received the washing with water. For Christ also said, 'Except ye be born again ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'" That water baptism is here alluded to is seen in the fact that "they are *brought* by us where there is *water*," in order to be regenerated. It is proved, also, by the fact that they were *washed*, the baptismal formula, in the name of the Father, etc., being used. As evidence that it was not a sprinkling or pouring, he speaks of the baptism as a *birth*, as bearing a striking likeness to a birth, which sprinkling and pouring certainly do not.

The Shepherd of Hermas, who wrote probably about 150 A. D., on page 420, "Apostolic Fathers," where he is certainly speaking of baptism, says: "The seal, then, is water; they descend into the water dead, and they arise alive." Again, same page, he says: "Accordingly they descend with them into the water, and again ascend." If it be natural, and persons are wont to *descend into the water* and then to *ascend* in order to sprinkle or pour, then sprinkling or pouring may be alluded to in this passage, otherwise immersion is the inference.

Clement of Rome, the reputed author of the "Recognitions of Clement," wrote probably in the latter part of the second century. A passage from the "Recognitions" is quoted by Origen in his "Commentary on Genesis," written in 231. On page 276 we read, "But every one of you shall be baptized in ever-flowing waters," etc. This harmonizes well with the idea of immersion, but not with the idea of sprinkling or pouring.

The same author, page 332, speaking of baptism, says: "But when you have come to the Father, you will learn that this is his will, that

you be born anew by means of waters, which were first created." And same page, "For thus hath the true Prophet testified to us, with an oath, 'Verily I say to you, that unless a man is born again of water, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'" A sprinkling or pouring is not a *birth* of water.

In Mosheim's Church History, translated by the celebrated Congregationalist, Murdock, vol. i, page 87, we have this language: "In this century [the first] baptism was administered in convenient places without the public assemblies, and by immersing the candidates wholly in water." For this opinion he cites Vossius, Fabricius, and others cited by Fabricius.

Mosheim, vol. i, page 137, speaking of the baptisms of the *second century*, says, "The candidates for it were immersed wholly in water, with invocation of the sacred Trinity, according to the Savior's precept," etc.

Mosheim, in his "Historical Commentaries on the State of Christianity during the first Three Hundred and Twenty-five Years," vol. i, page 62, gives us the history of the baptism of Novatian in the middle of the third century. Novatian was a very learned and distinguished philosopher at Rome. It is said "a deep and settled melancholy had fastened on his mind." He finally professed faith in Christ, some think hypocritically, others not. The Christians who attended him believed that he had a demon, and they proposed to cast it out through the exorcists, and to restore him to health. Of course they insisted that he should be baptized and attend to the other ceremonies required by the church. They attempted to exorcise the demon, but it would not go out. It is proper to state, also, that he was a man of unblemished moral character. While under the operations of the exorcists he "was seized with a threatening disease," and "was baptized in his bed, when apparently about to die." He recovered, but he would not submit to be *crossed* or *signed* by the bishop: nor would he submit to *many other rites* prescribed by the church but not found in the Word of God. The bishop, *Fabian*, perhaps, after awhile made him a presbyter in his church. To this many objected; indeed, it was done "contrary to the whole body of priests, and of a large part of the church." The author says, "It was altogether irregular, and contrary to ecclesiastical rules, to admit a man to the priestly office who had been baptized in bed, that is, who had been merely sprinkled, and had not been wholly immersed in water, in the ancient method. For by many, and especially by the Roman Christians, the

baptism of *clinici* (so they called those who, lest they should die out of the church, were baptized on a sick bed) was accounted less perfect, and indeed less valid, and not sufficient for the attainment of salvation."

Nearly all that is generally quoted concerning Novatian is taken from what Cornelius of Rome has written of him. Cornelius was a bitter opponent of Novatian, "and nearly all the charges he brings against him, great as they may seem to be, relate to the intentions of the mind, which are known only to God; and some of the charges reflect more disgrace on Cornelius himself than Novatian." You will notice that the language of the quotation is, "He was *merely sprinkled*, and had not been wholly immersed in water, in the ancient method."

I will here read again from Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," translated by Prof. Torrey, vol. i, p. 310: "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, of being entirely penetrated by the same. It was only with the sick, where the exigency required it, that any exception was made, and in this case baptism was administered by sprinkling. Many superstitious persons, clinging to the outward form, imagined that such baptism by sprinkling was not fully valid, and hence they distinguished those who had been so baptized by denominating them *clinici*. The bishop, Cyprian, expressed himself strongly against this delusion. "It is otherwise," he says, "the breast of the believer is washed, the soul of man is cleansed by the merits of faith. In the sacraments of salvation, where necessity compels and God gives permission, the divine thing, though outwardly abridged, bestows all that it implies on the faithful."

"Or if any one supposes that they have obtained nothing because they have been merely *sprinkled* with the water of salvation, they must not be so deceived themselves as to think they ought, therefore, to be baptized over again in case they recover from their sickness. But if those who have once been consecrated by the baptism of the church can not again be baptized, why fill them with perplexity in regard to their faith and the grace of the Lord?"

This, taken in connection with the fact that it is known from other sources that immersion was the practice of the church every-where at this time, is deemed sufficient for the present in regard to the practice in this century.

In "Mosheim's History," vol. i, p. 281 (fourth century), we read: "For the more convenient administration of *baptism*, sacred fonts or baptisteria (fifteen) were erected in the porches of the temples." And in note fifteen he says: "The *baptistries* were, properly, *buildings adjacent* to the churches in which the catechumens were instructed, and where were a sort of cisterns, into which water was let at the time of baptism, and in which the candidates were baptized by immersion."

Remember, the churches of the author, Mosheim, and of the American translator, James Murdock, both practice sprinkling for baptism, to which add the fact that they were superlatively distinguished for their learning and means of information, and the conclusion is inevitable that the history given is right, or that immersion, and not sprinkling, was the practice in the fourth century.

MR. DITZLER'S THIRD ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My brother thinks there is a test of candor that will work both ways. He said the word circumcision meant "to cut *all* around," and I said that the word itself did not imply the action. He appealed to Liddell & Scott to sustain him. I will read from Robinson, who is of the highest authority. Mind you, I was using the verb form, "περιτέμνω (*peritemno*), to cut around, to circumcise." Liddell & Scott's Greek Lexicon: "To cut round, clip round about, to circumcise, to make incisions all over one's arms, etc., to cut off and hem in, etc., cut off." You see he is a very candid man. He would make you believe that what I said was not there, and wants to make you think I am angry. You remember the story of "stop thief," and you know how he has been yesterday and to-day. He reads constantly from Mosheim, as though he lived in the apostolic day. The old gentleman just died in the past century. The brother takes a man who lived seventeen hundred years after the last apostle died to prove that a thing was not apostolic; a man that he himself regards as totally unreliable. Mosheim is fine authority on baptism, of course! Then he says Josephus was educated in Hebrew and Greek. Just think of it! Josephus himself tells us that when he went to Rome and became a general in the army he had to learn Greek. He learned it from classic sources, and tried to write in classic style. Winer says: "The later (Greek dialect) (differing again in some measure in the different provinces of Asia and Africa) constituted the *primary basis of the style* of the *Septuagint* and the *Apocrypha* as well as of the *New Testament*. The Jews in Egypt and Palestine learned the Greek first by *intercourse* with the Greeks, *not from books*. No wonder, then, if, when writing, they retained the peculiarities of the popular language. So the (Seventy) LXX, the New Testament writers, and the authors of many (Palestine) Apocrypha. *A few of the learned Jews, who valued*

and studied Greek literature, approached nearer to the *written language*, as Philo and Josephus." Winer now adds a note: "That the style of the *latter* (Josephus) *can not be accounted the same as that of the Septuagint, or of the New Testament*, will be readily perceived by a comparison of the sections in the earlier books of the Antiquities with the parallel ones of the Septuagint."—Winer's "Idioms," § 2, p. 27.

Josephus declares that he did "far exceed them (his countrymen) in the education of my country. *I have also been anxious to obtain the learning of the GREEKS, having learned the elements of grammar, though I have been so long accustomed to our own tongue (Hebrew, i. e., Syriac) that I can not pronounce Greek with accuracy.*" He wrote a history of the Jewish war in Hebrew before he composed in Greek. "I purposed," says he, "to narrate in the Greek language, to those under the Roman dominion, the things which I formerly composed for the barbarians of the interior *in my native tongue.*" Hence he was commanded by Titus, from a convenient position, to address the Jews, and he "declared the message of the Emperor in *Hebrew,*" *i. e., Syriac.*—Antip. Jud. xx: 11, 2. Bell. Jud. Prævem 1; vi: 1; v: 6, 3. In the first place, Winer says that Josephus did not use the kind of Greek that is used in the Bible. Certainly he himself shows he was not educated in the Greek at all, but learned it later in life, and yet my brother says he was educated in Greek as well as Hebrew. He is a very reliable man to make assertions.

I now take up the Greek lexicographers. I will quote Mr. A. Campbell on these authorities first. I quote from his "Christian Baptism," 123, "Debate with Rice," 58, 75, 78, 118: "I will rely **EXCLUSIVELY** upon the *most ancient*, the *most impartial*, and the *most famous* lexicographers. . . . I prefer them," etc. Yet they were

1. Not most ancient by *one thousand years*.
2. Not *impartial*, since nearly all of them were immersionists.
3. Quotes mainly those who did not treat it *scientifically*, but who defined it by a preconceived and settled fact as to their own minds, by Rom. vi: 3, 4.
4. Omits *all* native Greek lexicographers. Think of *Webster, Richardson, Johnson, etc.*, laid aside for a French or German dictionary to define our tongue for us!
5. A. C. assumes that immerse, dip, plunge, are all the same (Debate, 96.) You know they are very different.
6. "Christian Baptism" (A. C.'s) of Lexicons: "(2d.) *Not one of them ever translates any of these terms by the word sprinkle,*" p. 126.

(2). "We have, then, *the unanimous testimony of ALL the distinguished lexicographers known in Europe or America that the proper and every-where current signification of baptizo . . . is to dip, plunge, or immerse, and that any other meaning is tropical, rhetorical, or fanciful.*"—*Ibid*, § 126-7, 147.

"They ALL, (lexicons) WITHOUT ONE SINGLE EXCEPTION, give dip, immerse, sink, or plunge, synonymously expressive of the true, proper, and primary signification of *baptizo*; NOT ONE of them giving *sprinkle* or *pour* as a meaning of it, or any of its family." "It never has been (Debate, 109) translated by either *sprinkle* or *pour* by any lexicographer for eighteen hundred years" (Debate, 139). "Can not show one (Greek dictionary) that gives wash as its first meaning."—Debate, 118.

1. STOKIUS, βάπτω, tingo, moisten, stain, sprinkle.

2. SCHLEUSNER, mergo, im. tingo int. imbuo.—Rev. xix: 13, vestis tincta sanguine, "stained with blood."

3. FACCIOLATUS & FORCELLINUS, Tattius, Latin—latis Lex. gives βάπτω as the synonyme of tingo.

4. ANDREWS' Lat. Lex., Βαπτᾶ, painters.

5. ANTHON'S Clas. Dic.:

"Βαπτᾶ. The priests of Cotytta. The name is derived from βάπτω, to tinge or dye, from their painting their cheeks and staining the parts around the eyes like women."

6. KUHNER'S Gr. Gram., § 143, p. 173, βάπτω, to tinge.

7. DALZEL—Græci Maj., βάπτω (tingo), tinge.

8. URSINUS' Gr. Lex., to stain, to dye, to wash or cleanse (abluo), to sprinkle—aspergo.

9. GROVES' Gr. Lex., to dip, plunge, immerse, wash, wet, moisten, sprinkle, steep, imbue, dye, stain, color.

10. GAZES, a native Greek lexicographer of immense research and learning, defines βάπτω thus: Βάλλω τι μέσα (εις τὴν βιφήν) εἰς τι. 2. χρωματίζω, βαφοῦ καὶ δυθίζω, χάνω τι μέσα εἰς τι. . . 4. Βρέχω, λούω, πλύνω. 5. Αντλῶ, γεμίζω. "To cast or thrust down. 2. To stain, to dye, also to sink, to pour any thing into or on any thing. 4. To shed forth, as tears, rain, sprinkle; to wash, to wash the hands. 5. To draw, absorb, or pump forth water; to fill." These are the highest authorities known. Here Mr. Anthon tells us clearly the reverse of what he wrote to that Baptist preacher. And what becomes of the bold assertions of Mr. Campbell, just quoted? These assertions have been proclaimed over all the land for years, yet you see they are the reverse of all the facts.

I will now take up the lexicons on βαπτίζω (*baptidzo*), to baptize, and see if they sustain my cause or my worthy brother's. As all agree that in classic Greek it means to sink—the Latin of which is immerse—to drown, to intoxicate, to perplex, to make drunk, for the present I omit the body of them, though they all fully sustain my position. I omit the body of the classics because, 1st, The word does not occur once in the whole Bible in such a sense as it *always* occurs there, in a *profane, secular* sense. 2d. It *never* occurs in them as it does in the Bible, for in the latter it *always* occurs in a *religious* sense. I will quote the leading and best classical lexicons, though, because they are written by native born *Greeks*, and some of them are very ancient. While Mr. A. Campbell professes to quote “the *most* ancient,” and “rely *exclusively* on them,” he does not quote a single one of them, nor a single *native* Greek lexicographer. His earliest is 1572.

1. Hesychius was a native Greek lexicographer of the fourth century. He only gives the root of βαπτίζω, viz: βίπτω, and defines it by ἀντλω (*antlo*), to absorb, draw, or pour forth water, pump water.

2. Suidas was a very learned native Greek, and spent his life in the tenth (10th) century in collating, and editing, and preserving Greek literature. To him we are indebted for much that otherwise never would have survived his day. He compiled a Greek lexicon filled with quotations. He defines it by simply πλύνω, *pluno*, to wash. It is βάπτοισι πλύνουσι. A. Campbell renders πλύνω, wash. It has no other meaning. See his “Christian Baptism,” 155, 156, where he says it occurs seventeen times in the Scriptures—always *wash*.

3. Phavorinus, a native Greek lexicographer of about the fourth century, defines βάπτω simply, and by πλύνω (*wash*).

4. Zonaras, a native Greek of the tenth century, and one of the four great historians of Constantinople, defines βαπτίζω by καθαρίζω—to cleanse, which was always done religiously by sprinkling.

5. Julianus, one of the most learned and acute adversaries Augustine had in the fourth century; a man of profoundest erudition, and thoroughly posted in all these matters, says βαπτίζω—“*perfundere interpretatus est—baptidzo, means to sprinkle.*” He was a Christian father of the most careful disposition; calm, learned, and, as Beza says, “Adversus quem eruditissimos libros scripsit Augustinus”—the opponent “against whom Augustine wrote his most learned works.”—Beza’s “Annotationes Græcæ Nov. Test.,” Matt. iii: 11, 1598.

6. Augustine, fourth century, if not the most learned, only Jerome

was more so, of all the Latin Fathers, and by far the most influential, admits this with a limitation, to which we yield assent. He said: "*Baptizandi verbum (βαπτίζω) ex Græca Latina lingua sic habet, ut non soleat nisi in sacramento regenerationis intelligi.*" "The Latin language has the word baptize from the Greek; so that it is not to be so understood, except in the sacrament of regeneration." That is, in classic Greek it is not to be understood as meaning sprinkle; but as a New Testament or Bible word, it is.

7. *Tertullian*, A. D. 190: "Mergere non tantum, sed et perfundere."—"De Anonia," Pond, p. 25. It means not only to sink, but also to sprinkle.

These last three, though they never wrote lexicons, speak from a lexicographical stand-point. Now let him show such a record on his side where the ancients viewed it in its lexical sense. He can not do it.

8. *Sophocles* has just published a lexicon restricted to the later iron age of Greek, and largely the patristic Greek of the Dark Ages. I know nothing of its merits, but will give his definitions, as the immersionists have raised such a shout over him: "βαπτίζω, to dip, to immerse; sink, to be drowned (as the effect of sinking); to sink. Trop., To afflict; soaked in liquor; to be DRUNK, INTOXICATED. 2. Mid. To perform ablution; to bathe; βαπτίζεσθαι τοῖς δάκρυσι; bathed [baptized] in tears; to plunge a knife. 4. Baptizo, mergo; mergito, tingo (or tinguo); to baptize—New Testament passim. There is no evidence that Luke and Paul and the other writers of the New Testament put upon this verb meanings not recognized by the Greeks. [So say I, with all my heart.] βάπτισμα, baptism, the rite—New Testament passim. Passim, i. e., generally. βαπτιστής, baptizer, ablutor; one who baptizes; a purifier."

I now give you the greatest standards of native Greek lexicographers in modern times, who wrote in Greek, spoke in Greek, and who certainly should give us the true definition.

9. *Kouma* is a native Greek of this century. His lexicon is written in modern Greek on the ancient Greek. He thus defines βαπτίζω: "Μ. ἰσὼ ἐκ τοῦ βάπτω; βυθίζω, βουτῶ συχνάκις εἰς ἕρπον, κατα βρέχω, βρεχω. 2. ἀντλῶ 3. βαπτίζω . . . ἐκκλῆσ Σ. Future tense, βαπτίσω, from βάπτω—to sink, to put frequently into water; to besprinkle [κατὰ, down, and βρεχω, shed as tears; let fall, as rain—Luke vii: 38; Matt. v: 45; Luke xvii: 29. Spargo, demitto, rigo. Schleusner, sprinkle, let fall, moisten]; to shed forth, sprinkle. 2. To draw or pump water. 3. In an ecclesiastical sense, to baptize."

10. Gazes was a native of Melias, Thessaly. He was educated at Venice, traveled over Europe; was one of the most learned of Greeks; was a member of the committee that framed and signed the Declaration of Grecian Independence. He put forth his lexicon, founded on Schneider's, with changes and improvements, at Venice, three volumes quarto, which the learned Hilarion followed, who, with the approval of his archbishop, revised the translation of the Bible by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Here is his definition in full: βαπτίζω: Μ. σω (βαπτω). Συχνά βουτῶ τι μέσα εἰς τι καὶ ἐντεθεῖν ἀνὰ του. Βρεχω τι, ποτίζω, ἐπιχυνω, λούω. 2. ἀντλῶ βουτῶ εἰς τὸ νερὸν ἀγγείον τι διὰ τὰ ἐκβάλλω. 3. πλύνω τὰς χεῖρας, ἢ λούομαι. 4. βαπτίζω, παρα Χριστιανοῖς, etc. "Baptidzo, future tense, baptiso (from baptō), to put frequently any thing into any thing, and thence upon it (*ana tou*); (*brecho ti*) to pour forth any thing; to water (*pontidzo*); TO POUR UPON (*epichuno*—ἐπι, upon, and χυνω, to pour); to wash (*louo*). 2. To draw or pump water; to put a vessel into a place of water that I may pour it out. 3. To wash the hands, or perform ablution. 4. Among Christians, to baptize."

This exhausts native Greek lexicography on this subject. It needs no comment. But what becomes of the publications and declarations that have gone forth for years over all the land, that no lexicographer, ancient or modern, "Greek, Jew, or Turk," ever gave pour or sprinkle as meanings of βαπτω or βαπτίζω?

11. Grimshaw, "βαπτίζω, to wash, dip, or besprinkle."

12. Valpy's "Latin Lexicon," an eminent Greek scholar, indeed, who gives the Greek with the Latin—"βαπτίζω, to wash." That is all.

13. Ed. Robinson's "Lexicon of the New Testament" (classic use he gives, first, as), to dip in, to sink, to immerse; in Greek authors, spoken of ships, etc. In New Testament, to wash, to lave, cleanse by washing; wash one's self; to perform ablution." He then adds, in a note to the word:

"NOTE.—While in Greek writers, as above exhibited, from Plato onward, βαπτίζω is every-where to sink, 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."—Ed. 1854.

14. Wahl's "Clavis," New Testament. Wahl, one of the most excellent lexicons we have, simply gives, 1. Lavo; 2. immergo—I wash; 2d. I immerse. 3. Metaph. obruo aliquem aliqua re, largiter imhuo. Pass. obruor, largiter imbuor, ut πνεύματι abunde dare Spiritum div. Metaphorically, to overwhelm any thing with any thing; to abun-

dantly wet, imbue, as with the Spirit; to give the divine Spirit abundantly. “*βαπτισμός*, 1. *immersio*. 2. *lotio, lustratio aqua facta*—Marc. vii: 8; Heb. ix: 10. Immersion, washing, cleansing accomplished with water,” etc. In brackets he puts the general classic definition thus: [*demergo, submergo*—Polyb. i, 51, 6. Diod. Sic., xi, 18, *si lect sana*; to sink down, to submerge, *i. e.*, to sink under in Polybius i, 51, 6. In Diodorus Siculus xi, 18, if the reading be correct.] Then he gives the New Testament definitions in order, as above.

Wahl is a high authority, but, like Stokius, he mixes up his classical and biblical definitions, of which they have been much complained of by critics.

15. Stokius simply gives “*βαπτίζω, lavo, baptizo*,” I wash, I baptize. I will quote him in full hereafter, as he is held as so important an authority by immersionists.

16. Schætgen gives “*mergo, immergo*,” as its classic meaning. “In Mark and Luke, *abluo, lavo, largiter PROFUNDO*,” *i. e.*, “to sink, immerse; in Mark and Luke, to wash, cleanse, *POUR profusely upon*.” So much for the Greek lexicons. You see they abundantly sustain my proposition.

Now, I have given you an elaborate review of the meaning of this word, but I shall investigate it still further, and in a regular way, though my brother has already run all over the subject. There is a word in the Bible which means baptize, and which is translated *βαπτίζω* (*baptidzo*) by the Seventy, *i. e.*, by the Greek translation made some 280 years before Christ. The learned Seventy of the Septuagint renders טָבַל (*tabhal*) by *βαπτίζω* (*baptidzo*). This word is the word for baptize in Hebrew, and in its radical form means *to sprinkle*. It also sometimes implies *to stain*.

1. Buxtorff's Hebrew Lexicon defines it, “*tinxit, intinxit, demersit, immersit*; that is, to stain, to dip, to sink down, to sink in, immerse.”

2. Davidson defines it, “to dip, immerse, to stain; Arabic, to dye with colors.”

3. Hottinger gives only “*tinxit, abluere*, to stain or moisten, to wash.”

4. Gesenius' Thesaurus has *tinxit*, etc.

5. Johannes Simonis (1757, by J. Wetstein), gives *tinxit, intinxit, immersit, demersit*.

Furstianus, “*rigare, tingere, perfundere; immergere*; to water, moisten, **TO SPRINKLE**; to immerse.” Remember, this man was a Jew, and

the most learned rabbi now in the world, and he shows that the radical idea of this word in Hebrew is to sprinkle. I quote from his Hebrew lexicon: "טבל, to moisten, to sprinkle, *rigare, tingere*; therefore, to dip, to immerse." He says, "The fundamental signification of the stem is to moisten, to besprinkle, connected with its organic root ובל with that in בל (*bal*)."

Here is a word, my friends, the fundamental signification of which is to sprinkle, which the learned Greeks, who translated the Bible, rendered into βαπτίζω (*baptidzo*.)

Again, I could give you many Hebrew roots which correspond with other words, showing the radical idea of this word. Then, there is another word in the Hebrew, that in cognate languages is translated from and into βαπτίζω. It is צבע. In the first place, we have טבל (*tabhal*) translated βαπτω and βαπτίζω in the Greek Septuagint, used by the apostles and early Greek Church almost altogether, which means to sprinkle. Then we have צבע (*tzabha*), which is rendered βαπτο (*bapto*) constantly by the Seventy, and צבע (*zebha*) is the Chaldee, Syriac, and Arabic word for baptize. 1. Furstianus gives "צבע (*zebha*), Chaldee, tingere, irrigare, sicut, Heb. *tzabha*. B. PERFUNDERE, imbaere. Ithpa. tingi, tinctum esse," to moisten, water, SPRINKLE (Paal), "to wet, be wet," corresponding to the form of *bapto* in the Greek. In his lexicon, Furst gives "to moisten, to besprinkle, Syriac, to baptize; Paal, to water, to moisten. In Targ., to dye." "The fundamental signification" of the Hebrew seems to be, to "moisten, to wet, like the Aramæan (Syriac) *zebha*, then to color. Compare the Arabic *tsavhiv*, 'what is poured out,' juice (*sabha*), 'to flow.'" Gesenius—" *tzabha*, Arab., to flow, to trickle as water." Now, this word, in its radical form, means to pour, to sprinkle; in the Arabic, in its radical form, to pour; in the Paal form it means to sprinkle, to besprinkle, to moisten. This corresponds also to βαπτίζω, to baptize.

Such facts are worth ten thousand such authorities as he reads, that are hundreds of years since the days of Christ, or, if from the Greek fathers, it is from an age when they believed that the longer they staid in the water the more of Christ's spirit they absorbed from it. If this word did not imply sprinkling, how could these things be brought out so clearly?

There is another word in the Hebrew Bible of constant occurrence, which Mr. A. Campbell, Carson, etc., insist *always* implied *immersion*, רץ (*rachatz*), to wash, bathe. Its radical meaning is "to bubble up, to flow, to pour out, to drip" (Furst). It is translated in the Sep-

tuagint by *λοῖω* (*louo*), *χέω* (*cheo*), to pour, *νίπτω*, wash, *πλύνω*, *ἀποπλύνω*, etc., wash, wash clean. See A. Campbell on (*rachatz*) wash, *λοῖω*, etc. (Ch. Baptism, 155, 156, 173, 174, 177.) He urges that it was always by *immersion*—this wash, *rachatz*—and referred to Eph. v: 25; Heb. ix: 10.

I will now quote further authorities on the Chaldee (same in Syriac exactly and Arabic) *צִבְחָא*, *tzebha*.

1. Davidson.—“Aphel, to wet, moisten.

2. Hottinger.—“Heb. R., *tinxit*. Syr., *tingit*, *immergit*. Ethpa., *tingi sanguine*. Hence, *Baptismum*. Hebrew root, to stain, moisten. Syriac, to moisten, to immerse. Ethpaal form, to be stained or moistened with blood (*e. g.*), hence, *Baptism*.”

3. Buxtorff's Heb. et Chal. Lexicon.—“*Pinxit*, *tinxit*, *coloravit*—to paint, to stain, to color.”

4. Gesenius' Lexicon.—“Chaldee, to dip in, immerse. Paal, to wet, moisten. Ithpa., to be wet, moistened. In the Targums often to dye, to color.”

It should be stated that it never occurs in Chaldee except in the Paal and Ithpaal forms; hence, Gesenius gives no references under dip, immerse, but does under the Paal and Ithpa. forms. He renders the noun from it by hyena, *i. e.*, from its colors.

5. Gesenius' Thesaurus: “*Tinxit*, *intinxit*, *inde colore imbuere*. Syr., *id.*, *etiam de baptismo*, *et ita apud Zabios*. To stain, to dip, thence imbue with color. Syriac, it is the same as baptize, and so among the Sabians.” As the Latin, *tingo*, Greek, *βάπτω*, so in all these languages, words that applied to the dropping of coloring fluids, as blood, juice of grapes, of vines, trees, are the words for baptize. In the Arabic it also applies to juice of a tree which falls upon any thing, and stains or colors it. Now, if the word *βαπτίζω*, *baptize*, implied immersion, as a religious ordinance, how could these ancient writers and translators, indorsed by the apostles, in their translation, translate this word, which meant to *sprinkle*, by *baptidzo*, unless *baptidzo* implied sprinkling?

The first place that the word *תִּבְחַל* (*tabhal*), baptize, occurs in the Bible is a case where *sprinkling* was the mode. I refer to the case of Joseph's garments, which I shall refer to hereafter. There immersion is out of the question. His garment was “baptized with the blood of a kid of the goats,” which was slain to procure it. The word itself meant to sprinkle, and the oldest and best translation of the Bible in the world, the Peshito-Syriac, renders it by *to sprinkle*, though King

James' translation renders it dip. His garments were not dipped, but simply baptized by *aspersion*, not by *immersion*. Hence, the word, רָחַץ (*rachatz*), applied as the action of baptism, means "to flow, to pour out," as defined by Furst and other lexicographers. The Syriac has a like import, though I have not time now to examine it.

Now, my friends, as I have before told you, I am bringing up these more abstruse points. To-morrow I will reach plainer matters. I give you those fundamental facts from which to draw your conclusions. Remember, therefore, that the original word for baptize, which is the Hebrew word *tabhal*, means to sprinkle; and that the other words rendered *bapto* primarily mean to sprinkle.

[Time expired.]

MR. WILKES' THIRD REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My friend has a right to examine this question in whatever order or way he sees proper. I shall not complain of him for doing so. I will, however, take the same liberty, in replying. I will commence just where he left off.

He is to show us very soon what the Syriac word means, and he promises, or intimates, he will show us that the Syriac word for baptism means "sprinkle" or "pour." If he fails to do that he proves nothing with regard to his proposition. If he succeeds he will prove this much, that in the *Syriac* language, or translation, he is sustained. But still he has on his hands the labor of proving that this is the sense in which the word *baptizo* is used in the *Greek* New Testament.

The Syriac Bible is an uninspired book. Mr. Ditzler can not prove that the Syriac word *amad* means to sprinkle or pour, either in the literature of the Syrians, or in the translation called the Peshito-Syriac Bible.

Again, my friend says that *rachatz*—a word never used for baptism in the Hebrew—means to apply the element to the person instead of applying the person to the element. As this has no kind of connection with our controversy, so far as I can see, he must excuse me if I say that I need not answer it at all. I think, however, that he is mistaken. He says the Arabic word for baptism means to *pour*. I respectfully suggest to my friend that the Arabic word for baptism does *not* mean to pour. It means to immerse; and whenever he comes down to the point of bringing authorities, instead of simply making a statement, he will see whether it means to pour; he will find himself mistaken.

He says that "*tsēva*, the Chaldee word for baptism, fundamentally means to sprinkle." In regard to that I have just one single authority to read to you, and that is a Hebrew and Chaldee lexicon. The word

tsēva is Chaldee, and the definitions given by Gesenius are "to dip in, to immerse," and then he gives "to wet, to moisten."

Again my brother says the word *tával*, as he reads from Fuerst, means "to sprinkle." I think Mr. Ditzler is mistaken again. Gesenius, the father, almost, of Hebrew lexicography, says *tával* means "to dip, to dip in, to immerse, with the accusative of the thing," etc., and then he cites Genesis xxxvii: 31, which, I believe, is the case of Joseph's coat being dipped into the blood of the kid.

Buxtorff, in his lexicon, defines *tával* also; he says, "*tával*: tinxit, intinxit, de-mersit, immersit," which is, to dip, to dip in, to immerse, to plunge.

I must say to you, in candor, that Brother Ditzler has represented Fuerst correctly. He read from Fuerst that *tával* means "to sprinkle," in its fundamental sense. But Dr. Gesenius says it means "to dip, to dip in, to immerse." Here are two great lexicographers divided in their opinions if they are represented to us correctly. Now, which is right? Buxtorff says it means "to dip, to dip in, to immerse, to plunge." I submit, how are we to know which of these two men is right? Mr. Davidson says it means "to dip, to immerse," and Mr. Davidson says that, in making his lexicon, which was after Gesenius and Fuerst, he examined both of these and chose to follow Gesenius rather than Fuerst.

But I have something to present better than either. I have to state to our hearers that the word *tával* occurs only sixteen times in the Hebrew Bible, and not in *one single case* does it, or can it, mean to sprinkle; it *never* means to pour, it *never* means to wet, or moisten, not once; it *never* means to wash, but it *always means to immerse*.

In translating *tával* from the Hebrew into Greek the translators used *bapto* in some of its forms fourteen times; *baptizo* in one of its forms once, and *moluno* once. *Bapto*, *baptizo*, and *moluno*—Greek—are translated into English, fifteen out of the sixteen times, by "dip," and one time by "plunge." What does *tával* mean, then? The way to know the meaning of a word, when lexicons conflict, is to go to the place where the lexicographers went, or ought to have gone, and there see which is right. The word *tával* is used sixteen times in the Hebrew Bible, and every time it means immersion. My friend presents one case, and but one, for we have discussed this matter before, in which he claims that *tával* may mean something else than immerse. I think he said that *tával* is represented once by *moluno*, and this is the only exception. I think *moluno* is the translation of *tával* in Gen. xxxvii: 31, which means to soil or stain. It does not mean to sprinkle or pour.

My friend thinks that *lával*, in the case of Joseph's coat, means, what? *Pour*? That would be impossible. Sprinkle? That could not be. What can it mean? As we have it in the English version, it means to dip. That is the *current* meaning of the word, and I have a right to assume the *current* meaning of the word to be the *correct* one, unless there be some fact in the connection that forces me from it. There is, here, no such fact. *Could* Joseph's coat have been dipped in the blood of the kid? Is there any *necessity* for departing from the current meaning? I answer, the coat *could* have been dipped, in that case, and it was dipped.

My friend says "washing may be done by sprinkling or pouring." That is a mistake. Washing is not done by either sprinkling or pouring. If I wash my hands, should I do it by sprinkling or by pouring? My friend says I *might* do it by pouring. I answer, not so. If I wish to wash my hands, I *may* hold them so that another person pours water over them; but the *pouring* is not the *washing*. The water may be poured on, but the washing is done afterward. Washing is something different from pouring.

My friend says, the classical meaning of *baptizo* is to make drunk, to drown, etc. I think not. He is not exactly correct. In its tropical application, or in its figurative use, it may be proper to say, it means to make drunk, or to drown. When we say that a man is drunk, may we not say that his intellect is overwhelmed by the use of whisky or liquor? Because his intellect is so under the influence of the spirit, that he is, as it were, overwhelmed, just as the body of a person is overwhelmed when he is baptized, we may say he is baptized in liquor; so that baptism, in its literal sense, is the basis of its figurative use; or you may conceive the mind, or intellectual faculties of a man, as much under the influence of the whisky he has drunk, as the body is under the influence of water when it is immersed. You must remember that the idea, in both cases, conveyed by the word is that of overwhelming or submerging. Drunkenness is a mere effect, just as washing is an effect of baptism, and not the meaning of *baptizo*. Washing is a consequence of baptism; and as the consequence of a thing sometimes takes the name of the thing, so baptism is sometimes defined to be washing.

My friend had better leave *bapto* out of the controversy. This word is not in the controversy; the Spirit never used it nor any of its family to designate the ordinance; but it selected an entirely different word. I, therefore, lay it aside.

He says that Josephus did not study Greek at an early age; I state that Josephus studied Greek and Hebrew. I will in due time read it from my manuscript; and let me tell you emphatically, that I have as high authority for it as any that could be found on the continent of America.

Mosheim, he says, relied upon Tertullian, whom my brother regards as totally unreliable. He intends to "demolish" Mosheim, and to "ruin Dr. Conant." He has a *penchant* for "demolishing" great men. Well, if it be a pleasure to him, I have no reason to complain.

My friend says that "Hesychius gives as a definition of baptizo, *abluo*; Gaze gives *Brecho* and *abluo*; Kouma gives, putting frequently into water,"—I did not catch the remainder—and "Suidas," he says "gives *pluno*; Zonaras gives *katharizo*." He said, Wahl gives *lavo*, and then *mergo* as the second meaning. Stockius, he says, defines by *lavo*, first, and, secondly, by BAPTIZO. "Julianus gives *perfundere*, which he says means to sprinkle." But Julianus is not a lexicographer, nor does *perfundere* mean, primarily, to sprinkle. Julianus says nothing about either sprinkle or pour, as he represents him.

I tell my friend, candidly, that in almost every thing he said with regard to these seven lexicographers, he is mistaken. He gave us, indeed, their definitions from *second-hand authorities*, and I warn him, fairly, as a Christian gentleman ought to do, that in regard to nearly all these matters he is mistaken. These lexicographers do *not* define the word as he tells us; or, if they do, I am mistaken. But I am perfectly willing that he should lay before us the authorities from which he quotes, and I will examine them. If he has the lexicons themselves, I ask him to loan them to me, and I will examine them. But till I have done so, I must and do utterly deny that he is right. My brother is a little angry. It is not good for him to exhibit the amount of temper he has recently displayed. Suppose he is mad, and stung as he may be under a sense of defeat, he can not sustain his statements in that way. I am willing to risk my reputation, what little I have, on the statement, that he is utterly at fault in these lexical representations. But of this in due time.

I now propose to continue my regular course of argument, and to examine the testimony of authorities who lived at the time of the apostles, and after.

Josephus was born at Jerusalem, about A. D. 37. He was educated in all the learning of the Jews—*Hebrew* and *Greek*. He was, even while quite young, often consulted by the most distinguished men

of his nation on the nicest points in their law. At the age of twenty-six he was chosen and sent to Rome to plead, before Nero, the cause of certain priests whom Felix, governor of Judea, had put in "bonds." On the voyage, he says: "As our ship was *baptized* in the Adriatic Sea, we that were in it, being about six hundred in number, swam for our lives all the night," etc. Of course the ship was submerged. He did not understand the word *baptizo* to mean sprinkle or pour. He used it in its current sense.

Josephus, describing the murder of Aristobulus, who was, by the command of Herod, drowned in a swimming bath, Ex. 16, says: "Continually pressing down and baptizing him, while swimming, as if in sport, they did not desist till they had entirely suffocated him." No intimation of sprinkling or pouring here, though the word *baptizo* is used.

Same writer, Ex. 22, describing the contest of the Jews with the Roman soldiers on the Sea of Galilee, says: "And when they ventured to come near, they suffered harm before they could inflict any, and were *baptized* along with their vessels; . . . and those of the *baptized* who raised their heads, either a missile reached or a vessel overtook." This writer uses the word *baptizo*, in some of its forms, thirteen times or more, and *always* in the sense of immersion; never, *possibly*, in the sense of sprinkle or pour. This testimony is the more valuable, in that it is given by a *Jew*, educated at *Jerusalem*, who wrote in Hellenistic Greek—the New Testament language.

Plutarch, born in Bœotia, in the year 50 A. D., or, probably, a little earlier, describing the operations of Archimedes' engines for destroying the Roman fleet, Ex. 3, says: "Some (of the vessels) thrusting down, under a weight firmly fixed above, they sunk into the deep; and others, with iron hands or beaks, like those of cranes, hauling up by the prow till they were erect on the stern, they baptized."

Epictetus, born about 50 A. D., Ex. 27, uses the word in the sense of submerge.

Philo, the Jew, who wrote about 50 A. D., uses the word twice, Examples 136 and 142, in allusion to the overwhelming of the reason in case of drunkenness. These are figurative uses of the word, which receive their significance from the literal.

Dion Cassius, 155 A. D., was born at Nicea in Bythia. He was a celebrated Greek historian. He occupied a high position at Rome, and is celebrated for having written a history of Rome in eighty books. He uses the word *baptizo* many times. In his account of

the efforts to escape from the flames of the burning vessels (near the close of the battle at Actium) he says, Ex. 37: "And others, leaping into the sea, were drowned, or, struck by the enemy, were *baptized*." See also Ex. 31.

Lucian, born A. D. 135, in his satire on the love of the marvelous, pleasantly describes men walking on the sea (having cork feet), and says: "We wondered, therefore, when we saw them not *baptized*, but standing above the waves and traveling on without fear."

Porphyry, born 233 A. D., describing the lake of probation, in India, and the use made of it by the Brahmins for testing the guilt or innocence of persons accused of crime, says: "The depth is as far as the knees; . . . and when the accused comes to it, if he is guiltless he goes through without fear, having the water as far as the knees; but if guilty, after proceeding a little way, he is baptized unto the head." In this case the guilty man is represented, by the word *baptizo*, to be submerged. How entirely out of the question to suppose the baptism in this case was sprinkling, I leave you to judge.

Gregory, bishop of Neocæsarea, about the year 240 A. D., describing Origen as an experienced and skillful guide through the mazes of philosophical speculations, says, Ex. 44: "He himself would remain on high in safety, and, stretching out a hand to others, save them, as if drawing up persons *baptized*."

Chrysostom, born A. D. 347, in a discourse on gluttony and drunkenness, Ex. 158, says: "For as a ship that has become filled with water is soon *baptized*, and becomes deep under the waves, so also a man, when he gives himself up to gluttony and drunkenness, goes down the steep, and causes reason to be overwhelmed beneath the waves"

Heliiodorus, A. D. 390, Ex. 81, teaches a like lesson. Achilles Tatius, A. D. 450, Ex. 54, the vessel being thrown on her beam's ends in a storm, says: "We all, therefore, shifted our position to the more elevated parts of the ship, in order that we might lighten that part of the ship that was *baptized*." But the part baptized was under water; hence, to be baptized, in *this case*, was to be under water.

Same writer, Ex. 55, shows that a ship *almost* under water is *almost* baptized. If it had been altogether under the water it would have been wholly baptized. The condition, then, of its being *baptized* was, that it should be *under the water, submerged*. Ex. 82. Achilles Tatius, A. D., 450, says there was a fountain of gold. A pole, with pitch on

the end of it, and plunged into it, is said to be baptized. The meaning of the word is, here, not doubtful.

Suidas, tenth century, "Greek Lex.," Ex. 43: "Desiring to swim through, they were baptized by their full armor." The word is, undoubtedly, used here in the sense of immersion. They were submerged.

Cyrril, A. D. 375, who was bishop of Jerusalem in 350, says, Ex. 176: "For as Jesus, assuming the sins of the world, died, that, having slain sin, he might raise thee up in righteousness, so, also, thou, going down into the water, and in a manner buried in the waters, as he in the rock, art raised again, walking in newness of life." Same writer, in Ex. 178, employs this language: "And ye professed the saving profession, and sunk down thrice into the water, and again came up, and there, by a symbol, shadowing forth the burial of Christ."

The same writer, says, Ex. 180: "For, as he who sinks down in the waters and is *baptized*, is surrounded on all sides by the waters, so, also, they were completely *baptized* by the Spirit."

Basil the Great, born A. D. 330, bishop of Cæsarea in 370, says: "Imitating the burial of Christ by the baptism; for the bodies of those baptized are, as it were, buried in the water." In the same passage, a few lines below, he says: "The water presents the image of death, receiving the body as in a tomb."

Chrysostom, born A. D. 347, bishop and patriarch of Constantinople, says, Ex. 184: "For, to be baptized and to sink down, then to emerge, is a symbol of the descent into the under world, and of the ascent from thence. Therefore, Paul calls the baptism the burial, saying, 'We were buried, therefore, with him by the baptism unto death.'" Chrysostom uses the word constantly in this sense.

Gregory, of Nazianzus, born 330, on the holy baptism, says: "Let us, therefore, be buried with Christ by the baptism, that we may also rise with him; let us go down with him, that we may also be exalted with him; let us come up with him, that we may also be glorified with him."

John, of Damascus, born near the close of the seventh century, "On Faith and Baptism," says, Ex. 190: "For baptism shows the Lord's death. We are, indeed, buried with the Lord by the baptism, as says the holy apostle."

Theophylact, A. D. 1070, archbishop of Achrída: "For one baptism is spoken of, as also one faith, . . . with invocation of the

Trinity, and to symbolize the Lord's death and resurrection by the threefold sinking down and coming up." In another connection he says, "Bathing the whole body in water."

Apostolic Canons. Can. 50, made in the fifth century, Ex. 235: "If any bishop or presbyter shall not perform three baptisms for one initiation, but one baptism, that given into the death of the Lord, let him be deposed." The *tria baptismata* were never three sprinklings, but always three immersions.

Tertullian, A. D. 165 or 170, a presbyter at Carthage, who was a man of much note, in quoting Romans vi: 3, says: "Know you not, that as many as have been immersed (*tincti sumus*) into Christ Jesus have been immersed (*tincti sumus*) into his death?" Also, in baptism, he says: "We rise (*resurgimus*) in the flesh, even as Christ also." The same writer: "Then we are three times immersed (*ter mergimur*), answering somewhat more than the Lord, in the gospel, required."

Again: Tertullian, Ex. 209, says: "As of baptism itself there is an act of the body—that we are immersed (*mergimur*) in water; a spiritual effect—that we are freed from sin."

Ambrose, A. D. 340, Ex. 210: "Thou wast asked, Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty? Thou saidst, I believe; and thou didst sink down (*mersisti*), that is, wast buried."

Jerome, author of the "Latin Vulgate," and, perhaps, the most learned of the Latin fathers, was born about 331, and died 420. His testimony, like that of Tertullian, is direct and distinct in favor of immersion. He says, Ex. 215: "And thrice we are immersed (*et ter mergimur*), that there may appear one sacrament of the Trinity."

Alcuin, born 735, Epis. 90, to the brethren at Lyons, France, Ex. 217, speaking of the Christian rite of baptism, says: "And so, in the name of the Holy Trinity, he is baptized with a trine submersion (*trina submersione baptizatur*)."

MR. DITZLER'S FOURTH ARGUMENT.

WEDNESDAY, December 21, 10 A. M.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

On closing yesterday evening my brother seemed to misunderstand me again, always in his favor, too, which seems to be strange. He said that I said classic Greek left them *in* the water. Of course, that did not amount to much, but I did not say so. I said it left them *under* the water. There is a great difference between being *in* the water and being *under* it. Classic Greek, when it puts them *under* the water, *leaves* them under. He translates Buxtorff "dip, dip in." Now, the word he renders dip is *tinxit*, which is frequently applied to moistening, staining, coloring, sprinkling, and sometimes to dipping. What is the difference between "dip" and "dip in?" The next word being *intinxit*, which properly means "dip," and seeing that, he had to render the one word "dip" and the other "dip in." I suppose "dip," in his sense, means "dip in." By dipping he means, in the Greek technicology of the Christian Church, *submergence*, and, therefore, why does he have two words meaning the same thing, though he renders one "dip" and the other "dip in?" That implies that there may be a "dip" which is not "in;" that there can be an immersion in which the person is not in the water at all. I do not suppose he holds that view.

My brother said I was nearly a whole day on *βάπτω*, (*bapto*), when you know I did not spend five minutes on *bapto* during the whole day. He is very accurate in not misrepresenting his opponent, is he not? He says we do not wash by pouring. Pouring is the action by which, at least, the water reaches our hands; sometimes we dip up the water with one hand on to the other, and thus wash. Is immersion washing, as he argues, even when we immerse the hand to wash? He argues that the *rubbing* is the washing; then neither immersion nor

pouring is washing from his stand-point. How does that help his case, then?

He will not respect my authorities or my arguments, he would have you to understand, unless I produce the original works. It is very remarkable that a man should stand here and read almost all day, almost the whole of his part of the day, from a little book—a very respectable one on the immersion side, I grant, Mr. Conant's "*Baptizein*"—that he should borrow every argument he offered yesterday, and every quotation he made, from beginning to end, from one little compilation, and then call upon his opponent to produce all the original authorities. That is modest, indeed!

He has a great way of saying, "I deny it." I read from Julianus, and made the quotation from an immersionist source, from a man who has admitted immersion, and whom my opponent quotes in favor of immersion, though he did not belong to the immersion church; he was a Presbyterian, yet he argued in favor of immersion, and was then arguing in favor of it. I refer to Beza, his Latin Commentary, on 3d Matthew, folio 1568, over three hundred years old. The quotation from Augustine was from the same place, and I gave the Latin, and read it in his hearing.

I proceed with my argument. On the Hebrew word *tabhal*, on which he gives you so many lexical authorities, he quotes Gesenius as against my position, but he quotes from a translation and not from the original, which is the authority, and in which, though the translation is by a Pedobaptist, the word rendered "dip" is, in the original, *tingo* (*tinxit*), which implies both *sprinkling* and dipping, as I read from a number of examples from the Latin yesterday. I have Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, on which his great reputation rests, before me; it is in six volumes, though I have had it bound in three, and "טבל *tahval*—*tinxit*, *intinxit*, *immersit*, (Chaldaic *tebhal*); id. Arab. *tamala*, *colore imbuunt vestem*, *cruore infecit sagittam*; Syr. *Tabhal* and *tamal*, *inquinauit*, *polluit*—to stain (by sprinkling or imbuing) to dip, to immerse. Chaldaic and Arabic same, to imbue or stain a garment with color, to moisten an arrow with blood," and so on. Likewise in Syriac, as well as in other languages, especially the Syriac, he gives "*inquinauit*, *polluit*, to stain, to pollute," to stain by dropping blood or any thing so as in any way to defile, whether by dropping, staining matter on it, sprinkling, pouring, or immersion.

Now, the Hebrew word for immersion, *tabha*, is not rendered *tinxit*, but is defined, in Gesenius' *Thes.*, vol. i, p. 542, thus: "טבע *Tabha*,

pr. immersit, impressit in materiam mollem, ut lutum, hinc sigillum impressit, obsignavit—to sink, to press in, to impress into any soft substance, as clay; then, to impress a seal, to seal,” etc. To show you the superiority of Fuerst over Gesenius, I remark that first Bopp and then Grimm discovered, in the present century, as all scholars now agree, the true law of the affinity of languages, by which we may discover the *root* of a word, and trace its meaning through different languages and cognates, so as to perfectly understand and trace out every shade of its meaning.

Gesenius wrote his lexicon *before* this law was developed; and he himself admitted, after he had finished his work, that he had *not founded his lexicon on the true basis*. He saw that Fuerst had the true basis, and had the right position. And as to Mr. Davidson—not Samuel Davidson—the digest he prepared for students who knew nothing about Hebrew is a simple elementary work which no scholar wants. I showed that he had never studied these great principles. Gesenius admitted the very thing I contend for, that his lexicon was not based on the true philosophy for discovering the roots and the true meanings of words. To show you that this is so, Gesenius gives as the root of the word *tabhal*, טב, *tab*, which no Hebrew scholar would now accept. There is no such root in the word. He gives it a meaning the reverse of that which it has. Thus, he gives it *immerse, dip*; whereas the right word is *tabhal*, root, טל, *bal*, which implies sprinkling. There is a number of other words which have the idea of affusion, pouring, flowing, and effervescing; and the same root is discovered in all these words and the kindred languages. Hence, Fuerst's authority is worth ten thousand such authorities as Gesenius; though, in his day, Gesenius was a great authority. It was, however, before this great law of the true affinity of languages was discovered by Grimm, whose works I have, comprising nearly three thousand pages. I, therefore, again read Fuerst on *tabhal*, which is to moisten, besprinkle, baptize. On page 511, I read: “The fundamental signification of the stem is *to moisten, to besprinkle*, connected in its organic root, *tabhal*, with that in *bal, za-bal, sha-bal, bul, balal*;” “to flow,” “to stream, rain;” “*bul*, to bubble up, flow, rain;” “*balal*, flow, drop, as tears, moisten, wet;” “*shabal*, to bubble up, to flow, pour, rain.”

I now quote the greatest Hebrew work that has ever been written—the most critical and learned, and which, as a great authority says, leaves nothing more to be desired in that direction. I hold in my hands the great and thesauritic “CONCORDANTIÆ *Librorum Sæ-*

rorum V. T. . . . addito Lexico Linguae Sacrae Hebraicae et Chaldaicae Julio Fuerstio." It is founded on the true principles of linguistic interpretation now recognized by all critics without a dissenting voice. "טבל (*tabhal*), verb. trans. (impf. *yit'bal*), rigare, tingere, perfundere; immergere. Radix est *bal* (בל) . . . compara modo verba eadem de radice orta *abal*, *bal*, *za-bal*, *shabal*, etc., et sim. LXX βάπτειν, βαπτίζειν, μολύνειν," which I translate—to water (*i. e.*, pour water upon), to moisten (by sprinkling, bedewing, or otherwise), to sprinkle (applied to both sprinkling and pouring); to sink (*i. e.*, immerse—sink). "The root (of *tabhal*) is *bal*. . . . compare the words derived from the same root with a kindred meaning—*abal* (moisture), *bul* (to flow, or rain); *bal-al* (to flow, drip, moisten); *shabal* (pour, rain, flow)," etc. That you may see the force of this, I will give you some words that have this same root, *bal*, just as *baptidzo*, and *bapto*, and *baptistae*, etc., all have *bap* as the root or stem word.

1. יבל (*yā-bal*), fluere, manare, rigare, affinia sunt *vv. bal*, *abal*, etc.; to flow, stream, pour; drop down, distill; moisten, pour water on. Kindred roots are *bal*, *yabal*, *abal*, etc.

2. יבל.—1. *Ya-bael*, "to well, to flow, to stream. Arabic, *mabala*, to flow copiously (to stream, to rain). 3. To be moist."

3. אבל, *abael*—root, *bal*—"to shoot forth, grow, spring forth fresh, from the idea of fresh spring and sprouting, of *moisture*."

אבל—river, stream—idea of *flowing*.

4. בול (real root), "to bubble, to flow, to stream forth copiously, to spring forth. Hence, מבוול (*mabbul*), a fountain. 2. To sprout forth. בול, *bul*—root, *bal*—rain."

5. "בלל, to flow, to drop (of the eye [tears]), then to be moistened. Ps. lxi: 11, anointed, moistened, to moisten, wet," etc.

6. "שבול, to bubble up, to flow, to pour, of rain, a river, etc. Arabic, *shabal*, rain; to flow down."

Thus you see that the idea of affusion, sprinkling, and pouring, is the foundation-thought—is the fundamental idea of this word *tabhal*, the word for baptize, and which corresponds to *βαπτίζω* (*baptidzo*) in the Bible and all Greek translations.

Now, that you may see its use, I give you a striking instance of this word as used among the Hebrews, where its application is settled as definitely as its root meaning:

"There was not any like to Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, under the second Temple. He one day struck his foot against a dead tortoise, and went down to Siloam, where, breaking all the little particles of hail, he baptized יטבל *ts-*

tabhal, himself. This was on the shortest day in winter, the tenth of the month Tebeth."—Lightfoot's "Horæ Hebraicæ et Talmudicæ," vol. iii, p. 292.

Now, here we have the use of the word *tabhal*, which my brother insists means immersion, and the man baptized (*tabhal*) himself with the hail that he could melt in his hand. Does that look like immersion? Here we have a clear case in the Hebrew.

I now take up the Syriac language. That this is important the "Millennial Harbinger" of September, 1870, in a note, sufficiently shows. That Mr. Conant attached so much importance to it, also demonstrates this fact. It is the oldest, the purest, the best, and most literal translation of the Bible in the world, as all scholars admit. It was almost within the apostolic days, if not in them, in almost the very vernacular in which the Savior and his apostles preached.

Amad is the word used. Mr. Gotch is a great immersionist, though I do not know to what church he belongs; his work, however, is used a great deal by immersionists; and on page 132 of his "Bible Questions," he says of this word:

"But as respects its use, it has been shown to be absolutely necessary to give some other meaning than that of 'standing;' and that the meaning which actually is given in the version of the Bible, as well as by Syriac writers, is *washing* or *ablution*."

This man, then, they have been quoting so long as in favor of immersion, admits that *amad* does not make it immersion, but *tzeva* is the word they rely on.

I now quote from other authorities; but I will read first from Mr. Campbell:

"These three great authorities [Castel, Buxtorff, and Schaaf] give to *amad* THE VERY SAME MEANINGS which our twelve Greek lexicons give to *baptizo* and its family—to immerse, dip, or plunge, and *figuratively* to wash or cleanse."—Campbell on "Baptism," p. 136.

He says that these authorities give *immerse*, *dip*, and *plunge* as the meanings of *amad*, and *wash* only as its "figurative meaning."

I will now quote what the lexicons before me say: בָּטַח (*amad*) is the New Testament word for baptize generally, and never occurs with that meaning in the Old Testament, nor in Syriac and Chaldee literature of earlier days. Now, Schaaf, Castel, Gutbier, Hottinger, Michælis, and Oberleitner could not find a place in the New Testament where *amad* or *amad* meant immerse, dip, or plunge. Nor could

they find but *one* in the Bible—that was Num. xxxi: 24—where the original Hebrew and Greek do not have the words for baptize or their roots. I now quote the great Syriac lexicons named as favoring immerse by Campbell, and others I have he never names.

1. Gutbier: *amad*, baptizavit, baptizatus est, item sustentavit—to baptize, is baptized; likewise, so support.

2. Gesenius' Thesaurus: *amad*, Apud Syros Christianos *amad* est baptizatus est, quia baptizandus stabat in aquam. Among the Syrian Christians *amad* is to baptize, because the person to be baptized stood in the water (*i. e.*, while being baptized).

3. Catafago (Arabic Lex., same word): "The being wet with rain." This last work is by an eminent scholar, who lived for years among the orientals, and spoke their language.

4. Hottinger. Mr. Campbell loved *old* authors. The work I hold in my hand was issued 1661, being a Lexicon of Syriac, Arabic, Hebrew, Æthiopic, etc. *Amad*, baptizare; Arabic, baptizavit, to baptize; Arabic, baptize.

5. Oberleitner is a high authority. I read from him: *amad*, ablutus, baptizatus est, Aphel (*forma*) immersit, baptizavit—to wash, to baptize. Aphel form, to immerse, to baptize. Noun, *amudho*, baptismus, lavacrum, columna—*baptism*, a *washing*, a *columna* (latter from idea of *standing*).

6. Castelli's Syr. Lexicon, founded on several native Syriac lexicons while the Syriac was a living language. My copy is by Michaelis, with notes added—1788: *Amad*, ablutus est, baptizatus est. Aphel, immersit Num. xxxi: 24, baptizavit. To be washed, baptized. Aphel form, to immerse, Num. xxxi: 24, to baptize. Noun, *ablutio*, *baptizatio*, *baptismus*, *lavacrum*, a *washing*, *baptism*, act of baptizing, washing.

7. Schaaf. I have reserved him to the last, as his is acknowledged to be the greatest of all yet completed. He had advantage of all the rest also. It is the largest of them all, though only on the New Testament: *Amad*, m. *abluit se*, *ablutus*, *intinctus*, *immersus in aquam*, *baptizatus est* . . . *tinxit*, *baptizavit*, *abluit se* Luke xi: 38; Mark vii: 4, to wash one's self, be washed, to be dipped, immersed (sunk) in water, to be baptized . . . to stain (as opposed to dyeing by dipping, but by sprinkling or touching by partial application of staining matter—or to moisten) to baptize, to wash one's self, Luke xi: 38; Mark vii: 4. Noun, *mamudhitho*, *baptismus*, *baptisma*, *baptisterium*, *lotio*, *ablutio*; a *washing*, *baptism*, *baptistery*, a *washing*, *cleansing*.

Now, we have read you all the lexicons, all of which are here be-

fore me, and *not one* sustains Mr. Campbell in his bold assertion, which assertion has been repeated over all the land. He says they "give immerse, dip, or plunge as the meanings of *amad*," and "wash" or "cleanse" only as its *figurative* meanings. Yet you see it is not so at all—nothing of the kind.

Now, if we wish to understand what is meant by *amad*, washing, I can give you an example. They say it is immersion. I read from the discussion reported in "Bibliotheca Orientalis," tom. iv, ccl. (250). There was a discussion in the ancient Syriac Church on the gender of the verb *amad*, and as my brother has a great aversion to Syriac, I will give him the Latin translation of it, which, as he uses Latin more familiarly, will not be so distasteful to him. They were discussing points, to which I need not refer, involving the Trinity:

"Quando baptizat, etiam cum invocatione Sanctissimæ Trinitatis & aquæ naturalis *ablutione*, immersione, vel *aspersione*, non est verus baptismus." When he baptizes, even with the invocation of the Holy Trinity, and with a washing (*ablution*) of natural water, immersion or *sprinkling*, it is not true baptism. "It is not true baptism," they go on to say, "unless the proper word is used also." This ancient discussion settles this word.

I read again from this Council: "Si baptizans, uteretur illo præsentis imperativi, si cætera adsint recta, nempe intentio, in aquam naturalem *immersio*, *ablutio*, vel *ASPERTIO*, cum Sanctissimæ Trinitatis expressa invocatione." (Biblioth. Orient., Romæ, 1719, tom. iv, 250.) If, when he baptizes, he uses that (form of *amad*) for the present imperative, if other things are right, especially the intention, immersion in natural water, ablution, (washing), or sprinkling, with the invocation of the Holy Trinity expressed, etc.

Here, now, we have a discussion in a Syrian council of the learned men of the Nestorian Church on *amad*, as to its gender—verbs in the Syriac, Hebrew, etc., have gender—and they make a distinction between *washing* (*lavit*, *abluit*) and immersion, and agree that the Syrians by that word baptized by *ablution* and *sprinkling*, as opposed to immersion.

If *amad* did not include sprinkling and affusion in the form of pouring, how could the Syrians use this language? That is decisive of the word *amad*. Besides, the lexicons define it by giving "wash" *first*. This settles that question forever.

But there is another word for baptism in Syriac, צָבַח (*tzebha*, *tzeva*, or *tzeva*, pronounced also *seva* or *sebha*), the same in Chaldee,

Arabic, and Syriac. It is *the regular* word for baptism in Chaldee, and was in Syriac till, as the immersionists argue, they laid it aside for *amad*, perhaps because of the Sabæans' use of it. Moses Stuart, "Biblical Repos.," Ap. 1833, p. 363, says: "For the Syriac has a word, *tzeva*, like the Chaldee צָבַע (*tzeva*), etc., which means *to plunge, dip, immerse*," etc. He urges that in not using this word, but *amad*, it is *against* immersion. Rice, in debate with A. Campbell, and all the others I have ever examined, follow him. But my investigations have enabled me to utterly refute all of this. The bitterest immersionist in America, in issuing Stuart's work says, in an appendix: "The very word (*tzeva*) which Professor Stuart mentions as properly signifying immersion, is often used to designate the ordinance of baptism."—J. R. Graves's Stuart, 155. Gotch says of this word, 127, "Bible Questions," that the name implied that they immersed, were "dippers"—*Trabians*—Sabians. He then quotes Dr. Henderson as stating that *tzeva* means "to sink, dip, or put under water." This is the almost constant Syriac word for βάπτω in Old and New Testament, as Stuart ought to have known, and is translated by βαπτίζω, as he ought to have known also, constantly in old Syriac literature. It is the translation, also, in the Bible of the Hebrew *tabhal*, *to baptize*, in the Peshito-Syriac. I will first give the lexicons on this word, then its analysis.

1. Hottingeri Etymologicum Orientale; sive Lexicon Harm. ἑταρωλωτου. Hebraicæ, Linguæ, Chaldaicæ, Syriacæ, Arabicæ, Samaritanicæ, Æthiopicæ, Talmudicæ.—Rab., etc., MDC. LXI.: *tzeva*, tinge, immerget oleo vel liquore. Ethiop. tingi sanguine. Hinc iidem *matzbhuitho*, i. e., *mamudhitho*, baptismus. To moisten or stain, to sink in oil or liquor. Ethiopic, to be stained or besprinkled with blood. Hence, same as *memudhitho* (the N. T. Syriac noun from *amad*) baptism.

2. Schaaf: צָבַע (*tzeva*) tinxit, intinxit, intingendo lavit, abluit, infecit. To stain or moisten, dip, cleanse by dipping, to wash, to cleanse or perform ablution, to wet.

3. Castel: *tzeva*, tinxit, intingendo lavit, abluit (baptizavit), infecit. To stain or moisten, to cleanse by dipping, to wash, to baptize, to wet or moisten. Noun, "*matzvintho*, baptismus, lavacrum," baptism, washing. In a note by J. D. Michaelis: "Sabii nomen Mendæosum, i. e., discipulorum Joannes, qui ita a baptizando dicti, baptistæ, sen-
t Græci illos vocant ἡμεροβαπτισται." Sabians, the name of the Mendii, that is, disciples of John, who are called *Baptists* from their manner

of being baptized, or, as the Greeks call them, Hæmero—Baptists—those who baptize themselves *every day*.—Syr. Lex., 749.

4. Gutbier: *tzeva*, tinxit, lavit, to moisten or stain, to wash.

5. Oberleitner: tinxit, intinxit, abluit, moisten, dip, wash.

6. Gesenius' Thesaurus, Syr. id. (*tzeva*) etiam de baptismo, et ita apud Zabios. In Syriac the same word is used for baptism, and is so used among the Sabians.

7. Fürst: "Heb. et Chaldee Lex.," *tzeva*, "to moisten, to besprinkle, to baptize. Paal, to water, to moisten." This is its "fundamental signification."

8. *Concordantiæ et Lex. Heb. et Chaldee*, Julio Furstio: *tzeva*, aram, *tingere, irrigare*, secut Heb. *tzava*. Pa. PERFUNDERE, *imbuere*. Ithpa. *tingi, tinctum esse*. Aramaic (Syriac), to stain, to moisten, to water, pour water upon; same as Hebrew. Paal form, to sprinkle, to pour forth. Ithp. form, to be stained, etc. We will see more on the root meaning of this in the same word in Arabic. Its fundamental signification is to sprinkle, moisten by sprinkling, bedewing, pouring. Now the root is *tva, savh*, and so connected with the root in *dabah, dab, yab, zab, zaph, tsaph*, or generally with *sabha, sava, shabha, sabha*. In either case sprinkling lies at the root of its signification. Unquestionably the latter, *savh*, is the true root. Yet, if *tab* be the root, then sprinkle and pour are its fundamental signification, as the following words of the same root will show, *dabah (dab-tzab)*, to cause to flow out; (*nataptaph-tabh*, the root), to drop, to drip, to flow, to drop down (maim) of water.—Judges v: 4; Ps. 68–9. The Arabic is *notaph*, Syriac, *netaph*, and *zab, tsaph, zaph 1*, all same root. Hence *nataph*, a drop of water, gum or resin, Job xxxvi: 27; Ex. xxx: 34, *netaphah*, resin, trickling, of the dropping of an aromatic resin, etc. *Shatpah*, "to flow, to stream, to pour out." *Shateah* (noun) an outpouring, a rain-gush.

The other root is in *sava*, to overflow, run over; organic root is *sav*, to flow, Arabic, "*sav, to pour out*." *Shabha*, "to flood, overflow," *ratabh (rataw)*, "to be moist, wet," Job. xxiv: 8; "to be juicy, fresh, to make wet, moisten." Arabic *savaga*, "to pour." *Rataph*, "to be moist, fresh, juicy, refreshed."—Job. xxxiii: 25. All these words show the kindred signification of this word, upon which Gotch and Lindsay rely to prove immersion. Now that is the word in Daniel (and it is the same in Chaldee), where Daniel's body was "wet with the dew of heaven." The Chaldee is "baptized with the dew from heaven." There immersion is out of the question. In the Syriac the word is

the same. Daniel wrote in Chaldee—the inspired word, therefore, is Chaldee. The immersionists have argued that the Chaldee word for baptism is *tzeva*. M. Stuart never examined that word. He never got the Syriac version of the Bible, I have been told, till he was a very old man. This word in the Bible is applied to the falling of the dew upon the man's body. "And his body was baptized (*tzeva*), with the dew of heaven."—Daniel iv: 20. The Vulgate is, *et rore coeli CONSPERGATUR*, and he was SPRINKLED with the dew of heaven. Jerome, the translator, was the most learned in the Hebrew of all the Latin fathers, and only Origen of the Greeks could claim equality with him. Verse 22: the same Chaldee is rendered—*et rore cali tingatur*—wet or baptized with the dew of heaven. The Itala has the same.

Here we have, except the Syriac, the purest and best translation, the *Itala*, that ever was, made in the second century, close to the apostolic day. This old Latin translation renders the word baptize by "SPRINKLE," and not by immerse. It also renders it by "INFUNDERIS"—"his body was SPRINKLED with the dew from heaven."—iv: 22. *Infunderis* applies often to mere sprinklings, sometimes to pourings. Whichever our opponents take (and it has always one of these meanings), and they may take either if they wish, it is equally damaging to their theory and practice. But we have additional, and equally decisive, proof that *tzeva* or *sava* does not imply immerse, but just the reverse. I quoted from Tomus iv, on *amad*. I now quote Tomus i, 2, "BIBLIOTHECA ORIENTALIS," Clementino, Vaticana, in qua MSS. Codices Syriacos, Arabicos, Persicos, Turcicos, Heb., Samar., Armen, etc.—Romæ MDCCLXIX (1719). It is the account of an early Christian martyr, Simeon Barsabœ, the bishop of Silencia and Ctesiphon: "*Ephiskupho dhaselek vedhaktisphon mashenoitho*"—he bore the episcopacy of Silencia and Ctesiphon, and was surnamed *bar tzabhoë*, . . . etc.; and he indeed BAPTIZED his garments (*tzeva*) with the blood of his own life—body—*dh'naphshel*—*bhadhmo*. The Latin runs, also, "ipse vero animæ suæ vestes proprio cruore TINXIT." Ephraim Cyrus, *ibid*, 119, "The devil—*tzaveh*—*tinxit*—baptized Manes a green or tawny color."

Here, now, is a man hung upon a cross; they pierce his side, and he is called THE baptist in Syriac, because that, in the flowing out of his blood it (*tzeva*) baptized his garments; therefore, they call him THE baptist—the first time it occurs in history implying being baptized. Here we have the use of the word *tzeva* in a case where dipping,

plunging, or immersion is out of the question. Thus, we see, instead of going to heathen Greek, which the apostles never used, read, or understood, and which he is quoting, to prove Christian baptism, βαπτίζω, a word that leaves the man besotted, soaked, or sunk to the bottom, and there left, I go to those who read the Bible; for Jerome was the best Hebrew scholar of all the Latin fathers, only Origen equal, of the Greek fathers. He translated the Hebrew directly into the Latin language; he could also render the Greek into the Latin, and was familiar with Chaldee, Hebrew, and Syriac; and he renders the word *tzeva* by *sprinkle*, never by *immerse*. The *Itala*, made next to the Peshito, and from the Hebrew and Greek, has it *sprinkle*; and we have an example in the *Bibliotheca*, the first Syrian book we have next to the translation of the Bible, which gives it *baptism*—where a man's blood baptized him while hanging on the cross.

I will, in due time, take up the Arabic, and show just as strong a case in that as in the other. I will remark that, there is a large number of words in the Arabic that imply immersion; some never mean any thing else, others sometimes mean something else. Among others, we find employed *ghamata*. 2. *demersit in aquam*—to sink down into the water; submerge; *ghamara*, *textit rem aqua*. II. *tinxit re*, etc. VII. *demersus fuit*. VIII. *demersus fuit*. To cover a thing with water. II. To stain with any thing, as a woman paints her face. VII. To sink down. VIII. Same. *Textit aliquem aqua*—to cover any thing with water.—Freytag's "Arabic Lexicon," p. 453. Yet this same word is applied—*gumron*, noun form—to *linimenti genus ex planta confectum, quo faciem mulieres tingunt*, etc.—a certain kind of smearing stuff prepared from a certain plant, with which women stain their face.—*Ibid*. We have four words in the Arabic language that imply immergence, submergence, and nothing else—*ghamara*, just given, *ghatasa*, *ghamasa*, and *ghamata*, just given also. *Ghamasa* is very strong indeed. Yet not one of these is ever used in the Arabic translation for βαπτίζω or *tabhal*—baptize—in Hebrew or Greek. Now, if *tabhal* or *baptizo* meant immersion, why were not these words used? and why did not those who were thoroughly versed in the languages and usages of the Bible and church, translate them by a word definitely meaning *immerse*? On the contrary, the word βαπτίζω is translated by *amada*. My opponent can not find a single lexicon anywhere that defines *amada* by immersion in the Arabic language. We have here Catafago, who translates *amada*—"the being wet with rain." I have, also, Kosegarten

and Freytag's "Arabic Lexicon;" and under *amada* there is not a word about dip, or even *tingo* or *intingo*. They can not prove it from *amada*, one of the words used; but the immersionists contend that *savaga*, or *tsavagha*, which is exactly the same as *tseva* in Syriac, is where they get the immersion; but we have seen it translated *sprinkle*, and not *immersion*. We have seen, from its application in the Syriac, that it can not mean immersion. The original and root meaning of *tsavagha*, as given by different lexicons, is *pour*; and the word itself is defined by Kosegarten—"tinxit aliquid aliqua re"—to stain any thing with any thing. Freytag gives *tinxit*—stain, moisten, or sprinkle. Catafago gives "dyeing, baptizing." *Savagh*, *color*, *tincture*; *sabbagh*—*savagh*, "a dyer, tinger, painter." Hence, suba. Aurora, morning tinge, dawn. The root is *savvah*, or *sabha*.

Let us have the radical meaning, now, of this word, claimed beyond all other words by the immersionists. Kosegarten's "Lexicon:" 1. effudit, infudit. 2. effusa fuit. (That is all.) To pour out; pour forth. 2. Poured out.—Freytag's great "Lexicon Arabico-Latinum." G. W. Freytag. "Halis Saxorum," MDCCCXXXVIII: . . . *Tsava*. 1. fudit, effudit. 2. effusus, fusus fuit. 3. descendit declivi loco *in vale*. 1. To pour; pour out. 2. Poured out; to be poured out. 3. To descend or fall down from above into a vale or place below. *Sibbhon*, *effusus*, de aqua, poured out; spoken of water; *sughbhahon*, "*res effusa*," a thing poured out; "spoken" of juice of grapes, of trees, etc; *vini portio*, part of the vine, any of the juice, or of any thing; *effusa*, shed, or oozing forth; *sibhghon pigmentum*, id., quo quid tingitur, paint; that with which any thing is stained or colored; *sibhghohon*, dj. pigmentum; religio, paint; religion, i. e., *baptism*.

Catafago: *Sabhbha*, or *sabb*, "*effusion, pouring out water*."

Fürst gives it as the root of *tseva*—*sabha*, "what is poured out;" *sav'ha*, "*to flow*." It applies to the falling juice of trees, vines, bursting of grapes. It is so applied in the Al Koran—the Bible of the Arabs. There is one more word—*ghasala*—rendered from βαπτίζω, in the New Testament, meaning always simply to wash—*lavit*. Βαπτίζω is rendered *ghasala* (Mark vii: 4; Luke xi: 38), and βαπτισμὸς is rendered *ghaslon* (Mark viii: 4, 8; Heb. vi: 2; ix: 10).

1. GOLJUS: *lavit*, *abluit*. V. *diligentur lavit perluit que membra*. VII. *ablutus fuit*. VIII. *semet lavit et abluit aqua sudore maduit ac perfusus fuit equus*. Wash, cleanse. V. Carefully wash and cleanse the body, etc.; a horse wet with sweat; perfused, etc.

2. KOSEGARTEN: *lavit, abluit aliquid.* n. *lavatio, lotura*—washing, etc.

3. FREYTAG: *lavit, abluit.* II. *multum lavit membra.* VIII. *semet lavit et abluit aqua.* *ghislon, aqua, qua lavatur; ghuslon, lotura; aqua qua lavatur; gislakon, aqua adhibetur ad levandum*—water used for washing. *Ghasilon, lotus, ablutus*—washing, cleansing.

4. CATAFAGO: *gasala* or *ghasl*, washing; performing ablutions; *ghasul*, any thing used in washing the hands, as water, etc.; *ghassāl*, one whose business it is to wash the bodies of the dead; *ghusalat*, dirty water, with which any thing has been washed.

These are some of the facts my labors have enabled me to bring out on this question. He can not meet them—they can not be met.

[Time expired.]

MR. WILKES' FOURTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My friend comes to the work this morning in good earnest, and I am glad that I have no *quarrel* with him, though I may have a *controversy* with him.

He says the word *baptizo*, in its classic use, leaves the party *under* the water, not simply in it. All the honor of that criticism is his. I remark that the word *baptizo* does not *leave* the person or thing baptized anywhere; there is no *leave* in it. It carries the idea of being under any kind of liquid, or any element into which a person or thing may be put, but it has nothing to do with the question of how deep they may go, or how long they may stay, or whether they come out at all or not. It has nothing to do with that question. When we come to the Bible argument we will see how they *get out*. The Bible makes provision for that.

My friend says that I rendered *tinxit* and *intinxit* by dip and dip in. Why give *both* these definitions? he asks. Now the authors give us these *two words*, though they mean substantially the same thing. I put to him the question, Why do the lexicons give us, for *baptizo*, the definitions, *mergo* and *immergo*, both? He does not deny that *mergo* means to plunge and *immergo* means to plunge in. We have these definitions in the very best lexicons on the face of the earth.

He says that Gesenius gives as definitions of *taval*, *tinxit*, *intinxit*, *immersit*. That is correct, I presume. But I have a word to say on that subject. The lexicon of Gesenius was translated by Edward Robinson, who was an earnest advocate of my friend's side of the question, and he, seeing in the lexicon of Gesenius the words *tinxit*, *intinxit*, *immersit*, as definitions of *taval*, and knowing the meanings of these words, renders them, *to dip*, *to immerse*, *to plunge*, or *to dip*, *to dip in*, *to immerse*. What, then, is the meaning of *tinxit*, etc.? There is but one conclusion; for Mr. Robinson, as my friend knows, is very distinguished, and an author of great reputation on *his own side* of the

question. But the truth lay before him, and he must speak that truth or he would be detected. He renders not only *tával*, to dip, but he gives us, incidentally, the meaning of *tingo*, which also means to dip, according to Mr. Robinson.

My friend says that Bopp and Grimm have developed the perfect idea in regard to Hebrew lexicography and grammar. He did not tell us how much light these men threw on Hebrew lexicography, or how they define *tával*, and till he develops his arguments further I may be allowed to proceed. I have this to say, however, that Mr. Davidson, in his *primer*, Mr. Ditzler calls it, on Hebrew lexicography, gives us *tával*, and defines it "to dip, to immerse," first; and, secondly, to stain, but supports the latter definition by no reference. He wrote after Grimm and Bopp. Now the question is, what was before Mr. Davidson at the time he wrote? He says in his preface, sec. 10:

"In preparing the lexicography Gesenius has been chiefly relied on for definitions, but the works of Drs. Lee, Winer, Biesenthal, Fürst, and others, have been compared throughout."—Introduction to Davidson's "Hebrew and Chaldean Lexicon."

Dr. Davidson, though he wrote a small work, is not demonstrated to have been a small man, for the whole Methodist Conference of the United States, combining the learning of all their bishops and ministers, gives us one of the *smallest books* ever published in the United States.

I wish now to dispose of *tával* and *tingo*. I am willing that my reputation, if I have any, shall go to the world on the statement that *tával* means to dip, and *tingo* means to dip. If my brother is willing to let the question go as it is, I am, for it is the truth that both of them mean to dip, and the scholarship of this continent and of Europe has so passed upon it and has so decided it.

I may here state that I had the pleasure and honor, since I came here, of a call from the Jewish Rabbi of this city, Dr. Kleeburg. I asked him particularly, in the presence of a number of gentlemen, what *tával* means. Said he, "it means immersion." "Does it mean any thing else?" I asked. "Nothing else," was his reply. "What is the Jewish practice in regard to the baptism of proselytes?" I then asked. "Immersion," was his reply; "and," continued he, "we have an immersion to take place here very soon." "Do you ever sprinkle for baptism?" I then asked. "No, sir," he replied. "Does *tával* ever mean to sprinkle or to pour?" "No, sir, never."

It is a work of supererogation to pretend to say any thing more on this subject; and I am inclined to let it alone. My friend is perfectly welcome to all the honor and laurels he can gather from any further criticism he chooses to make.

In the Syriac, Hebrew, and Greek lexicons from which he read, not once did we have sprinkle as the definition of the word for baptism. I believe he read as *one* definition of *tával*, to sprinkle, but not of *baptizo*, nor any word that is applied by the Spirit of God to the ordinance of baptism; for *tával* is never so applied, nor is *séva*, in the Bible.

He tells us that in the record of some transactions among the Syrians, at some date not given, there is a statement made to the effect that in baptizing there was an ablution, or a washing, literally a cleansing, also a *sprinkling*. I will just say to my friend that if he will pass the fifth century, I will allow he can very easily prove that there was sprinkling in some localities. He can prove nearly any thing else also. But sprinkling for baptism never came into *common* use, even in the Catholic Church, until the year 1311, as we will show in the future.

He says that in Daniel *séva* is used for baptism; that it is also applied to the *falling* of the dew from heaven. Now, I say distinctly to my friend that *séva*, the Chaldee word, is not applied to the *falling* of dew. If he will turn to the Septuagint, he will find that the word *bapto* is not applied to the *falling* at all; and as to Jerome's translation of that passage, we will look at that presently, remarking, meantime, that it is very doubtful indeed, whether we have here just the language of Jerome. It is not very clear from the translation what Jerome said. These translations have undergone so many revisions, and so much of the original has been lost, that it is difficult to *know* what Jerome really did say.

My friend then refers to the Arabic, and cites *amada*, the word for baptism in that language, which I say means immersion.

He denies that Josephus studied Greek, and that he was educated in it. I will read, on this point, from Chambers' Encyclopedia, 1868:

"JOSEPHUS, FLAVIUS, a celebrated Jewish historian, was born at Jerusalem 37 A. D. He was of both royal and sacerdotal lineage, being descended, on the mother's side, from the line of Asmonean princes, while his father, Matthias, officiated as a priest in the first of the twenty-four courses. The careful education he received developed his brilliant faculties at an unusually early period, and his acquirements both in Hebrew and Greek literature—the two principal

branches of his studies—soon drew public attention upon him.”—“Chambers' Encyclopedia.” Art. JOSEPHUS.

With respect to *tával*, to make the matter clearer, I remark: This word occurs sixteen times in the Hebrew Bible, and it is never in any case rendered sprinkle or pour, in our English version, and never can be. The word *sprinkle* occurs about thirty times in the English Bible, and the corresponding word in the original Hebrew is never *tával*. The word *pour* occurs over one hundred times in our English version, and is never once complemented, in the Hebrew, by the word *tával*. *Wash* occurs fifty times in our English Bible, and is never a translation of *tával*. There is, then, a distinct difference between *tával* and the Hebrew word which means to sprinkle.

I will now refer to a statement made by my friend in regard to Wahl's lexicon. If I do not mistake, he said that Wahl gives *pluno* as a definition of baptizo. I have Wahl in my hand. He says: “Baptizo, f iso. (a bapto, mergo; sæpius mergo, in N. T. :) 1) immergo (universe—Jos. Ant., ix, 10, 2; xv, 3, 3. Polyb. i, 51, 6. a) proprie et quidem de immersione sacra.” (*From bapto, to immerse; more frequently to immerse in the N. T.*) 1) *To immerse (always in Jos, etc.). Properly and truly concerning sacred immersion.*

He then read from Stockius, and the record will show that he said Stockius DEFINED *baptizo*, first, to wash, then, to baptize. I say that Stockius does *not* DEFINE it, first, to wash, secondly, to baptize. That, now, is a clear issue. I deny respectfully, but positively, that Stockius so defines *baptizo*; he does not do it in my brother's copy, nor in mine. We have in Stockius the word *bap'izo*, and immediately afterward *lavo*, and then *baptizo*; but he does not DEFINE the word there. He tell us, on the title page, the order in which he defines words. As this is important, I will read the title page of Stockius' work:

“CHRISTIANI STOCKII, prof. publ. in Acad. Ien., clavis linguæ sanctæ Novi Testamenti aditum aperiens, vocum significationes tum generales, tum speciales ordine concinno exhibens tam tironum, quam homileticæ et exegeseos cultorum studiis apprime inserviens, ac subinde concordantiarum vicem supplens, cum indice vocum. Editio quarta, auctior et emendatio. 1743.”

The translation of which is as follows:

“Clavis of Christian Stockius, Professor in Public Academy at Jena: Opening the way to the sacred tongue of the New Testament; exhibiting, in convenient order, first, the general and then the special meanings of words; assisting, especially, the studies (or efforts) as well of tyros as of the cultivators of homiletic

and exegesis; and then supplying the place of concordances, with an index of words. Fourth Edition, enlarged and improved."

The point I wish you to notice is, that Stockius says he gives, first, the *general meaning*, and, secondly, the *special meaning*. I now go to Stockius, and, under the word *baptizo*, I read:

"1.) Generatim ac vi vocis *intinctionis* ac *immersionis* notionem obtinet. 2.) Speciatim, a.) *proprie est immergere ac intingere in aquam.* β.) *Tropice.* 1.) per *Metalepsin* est, *lavare, abluere*, quia aliquid intingi ac immergi solet in aquam, ut lavatur, vel abluatur, quamquam & adaspersendo aquam, *lotio* vel *ablutio* fieri queat & soleat. (Marc vii: 4, Luc. xi: 38.)—Stockii "Clavis Linguae Sanctae Novi Testamenti," p. 183.

Which I render 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. β. Tropically. 1. It is, by metonymy, to wash, to cleanse, because any thing is accustomed to be dipped and immersed in water that it may be washed or cleansed; although washing or cleansing may, and is accustomed to be done by sprinkling water also (Mark vii: 4; Luke xi: 38)."

Once more, as I wish to make a careful examination of Stockius. Under the head of *baptisma*, he says:

"1.) Generatim & vi originis notat *immersionem*, vel *intinctionem*. 2.) Speciatim, α.) *proprie* notat *immersionem*, vel *intinctionem* rei in aquam, ut abluatur, vel lavetur. Hinc transfertur ad designandum primum Novi Testamenti sacramentum, quod *initiationis* vocant, nempe *baptismum*, quod baptizandi olim in aquam immergebantur, ut hodiernum aqua iis saltem adspargatur, ut & peccati sordibus abluantur, illius remissionem consequantur, & in fœdus gratiæ recipiantur, tanquam hæredes vitæ æternæ."

I translate 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."

The authority amounts to this: Stockius states that the word *generally* means "immersion;" specially does it mean immersion, "in or-

der to cleansing or washing." "Formerly, those that were baptized were immersed in water;" "nowadays," that is, toward the time in which he wrote, "water is *only sprinkled* upon them." That is exactly the fact.

Again: with reference to *baptizo*, from what my friend stated yesterday, the matter is left in a state not very satisfactory to me. The record will show what his language was. The lexicons of Suidas, Zonaras, and Hesychius are, I grant, very rare. My friend complained a little of me because I did not give the original of *one* quotation; but when I ask him to bring forward either the originals or the works in which the originals are quoted, he does neither. On account of the difficulty of obtaining the works I have mentioned, for they are rarely to be found, except in the European libraries, I wrote to Dr. Conant, through a friend, to give me the definition of *baptizo* and *baptisma*, as found in these lexicons, and he has answered as follows:

"NOVEMBER 18, 1870.

"TO WM. H. WYECHEOFF, LL.D., *Cor. Sec'y of Am. Bible Union:*

"MY DEAR SIR:—Your friend asks, 'What is the definition of βαπτίζω and of βαπτισμα, as given by each of the following lexicographers, viz.: Hesychius, of the fourth century, Suidas, of the tenth, Zonaras, of the tenth or twelfth, and Gaze, of the seventeenth?'

"Hesychius' lexicon does not contain the words; being only a glossary of words that needed defining, which was not the case with these words.

"Suidas has only βαπτίζω. He gives no definition of the word, and only says 'it is used with the accusative case.'

"Zonaras has not the word βαπτίζω. Of βαπτισμα he gives only a theological definition—'the remission of sins by water and the Spirit,' etc., saying nothing of the *action* expressed by it.

"Gaze defines it, 'to dip repeatedly; hence, for, to drench, to wash, to bathe.'

"Very truly, yours,
T. J. CONANT."

A number of definitions, purporting to be from these lexicons, have been circulating, which, I believe, are not to be found in these or any other lexicons ever compiled; and my friend has helped to peddle them about. Now, Dr. Conant may be relied upon; and, having these lexicons around him, we may safely conclude we have been furnished with the truth on this subject. Dr. Conant has too good a reputation to risk any thing in this direction. Hesychius does not contain the word at all; and the other lexicons define the word as I have read.

I have, also, in another letter from Dr. Conant, the definitions of Kouma's lexicon. *Baptizo*, he says, is "to immerse, to dip repeatedly into a liquid." This presents you, I believe, with all the lexical authorities that my friend offered. It is notable and noteworthy that, after all the straining and research of my distinguished friend, he is unable to find a respectable lexicon that defines *baptizo*, to sprinkle or pour; and yet that is precisely what he is here to establish.

Incidentally, we have, in Schleusner, vol. i, p. 38, a definition of *taval*: "Baptizo, properly, to immerse, dip, plunge into water; from *bapto*, and corresponds to the Hebrew *taval*."—2 Kings v: 14.

Taval, according to this distinguished authority, means to dip. I notify my friend, as I before suggested, that I shall leave *taval*, for it is not the word used by the Savior in instituting the ordinance of baptism. I mean, also, to leave *tingo* and *bapto*, though *bapto* occurs seventeen times in the Septuagint, and in our common version is, I believe, translated every time but two by "dip." It also occurs five times in the New Testament, and is there always translated by "dip." My friend wants to make something out of *tingo* and *intingo*. He wants to get sprinkling in somehow. So he defines *baptizo* by *tingo*. Then he defines *tingo*, to wet, or moisten, which may be done by sprinkling. He then swings round the whole circle and applies "sprinkle" to *baptizo*, which he can not do directly.

I will notice the Arabic and Syriac at the proper time; but we are now on that department of the investigation that would lead us to understand what the Savior meant when he said, "Go, baptize all nations." When we know the meaning of the word the Savior used, we will then know what was the act or the thing meant by *baptizo*. The question now is, What does it mean in 2 Kings v: 14? The prophet told Naaman to go and wash himself seven times in the Jordan; and Naaman went down to the river and *baptized* himself seven times; we have it in the English version, "dipped himself seven times in the Jordan." We have *baptizo* used here in the sense of "dip." Also in Isaiah xxi: 4 we have the word *baptizo* in the Septuagint—the very version the apostles and the Savior read in the synagogue, and which the Jewish people read while the apostles were preaching to them. There it is said that "fearfulness affrighted me," or lawlessness has overwhelmed me. In Judith xii: 7 it is said, "She washed herself in the fountains of water by the camp." There *baptizo* occurs again. It will be my duty, in a future address, to show

you that the practice of the Jews, in washing, was to immerse the whole body, as the Jewish rabbis themselves say, and as Jewish literature abundantly testifies.

Again: we have in Ecclesiasticus the case of a man who baptized himself after he had touched a dead body. This he did in order to cleanse himself from ceremonial impurity. The question is asked, Having baptized himself from the dead body, what is he profited by that if he touch it again? That is what the Jews did in the case of touching a dead body. If you will refer to the Jewish law on the subject of cleansing, after a man had come in contact with a dead body, you will find that he had to bathe his whole body in water before he was regarded as clean. There never was a case, in all the Jewish ablutions or purifications, where they sprinkled water and blood, or water and ashes, but that in the *same case* they were required to bathe the *whole body in water*. Now, this man who had touched a dead body went and baptized himself—"bathed his whole flesh;" and the question was raised, if he afterward should touch a dead body, what had he been profited by his bathing? Of course, he had not been profited at all. Thus we learn the meaning of *baptizo* here.

MR. DITZLER'S FIFTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

The question of Josephus' education is a question of fact. I have read to you what Josephus says about himself. He tells us among the Jews, "those who have learned FOREIGN languages, are not at all esteemed." This is in same paragraph from which I read before, where he had to learn the grammar and *pronunciation* of the Greek after he had written some of his works. Now, if he had been so educated from a child, how was it that he never, in all his life, learned to pronounce it correctly? He "learned the elements of grammar," and had "been so long accustomed to *our own tongue* that I can not pronounce Greek with accuracy." So says Josephus. Here you see he admits that the Hebrew was his native tongue, and that he had to learn Greek from classic sources in after years.

My brother says it is not altogether certain that we have Jerome's language. We have just this much assurance. We have as much assurance that the version we have is Jerome's language, except a very *few verses*, which we know to have been an interpolation, as we have that the Greek Bible, which we both use, is the composition of the apostles. I can throw as much discredit on the *Greek* text as he can on Jerome. Now let him go to work. We have the same proof of one that we have of the other. He says Robinson was a zealous advocate of sprinkling. Robinson never wrote a book upon that subject, or advocated it, in his life. He never gave the subject any special attention.

But my brother says *tingo* and *intingo* are the same in meaning. Well, I will give you the lexicons. Ainsworth defines *tingo*, "1. To dye, color, or stain. 2. To sprinkle, to imbue. 3. To wash. 4. To paint." On *intingo* he gives "to dip in, to steep, to dye." Andreus defines *tingo* by "to wet, moisten, to soak or color, to dye, color, tinge." To *intingo* he gives simply "to dip in." These are the usual definitions, and though my brother says the words are the same in

meaning, he can not find a lexicon on earth that will sustain him in the assertion. *Intingo* I have never found to imply *sprinkle*, but I could read you hundreds of cases to show you that *tingo* is so used. He has brought up Stokius and the lexicons. I am glad of it, for I never could get him to do it before. He has been writing to Dr. Conant, of New York, to Dr. Barnes, of Philadelphia, and yet they and their papers have published that it was a small matter to meet me, yet he has been canvassing the whole East and ransacking Philadelphia and New York to get me in trouble. Strange consistency! As to Hesychius, I intended to call attention to him in my next speech. I know of but one person in the South-west who owns a copy, and that is a very learned Episcopal minister of Henderson. Hesychius simply gives the root βάπτω, *bapto*, which Mr. Campbell says has the same meaning as *baptizo*. He gives it *antlo*, to draw, dip, or pour out water. Suidas gives *bapto* and defines it by *pluno*, which is rendered *madefacio*, *lavo*, *abluo*, etc., wet, wash, cleanse. Elder Braden, in his debate with Hughey, tries to get "*immerse*" out of it, but, mind you, the original root, *bapto*, only is given, and τάλωω, *wash*, is the *only* definition given. And when Conant comes to Gazes he dodges the whole question on the Greek definition, and tells us he defines it dip. I have a place here where he has it immerse, "and *bathe*," when the context shows sprinkle is meant, and where the very word sprinkle, and others, where baptize with tears, with blood of martyrdom, etc., occur. And here it is done, they are baptized, ὑγραινομένου, by being sprinkled with water, by which τὸ σῶμα βρέχων, the body is besprinkled; p. 110, "Baptizein."

To show you the unreliability and cunning of Dr. Conant I will read you what he says about the baptism of Judith, a Jewess, in the days of the invasion by the Assyrians. He urges that Judith immersed herself in the fountain, where it is evident she could not have done so as a decent and modest woman, and the Greek preposition ἐπὶ with πηγῆς forbids it. The Greek is καὶ παρεμεινεν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ ἡμέρας τρεῖς, καὶ ἐξεπαρέβετο κατὰ νύκτα εἰς τὴν Φάραγγα Βετυλῖα, καὶ ἐβαπτίζετο ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ἰδατος. He renders it IMMERSSED HERSELF in the camp at the "fountain of water." The Greek is: "And remained in the camp three days, and went forth at night into the valley of Bethulia, and baptized herself at the fountain of the water in the camp." As I see Braden and others have made great use of this, I will thoroughly expose it. We urge that it was immodest to immerse herself in a state of nudity before the soldiers. They urge that there was no immod-

esty about it. The great Baptist writer, Carson, says of it: "It is perfectly incomprehensible to me how any one can find a difficulty in this instance. *The most scrupulous and even romantic delicacy is provided for in the RETIREMENT of the lady to a fountain in a valley.* It is evident that, though in a camp, she was in such a part of it *as afforded her the necessary seclusion.*"—Carson on Baptism, 318. To prove this idea Dr. Conant says: "Compare, in ch. vi : 11, '*the fountains that were under Bethulia;*' ch. vii: '*and [Holofernes and his horsemen] viewed the passages up to the city, and came to the fountains of their waters, and took them;*' v. 7, '*and they [the Ammonites and Assyrians] pitched in the valley, and took the waters, and the fountains of the children of Israel.*' There was evidently no lack of water for the immersion of the body, after the Jewish manner, namely, by walking into the water to the proper depth, and then sinking down till the whole body was immersed."—"Baptizein," p. 85.

Now, in the above, ver. 7, of chap. vii, he stops short of the very words that refute them, and show it *was not private.* The next words after, "*and took them,*" are "AND SET GUARDS OF MEN (*παρεμβολὰς ἀνδρῶν*) OVER THEM." Would she, an extremely modest woman, who even would not bathe in her garden till a servant assured her no one was in it, then with locked doors performed her ablution, go before those rude soldiers, and prepare for it, and immerse herself? But the force of the Greek utterly forbids. Were it immerse, it would at least be *εἰς τὴν πηγὴν*, accusative case, with *eis*, into, not *epi*, at.

But he says there was no lack of water, etc. Yet the context shows they were perishing and dying by thousands for lack of water. He says "any other use of water for purification could have been made in the tent." Conant knows, 1. She, as all Jews were taught in the Bible, was to wash at a fountain, a running stream, if it could be had. 2. She wished to go in and out, so as to get used to it, so as to accomplish her purpose of dodging the guards when she should murder him. Conant says again :

"One of the oldest Greek manuscripts [No. 48], and the two oldest versions [the Syriac and Latin], read, '*immersed [baptized] herself in the fountain of water*' [omitting '*in the camp.*'] According to the common Greek text, this was done '*at the fountain*' to which she went, because she had there the means of immersing herself. Any other use of water for purification could have been made in her tent."

He gives then, in a note, as follows :

"*Ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ 2^ο* [58 (*ed. Holmes et Parsons*). "*Ἐὰν τῆς πηγῆς*] . . . *ἐν τῇ πηγῇ*

58 (*ibid.*). Et baptizabat se in fonte aquæ (*Vel. Lat. ed. Sabatier*). Syriac: *v'amado heveth bh'aino dh'mai* (*Bibl. Polyglott., ed. Walton*)."

Now, this Syriac which he gives is: "And she baptized—washed—herself at the fountain of water." It exactly corresponds to the Greek, 1 Sam. xxix: 1, "And the Israelites pitched by a fountain" (*bh'ainan*), at, by the fountain—"which is in Jezreel." Same word. So Judith vii: 3, "And they encamped the whole army (*bh'aino*) by the fountain." Ezek. i: 3; x: 15, 20, *bhe* and *al*, at the river, occur repeatedly, where Ezekiel stood and saw the vision.

Now, the word he renders "immersed" is the very word I read five or six Syriac lexicons on, showing that it meant to wash, and applied to sprinklings and ablutions. Now he tells us it is "immerse," when he has no proof of it in the world. Not only so, but he renders it "in the fountain," when we have twelve examples from the Syriac writings showing that it always meant at the fountain, in that connection. You see he is very reliable authority indeed! And when he comes to the Greek words of Gazes and Kouma, he says they mean dip!

Next I take up Wahl. I have already read you what Wahl says, but my brother reads from his notes and analysis, which gives immerse. I gave you immerse as one of his meanings. Wahl says, 1. *lavo*, 2. *immergo*; 1. to wash, 2. to immerse. He says in the New Testament *lavo*, and refers to Mark vii: 4.

Now I take up Stokius, who has made so much fuss in the world, and whom Mr. Campbell approves so highly. That you may see how much importance he attached to the opinion of Stokius, I will read you from A. Campbell's works: "Has he produced a lexicon, of the eighteen centuries past, giving *sprinkle* or *pour* as the *proper* or as the *figurative* meaning of *baptizo*? . . . Let him produce any modern dictionary, English, French, Spanish, German, etc., thus expounding the Greek words *bapto* or *baptizo*." (Debate, 181.)

Of Stokius: "This great master of sacred literature" (Debate, 60), "one of the most learned rabbis in the school and learning of orthodoxy," (206) "the two still more venerable names of Schleusner and Stokius." (208, Debate.) "Schleusner, a man revered by orthodox theologians, and of enviable fame." (58).

A. C. (Debate, 208) declares Stokius and Schleusner "are still more decidedly with us [them] . . . than *any one* or *all* of the *classic* dictionaries."

STOKIUS.—I charge Mr. A. Campbell, 1. That he omits Stokius'

definition as a New Testament lexicographer, as he suppressed Schleusner's, and only quotes his general analysis and comment given in a note, where its classical and New Testament use are both given.

2. He mistranslates the Latin.

3. Interpolates it with quite as much more of his own additions, giving it a sense not in Stokius.

4. He suppresses Stokius' definition of how the New Testament washing was performed—by sprinkling as well as in water immersed.

5. Suppresses not only "*adspargendo aquam,*" but "*prout olim aqua baptizandis copiose AFFUNDEBATUR.*"

6. Debate, 118, with Stokius before him, declares no New Testament lexicon gave *wash* as first meaning.

A. Campbell's quotation of Stokius' Latin :

"1. Generatim, ac vi vocis intinctionis ac immersionis notionem obtinet. 2. Speciatim (A) proprie est immergere ac intingere in aquam. 3. (B) Tropice, per metalepsin, est lavare, abluere, quia aliquid intingi, ac immergi solet in aquam ut lavetur vel abluatur. Which I translate," etc.

"Generally, it obtains the sense of dipping or immersing, *without respect to water or any liquid whatever.* 2. Specially, AND IN ITS PROPER SIGNIFICATION, IT SIGNIFIES to dip or immerse in water. This is its New Testament sense. 3. Tropically, and by a metalepsis, IT MEANS to wash, to cleanse, because a thing is usually dipped or immersed in water that it may be washed, THAT IT MAY BE CLEANSED. Its general sense is to dip. Its proper sense, to dip in water. Its figurative sense, to wash, to cleanse. This is a true version of this great author."—Debates, 206, 207.

Compare this translation with the original, and you see all the words that I italicize are added, and are not in Stokius—all the small capitals are mistranslations. Rice admitted he never saw Stokius, and hence, as in many other cases here, was grossly imposed on.

Now, here is Stokius' definition : "*βαπτίζω, lavo, baptizo. Passivum, βαπτίζομαι, luor, labor; βαπτίζω, baptidzo, I wash, I baptize; passive voice, baptidzomai, I am washed, I am cleansed, I am baptized.*" He, after translating a number of texts by baptize, renders Matt. x: 38, by wash—"et lavacro, quo ego labor, lavare—and be washed, cleansed, purified, with the purification with which I am purified." Mark vii: 4, loti, washed, Greek, *βαπτίζονται*. Now follows his usual note appended, where he mixes the classical and New Testament meanings, quoted by Mr. Campbell, but garbled terribly, as you will see now by a comparison.

The last words Mr. Campbell quotes from Stokius are "vel abluatur." Now, I will give the quotation: ("1.) *Generatim ac vi vocis intinctionis ac immersiones notionem obtinet.* (2.) *Speciatim (a) proprie est immergere ac intingere in aquam.* (β) *Tropice (1) per metalepsin est, lavare, abluere, quia aliquid intingi ac immergi solet in aquam ut lavetur, vel abluatur, quamquam et adspargendo aquam, lotio vel ablutio fieri queat et soleat, Marc. vii: 4; Luke xi: 38. Hinc transferetur ad baptismi sacramentum, etc. . . (3.) Per Metaphoram designat (a) miraculosam Spiritus S. (Sancti) effusionem super apostolos, aliosque credentes, tum ab donorum Spiritus S., copiam, prout olim aqua baptizandis copiose affundebatur, vel illi penitus in aquam immergebantur," etc., which I translate:*

"1. Generally, and by the force of the word, it obtains the sense of immersing or dipping. Specially (a) properly it is to dip or immerse in water. 3. (b) Tropically by a metalepsis it is to wash, to cleanse, because a thing is usually dipped or immersed in water that it may be washed or cleansed, *although also BY SPRINKLING the water* washing or cleansing can be, AND GENERALLY IS, *accomplished.* (Mark vii: 4; Luke ix: 38.) . . . (3.) Metaphorically, (a) it designates the pouring out of the Holy Spirit upon the apostles and other believers, as an account of the abundance of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, since anciently *the water was Poured copiously* upon those baptized, or they were sunk deep in the water," etc. "Βαπτισμός, lotio, ablutio, baptismus—*baptismos* (noun), washing, cleansing, baptism."

Now, Mr. W. K. Pendleton, president of Mr. Campbell's old college, Bethany, and son-in-law to Campbell by two marriages, and editor of the "Millennial Harbinger," in the "Harbinger" of December, 1869, editorially publishes thirteen pages of abuse of myself for the attacks I made on Campbell; and, not knowing what my charges were, translated the whole of Stokius' article, and, lo! it sustains *every charge* I made in every detail. Here I have it before me. He renders it also as I did, almost word for word. He says, p. 662: "The author's (Stokius') method is to give—*first*, the various meanings in which any word is used [italics P.'s] in the New Testament, with examples cited," etc. Exactly so. And in it we have seen he never renders it dip, plunge, or immerse once—not once.

But in the note, as Pendleton truly shows, where he analyzes the words, he gives the *classic* use as well as the New Testament use. And when he defines it "immerse," he does not give a *single reference to the New Testament*, but mentions a number of instances where it means

wash, not one immerse. Now, here is a lexicon that Campbell looked upon as the highest of authorities, which says this washing was generally done by *sprinkling*. But Mr. Campbell suppresses all that. He suppresses Stokius' definition of how the New Testament washings were done—by sprinkling as well as by being immersed in the water. He suppresses not only "*adspergendo aquam,*" but "*effusionem . . . prout olim aqua baptizandis copiose affundebatur;*" "the effusion of the Holy Spirit, since anciently the water was copiously poured upon those baptized." Here, now, this lexicographer testifies that these washings in the New Testament were customarily performed by sprinkling. He says also that the word carried the original meaning, the out-pouring of the Holy Spirit. They baptized by pouring, and from it the apostles got the idea of copious affusions of the Holy Spirit.

But Schleusner is also referred to. My brother knew I would expose that. Campbell thus quotes Schleusner in his "Christian Baptism," page 123, and "Debate," p. 58:

"1st. Proprie, immergo ac intingo, in aquam immergo. Properly it signifies I immerse, I dip, I immerse in water. 2d. It signifies, I wash or cleanse by water—(*quia haud raro aliquid immergi ac intingi in aquam solet ut lavetur*)—because for the most part, a thing must be dipped or plunged into water, that it may be washed."

And what now is the definition of this term by this greatest of all the New Testament lexicons that the world has ever produced? That lexicon that lies before him shows. I quote the whole definition of Schleusner, vol. i, 338-9, "Novum Lexicon Græco-Latinum in Novum Testamentum . . . Joh. Fred. Schleusner, Philol. et Theol., Doctor, etc., etc., 1824," in three volumes:

"βαπτίζω. 1. Proprie: *immergo ac intingo, in aquam mergo, a βαπτω. . . IN HOC AUTEM SIGNIFICATIONE NUNQUAM IN N. T. sed eo frequentius in Scriptt. Gr. legitur, v. c. Diod. Sic. 1, c. 36, de Nilo exundante. . . Strabo, Lib. xii, 391, etc., etc. Jam, quia haud raro aliquid immergi ac intingo in aquam solet, ut lavetur, hinc 2. abluo, lavo, aqua purgo notat. Sic legitur in N. T. Marc. vii: 4, καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ βαπτισῶνται (in quibusdam codd. πάντῶνται), οἷα εσθίοναι et res, in foro coemtas, nisi prius aqua ablutæ et purgatæ fuerint, non edunt. Luk. xi: 38. . . ἐβαπτισθη. . . lavasse. βαπτίζεσθαι non solum lavare, sed etiam se lavare significare, multis locis probare potest. 3. Hinc transferetur ad baptismi ritum solemnem, etc. 4. Metaphorice: ut Lat. imbua, large et copiose do, atque suppedito largitei profundo.*

"βαπτισμα, baptismus; βαπτισμός, lotio, purgatio, ablutio."

"Baptidzo. 1. Properly: to immerse or dip, to plunge into water, from βαπτω.

BUT IN THIS SENSE IT NEVER OCCURS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, but in it

frequently in (classic) Greek writers, for example, Diodorus Siculus 1, ch. 36, used of the overflowing of the Nile, in Strabo, etc. etc. Now because not rarely (not unfrequently) a thing is accustomed to be immersed or dipped in water, that it may be cleansed, hence, 2, it means to cleanse, to wash (*i. e.*, in any way that will cleanse), to purify WITH WATER. Thus (in *this* sense) it occurs in the New Testament. Mark vii : 4, and (having come) from the public place, they will not eat unless first they baptize themselves (Latin of S.); and things purchased in the market they will not eat, unless first cleansed and purified with water. In many texts it is *rantisontai*, sprinkled (*i. e.*, for baptized). Luke xi : 38 . . . baptized—*washed, baptizethai* (to baptize), not only means to wash, but also to wash one's self, as can be proved in many places. 3. Hence, it is transferred to the solemn rite of baptism, etc. 4. Metaphorically: as (*i. e.*, equivalent to) the Latin to imbue, to give and administer to (any one) largely, TO POUR FORTH abundantly.

"*Baptisma*, baptism; *baptismos*, a washing, cleansing, purification."

I have now translated all of his definition literally, just as he wrote it.

Now, while Schleusner gives immerse and dip, he takes care to say it never occurs in this sense in the New Testament. But they leave that out. Here Schleusner, whom Campbell holds up as one of the best lexicographers in the world, defines *baptidzo*, as a classic word, by immerse, and gives a number of references, such as the submergence of land by water, immersion of animals, people, etc., and then says *it never has this signification in the New Testament*. They leave that out; it defeats their ends. But that is not all. The following is left out by Campbell, and so by all others of that school, which very materially alters the sense. He tries to make it appear that the washing referred to was by immersion, which the author shows is not the case, in the most emphatic manner: "Now because a thing is not unfrequently immersed or dipped *in water*, that it may be cleansed, hence, 2d, to cleanse," etc. He pretends that the cleansing is accomplished *by immersing*. No such thing is dreamed of by Schleusner. For he had just stated that *it never* meant immerse, dip, or plunge, in the New Testament. But he urges that from cleansing by dipping in *water*, it came to mean to cleanse without any regard to mode, and quotes that many of the Greek copies read *sprinkle* for baptize. All these facts Mr. C. utterly suppresses, and what he gives, he garbles, misquotes, and mistranslates. Sad is the cause that is to be supported thus. Now, Mr. Campbell says no lexicographer ever gave pour as a meaning of *baptidzo*; and here Schleusner says it means, metaphorically, to give, administer to, to *pour forth* abundantly. That is the way some persons use books, but it is not the way I use them.

But further, on the subject of translations, let me refer to *tabhal*, the Hebrew word for baptize. My brother says that, in our English version of the Bible, it is rendered dip so many times, which is true; but that translation was made by *immersionists*, when *immersion* was the statutory law of the land. It was made also sixteen hundred years after the birth of Christ. But here we have the Greek version, which the apostles used rendering *tabhal* by *μολύνω* (*moluno*), which means "to stain, sully, to sprinkle," Liddell & Scott's Gr. Lexicon. It was stained by *sprinkling*. And then, in the best translation that the world has ever known, the Peshito-Syriac, it is rendered *sprinkle*, and never immerse. That is worth ten thousand such authorities as James' version, made by immersionists under immersion laws, fifteen hundred years after the days of the apostles. Here we have *βάπτω* and *βαπτίζω*, both branches of the same original stock, and their meanings are one and exactly the same; and also the Peshito-Syriac, made at that time, and by many believed to have been made by one of the apostles themselves, which renders *tabhal* by sprinkle. It never renders it by immerse, dip, or plunge, but renders *bapto* also by the word *sprinkle*, and Campbell and all the rest of the learned immersionists say *βάπτω* has the same meaning that *baptidzo* has. So it not only renders *tabhal* (*baptizo*) by *sprinkle*, but *bapto* also, and it never renders either of them by immerse.

In the next place, we have the old *Itala* translation, made in the second century, and, next to the Peshito-Syriac, the best in the world. It never renders *βαπτίζω*, *baptidzo*, by immerse, dip, or plunge, but it does render the Chaldee word for baptize by *sprinkle*, and it renders *bapto* by *sprinkle*. Next we have Jerome's translation, of the fourth century. He was a man who thoroughly understood both Greek and Hebrew, and he never rendered it by immerse, dip, or plunge. He translates the *bapto* of Revelations xix : 13, by *sprinkle*. and the Chaldee word for baptize by *sprinkle* also—*conspergatur*—also, *infunderis rore cœli*—"sprinkled with the dew of heaven."

MR. WILKES' FIFTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My friend read a passage from some author not named, I believe, by him, that seemed to show that Josephus was not profound in the learning of the Greeks; that he could not master the pronunciation of Greek, and so on. I suppose my opponent knows very well that a man may be well educated in a language without knowing all the literature of that language, and he may be well educated in a language and yet pronounce its words very improperly. I presume to say that my friend would not be understood by a *Syrian* were he to read to a native in Syriac. I doubt exceedingly whether a Greek, if we had a person of that nationality here, would understand one word my friend might read in that language. Though Josephus was a Greek scholar, there was, no doubt, much in Greek literature and pronunciation that he did not understand. That, of course, we all know, but he was educated at home, at Jerusalem, in "Hebrew and Greek," and was a brilliant and a proficient scholar in those languages *before* he went to Rome.

I wish to call my friend's attention to this fact: We have in *English*, which all our hearers and readers can understand, Greek lexicons by the most distinguished scholars *on his own side of the question*. How does it happen, if *baptizo* means to sprinkle or pour, or, if *baptisma* means sprinkling or pouring, how, I ask, does it happen—and I put it to the good sense of this audience—that such men as Robinson, Liddell & Scott, Pickering, Grove, and the other great lexicographers of Europe and America do not give sprinkling or pouring as the definition of *baptizo* or *baptisma*, or of any word applied to the ordinance of Christian baptism? That is a singular fact. Another singular thing is that the Pedobaptists, those who sprinkle—I do not know exactly what to call them; I do not want to call them sprinklers—though they have the utmost assurance that *baptizo* means sprinkling, so much so that they can in the name of God sprinkle a man, yet in

the translations of the New Testament, where they meet with that word, as they do about one hundred and twenty times in different forms, they find no one place where their souls will allow them to translate it sprinkle. More than that, do you not believe, in view of the great anxiety my friend and his brethren every-where feel on this subject, that if they could find one place where they could translate *baptizo* or *baptisma* by sprinkle or pour they would do it, and that in eager haste? Do you not think so? You know they would. And yet we have the fact staring us in the face that in none of the great lexicons of Europe and America, that come to us freighted with the primary, secondary, and, latterly, with the tropical definitions of the word, and in none of the translations made by scholars, renowned on my brother's side of the question, and practically sprinklers, do we ever, in a single case, find even one that gives us "sprinkle" or "pour" for baptism. Let my brethren on the Baptist side of this question make a translation or a lexicon, and they will give you immerse, or some such word, for *baptizo*. They hesitate not to do it, for they have the truth on their side, and they are willing to risk stating that truth. But what is the risk in telling the truth, in translating what the Bible says about baptism? Once I put that question to my friend and pressed it upon him; finally he replied: "Well," "that is a sacred word." I do not want to laugh, because that would be impolite. But does he expect serious and God-fearing men to recognize in that answer any thing that ought to be respected? If he does, he is making too hard a demand upon me. There is a word for the Lord's supper that is translated; there is a word for God, and that is translated; there is a word for Savior, for the Holy Spirit, and they are all translated. Yet he is so affected in his conscience that he can not translate the word *baptizo*. He is attaching too much importance to baptism; he regards it as *too sacred*, too much so altogether. Now, my friend either knows, or he ought to know, what the word *baptizo* means. You would think from the way he talks that he does know. If he were making a translation for the people, and had any intelligence which they do not possess; if, for example, he knows that *baptizo* means to sprinkle, he ought to say so; if he knows it does not, let him say that, and say it like a Christian man talking to his fellows as before God, standing for the truth. Let him say plainly to the people what it means, and then come forward with his authorities until the people are compelled to accept the truth. But will he do that? No! As I told him once, and I now repeat it, he would not

translate that word by sprinkle or pour, and risk his reputation for scholarship upon it, for his right arm. The man has not been found with that kind of temerity. No! no!! Why will a man *talk* so much about *sprinkling* and *pouring*, and browbeat people so hard in discussion as he does, or tries to do, and try to *prove* that sprinkling is baptism; and then, when he puts his hand *timidly* to the page in translating, and comes to *baptizo*, he says, "it will not do to say sprinkle *here*, nor *here*, nor *here*, nor in any one of the hundred and twenty odd places where it is found?" No man has ever been willing to do it, which is singular, and which I leave Mr. Ditzler to explain.

He says we have been writing all over the country. What does he say that for? I wish to call attention to this point. He says we have been writing to Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and probably to Europe. Suppose we have, what of that? There are just two points in it; one is, *we* wanted information that we did not have, and *he* wants to announce the fact that there was something in the world *we* did not know. That is true. There are a great many things *I* do not know. Another point is this—and it is *the one* which my friend desired to make particularly—he wanted it to be understood that *he* had stirred up a great excitement in this country, and he hoped that the people would be very much astounded at his *vast scholarship*. That is a proposition about which he is mistaken, just a little mistaken, that is all. It has not excited *me* much, nor the *people*.

I confess to you, sir, that I have written to New York, and Philadelphia, and to Europe, because, when I commenced to discuss these questions, I wanted to understand them; and I, therefore, obtained all the lexicons and grammars of Europe and America that I could; *and I have studied them*. My friend gloats over the circumstance that *he* has not studied the question for a week in five years. *I have* studied it, and I think I understand it; and that is the reason why I come before this audience. If I did not, I would not stand here.

My friend quotes from Wahl, and says, when he comes to *New Testament* definitions, the first is "wash." I answer, he is mistaken about that. Under the head of *baptisma*, Wahl says: "In New Testament, *immersio*. *Legitur de immersione sacra nunc Johannis, nunc illa, quam Jesus instituit.*" In N. T. :) immersion. It is spoken concerning the sacred immersion, which was instituted now, of John, then concerning that which Jesus instituted.—They *both* practiced immersion. That is *baptisma*. But my friend will say that I did not read under *baptizo*. I did read that once; I will read it again: "*Bap-*

tizo, f. iso. (a. *bapto*, *mergo*; *sæpius mergo*, in New Testament:) 1. *immergo* (universe—Jos. Ant., ix, 10, 2; xv, 3, 3. Polyb. i, 51, 6). *a) proprie et quidem de immersione sacra.*" (From *bapto*, to immerse; generally to immerse in the New Testament.) 1. To immerse (always in Josephus, etc.). Properly and truly concerning sacred immersion.—

I respectfully suggest, it is scarcely "*wash*," *first*, in the New Testament definitions, according to Wahl! "That is the way some men quote authors!" I beg leave to say, and I repeat, "that is the way some men read authors;" and if there is any doubt—

Mr. Ditzler.—Of course, *you* did not read it right, and every Latin scholar knows it.

Mr. Wilkes.—There is *one* Latin scholar [pointing to his opponent] who does not know it.

Mr. Ditzler.—Will you allow me to read it, to show that you have not read it correctly?

Mr. Wilkes.—I will—in your next speech.

Moderator.—We have decided before, that you must not interrupt each other, but reply in your subsequent speeches.

Mr. Wilkes.—I will try not to interrupt him.

I call your attention, now, to Schleusner. My friend says—and it was unkind of him; he ought not to have said it; our relations are such that it is better he should not so speak—that I read in Schleusner just to the place where it would have been against me, and then stopped. What was I reading about? I was reading, from Schleusner, on the subject of *tával*; that was all; and, if my friend did not know it, he ought to have known it. Schleusner says—I will give the English—"Baptizo, properly to immerse, to dip, to plunge in water; from *bapto*, and corresponds to the Hebrew *tával*." That would show that *tával* means to immerse, to dip. That is what I was on, and that was *all*. Then my friend gave the balance, and did not give it right, either. Schleusner goes on to say that it is not used in the New Testament *strictly* in the sense of immerse, plunge, or dip; he then says it is more frequently used in the *classic Greek writers* in this sense. That is true. Then he proceeds to give us some Greek quotations, in which the word *baptizo* is used in the sense of overwhelming or submerging, as in the case of animals being drowned or submerged when the river overflows. Next, he gives, in Latin, the *translation* of the Greek, and then uses the following language: "Jam, quia haud raro aliquid immergi ac intingo in aquam solet, ut lavetur, hinc 2) *abluo, lavo, aqua purgo notat.*"

I translate: Since any thing is frequently or commonly to be immersed and to be dipped in water, that it may be washed, hence 2) (*that is, from that circumstance, and in view of that fact*) it denotes *abluo*, to cleanse, *lavo*, to wash, to purify in water.—It denotes to wash, to cleanse, and to purge with water, *because* these things are done by dipping, etc.

In that sense, says the author, it is used in Mark vii: 4. It is never used in the New Testament *strictly* and *simply* in the sense of *just going into the water*, when it designates the ordinance of baptism. That is what Schleusner means; it has a distinct and an additional meaning; it has the idea of cleansing in *connection with* the idea of immersion. He says it is commonly spoken of as denoting that the thing is to be dipped in water, *that it may be cleansed; and, on that account*, *ABLUO* and *LAVO* are used as definitions of *baptizo*. He means simply this: That immersion in water is not *all* that is meant by the word; that it has in the New Testament *application* a meaning beyond simply letting fall or putting into the water; that it carries with it, in his estimation, in addition to the idea of going into the water, the idea of *to cleanse*; and that is his reason why *abluo*, meaning to cleanse or wash away, is used to define *baptizo*. Then he gives the opinion on Mark vii: 4, that it is immersing or dipping into water for the sake of cleansing. That is exactly what Schleusner means. Is that "Latin read right?" Let my friend answer when he makes his next speech. There is an idea in my friend's mind that he can read Latin as no one else can. I make no *great pretensions* to reading Latin; but I can read a *few passages here and there, at least*.

I will now briefly look at the remaining points I wish to refer to in this speech. My friend, speaking of Stockius, said that "he *commences with classic meanings, and then gives New Testament definitions.*" But Stockius' lexicon is a *New Testament lexicon*, and it gives the *New Testament use of words*. It says that immersion was the practice formerly, pointing back to the beginning of the Christian dispensation; but *now*, it says, the water is sometimes "*only sprinkled upon them.*" That is just the true history. My friend quoted abundantly from that author. I do not recollect all the words of his quotations, and, therefore, I can not answer particularly beyond this, that if Stockius used his language in his sense of it, this is the reason of it: When pouring began in Rome, in the year 252 A. D., in the case of Novatian, it was conceded by the parties present that baptism was immersion; but they argued that God would take the will for the deed if

they came as near the thing commanded as they could. Therefore, they poured the water on him—*perfundere* meaning to pour copiously—and that is the fact. *Perfundere* is the word used in Latin to describe it, and it means to pour all around, or copiously. I have not examined the passage in Stockius where *perfundere* is used; but I admit that it was not uncommon, after the third century, in the case of sick persons, or with persons who were too weak to undergo immersion, for them to come as near as they could to the ordinance, and (*perfundere*) to pour copiously on those to be baptized. I admit this to be the fact. But Stockius makes a distinction between what *had been* and what was *then* the practice. He says: “Formerly they immersed; now they sprinkle.” My friend admits that “they poured *profusely*,” which is the fact.

I wish, now, to make some remarks on versions made before and after the Christian era.

Versions made before Christ, and after, often indicate very clearly the sense in which the word *baptizo* is used in them. I will collate some of them. Version of the LXX, Ex. 166, 2 Kings v: 14, “And Naaman went down and dipped himself (*ebaptisato*) seven times.” This version was completed, says Dr. Conant, as early as the middle of the second century before Christ.

In the version of Aquila, first half of the second century, A. D., Ex. 170, Job ix: 31, it is said: “Even then thou wilt *plunge me (baptiseis)* in corruption.”

Version of Symmachus (Psalm lxix: 2, English Bible), last half of the second century, A. D., Ex. 171, “I am *plunged (ebaptistan)* into bottomless depths.”

Version of the LXX, Ex. 173, Is. xxi: 4, “Iniquity *baptizes* me.” Here the prophet is speaking of the overwhelming effects of lawlessness, and the translators conceived it as a baptism, and hence they employed one of the forms of *baptizo* to express it.

Same version, Judith xii: 5-9, Ex. 174. . . . “And (she) went forth by night into the valley of Bethulia and baptized herself in the camp at the fountain of the water.”

Same version, Wisdom of Sirach xxxiv: 27 (English Bible, Ecclesiasticus xxxiv: 25), “Baptizing himself from a dead body and touching it again, what is he profited by his bathing?” His baptism was a bathing, as the law of Moses required.—Num. xix: 19.

Kitto, edited by W. L. Alexander, Congregationalist, etc., says: *Baptizo*, in the LXX, only four times. After giving the referen-

ces and commenting on the same, he says: "In the Greek, then, of the LXX, *baptizein* signifies *to plunge, to bathe, to overwhelm.*"

Hebrew version of the New Testament made 1599, by Elias Hutter, as also one by the learned Greenfield, in both of which *baptizo* is invariably rendered by *taval*, which is *to immerse*.

The old Syriac or Peshito is, without doubt, one of the most ancient and accurate versions of the New Testament ever made. Its date is probably somewhere in the second century, though this is doubted by some of the best authorities. It was made in the country in which the apostles lived and wrote, and in a language very nearly like that in which the apostles and the Savior preached. The word selected to represent *baptizo* is *amad*, which signifies, primarily, to stand; but, of course, to stand is no definition of *baptizo*. It may be asked, how did *amad* come to represent *baptizo*, in this version? Gesenius, in his Hebrew and Chaldee lexicon, says: "In the Syriac Church *amad* is to baptize, perhaps because the person to be baptized stood in the water."

Krestiti is the Slavonic word for baptism, which signifies *to cross*, yet those who use it all *immerse*. They do this, not because *Krestiti* means to immerse, but because making the sign of the cross is a striking and prominent part, in their estimation, of the baptismal ceremony. So, to stand in the water, may have struck the Syrian. One thing is beyond doubt, *amad* does not mean to sprinkle or pour. For its current sense, see Greenfield, etc.

The Arabic version was made—the Polyglot—in the seventh century, and others in the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries. In all of them *amada* is used for *baptizo*, which signifies in these versions to immerse.

The Latin Vulgate, by Jerome, completed near the end of the fourth century, transferred the word. So did also the old Italic version, made probably near the close of the second century, or about the age of Tertullian. The Greek words for baptism were evidently naturalized into the Latin language, with their meanings, at or before the time these versions were made, just as the Latin words *mergo*, *immergo*, and hundreds of others, anglicized, are brought into the English language.

There is no dispute that from the time of Tertullian to that of Jerome—from two hundred to four hundred—immersion was the practice of the church. This, all know, was the unvarying practice in all places during those centuries, except that pouring in the third century

began to be regarded as *sufficient* in some cases and places. But this was permitted *only* in cases of extreme illness, or in other cases where immersion was thought to be impossible and delay would be fatal.

It even then stood *only* on church authority, being called ecclesiastic baptism, and was pleaded on the ground that God loves mercy better than sacrifice.

But in regard to the sense in which Jerome, author of the Vulgate, used the transferred words, we are not left in doubt. He says himself, in his comments on the Epistle to the Ephesians, book 2, chapter iv: "et ter mergimur, ut Trinitatis unum appareat Sacramentum," which I translate: *and thrice we are immersed, that there may appear one Sacrament of the Trinity.* You will observe that he does not speak of a case simply, but of what was customary, putting himself among those who were immersed when baptized.

MR. DITZLER'S SIXTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

As to Josephus' education, I have already read sufficiently from the first volume of Samuel Davidson's Introduction. I have often read it from my own copy of Josephus, but as Davidson is the highest authority, and had the Greek of Josephus, I read from him. I showed you that he never studied Greek until after he had been a high priest, a general in the army, etc.

My brother says I will not translate βαπτίζω "because it is a sacred word." He may have understood me to talk that way, but he is mistaken. I never talk that way. You will learn how I talk on that matter when I come to it. He says that lately he has studied this subject a great deal, and that I have not; therefore I am unprepared to debate, and that it is not safe to trust crude knowledge: I reply, *hot-bed preparations are not good*, and his arguments give evidence of the *hot-bed*. For years I have matured my views on it in my philological studies. He confounds Wahl and Stokius together, and what was the result? I confess that I have thought, heretofore, that he had a strange way of dealing with serious matters, but in his excitement and anger to-day he did a thing I could not have believed he would do. On Wahl's definition of baptizo he read: "*Baptizo, demergo, SUBMERGO IN THE NEW TESTAMENT*," making Wahl say that *submergo* was the *New Testament* meaning, as if there was not a comma, semicolon, or any thing else between. Here is what Wahl says: "βαπτίζω (demergo, submergo, Pol. i: 51-6. Diod. Sic. xi: 18, si lect., sana; in N. T.) 1st lavo. Marc. vii: 14; Luke xi: 38, LXX, pro טבל (tabhal) 2 Regg. v: 14; 2d, *immergo*." Now, note well, *submergo* is put in brackets. He then refers to classic authors and comments briefly, and then there is a semicolon which disposes of that matter, and then he begins, "In the New Testament"—still in brackets—then he gives the New Testament definition thus: 1. "I wash. 2. I immerse." Now I insist that this shall go into the report of the

debate as I have read it, with the same punctuation that it has in the lexicon, and if he is willing to go into print in that way I have nothing more to say on that point. Then on Stokius! how he did argue. It is astonishing. Look at the doubt he tries to throw on any thing I bring. It shows the extraordinary fairness of my brother. When I read "The water was anciently poured upon those baptized," he says, "if it be in Stokius," when he has a copy of Stokius on his table; knows that Pendleton copied and translated it in the "Harbinger" of December, 1869; that it was copied in the "Apostolic Times," of Lexington, of which Mr. Wilkes is a co-editor; and has been read in the Latin by me in every debate we have had, and become so notorious as to attract general attention; is under the very section and on the same page from which he has quoted from Stokius. Yet he wishes to leave the force of a doubt on your minds. That is candid, of course. Now, here is his argument. He says Stokius' definition—"pouring out"—as meant by βαπτίζω, was founded on the fact that in the third century after Christ they poured water profusely on those baptized, and says that *profundo* means to pour profusely, though it is applied constantly to the falling of tears, of dew, and the simplest aspersions. Now look at it. Stokius says "it signifies *effusionem*, the pouring out of the Holy Spirit," etc. He says it was so used, it had such a meaning, because "anciently the water was copiously poured upon those baptized," and so it represented "the abundance, the outpourings, of the gifts of the Holy Spirit," says Stokius. Now, how could Stokius say that the New Testament writers used βαπτίζω to represent pouring, and urge that it was by the apostolic writers applied with this meaning to the Holy Spirit's descent, pouring out on the "apostles and other believers," because "anciently the water was copiously poured on those baptized," if pouring was not known till centuries after they wrote and were dead? How could the pourings of the third and fourth centuries after Christ be used by Paul, Peter, John, and Luke, as representations of what βαπτίζω meant when they wrote? Such is the extraordinary kind of arguments they have by which to prove immersion.

My brother has had an interview with a Jewish rabbi here. I had an interview with the same gentleman last spring. I met him in this hall, I believe, and then afterward went to his house. He says they use the word *rachatz* for that ordinance, and what is the meaning of *rachatz*? "To overflow," "to pour out," etc. It is interpreted by Aben Ezra to be "the washing of the body, or baptism."—Horæ Heb. et Tal., Lightfoot, vol. ii, p. 55. Fürst says: "The fundamental signifi-

cation is to *flow, pour out, to drip.*" It is translated *χέω* (*cheo*) *pour* by the Septuagint. It is the word that represents the washing, which he himself quoted for baptism when Paul speaks of "the washing of regeneration."—Titus iii: 5. It is the same word used, Eph. v: 26, where Mr. A. Campbell says it is called "Christian immersion." Mr. Campbell says, "We have, indeed, divers bathings, *βυπτισμοῖς* (*baptismois*), in water alone, . . . in Leviticus xv: 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 16, 18, etc. Here are *ten* diverse bathings in one chapter."—Chr. Baptism, 173-4. He gives many other passages, as Lev. xvii: 15, 16; Num. xix: 7, 8, 19. "These washings or bathings are uniformly expressed by *louo*, and contrasted with pourings and sprinklings. . . . These are, therefore, called by Paul *diverse baptisms*, or *baptisms*, on diverse occasions."—*Ibid*, 174. Now this *louo*, wash or bathe, is *rachatz*, *רָחַץ* in the Hebrew in every instance he gives, and *λούω, νίπτω, τζίνω, χέω*, wash, pour, are the Greek renderings, as already shown. This washing, then, called immersion and baptism by our opponents, and called baptism by Jews and Paul, means to *pour*, to distil, drop, in the Hebrew.

As *tabhal* is likely to figure largely here, I will read from Hävernick: "A General Historico-critical Introduction to the Old Testament, by H. A. Ch. Hävernick, late Teacher of Theology in the University of Königsburg, MDCCCLII (1852)." This is held by scholars to be the best introduction to the Old Testament ever produced. Page 221, he shows the different systems espoused to develop the study of the Hebrew language. "The *formal* conception of the stems" was an important point—all important. "Both (schools) set out from the principle that the *radices* (roots) of the Hebrew are *biliteræ* (two radical letters forming the base of the word), and that the grand meaning of the *biliteræ* must be evolved from the meaning of the letters composing it." He shows that Danz founded the best later school. After Ch. B. Michælis and Störr "there . . . prevailed . . . a certain *empiricism* which is to be viewed in relation to the earlier as a *retrogression* in the method of investigation, and by which penetration into the Hebrew was little furthered. *To such an empirical mode of treatment*, in opposition even to what had been before attempted, did Vater yield himself. However distinguished for careful collecting of materials, and tasteful arrangements, are the lexical and grammatical works of Gesenius, they are, nevertheless, *confined to this EMPIRICAL STANDPOINT*," 223-4. "'By Ewald's *Kritische Grammatik*' this was for the first time assaulted, and a *scientific* investigation of the language, proceeding upon the proper laws of speech, and placed upon a footing

of due harmony with the historical appearance and development of the language, was entered upon. His efforts and those of Hupfeld have thus *once more* begun to create positively *an epoch* in the study of Hebrew, an advance which is also beginning, at least, to make itself apparent *in the lexical department.*" "Buxtorff still remains the completest compilation of lexical and grammatical matter here, and *there is still wanting a GENUINELY SCIENTIFIC* and independent, even in the grammars of J. D. Michælis, Winzer (Hebrew older work), and others." I have had Hupfeld's work, some ten years—the ablest yet out. Of him he says: "In more recent times they (these principles) have found, *for the first time*, a worthy critic in Hupfeld."—Note, p. 222. Now, as Ewald and Hupfeld brought out the true principles of Hebrew study, and demolished the empirical system of Gesenius, Furst takes up their results and brings them out in all their force, and makes a new era again in Hebrew study. The far-fetched and utterly silly analogies of Gesenius are crushed, and the true laws for discovering Hebrew roots and meanings made perfectly clear.

These are not heathen works, but translations of the *Bible* by men who lived in an age to understand these things, and who did not talk about baptizing by *making drunk, sinking ships, etc.* To further show you the use of *tabhal*, I will give you two or three other words of a kindred nature, but *the same root*: *shabhal*, "to bubble up, to flow, to pour, as of a rain, a river." Arabic, *shabahla*, "to inundate, to flow." Here you see these kindred words having the same root, have a like idea of flowing, pouring, raining connected with the word used for baptism. I will give you another example: *yabhael* is another kindred word, hence it means "to flow, to stream." Arabic, *wabala*, "to flow copiously, to stream, to rain." Hence, to be wet, moist. *Yabhal*, "a brook, a stream." I gave many in my third and fourth speeches.

My brother quotes B. Davidson, but he can not get up a case of immersion. He cites the word *tzava*, which is from *tzava*, and in *Aphel* means "to wet, to moisten." So Davidson defines it. You can wet any thing by sprinkling or pouring. As an example, he gives the case of Nebuchadnezzar, who was wet by the dew falling upon him. Of course, there was no dipping in that case. As I have already said, too much importance can not be attached to these facts.

I now take up the case of Joseph's garment: "And they took Joseph's coat, and killed a kid of the goats, and dipped the coat in the blood."—Genesis xxxviii: 31. That is King James' translation.

The Hebrew is: *wayitbeles eth-hak-kuttoneth baddam*—and they baptized the coat with the blood. The Greek is: *και ἐμόλυναν τὸν χιτῶνα τῷ αἵματι*—and they stained the coat with the blood. Vulgate: *tinzerunt*—stained. The Peshito-Syriac is: *vephalephaluh lekutheshhino bhadhmel*—“and sprinkled the garment with the blood.” Itala is also “stained with blood,” *tingo*, to stain.

1. In the first place, the only object Joseph's brethren had in staining his coat with blood, was to make the impression upon the father that some “wild beast had slain him.” It was against their plan to submerge it in blood. 2. The father *recognized* “the coat of many colors,” which would not have been the case, if it had been completely *submerged* in blood. 3. Then the blood of a kid would not be a sufficient quantity to immerse a coat in. If it had been dipped or immersed in blood, it would have defeated the very thing they had in view; for it was their object to impose upon the old man. But had Joseph been slain by a wild beast, it would have been quite probable that his outer coat would have been sprinkled or stained by the blood falling upon it. Immersion is out of the question. This is the *first time* that the word *baptize* occurs in the *history of the world*, and it is rendered *sprinkle* by the *best translation* in the world. Now, can we bring up a translation which followed the Latin as a guide, and was made by immersionists fifteen hundred years after the apostles died, when immersion was the law of the land, and put it against the Peshito-Syriac, *made when the same apostles were living*, or within a few years of their death, as all scholars agree? There are other examples I might bring up if I had time, *e. g.*, Lev. xiv: 5, 6, where it is *tabhal* in the Hebrew—baptize.

My brother said in substance, if I understood him rightly, that the word *baptidzo* is nowhere wash; that is to say, that wash and baptize are not so related that one gives a true idea of the other. He gave an example from 2 Kings v: 14, where “Naaman went and dipped himself,” as the immersion version has it. The Hebrew is, v. 10, *verahatzetta* (*rachatz*); Greek, *λουσαι* (*lusaí*)—(*λούω*) “wash thyself at the Jordan, or in the Jordan seven times.” He was told to wash. The Hebrew word meant literally to pour, besprinkle. In v. 14: “And he baptized himself seven times at the Jordan;” *wayitbal* (*tabhal*)—Greek, *και εβαπτισατο εν τῷ Ιορδανη*. The Vulgate and German are “he washed himself,” that is, ceremoniously, besprinkled himself. The Peshito-Syriac is *sacho*, washed; same word in v. 10, *wash*. They never immersed for any purpose religiously, and especially not for

leprosy. Lev. xiv : 7, "And he shall sprinkle upon him that is to be cleansed from the leprosy seven times." "He baptized himself seven times."

To show you the importance the immersionists attach to the Translations, I may read from President Pendleton's "Millennial Harbinger," of September, 1870, p. 515. He says, "A beloved brother sends us from across the waters a learned treatise on the mode and subjects of baptism, by J. B. Lindsay." He adds, "Our readers will be gratified with the following candid examination of the terms employed for baptism in the ancient versions of the New Testament. Endeavors like this are an overwhelming proof of the unity of conviction and practice on this subject of the entire Christian world for many centuries after the first planting of Christianity by the apostles."—W. K. P.

The Baptists, through their learned committee who published Gotch's tract in their "Bible Questions," greatly regret that they had not learned the great facts of the value of the Translations, or rather of the aid they gave them, earlier, and show that they were held as the most decisive of all arguments. The importance Campbell, Conant, and Gotch attach to them shows itself in all their writings. This writer, following Lindsay, says, "The word for baptism in Arabic was evidently *sabagh* (or *sabhagh*, as we pronounce it), being the same as the Chaldee *tzaba*, which, we have already seen, denotes to immerse, to dip." He quotes from the Koran, where he says "the same word occurs," chap. xxxiii : 20 (or 21), in the sense of *syrup*, *juice*, or *sap*—"We raise to you a tree which springs from Mt. Sinai, and produces oil and juice (*sabagh*) for those who eat it."

I showed you that this word meant to sprinkle and pour; that the root *saba* was translated by every Arabic lexicon in the world, and by Fürst, pour, trickle, drop, etc. Gesenius defines it, "to flow, to trickle, of water, to pour." (See under *tzabhabh*).

We come to the TRANSLATIONS. I. I will now give you a brief review of some of these translations. The old Itala translation is the next oldest translation of the Bible in the world. It is not known who made it. It was made in the 1st or 2d century. 1st. In the first place, this translation never renders *tabhal*, the Hebrew word for baptize, by immerse. 2d. It never renders *tzabha*, the other Hebrew word, which in Chaldee and Syriac signifies baptize, by immerse. 3d. In the next place, it never renders baptidzo by immerse; and it does render Βάπτω (*bapto*), the root of *baptizo*, by sprinkle. Rev. xix : 13,

aspersa sanguine, "sprinkled with blood." 4th. In the next place, it does render *tabhal* by wash once, and once only. In all other places, it transfers the word βαπτίζω from the Greek into the Latin. It also renders the Chaldee word for baptize by "*sprinkle*."

II. Jerome's Latin translation is next. It was made in the last half of the fourth century. He was the most learned of the Latin fathers except Augustine, perhaps more learned in Hebrew than he. 1st. He does not render *tabhal* immerse once, nor *baptidzo*. 2d. He does render *bapto* sprinkle, Rev. xix: 13, *aspersa*; also the Chaldee word *taebha*, which immersionists contend *never* meant to sprinkle, by "*conspurgatur*," to sprinkle, and by "*infunderis rore cœli*," sprinkled with the dew of heaven. He renders it by *tingo*, to stain, by *infectum*, to moisten, but never by immerse.

III. Then comes the Peshito-Syriac, the oldest version of the New Testament in the world. It is the best, and, as he admits, the most literal and purest in the world. It is nearest to the Hebrew language, with the Arabic, for they are dialects from the Hebrew, and as I will show, in about seven cases out of ten, the Abrabic root and the Hebrew are the same in meaning.

The Syriac was the native tongue, as A. Campbell and Pendleton state, of Christ. It was the vernacular of the apostles. In it they preached, in it they delivered their messages of life. Now, this oldest, purest, most literal translation—the only version in the sacred tongue of Christ—

1. Never renders βαπτίζω by dip, immerse, or plunge.
2. It usually renders it by *amad*, wash.
3. Castel and Schaaf could only find one place in the Bible where *amad* meant immerse—that was Numbers xxxi: 24, where the original has not any of the words for baptize.
4. It renders φωτίζω, to enlighten, shed light upon, by *amad* several times.
5. The washings in Siloam are *baptisms* (John v: 2, 4; ix: 7, 11), *mamudhitho*. Siloam is called in these places, *mamudhitho*, *baptisteries*.
6. *Sacho*, *secho*, wash (2 Kings v: 14). I gave you the lexicons on it.
7. *Tzeva*, often to sprinkle (Dan. iv: 12, 20, 21; v: 30), from Chaldee of baptize.
8. *Zelach* (Rev. xix), to sprinkle (βάπτω). "And he was clothed

with a garment *sprinkled with blood*;" Syr., *vemataph mono bdhezalich badhmo*.

9. Genesis xxxvii : 31, *tabhal*, baptized, is *phalphaluh*, sprinkled.

10. Luke vii : 38, 44—Greek, *Βρέχω*, to rain, shed forth, sprinkle; Syr., *hadhe dhen bh'dhemeiah reglad tzabhath*—" *But she with her tears MY FEET HATH BAPTIZED.*" Here is *tzera*, their word for *immerse*.

MR. WILKES' SIXTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In replying to my friend's speech, I commence where he concluded. He tells us that, "in the Jerome translation of Daniel, where it is said the king was 'baptized' in the dew of heaven, it is *sprinkled* with the dew of heaven." He says the Latin translator employed the word "*infectum*—to moisten;" that "Jerome conceived the king's baptism to be a moistening by the sprinkling of dew." I reply, the Hebrew word at this verse is not the one employed to designate baptism; nor is the word in the Greek of the Septuagint here, or in the Latin, the one ever so employed. Nor is it true that "*infectum*" means, primarily, to "moisten." Leverett's "Latin Lexicon" defines as follows: "*Inficio*, properly, to put into." This is the *first* meaning.

Again: The Italic translator—who made the translation we do not know—did not translate the word at all; he *transferred* it in the New Testament. Now, the question is, In what sense did he use the transferred word? I would remark that he did not transfer it in the sense in which we use the term transfer. The Greek word *baptizo* was in common use then, and its meaning was as well understood as the meaning of the word immerse is with us, though it is an Anglicized Latin word. In that version the word was transferred with its meaning; although, as I say, it was as well understood as the word immersion is understood in English; so that it was not literally a transference; it was merely the taking a word which was understood, as its history shows, to mean immersion, and using it.

In regard to the case of Naaman, the history is so simple in itself, so plain, that no one, by comment, can make it plainer. The officer was told to go and wash himself, perhaps in allusion to the practice of the Jews—"Go, wash yourself from the leprosy;" and he went and baptized—dipped—himself seven times in the Jordan. By common consent that baptizing was dipping; hence, in the English version we read, "He went and dipped himself seven times in the Jor-

dan." My friend says there was no immersing for the leprosy; that it was "*always sprinkling*." He says "there was no *immersing* in the case of cleansing a leper."

Now, this is a question of fact, and the issue is directly made between him and me. I hold that the leper was to *bathe* his *whole flesh* in water, which is an immersion. It is recorded that Naaman was cleansed. It is true *tâval*, in the Hebrew, is not the word used for wash in the prophet's command; the reason being that the word which was used looked to the *result* more than to the act; hence, *rachatz*, indicating washing, was used, rather than *tâval*, which means immersion. I ask my friend to show me a case—and there are twenty different categories of cleansings from ceremonial uncleanness—I ask for one case, *including the case of the leper*, where the cleansing was by *sprinkling*, without the washing of the body. The fact is, there never was any ceremonial cleansing without bathing the body in water; and this was the case, not only with persons, but with things.

My friend says that Grimm and Bopp developed something very wonderful in regard to Hebrew learning. Perhaps they did; but what is that to him? He answers, that Furst made a Hebrew lexicon after that light was thrown on the question of Hebrew learning, and that he gives as the *first* definition of *tâval*, "to sprinkle, to moisten." I remark that Davidson made his Hebrew lexicon *after* Furst, and he gives us "to dip, to immerse," as the first meaning, and omits sprinkle.

My friend referred to what Davidson says in regard to *tsêva*, and dealt not exactly fairly with him on that question. His words, says my brother, are distinctly these: "*Tsêva*, to wet, to moisten." Now, he is right; but it is not the *first* definition which Davidson gives; he leaves out the *first* definition, which is "to dip in, to tinge, to dye," and *then* comes his definition. Out upon such quotations from authorities!

Again: He says the translators of our common English version were immersionists. The fact is, the English people were immersionists up to about the time of Queen Elizabeth; after that, on account of the great influence of some persons who concluded to practice sprinkling for baptism—though immersion was in the rubric still, and was required by the law of the church during all the reign of Elizabeth—immersion fell into disuse; and for almost a century before our common version was made, sprinkling and pouring were in com-

mon use; and those men who sprinkled and poured were the men who made our version. These are the facts. But I had better read from Dr. Wall. He is attempting to show the difficulty of breaking off from sprinkling and pouring and returning to the ancient immersion. He says.

“But there are, beside this general, two particular obstacles which it may be fit to mention 1 One is, from that part of the people in any parish who are *Presbyterially* inclined As the *Puritan* party brought in this alteration, so they are very tenacious of it, and, as in other church matters, so in this, particularly, they seem to have a settled antipathy against the retrieving of the ancient customs Calvin was, I think (as I said in my book), the first in the world that drew up a form of liturgy that prescribed *pouring water* on the infant, absolutely, without saying any thing of *dipping* It was (as Mr Walker has shown) his admirers in England who, in Queen Elizabeth's time, brought *pouring* into ordinary use, which before was used only to weak children”—Wall's “History of Infant Baptism,” vol 11, p 463

That shows that pouring was introduced, or at least brought into common use, in the days of Queen Elizabeth, which was quite a time before our common version was made I read again from the same writer :

“And when there was added to all this the resolution of such a man as Dr Whitaker, Regius Professor at Cambridge, ‘Though in case of grown persons that are in health, I think dipping to be better, yet, in the case of infants, and of sickly people, I think sprinkling sufficient’—The inclination of the people, backed with these authorities, carried the practice against the rubric, which still required dipping, except in case of weakness So that in the latter times of Queen Elizabeth, and during the reigns of King James and of King Charles I, very few children were dipped in the font”—Wall's “History of Infant Baptism,” vol 1, p 581

You will see that in the English Church, in the days of Elizabeth, pouring had come into ordinary use, and, as Dr. Wall says, the ancient custom of immersion was being laid aside For many long centuries before that it had been the practice to sprinkle water upon *sick* and *weakly people* only, and this gave an opportunity to introduce it in other cases. Persons sometimes were quite sick, in order, it may be, to be sprinkled, instead of being, as Paul said, buried with the Lord in baptism. And then “*fond ladies*” and *delicate* persons would choose to be sprinkled rather than be baptized. The name of the great Dr. Whitaker was used in favor of *extending* this privilege a

little further than to the sick, and, notwithstanding the authority and force of the English rubric, it was carried against it, and sprinkling and pouring were introduced long before the making of our common version.

The statement that our English version was made by immersionists is, then, not true. Notwithstanding that, in every case where *bapto* occurs, seventeen times in the Old Testament and five times in the New, these persons translated it "dip," except two; and where *baptizo* occurs, as in the case of Naaman, the leper, they translated it "dip;"—"he went down and *dipped* himself seven times in the Jordan."

I have another line of thought to which I invite your attention briefly. You will observe that thus far we have occupied your time too much with Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, Arabic, and Coptic, which neither the people who hear us, nor the people that will hereafter read us, will ever understand. I am *compelled* to this course. If I should decline to reply, it would be said there is much in it that can not be answered; and if I pursue the course of following my friend, it will be said that it is not understood and is time lost. Nevertheless, there is a necessity on me to answer him, and I will do so a little while longer; then, I now notify my friend, I am going to the language of the New Testament, to that which was used by the Holy Spirit in regard to baptism, not to the Hebrew, Chaldee, or the Latin Vulgate of Jerome. I am going to the Greek of the New Testament, to examine the language of our Lord Jesus Christ, to see what he meant when he said: "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them," etc. We must come to that soon. The people are interested in knowing; it is our duty, and we propose to give them information upon this subject.

In addition to giving the classical use, the Hellenistic, and the current use of the word *baptizo* for five hundred years before the Christian era—and coming up to the Christian era we then passed on, selecting such men as Josepbus, who was born thirty-seven years after Christ, and Philo, a little later; then on to Hermas and Justin Martyr and others; to Tertullian, Cyprian, Jerome, Amhrose, and Augustine, and all along down for five hundred years after the birth of Christ, for the purpose of developing the sense in which the word *baptizo* was used—I now propose to take up the lexicons, and see what they say upon the subject. At present I am not advised that there is one that gives *sprinkle* or *pour* as the definition of *baptizo*. It is not in Stockius, though my friend may think so. I commence, then, with Scapula.

I should not have preferred to give the Latin had not my friend forced that course upon me. I should have preferred to give the English, and have referred to the Latin only when there was a difference between us.

Scapula, 1579: "*Bapto, mergo, immergo. . . . Item, tingo (quod sit immergendo).*" *Plunge, immerse, also to dye (because it may be done by immersing).*

"*Inficere, imbuere, apud Lucam xvi: 24, ut intingat extremum digitum suum in aquam.*" *To put into, to imbue, according to Luke xvi: 24. That he might dip the end of his finger in water. "Item, Lavo;" also, to wash.*

"*Baptizo. Mergo seu immergo: ut quæ tingendi aut abluendi gratiâ aquæ immergimus. Item mergo, submergo, obruo aquâ. Ité abluo, lauo.*" *I plunge or immerse: As we immerse things in water for the purpose of dyeing or cleansing them. Also, I dip, submerge, overwhelm in water. Also, I cleanse, I wash.*

"*Baptizomai. Mergor, submergor. Et metaph. pro obruor.*" *I am plunged, submerged, and, metaphorically, it is for, I am overwhelmed.*

"*Baptismos and Baptisma. Mersio, lotio, ablutio; ipse immergendi, item lavandi seu abluendi actus, Marci vii. Item baptisma apud Christianos Scriptores.*" *Immersion, washing, cleansing, the act itself of immersing; also of washing or cleansing.—Mark vii. Also, baptism according to the Christian writers.*

Hedericus' Lexicon, 1766.—"*Baptizo. Mergo, immergo, aqua obruo. (2) Abluo, lavo; (3) Baptizo, significatu sacrô.*" (1) *I plunge, immerse, overwhelm in water; (2) I cleanse, wash; (3) I baptize, in a sacred sense.*

"*Baptisma, immersio, intinctio. (2) Baptismus;*" *immersion, dipping; (2) baptism. "Baptismos," the same.*

"*Baptistees. Qui immergit, qui abluit; (2) Baptizator, baptista.*" *One who immerses, who washes; (2) one who baptizes, a baptizer.*

"*Bapto, mergo, immergo; (2) tingo, intingo; (3) lavo; (4) haurio, impleo hauriendo; (5) pereo, de navi.*" *To plunge, to immerse; (2) to dye, to dip in; (3) to wash; (4) to draw, to fill by drawing; (5) to destroy, of a ship.*

Parkhurst—New Test. Lexicon—died, 1797: "*Baptizo, from bapto, to dip. . . I. To dip, immerse, or plunge in water. But in the New Testament it occurs not strictly in this sense, unless so far as this is included in sense II, and III, below.*

"*II. Baptizomai, Mid and Pass., to wash one's self, be washed,*

wash, *i. e.*, the hands by *immersion* or *dipping* in water. Mark vii: 4; Luke xi: 38. The LXX use *baptizomai*; Mid., for washing one's self by immersion, answering to the Hebrew *tâval*. 2 Kings v: 14. Thus also it is applied in the Apocryphal books, Judith xii: 7; Ecclesiasticus xxxiv: 25.

“VI. Figuratively, to be immersed or plunged in a flood or sea, as it were, of *grievous afflictions* and *sufferings*. Matt. xx: 22, 23.

“*Baptisma*. I. An immersion or washing with water; hence, used in the New Testament for the baptism both of John the Baptist and of Christ. II. *Baptism* or *immersion* in *grievous* and *overwhelming afflictions* and *sufferings*.”

“*Baptismos*; an immersion or washing in water. *Bapto*; perhaps from the Hebrew *tava*, to *sink*, by transposition. To *dip*, *plunge*, *immerse*.”

Ewing—Lexicon, 1827. Glasgow, Scotland: “*Baptizo*; in its primary and radical sense, *I cover with water*, or *some other fluid*, in whatever manner this is done, whether by *immersion* or *affusion*, *wholly* or *partially*, *permanently* or *for a moment*; and, in the passive voice, *I am covered with water* or *some other fluid*, in some manner or other.

“Hence, the word is used in several different senses, referring either mediately or immediately to the primary idea. It is used to denote, first, *I plunge* or *sink completely under water*; second, *I cover partially with water*, *I wet*; third, *I overwhelm* or *cover with water by rushing, flowing, or pouring upon*. And in the passive voice, *I am overwhelmed* or *covered with water in that mode*. Fourth; *I drench* or *impregnate with liquor by affusion*. Fifth; *I oppress* or *overwhelm*, in a metaphorical sense, *by bringing afflictions or distresses upon*. Sixth; *I wash*, in general, without specifying the mode. Seventh; *I wash for the special purpose* of symbolical, ritual, or ceremonial purification. Eighth; *I administer the ordinance of Christian baptism*; *I baptize*.”

Under the eighth division, Mr. Ewing uses this language: “The ordinance of baptism is the pouring out of water, from the hand of the baptizer, on the face of the baptized;” but for this he gives no example.

Wahl—Clavis of New Testament. 1829. Leipsic.—“*Baptizo*, f. iso. (*a bapto*, *mergo*; *sæpius mergo*, in New Test. :) 1. *immergo* (universe—Jos. Ant., ix, 10, 2; xv, 3, 3. Polyb. i, 51, 6.) *a) proprie et quidem de immersione sacra*.” (*From bapto, to immerse; often to immerse, in the New Testament*.) First, *to immerse*, (*always in Jos. Ant., 9,*

10, 2; and 15, 3, 3. Polyb. i, 51, 6). (a) *properly and truly concerning sacred immersion.*

“*Baptisma.* In N. T.): *immersio.* Legitur de immersione sacra nunc Johannis, nunc illa, quam Jesus instituit. (b) *Ex metonym. actionis pro objecto ejus, ‘eis to baptisma iōannou,’* Acts xix: 4. (c) *Metaphor. pro, ‘baptisma,’ ‘baptizo,’ calamitatibus mergo.*” *Immersion.* *It is spoken now, concerning the sacred immersion of John; now concerning that which Jesus instituted.* (b) *By metonymy, for the object of the action itself, ‘into the baptism of John,’* Acts xix: 4. (c) *Metaphorically, for baptism, to baptize, to overwhelm with calamities.*

“*Baptismos.* (1) *Immersio; de immersione sacra.* Hebrews vi: 2. (2) *Lotio. Lustratio aqua facta.*”—*Immersion.* *Concerning sacred immersion.* Heb. vi: 2. *Wash, the act of purifying in water.*

“*Baptistees.* Qui immergit.” *One who immerses.* “*Bapto.* *Immergo, intingo.*” *To immerse, to dip.*

Schleusner, “*Lexicon New Testament,*” 1829, London. “*Baptizo:* 1.) *Proprie; immergo ac intingo, in aquam mergo; a bapto, et respondet Hebraico tāval.*”—2 Kings v: 14. *Properly, to immerse, to dip, to plunge in water. It is from bapto, and corresponds to the Hebrew tāval.*—2 Kings v: 14.

“*Baptisma:* (1.) *Proprie; immersio, intinctio in aquam, lotio.* Hinc transfertur (2) *ad ritum sacrum, qui baptismus dicitur, quo baptizandi olim in aquam immergebantur, ut veræ religioni divinæ obstringerentur.*” *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.*

Schrevelius (1685). “*Baptizo, to baptize, to plunge, to wash.*”

Trommius (1718), “*Concordance of the Septuagint.*” “*Baptizo, to baptize, to immerse, to dip.*”

Robertson, “*Greek Thesaurus.*” “*Baptizo, to baptize, to immerse, to wash.*”

G. J. Vossius (1648). “*Baptizo.* To baptize signifies to plunge. It certainly, therefore, signifies more than *epi polazein*, which is to swim lightly on the top, and less than *dunein*, which is to sink to the bottom so as to be destroyed.”

(Booth, p. 41.) Calvin (1509). “The word baptize signifies to immerse; and the rite of immersion was observed by the ancient church.”—“*Institutes,*” vol. iv, c. 15, § 19.

(Booth, p. 42.) Beza (1519). “Christ commanded us to be bap-

tized; by which word it is certain immersion is signified. . . . Nor does *baptizein* signify to wash, except by consequence; for it properly signifies to immerse for the sake of dyeing. . . . To be baptized in water, signifies no other than to be immersed in water, which is the external ceremony of baptism."

(Booth, p. 43.) Vitringa, a Dutch commentator (1659), and the greatest commentator of his age, says: "The act of baptizing is the immersion of believers in water. This expresses the force of the word. Thus, also, it was performed by Christ and his apostles."

Luther (1483). "The term baptism is a Greek word. It may be rendered a *dipping*, when we dip something in water, that it may be entirely covered with water. And though that custom be quite abolished among the generality (for neither do they entirely dip children, but only sprinkle them with a little water), nevertheless, they ought to be wholly immersed, and presently to be drawn out again; for the etymology of the word seems to require it.

"The Germans call baptism *tauff*, from *depth*, which they call *tieff* in their language; as if it were proper those should be *deeply immersed* who are baptized. And, truly, if you consider what baptism signifies, you shall see the same thing required; for it signifies that the old man and our nativity, that is full of sins, which is entirely of flesh and blood, may be overwhelmed by divine grace. The manner of baptism, therefore, should correspond to the signification of baptism, that it may show a certain and plain sign of it." (On Acts viii: 38.) Pedobaptism, examined by Abraham Booth, p. 45.

I have thus presented to you a brief outline of the course I intend to pursue. I now refer to the lexicon of Donnegan. His definition of *baptizo* is, "To immerse repeatedly into a liquid; to submerge; to soak thoroughly; to saturate; hence, to drench with wine."

In Pickering's "Greek Lexicon," one of the best ever made in this country or Europe, there is no sprinkle or pour. He says:

"*Βαπτίζω*, to dip, immerse, submerge, plunge, sink, overwhelm; to steep; to soak; to wet; *mid.*, to wash one's self, or bathe; *δι βεβαρτίουνοι*, soaked in wine, or drunken. *Plat. Symph.* 176, B; overwhelmed with debts. *Plut.*; with questions. *Plat. Euthyd.*; to overwhelm one with any thing; to be prodigal toward one; to sink a ship or galley."—"Greek Lexicon," by John Pickering.

I now present you with the lexicon of Mr. E. A. Sophocles. I hope my friend has learned better manners than to speak of this gentleman as he did in Missouri. Mr. Sophocles is a native Greek;

how much advantage that may give him I do not know, and I shall claim nothing from the circumstance. He is professor of Greek in one of the first educational establishments in America; and, so far as I am advised, he is not a member of any church. He takes this word and gives its meaning from one hundred and forty-six years before Christ, to eleven hundred years after Christ, including, particularly, its theological sense, if it has any, differing from the classical sense. He defines it, "to dip, to immerse, to sink." These are the literal meanings of the word. He gives its metaphorical meaning, "*to be drowned*, as the effect of sinking;" "*to plunge a knife*;" "*bathed in tears*," as though *plunged* in them. It is not at all unusual to speak of a man as being overwhelmed with liquor, as we speak of a man being overwhelmed with water.

MR. DITZLER'S SEVENTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

As to the word *infectum*, in Jerome, it is rendered almost habitually in the sense of stain, wet, dip, etc.

Mr. Wilkes.—What is the *first* meaning?

Mr. Ditzler.—Well, in different lexicons different meanings are given.

He tried to leave the impression on your mind that I had misquoted B. Davidson. He would be very glad to find me misquoting an author, as I have caught him so often. I now take his Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon: “*Tzeva*, Chaldee Aph., to wet, moisten” (Dan. iv: 22). He then gives the noun—“*tzabna*, *hyena*,” from its color—spots.

He tells you gravely that he is going to leave the Greek, Chaldee, and Arabic, which last two *he* has *never reached* in any sense of the word. He says the people can not understand these things, and he is going to do—*what?* Why, he is going—to the *Greek!* *Everybody* can understand *Greek*, of course. Any way, they can when we put it into English! But you can not understand a *Hebrew* or *Chaldee* word translated into English, but every body can understand a *Greek* word translated into English. That is the force of what the gentleman said, in much fewer words. He gives a long list of Greek lexicons that he says are on his side of this question; most of them are on my side, though he suppressed so much.

Now, *δύω* (*duo*), infinitive passive, *δύου* (*dunai*) does correspond exactly to the Latin *mergo*. They both mean literally to sink. Immerse is from *in*, put *im* for euphony, and *mergo*, to sink. *Demergo*—*de*, down—to sink down, like *καταβύω-kata* (*kata*), down. *Sub* means *under*—*submergo* is to sink under, to submerge—put, sink completely into, so as to be *under* the element. *Immergo*, *immergere*, *immersi*, *immersum*, is the conjugation. Now, *immergo* corresponds exactly with *εν* (*en*), in, and *δύω* (*duo*), sink in. So, when our lex-

icons of classic Greek render βαπτίζω (*baptidzo*) into Latin, as applied to sinking of ships, etc., they always render it *mergo*, *immergo*, *submergo*.

All immersionists render *mergo*, to sink. Conant, in "Baptizein," pp. 106, 108, 110, 117, 119, 133, renders καταβάω, noun καταβάσις (*kata-dasis*), by sink, sink down. "Three IMMERSIONS (BAPTISMS) the canon here calls the thrice sinking down in one initiation, that is, in one IMMERSION"—τὰς τρεῖς καταβάσεις; that is, he makes the Greek say, In three immersions there are three immersions, and these three are one immersion! (p. 133.) What Zonaras did say, was that in that place the baptisms were immersions, yet one baptism.

Conant renders ἀναβάω (*anaduō*), which is the opposite of κατα and ἐνόω, by *emerge*, i. e., *rise up*, come up again. (See pp. 110, 108, 107, etc.) "Then when we *emerge*, the new man comes up again"—ἀναδευόντων (*anadeuonton*). "For that the child καταβάσαι (*kata-dusai*) sinks down thrice in the font, and comes up ἀναδύσαι (*anadusai*)," etc., 108.

The Greek is the word for immerse, and the Latin would be *immerse* and *emerge*. So, page 110, "The threefold sinking down and coming up," he has it, where the Greek is τήτριση καταβάσει καὶ ἀναδύσει, threefold immersion and emersion. Now, if, as Campbell and Conant so clearly demonstrated, δύω, i. e., δύο ἐνόω, καταβάω, sink, sink in, sink down, are the Greek words for *mergo*, *immergo*, *de* and *submergo*, why are they not consistent, and render these Greek terms, and the noun καταβάσις by *immerse*, *immersion*, as they render βαπτίζω, βάπτισμα? Conant, 114: "The thrice sinking down symbols the three days burial." Theophylact: "The Greek is αἱ τρεῖς καταβάσεις, the three IMMERSIONS." Theophylact adds: "Then the man rises—ἀναδύσει, emerges." Conant has it "comes up." In Campbell's "Christian Baptism," pp. 127 to 129, I read at least ten times where he translates βαπτίζω by "sink," "sunk." "Whose ship being sunk or merged (*baptistheisis*)." "Sailing in a large ship . . . to be sunk or immersed (*baptizesthai*) so," etc., 129. "The pilot can not tell but he may save one in the voyage that had better be drowned (*baptisai*), sunk into the sea," 128. Now, *mergo* and *immergo*, sink, sink in, do not necessarily put any thing *under* the water. They may, they may not. A ship sinks in fifteen feet water, a steamboat in six feet water—neither is *submerged*. A horse, man, any animal sinks in mud—fence sinks in the ground. Hence, this Latin sentence, Ovid's *Metamorphosis*, xiii, 563, "Que genas oculis . . . immergerent manus"—"And plunges, immerses, her hands into the sockets of her eyes." While *mergo* sinks

one, it does not always sink them *under*. Ovid's *Met.*, xiii, 878: "I, struck with amazement, *mergor*, plunge into the adjoining sea;" xiii, 948: "And straight plunged into the deep"—*æquaræ mersi*. V. 595: "And plunged naked into the water."—*Nudaque mergor aquis*. But it often sends them to the bottom, just as βαπτίζω does in the classics. "Merguntque viros, mergunque carines"—they sink the men, they sink the ships. *Only while any thing is in, sunk in the element, is it immersed*. When it puts an object under the element, it is only immersed *while it is under or in the element*. I will apply this more fully hereafter.

You see, then, that *dunai, kataduseis, etc.*, are used as the words explaining the action of βαπτίζω when they did baptize by immersion, and can not, and do not, therefore, necessarily imply to sink to the bottom; and if *duo* does mean "to perish," it is the word by which the Fathers defined going down into the water to be baptized. He read one case of "three *kataduseis*" immersions in one baptism—*τὰς τρεῖς καταδύσεις . . . ἐν ἐνὶ βαπτίσματι*." And the "Apostolic Canons" say, "If a bishop or presbyter shall not perform *three immersions* (*baptismata*) for one initiation, but *one baptism*," etc. Now, this is the only place where the Fathers used *baptism* for immersion. And the above Greek is where Zonaras explains that "the canon here calls the three baptisms *three immersions*." Now, if *kataduseis* means, as he urges, to sink that you may perish, then it requires a man not only to perish to be baptized, but to perish *three times* in one baptism, *i. e.*, to be baptized once. Beautiful logic! That is the way they reason. Then they have always maintained that, *whatever may be the meaning of a word, you can substitute that meaning for that word wherever it may occur, and it will make sense*. That is one of their peculiar laws of language. They also tell us we are inconsistent; that we baptize persons by *sprinkling, pouring, or immersion*; and that, therefore, a man can not be baptized until *all these acts* have been performed. I, therefore, quote A. Campbell's "Christian Baptism," pp. 178, 179: "For the *special benefit* of the *more uneducated*, I shall deduce my twelfth argument for immersion from the FIRST PRECEPT OF THE DECALOGUE OF PHILOLOGY. That precept . . . reads thus: *The definition of a word and the word itself are always convertible terms*. For example: *A law is a rule of action*—is equivalent to saying *a rule of action is a law*." (Italics his.) He adds: "Now, if a definition or translation (which is the same thing) be correct, the definition, if substituted for the term defined, will ALWAYS make good

sense, and be congruous with all the words in construction. In order, then, to test the correctness of any definition or translation, we have only to substitute it in the place of the original word defined or translated." He then selects βαπτίζω as a test, urging it will make good sense in every place in the the New Testament. A. Campbell, "Soaking, wetting, dyeing, coloring, . . . are frequent meanings of *bapto*."—"Christian Baptism," 167. "Immerse, dip, plunge, all the same."—"Debate," 96. "It (Nebuchadnezzar's wetting from dew) was, then, a *general wetting*—profuse as immersion."—"Christian Baptism," 167.

Now, as they have made more capital out of this pretended canon than out of any thing else, as a philological argument, let us test it closely. If their rule be true, the man is not baptized until they exhaust their definition—to dip, immerse, sink, drown—on him.

In Conant's "*Baptizein*," the verb βαπτίζω and noun βάπτισμα occur, if I counted rightly (and I went over it several times with great pains), *two hundred and forty-four* (244) times, exhausting, he says, the use of the word in Greek literature. That is far from the case, though—very. He renders them, (1) *submerge*, twenty-two times; (2) *immerge*, nineteen times; (3) *dip*, nine times; (4) *plunge*, seventeen times; (5) *imbathe*, twice; (6) *overwhelm*, eight times; (7) *whelm*, forty-six times; (8) *immerse*, one hundred and twenty-one times. Take out the New Testament cases which are involved in the question—he gives fourteen cases from it—and it leaves one hundred and seven cases of renderings by immerse out of two hundred and thirty cases; for he had it immerse in these fourteen instances. Of these, five are of the Old Testament, rendered *whelm* once, *plunge* twice, immerse twice. Apocrypha has two—both rendered *immerse*. In all, two hundred and thirty cases—one hundred and seven being immerse by his rendering—it leaves one hundred and twenty-three against one hundred and seven for *immerse by his own showing*. Why not apply the logic of his facts to the NEW TESTAMENT?

From page 43 to 82 Conant has those words rendered *whelm*, forty-five times; *overwhelm*, eight times; *immerse only ten times*—fifty-three against *ten*. Here are forty-three cases of βαπτίζω—μα, *applying the element to the subject to ten where the subject is applied to, or immersed into, the element*. Why not carry that to the New Testament? He also renders it "*endure*," "*undergo*."

A. Campbell's "Christian Baptism," 127 to 130—three pages—renders βαπτίζω (1) *sink*, ten times; (2) *dip*; (3) *plunge*; (4) *immerse*;

(5) *drowned*; (6) *merged*; (7) *immersed*; (8) *overflowed*; (9) *drenched*; (10) *overwhelm*, ten times in one page—130; (11) *undergo* (in his version); (12) *endure* (in his version); (13) *administer* (in his version).

Here are *thirteen* renderings of this word βαπτίζω—*baptidzo*. Conant has ten renderings. Now, if it was *uniform* in meaning, or if it makes sense to substitute a true meaning of it wherever it occurs, *why do they not discover its true (ONE) meaning, and ALWAYS so render it?* Now let us try their rule by Sophocles' definition, which they now parade so much. Let us suppose my good Brother Wilkes marches ten or fifteen candidates out to a creek for immersion. He can not consider them baptized now till he exhausts the Greek word on them. Mind you, they say, and he always in our other debates used it, though I think he will do so no more, that if βαπτίζω means to sprinkle, pour, and immerse, then no one is baptized till he is sprinkled, poured, and immersed. Of course, the rule is puerile, but they consider it philosophical. Brother Wilkes begins according to Sophocles. He defines it "dip"—under the man goes. He defines it "*immerse*." He now immerses him. The next is "*sink*," and Brother W. sinks him awhile. But Sophocles gives *soak*, and he puts him in soak awhile. [Laughter.] Then he "*afflicts*" him. Sophocles says it means "*to intoxicate—make drunk*." Bring me a good dram of brandy for my candidate. [Laughter.] It means "*to drench*"—he wants some Fierabras next. It is to perform ablution—he washes him off now. It means "*to plunge in a knife*." There is some shaking now on the bank among the other nine. But I am not done with you yet. Sophocles and Campbell both say it means "*to drown!*" I look for the *other nine*—ahem! *they are not there!* [Laughter.] Try it by Campbell's rule again. Substitute Mr. Campbell's own definitions—*drench, sink, drown, soak*, "general wetting"—of βάπτω, and what sense does it make? "In those days came John the soaker, soaking in the wilderness." [Laughter.] "He that believeth and is *drunk* shall be saved." "Go, teach all nations, *drowning* them in the name of the Father," etc. "I have a *plunging* to be plunged with." "Can ye be plunged with the plunging with which I am plunged?" "John did preach the *drenching* of repentance." Or, "In those days came John the *sinker*, sinking in the wilderness." [Merriment.] Now, that is the *English* of John the *Immerser*.

Now, every body knows that this is simply absurd and ridiculous. No, my friend, baptism is not all that in a Christian sense, yet my

brother takes these classic lexicons to interpret its idea. We know that to make drunk, to intoxicate, to plunge a knife into a man, can not convey the New Testament idea of baptism. But as these lexicons mostly apply their definition to the sinking of ships, drowning of men, drunkenness, it is evident they can not define it as a New Testament word. I give you New Testament and *native* Greek lexicons which give "pour," "pour upon," "sprinkle," as meanings of this word, and wash, and show you it was done by sprinkling.

But I shall go farther on this point of my argument. They have called, called and recalled for us to give the place where the word *baptidzo* is translated "sprinkle." I have given you the Chaldee and Syriac word for baptize, the radical meaning of which is "to sprinkle." And now, as they have called so long for the other, I will accommodate them there also. I will remark that the manuscripts of the New Testament were carefully transcribed with great pains by the most learned and careful amanuenses, and sometimes they put another word in the original, but one of the same meaning, which is a translation of the word. Hence we find the two most ancient copies of the New Testament in the world, both of the first half of the fourth century, rendering the Greek *baptidzo* by sprinkle. This course of learned copyists has cost critics great labor and pains to find out which was the original word. Where two words often meant the same thing, they substituted the word which best explained the word in its stead. This is well known among critics. We have a place where all the facts and history show it was done by sprinkling, in Mark vii : 4. The Greek Testament reads *καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ βαπτισῶνται οὐκ ἐσθίουσι*—"and (coming) from the market-place they—the Pharisees and all the Jews—do not eat unless they baptize themselves." Now the critics of all ages have looked on this as proof of baptism by sprinkling. But I hold in my hand two copies of the oldest New Testaments in the world known to man, they are the purest, oldest, best, dating about the year A. D. 325. One is Tischendorf's famous *Sinaiticus Codex*, found near Mt. Sinai, 1859, the other is the famous *Vatican Codex*. They are exactly the same here, and read—*καὶ ἀπὸ ἀγορῆς ἐὰν μὴ βαπτισῶνται οὐκ ἐσθίουσι*—"and (coming) from the market-place they—the Pharisees and all the Jews—do not eat unless they (*rantisonται*) SPRINKLE themselves." The learned Euthymius, of the fourth century, so renders it also. There are also seven or eight copies of the Greek Testament—manuscripts—rendering it sprinkle, *βαπτισῶνται*. Here we have ancient Greek copies by the most learned men of the fourth century, men who thor-

oughly understood the Greek language, transferring the word from one manuscript to another in this way, showing that they considered the one in this place synonymous with the other. They knew that the baptisms performed by the Jews in "coming from the market" were done by sprinkling, and, therefore, they merely translated the word sprinkle. Then the best copies of the New Testament we have, have it sprinkle where the Greek is *baptidzo*.

I go on with the Peshito-Syriac rendering. I hold a translation of the old Peshito-Syriac in my hand. The Syrian Church held that it was made by one of the apostles, and no proof to the contrary has ever been adduced. It is the language in which Christ and the apostles preached, some critics contending that there is a slight shade of difference in the language. Rev. xix: 13: "And he was clothed with a garment (*dhazlich*) sprinkled with blood." The Greek is *bapto*, the root of *baptidzo*. *Tabhal* is rendered by *βαπτω* and *βαπτίζω*. And they themselves admit that *bapto* is the root of *baptidzo*, and that both are the same in meaning. But again in this old Peshito-Syriac translation the word Siloam is rendered baptistry, a place where they baptized. I read also from Luke vii: 38, "*bhedhmet metzabho*," with her tears she BAPTIZED his feet. I will read further, and, remember, *I am reading, perhaps, THE VERY WORDS THE SAVIOR SPOKE*, it may be THE VERY IDENTICAL WORDS Christ used. The only word from which immersion gets any comfort in Syriac is the word which I am about to use. I will first read it in the Syriac, Christ's native language, and translate word for word *literally*. *Ve*, and—*ethphenis*, he turned—*luth hoi*, to her—*athho*, (the) woman—*ve*, and—*emar*, said (lit. *ve mar*)—*le*, to—*sheman*, Simon—*cheze*, see—*ath*, thou—*athho*, woman—*hoathe*, this (this woman)—*le*, into—*bhathhek*, thy house—*eteth*, I came—*mazo*, water—*le*, upon—*reglai*, my feet—*lo Yabheth*—you gave me not—*hodhle dhen*, but she (*hadhe* is she)—*bhedhmet*, with her tears—*reglai*, my feet—*tzaveth*, HATH BAPTIZED. "And he turned to the woman and said unto Simon: Seest thou this woman? Into thy house I came, water upon my feet thou gavest me not; but she with her tears my feet hath baptized." Here you have, as near as the world can ever hope to have, the very words that Christ used, and in them we have this declaration: "But she with her tears my feet hath baptized." Now my brother will go into the classic Greek to induce you to believe that the apostles used the word *baptidzo* in the sense the heathens did, when it meant to sink a ship, to make drunk, etc., and from that would argue Christian baptism; but here we have the oldest translation of the Bible in the

world, the oldest translation of the New Testament, and the purest in the whole world, *the most literal* in the whole world, made nearest to the apostolic day, if not in it, in which we have, in the first place, not once immerse for *tabhal* or *baptidzo*. We have *tabhal* rendered by sprinkle. We have *bapto* rendered into sprinkle, and we have *baptidzo* rendered by *sacho* or *secho*, and *amad*, both of which include the idea of washing. Now, my friends, I would not give that for ten thousand times ten thousand texts from the classic Greek language, which the apostles never read in their lives, never saw in their lives, and could understand nothing about. And when they get their idea of baptism from the Bible, the word *baptidzo* is rendered from the Hebrew word *tabhal*, which I show you meant to sprinkle, and the original word, *tzeva*, meant to sprinkle, to baptize. The original root is to sprinkle, and they, considering *baptaizo* equivalent to *tabhal*, of course used it in the sense of sprinkle, and their baptisms were performed by sprinkling and pouring. I say I would not give these facts for *all the sinking ships that all the classic literature of the world can produce*. These men knew what they were talking about. They thoroughly understood this matter.

My brother begins to examine the authorities. I will come to the authorities to-morrow. I will pile authorities against authorities, just as I have brought solid *Bible facts* against his *classics*. But he says the English translation was not made under the immersion rule. I will read to you from Mr. Campbell's opening speech, in his debate with Mr. Rice, which he prepared with so much care, and which is understood to have been printed before it was delivered. On page 62 he says:

"Now, sir, when it is known, as we presume it will be before this debate closes, that the Bishops' Bible, published in the tenth year of Queen Elizabeth (1558), and on which so much of the present King James' Bible as appertains to the *action of baptism*, is especially based, was got up by the present Pedobaptist authority, at the very crisis when immersion was being repudiated to make way for affusion, in both Scotland and England, it will," etc.

Now remember, the Bishops' Bible was published in the tenth year of the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Queen Elizabeth began to reign in November, 1558. She was crowned in the succeeding January, her coronation being postponed on account of respect to the death of her sister. Now let us see what Mr. Campbell says in his "Christian Baptism," pages 191, 192, 197, 200. He says, 191, "For full thirteen centuries the whole world practiced immersion, with the exception

of invalids and pretenders of inability to endure cold bathing." Page 192, he shows that the law of England, 1530, was, "Let the priest baptize [the candidate] him by dipping him thrice in the water." So decrees the Common Prayer Book of Edward VI, 1549. He quotes a priest that it was still the practice, 1558. Only ten years after this the Bishops' Bible was "*published*." Of course, they had been translating it for years. Burnet shows they had been for years at this task. Campbell agrees that *that* version settled the action, *i. e.*, the rendering of the word in James' version, as all know it did. Page 197, Campbell says: "In the history of Christianity, *the whole world*, Eastern and Western Christendom, with the exception of a few sick and dying persons, practiced immersion during the long space of thirteen hundred years." He then dates license to sprinkle, 1311. Again, on page 200:

"The facts, then, are, the whole world immersed, with these few exceptions, for thirteen centuries. The east half of Christendom still continues the practice. The Greek portion of the church never to this day has given up the primitive practice." . . .

"But, even when the Council of Ravenna granted to France and the Papal territory the privilege of affusion, it is not to be concluded that the millions of Germany, France, Spain, Portugal, Italy, and *England* immediately accepted of the indulgence. *They did not*. France herself did not. *England held on for three centuries more to immersion*; so did some other portions of eastern Europe; and one portion of the Roman church holds on to this day to the old apostolic custom. We have, then, a tremendous majority, if that is of any value: the whole church for thirteen hundred years; the half of it for *eighteen hundred years*; and of the balance, some portions of it for fourteen hundred, and one large portion for *sixteen hundred years*."

Campbell then quotes also the statute of 1662, to the same effect. Conant, "Baptizein," quotes all these, pages 138, 139. I will read the last one:

"PRACTICE OF THE CHURCH IN ENGLAND.

"From the same, as revised and settled at the Savoy conference, under Charles II, 1662. (*Pickering's fac-simile, vol. v.*)

"Then the priest shall take the child into his hands, and shall say to the God-fathers and Godmothers,

"Name this Child.

"And then, naming it after them (if they shall certify him that the Child may well endure it) he shall dip it in the water discretely and warily, saying,

"N. I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

"But if they certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it, saying the foresaid words."

Wall shows, vol. ii, 462, that in Elizabeth's time they still almost universally dipped, but urges that, during her reign, it began to decline. But our version, copying the Bishops' in *all* ordinances, had that matter settled *long before* it fell into even *the least* neglect.

In a word, Mr. Campbell argues here, and Mr. Conant also advances the same argument, that as late as 1662, *fifty years* after James' version, immersion was the law of England. Mr. Conant gives the above examples to prove this; and as late as 1736, more than a hundred years after it was made, John Wesley refused to baptize a child because the law of the land required a certificate to be brought showing that it was too delicate to be dipped, and they not doing so, he refused to sprinkle it *solely on the score that to do so without a certificate would violate the law of the land.*

MR. WILKES' SEVENTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I wish to call your attention, for the sake of the record, and for the sake of those who are willing to hear us, to the lexicon of Professor Sophocles again ; especially because it is the latest, and the very best that has been made. My friend gets up something a little facetious, saying that *we* "hold to the theory of substituting the meaning of a word, in place of the word." Said he : "Sophocles gives, 'dip, plunge, and siuk;' and also, 'to drown, to make drunk, to plunge a knife in the neck,' etc., as definitions of *baptizo*." "Therefore," said he, "substituting the meaning of the word in the place of the word, we should have it, Go and immerse them, and dip them, and plunge them, and make them drunk, and drown them, and plunge a knife into them," etc. That may be funny, but one thing is very certain, it does my brother's intellect no especial credit. Suppose I plunge a knife into a man's neck ; is not that knife baptized in his neck, provided *baptizing is immersing or covering* ? If a man is made drunk, is not his reason overwhelmed, just as a man's body is overwhelmed when he is immersed ? Suppose a man is sunk in water, is he not baptized ? The question whether he is raised up again, is not now under consideration. The question is, Is he not then immersed ? The answer is, He certainly is ; and so with regard to drowning. Suppose a man is drowned ; is he not then immersed ? Does not my friend know that the Greeks did not include the idea of the *consequences* of being put into the water, as staying in the water or being drowned, as part of the primary meaning of the word. *He knows that*, yet he insists that the Greeks used the word *baptizo* to include the idea of drowning. They never did so "*in the world!*" In plunging a knife into a man's neck, the point is, that the knife is immersed. If it had been plunged into any thing else, it would have been called immersed or baptized as much as when plunged into a man's neck ; and yet my

friend takes the idea of *neck* as necessary to baptism, and the idea of *knife* as necessary to baptism, if Professor Sophocles is right. Professor Sophocles would not consider himself very much complimented by my learned friend, if he knew of the remarks made by him on his lexicon.

Professor Sophocles gives the *Latin* use of the word *baptizo*. He says it means "*mergo, mergito, tingo, or tinguo, to baptize;*" and then he cites Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Basil, Tryphon, Tertullian, Ambrose, Theodosius, Apostolic Canons, and a host of other authors in the Latin language, who used this word in that sense. Then he proceeds to say, in the note here: "There is no evidence that Luke, and Paul, and the other writers of the New Testament put upon this verb meanings not recognized by the Greeks." My friend would have you believe that the word, in the New Testament use, had a meaning not recognized by the Greeks. Sophocles, who professes to have surveyed the entire field, says there is no evidence that Luke, or Paul, or the other New Testament writers put upon this word meanings that were not given to it by the Greeks. And if it have no other meaning, then immersion is baptism, and sprinkling and pouring are to be rejected.

My friend says that my brethren "have all gotten up the idea, that a word may always be supplied or replaced by its meaning." He thinks that is a very foolish rule. I am perfectly willing that he should go on record to that effect; but I state here, if that rule is not correct, there is an end to ever understanding language, and especially an end to the *translation* of language. There never was a translation made "in the whole world" except upon that rule; and there never can be. Suppose I try to translate a passage of Greek. I find a word. I ascertain the meaning of it. I put the meaning of that word in the place of the word in order to translate it; and it could not be translated without that. And yet my friend stands up here, and tries to ridicule the idea of our putting the meaning of a word in place of the word! My dear hearers, it is axiomatic; it is self-evident; and it marks an abortion of reason, to call it in question, and still more, to deny it. The meaning of a word must take the place of the word, or there is no chance for defining it; and there is, therefore, an end of lexicography. Let my friend wear the laurels of the man who has discovered that this rule is wrong.

He has the handsomest criticism on Mark, seventh chapter and fourth verse, that I have seen. It has been my fortune, for some years past, to study, with some small degree of critical accuracy, the New

Testament Scriptures in Greek, English, Latin, and some other languages, and especially to *examine* criticisms on difficult and doubtful passages, but he comes here this evening with what he calls a criticism that transcends any thing in that line I have seen. He says that he holds in his hand the best *copy* of the New Testament Scriptures "in the world," and he says in his copy the "word sprinkle is given where the *Greek* has *baptizo* in one of its forms." Now, what did he then hold in his hand? He was holding the celebrated Vatican manuscript, itself in Greek, and he calls that a *rendering* of the Greek text. If he has gathered laurels for, and brought fame to his church, and glory to his brethren, and success to his cause, in that way, then he must have the honor of it, and I charge my Methodist brethren to take not a bit of it from him. The idea that the Vatican manuscript, which is itself in the Greek, is a *translation* of the Greek! I fail to martial, at this present moment, language that adequately expresses the feeling of abhorrence I have for such a *criticism*. The Vatican manuscript is simply this, it is one of the very oldest manuscript *copies* of the New Testament. In this place, Mark vii: 4, instead of *reading baptizo* in one of its forms, it *reads rantizo*. That manuscript differs from Tischendorf's, and also, I believe, from the Alexandrian, and from most of the others, and consequently it is not followed in making up our text. But to regard it as a *translation* out-Herods Herod himself. I have another statement to make referring to the same thing. My friend says that the Peshito-Syriac is the oldest version in the world. He has a peculiar way of emphasizing "*in the whole world*." He says the Peshito-Syriac has, in Revelation xix: 13, *sprinkled* for the Greek "*bebammenon*." Therefore, says he, we have a translation, the oldest in the world, and the most accurate, made into a language which, he thinks, the Savior and the apostles used, which gives, as the translation of *bebammenon*, a word meaning to sprinkle. Let us go slowly just here. Is that true? I answer, no; that is a mistake again. Has the Peshito-Syriac, the oldest, the most venerable and weighty translation in the world, as a translation of Revelation xix: 13, a word in that passage meaning to sprinkle? Is that true? I answer, no, not exactly. Now for the *facts* in this case. I have a little reputation. I expect to die, and I believe, in my heart, I shall stand before my God in judgment. What I state here I expect to confront me there. Now, what are the facts? The facts are that the old Peshito-Syriac, that venerable version made into the language in which, *possibly*, our Savior himself spoke, and

in which the apostles may have spoken, though that is doubtful, does not contain the *book* of Revelation, not a single word of it. And, still worse, my friend, Mr. Ditzler, *knows* it; for I told him so on several occasions, and quoted without contradiction from such authorities as Thomas Hartwell Horn, Dr. Smith, Dr. Kitto, and from many others who have spoken on that subject. I told him that that translation did not contain a word of the book of Revelations. Why does he, then, tell you that that translation has the word for sprinkle where the Greek is *bebammenon*? Why is that? He, in the secret precincts of his heart, may know why, if he knows what spirit he is of, which is a little doubtful. I do not know, and, therefore, I will not undertake to represent him. In the second place, the translation into Syriac of *Revelation* was, most likely, made in the sixth or seventh century, though the time when, exactly, it went into the Syriac version is not known, but it was attached, in due time, to supply the missing parts of the old Peshito-Syriac. The Peshito-Syriac did not contain the second letter of Peter. It did not contain the second or third letters of John. It did not have the Epistle of Jude. It did not have the Book of Revelation in it. That translation, when it was made into Syriac, used, it is true, a word in Rev. xix : 13, which means to sprinkle. But where did it get it from? That is, of what was it a translation? If it was, at that time, translated from a manuscript which had the Greek word for sprinkle in it instead of *bebammenon*, which is translated "*dipped*" in our common version, then nothing is gained. If that Syriac version was made from a manuscript that had, in the Greek, *bebammenon*, then my friend would have more reason on his side. But how does he know that that is true? He must *prove* it. Besides, the version of that part of the book of Revelation, made in the sixth or seventh century into Syriac, has no critical value. Those who most likely made it did not understand either the Syriac or the Greek language; the one from which and the one into which they were attempting to translate. Does my friend deny that? He need not, because he knows from proofs as strong as holy writ that these things are true, for they have been established before his face and in his presence. The fact is, there is a very grave and large possibility that that translation of the book of Revelation into the Syriac was made from a Greek manuscript that had *perirerammenon* in the text itself. Now, what are the probabilities? Mr. Gale, long since, made a statement substantially this: that Origen had quoted that passage, and in quoting

it had used the Greek word for sprinkle, rather than the Greek word *bapto*, to dip.

Mr. Campbell, in his debate with Mr. Rice, expressly contended—and it was almost prophetic—that there was a Greek manuscript, no doubt, in existence at the time that translation was made, and from which it was made, that had the Greek word for *sprinkle*, instead of *bebammenon*, in that place. In 1844 and 1859, Tischendorf, than whom there is no man more distinguished, or standing higher, as a collator of Greek manuscripts, went to Mount Sinai, and there discovered the Sinaitic Codex. It has the book of Revelation in it, and it has this passage in it; but instead of having *bebammenon* in that verse, it has *perirerammenon*, a word that *means to sprinkle*.

Now, if that text, which Tischendorf says is the oldest in the world, really was before the translators of this part of the Syriac version, then we can see how they could have translated the Greek word for sprinkle into the Syriac by another word which means to sprinkle in that language.

As we know we have one of the oldest Greek manuscripts in the world with the word for sprinkle in it here, before my friend can make an *argument* he must show that his translation was made from a manuscript that had *bebammenon* in it—a thing he can never do.

We have another fact. This passage in the book of Revelation was, most probably, written in reference to the passage in Isaiah, sixty-third chapter and first to fourth verses: "Who is this that cometh from Edom, with dyed garments from Bozrah?" etc. In the Greek Septuagint, if I am not mistaken, the very Greek word used in Isaiah lxiii: 3 is the word for sprinkle.

Now, in this book of Revelation there is a reference, no doubt, to that prophecy of Christ conquering his enemies, and who, as a conqueror, is represented as returning from the slaughter of his enemies with his vesture sprinkled with blood. These are the facts. Then my friend ought not to tell us that the venerable old Peshito-Syriac version has, as a translation of the word *bebammenon*, a word that means to *sprinkle*. For it is a mistake; it is a great mistake. But Homer nodded once; and if my brother will not perpetrate this blunder again I will forgive him; but if he does, I will suppose that he does it "*with malice aforethought*," and shall treat the case accordingly.

My friend presses the subject of Syriac. I propose, now, to give you some authorities on the subject of the Syriac. What is the defi-

dition of the Syriac word "*amad*?" What does it mean? The argument is, if we can find what the word *amad* means—the word used for baptizing in the Peshito-Syriac, as it was a translation of *baptizo*, made very early, not "by the apostles," but by parties who lived close to the apostles' day—we shall have fair grounds for inferring the meaning of *baptizo*. What is the meaning of that word in the Syriac language? I read from Dr. Gotch. My friend gets every thing he knows from some place, and so do I. As Mr. Campbell and Mr. Rice were very fond of reading from Dr. Gotch, it is no condescension for me to do so. I stand not above the level of such men as are my authors. I claim *not* to be their superior, as my friend assumes to be. I read from p. 118:

"It was there brought as a charge against Dr. Carey and his colleagues, that they had 'rendered "*to baptize*" by a phrase compounded contrary to the idiom of the language, but which can signify nothing else than *to give a dipping or immersion*.' The late amiable and lamented Mr. Greenfield, in his defense of that version, met this charge on the grounds that the phrase was idiomatic; that it was a correct rendering of the word *βαπτίζω* (*baptizo*); and that to render it by a term signifying *immerse* was in accordance with established usage. It is to this last point only that our attention is now directed. 'It may be safely affirmed,' says Mr. Greenfield, 'that many of the most accurate and valuable versions, both ancient and modern, are involved in the same accusation, and that there is no one which is directly hostile to that interpretation' (p. 40). And he adds: 'In consistency, if that aid' (*i. e.*, of the British and Foreign Bible Society) 'be withdrawn from the Serampore missionaries because they have rendered *βαπτίζω* (*baptizo*) to *immerse*, then must it also be withdrawn from the churches of Syria, of Arabia, of Abyssinia, of Egypt, of Germany, of Holland, of Denmark, etc.; and the venerable Peshito-Syriac version, the Arabic versions of the Propaganda, of Sabat, etc., the Ethiopian, the Coptic, and other versions, must all be suppressed' (p. 44). These statements were supported by an examination of the terms employed in the versions referred to."—"Bible Question," p. 118.

Now, the fact is, Mr. Carey, of notoriety so great that I need not speak of him, had translated the Scriptures into the *Serampore* language, and used the word which idiomatically expresses the idea of immersion for baptism. The British and Foreign Bible Society concluded that they would suppress the publication; that it should not go forth. Mr. Greenfield stood in their midst and told them that if they did, they would have to suppress most of the best ancient versions, including the venerable Peshito-Syriac version, which my friend here reads from; and they would have, also, to suppress the Arabic, Syriac, Coptic, and the German versions. They must suppress all

these and the Anglo-Saxon if they would suppress this. Now that is clear. But, says my friend, the word *amad* does not mean to immerse. Suppose it does not. Is he fighting against immersion simply? And am I to be regarded as attempting to establish immersion simply? No. He has affirmed before the people that "the sprinkling or pouring of water upon a proper subject, by a proper administrator, is Christian baptism." Now, I am insisting on immersion, simply in order that I may *disprove* and refute his position. When I answer my friend's speech, I am endeavoring to *refute*, and when I am trying to establish an incompatible proposition, I am trying to *disprove* his. And I think I do it. He says, then, that the word *amad* means—what? He says it does *not* mean to immerse. Suppose it does not mean to immerse. The question is, does it mean to *sprinkle*? I answer, no; it does not. He thinks he finds one place in Luke, seventh chapter and forty-fourth verse, where it means to sprinkle. "It!" What? What word? It is not *amad*, the usual word for baptism in the Syriac language, that is there used. It is another word. And how he may get "sprinkle" out of that other word, I care not, since neither in the Syriac translation nor in the Greek text is the word present that means baptism. This is the fact. What does that word *amad* mean? I have said, and my brother will not deny it—for Moses Stuart, Gesenius, and all the authorities that pretend to understand it, tell us the same thing—that the word, in its primary sense, means "to stand up;" and Gesenius says because of that circumstance it was, "perhaps," selected; "because the candidates for baptism stood up in the water." It is just what my friend's candidates never did "in the world." I said in my speech before, in that same connection, that the Russians selected the word *krestiti*, by which to designate baptism, which means "to cross." They selected it, not because the word cross means the thing that they do. It does not signify sprinkle, pour, or immerse, though they all immerse. They selected that word because it describes one thing that they deem of the highest importance; that is, when they have baptized their candidate, the bishop crosses it. *Krestiti* means to cross; and they give this name to the whole thing, because the crossing is the most prominent part of it. It may be, that in the Syrian Church *amad* was chosen to designate baptism, because the candidate, when he was about to be baptized, had to stand up in the water, which, to the eye of the Syrian, appeared to be one of the prominent features, and thus gave name to the entire ordinance.

MR. DITZLER'S EIGHTH ARGUMENT.

THURSDAY, December 22, 10 A. M.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I will notice one or two things before I come to some points on which my brother seemed to be very much excited yesterday, and is somewhat excited to-day. He indorses Mr. Campbell's celebrated rule of translation, and says I would deny that the meaning of a word can be put in the place of that word in a translation and make sense. If that were what Mr. Campbell said, no man on earth would object, but it is very different. Here is what Mr. Campbell said—I give it in substance—that *wherever* any word occurs, *any one* of its meanings may be substituted for that word and make sense; that is to say, for example, that any true definition of the word *baptidzo* can be substituted for it wherever you may find it in any Greek document, and make sense and read properly. I demonstrated that it would destroy all the laws of language in the world. Now Mr. Campbell himself utterly destroys that law, as I have shown you, and will show farther to-day. I barely call your attention to it now. To-day, some time, I will read again the law, and bring in other facts to show its absurdity. Remember, he says he indorses the law.

Then he refers to the Vatican manuscript. He would make you believe that I told you that the Vatican manuscript was a translation. Now, what did I do? I took great pains to tell you it was the most ancient copy of the Greek Testament in the world, and the purest. I then took the pains to tell you, before I brought out the fact I had in view, that these great and learned men who *copied* the manuscripts did sometimes take the privilege of not *literally transferring* a word, but *translated it into that which they believed it meant*, or into the sense it *there had*. Nothing was more common than this. The very language of Mark vii : 4, shows this: "And when they return from the market, they eat not unless they baptize themselves." All history goes to

show that these baptisms were especially performed by sprinkling; even the mass of the Pedobaptists, who hold that immersion was the custom of that age, admit this was done by sprinkling. It was the Jewish baptism. Hence these learned Greeks, who gave us the best copy of the Bible, a few pages being wanted, that we have, *translated* that word *sprinkle*. Here we have these manuscripts of the Bible translating *baptidzo* into *rantidzo*, to sprinkle. We have seven more manuscripts doing the same thing, thus giving nine Greek manuscripts, *i. e.*, ancient copies of the Greek Testament, that translate *baptidzo* into *sprinkle*. The same thing occurs in reference to Revelation. For instance, Origen, in quoting Rev. xix: 13, says: "And he was clothed with a garment—*επβαρτισμενον* (*errantismenon*)—*sprinkled* with blood." The Greek is *bapto*, and he translates *bebammenon* (from *bapto*), which is the root of *baptidzo*, and renders it "sprinkled with blood." Not only so, but Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, a native Greek of great erudition, and most eminent father, born A. D. 130, and Hippolytus, a learned polemic Greek father of the third century, translate it *sprinkle*. My brother says there must have been an ancient manuscript having the word *sprinkle*—*errantismenon*—which Origen copied. But how came *that* copyist to translate it *sprinkle*? But I will examine this matter closely, as it has exercised their writers very much of late. One of his brethren now present [Dawson] published an article last spring, saying that Mr. A. Campbell conceived the grand idea of such a manuscript, and, lo! Dr. Tischendorf found it, sure enough, as had been predicted. He compares Mr. Campbell, therefore, to the great astronomer who, from the movements of the heavenly bodies, guessed the presence of the star that for a time bore his illustrious name after it was by him discovered. Now the truth is, Mr. Campbell quotes *Dr. Gale*, who flourished over *two hundred years ago*, as his sole guide and authority, and owns he got the whole argument by his quotations from Gale, as well as conception of the idea from Gale. They are hard run for praise for their hero when they so pervert history. Now, Tischendorf's manuscript dates not earlier than A. D. 325. But Origen wrote A. D. 215. Now, *how could he copy a manuscript in A. D. 215 that was not made for one hundred and ten years afterward?*

My brother says if the Peshito-Syriac had *sprinkle* there must have been an ancient manuscript that had *sprinkle* in it. The Peshito-Syriac was made *still longer* before this manuscript was made, therefore it could not have been based upon it.

Now, in the first place, we have Irenæus, who was born in the year 130, only thirty years after the death of John the apostle, and he himself had a manuscript having *bebammenon* in it. Mr. Tischendorf's "Greek Testament," a copy of which lies before me, has *bebammenon* in it. Now, his manuscript, dating in the *fourth century*, has *sprinkled* in it. But it could not be copied by Origen, because, 1. It dates, at the nearest of all calculations, *a hundred and ten years later* than when Origen wrote. Hence, Origen could not have quoted it. The Syriac was still earlier than Origen. 2. Origen could not have quoted this manuscript, because he has it *εἰσπατισμένον*—*sprinkled*, while Tischendorf's manuscript reads *περιπεραμμένον* (*perirerammenon*), *besprinkled*, *sprinkled round about* with blood. This forever settles that question. 3. Tischendorf compiled a Greek text of the New Testament from *all* the manuscripts of the world, and ancient translators, Fathers, etc., in which *βεβαμμένον*—*bebammenon* (*βαπτω*)—is given as *the most ancient reading known*. But, 4. I have discovered more facts, that show it in a still more perfect light. Irenæus, who, as we told you, was born only *thirty years after John's death*—only, perhaps, thirty-two years after this Revelation was written, and who, therefore, quotes it ere it could be changed; and he thus translates it: "And he was clothed with a vesture **SPRINKLED** with blood."—"Irenæus against Heresies," b. iv, ch. xx, c. 11. But, worse still for my brother's cause, St. Hippolytus, a learned Greek archbishop, of the third century, and a martyr, wrote, among many other things, against the heresy of Noetus, in which, chapter fifteen, he quotes this first, just as it is: "'And he was clothed with a vesture *dipped* (*bebammenon*) in blood, and his name is called the Word of God.' See, then, brethren, how the vesture, **SPRINKLED with blood**, denoted," etc. Here, this eminent and learned Greek in Origen's day quotes the text with *βεβαμμένον* in it; and the latter is far, very far, superior to the version Mr. Wilkes names as made in the sixth or eighth century.

Now, the Syriac version of Revelation that I quoted is so perfect, so identical with the other parts made in, or within a few years of, the apostolic age, that such great scholars as Hug, J. D. Michælis, Samuel Davidson, etc., can not trace *any difference*, while the merest tyro can see the astounding difference between the ragged version he names and the Peshito. Samuel Davidson accounts for the absence of Revelation from the Syriac Canon by supposing the Peshito version was made "in *the first century*, before the apocalypse was written." Davidson, Lowth, Leusden, Carpzov, Bishop Kennicott, and Walton

fix its date in the first century. So believes Dr. Stiles, President of Yale College. In the face of these facts he assumes that Revelation was translated in the sixth or eighth century. At Mt. Sterling, last spring, he asserted it was made in 1627, because a certain manuscript was first published in that year containing it. I quickly called his attention to the fact that the Syriac ceased to be a living language in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, mainly so in the tenth. But whatever may have been the age of the version of Revelation, it is settled forever against my brother by this fact: Ephraim Cyrus, the most famous of Syrian writers, who flourishes in the middle of the fourth century, A. D. 348, quotes and refers to the Revelation of John—comments on it. Now, he knew nothing of Greek—could not read it. Now, how could Ephraim Cyrus quote it if it was not made until *two or four hundred years later than he lived*? Do you not see how absurd his position is?

Now, the Eastern Church did reject these books—Jude, the second of Peter, second and third of John's epistles, and Revelation—from the canon; but that does not show that they were *not translated*. In fact, it shows they were translated, for their canon was made *of the Syriac version*. How could they *reject* them from the canon if they were not translated? Hug, who has given this subject more attention than any other writer, demonstrates that Revelation was translated at the same time that the rest of the New Testament was—in or close to the apostolic age. But I have better authority than any of these. I will read you from "*Bibliotheca Orientalis Assemani*," tom. iii, p. 212. He first enumerates some of the Old Testament books in order, then says: "Reliqui verò libri Veteris paritur, ac Novi Testamenti, tempore Abgari (Syriac is *bhabhenet dh'abgor melek*) Regis Edessæ, curâ ac sollicitudine Thaddæi aliorumque apostolorum"—But the rest of the Old Testament (books) and *of the New Testament* were translated with great pains and accuracy by Thaddeus and the other apostles. I give the Latin translation of the Syriac, as my brother has such a *horror* of the *Syriac*. The Syrians ought to know best; and this was the belief and teaching of *the whole Oriental Church*. Here, then, we have the Syrian Church, that ought to know something about their Bible, testifying that the New Testament was translated together, Revelation and all.

Now, my brother would make you believe it (the translation of Revelation) was made late in the sixth or eighth century, and made from *corrupt manuscripts*! Even granting that Revelation was thus

made, what becomes of their facts? Suppose it had been made of corrupt *manuscripts*, what becomes of the other translations? There was the Itala translation, the Æthiopic, the Sahidic, the Basmuric—and every translation of the Bible for the first five hundred years of the history of the church has it sprinkle. There has never been discovered but one manuscript in the whole world that had sprinkle, and that was not in the way Origen quotes it, which shows that he did not borrow it; for the spelling, yea, the *very word* is *entirely different*. The Sinaiticus has it *perirerammenon*—*besprinkled*; though Origen has it *errantismenon*—*sprinkled*. Hippolytus and Irenæus have it *sprinklè*; and Hippolytus, *in the same line, translates it errantismenon*—*SPRINKLED*. What will he say to *that* now? He can not, he *dare* not, attempt to meet these crushing facts. But he supposes that the ancient reading was sprinkle—*ἐρραντισμένον*. Does *that* help him? Certainly not. It makes his cause worse; for then it would show that they considered *βάπτω* and *ραινῶ* equal in that passage, as they did *βαπτίζω* and *ραντίζω*, Mark vii: 4. It would show that they translated *sprinkle* by *βάπτω* (*bapto*) all the time, and from the apostolic day; for all agree that *βάπτω* is the most ancient reading we have, and only *one* manuscript has ever been found that has sprinkle. But three Greek fathers, all centuries earlier than *that* manuscript, and five translations, centuries earlier, save one, it earlier, have sprinkle. To prove that sprinkle was the reading, and that the *thousands* of copyists, hundreds of fathers, etc., for a thousand years uniformly and *always* translated sprinkle into *βάπτω*, save in *one* instance, only tenfold more damages his cause. Yet that is the plea they now set up, since Gale's day, espoused by Campbell, my brother, and their people. Desperate must be such a cause, indeed.

He now raises a great storm over Revelation. He goes off in a fury over the wild and ridiculous idea that that book was not translated from the Greek till the *sixth* or *eighth* century! Now, he grounds his delusion on Horne's words, vol. i, p. 271, all of which I will read: "There is *also* extant a Syriac version of the second epistle of St. Peter, the second and third epistles of John, the epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse (Revelation), which are wanting in the Peshito; these are, by some writers, ascribed to Mar Abba, primate of the East between the years 535 and 552. The translation of these books is made from the original Greek; but the author, whoever he was, possessed but an indifferent knowledge of the two languages." Now, that there were several translations made of these and other books, no one denies.

But no scholar will risk his reputation or historic standing by asserting that *that translation is the one I have in my hand*. Whoever heard of such assumption? Is *that this translation*? The Philoxenian-Syriac version was made A. D. 488 to 518, but it is a wretched production, comparatively. But it has not the Revelation either, though it has second Peter, second and third John (epistles), and Jude. Yet his favorite Dr. Murdock says, Appendix ii, p. 508—"Differing from the style of the same epistles in the Peshito version." The learned Hug contends that these books originally were in the sacred text (canon), but were afterward thrown out. Murdock opposes that, but admits that "the style of these books coincides more with that of the Peshito than with that of the *Philoxenian*."

Now, then, I proceed to recapitulate on the translations. It has been published to the world, that no translation, ancient or modern, has ever rendered any of the *bapto* family by to sprinkle.

A. Campbell's "Christian Baptism," p. 139 :

"Now, of some fifteen complete versions on my shelf, besides several partial ones, *not one* has ever translated any of the *bapto* family by the words *sprinkle*, *pour*, or *purify*."

"That no translator into any language, in any age, who knew the meaning of the word, did EVER translate A SINGLE MEMBER of the family of *baptizo* by the words *pour* or *sprinkle*."—"Debate," p. 130.

Conant says, p. 157, "Baptizein :"

"I remark, in conclusion :

"1. That the rendering given to this word, in this revision, is its true and only meaning, as proved by the unanimous testimony of Greek writers, both Pagan and Christian.

"2. That it accords with the religious instructions of the earliest Christian writers, and with the requirements and practice of the whole Christian church, till within a comparatively recent time.

"3. That it is the rendering of ancient versions sanctioned by the use of the church, and still retained in the vernacular versions of northern Europe.

"4. That it is the only rendering of the word in any version sanctioned by early use in the church, and is the only one used by scholars in their versions and expositions for the learned.

"5. That recent and living scholars, without distinction of ecclesiastical relations, unite in asserting this to be the true meaning of the Greek word."

Here we find *five* translations that I have noticed, translating it by to sprinkle. Then, the Lusitanian translation of the seventeenth century renders it by to sprinkle : "*e estaba vestido de huma vestidura SALPICADO*

—and he was clothed with a vesture sprinkled with blood.” Mark vii: 4; Luke xi: 38, it has *purificat*, purify, for βαπτίζω, and *lavado*, wash. Luther’s German, 1522, 1. Habitually renders it *taufen*, that just corresponds exactly to our use of baptize. Campbell shows that sprinkling was in full practice in Germany before the Reformation, and we know that Luther always baptized by affusion. Whatever may have been its radical meaning, it now had the popular use of baptize. Hence, he renders Matt. iii: 11, etc., always “*Ich taufe euch mit wasser.*” “I baptize you with water.” 2. He renders Mark vii: 4; Luke xi: 38, *waschen*—wash. Sem essen gewaschen hätte, Luke xi: 38—had not first washed. 3. Never immerse or dip. 4. Rev. xix: 13, is sprinkle. *Das mit blut* BESPRENGET war—which was SPRINKLED with blood. French is same as Spanish, transfers, save Luke xi: 38, etc., *wash*. Here we have seven of the old translations translating *bapto* by *to sprinkle*. Then we have Irenæus, Hippolytus, and Origen, of the second and third centuries, all going to show that this word does imply sprinkling as well as other modes: It is a fact that, FOR FOURTEEN HUNDRED YEARS, NO TRANSLATOR OF THE BIBLE TRANSLATED BAPTIDZO BY IMMERSE, DIP, OR PLUNGE.

My brother read from Gotch, yesterday, to show that the Teutonic version, as well as others, rendered it immerse, and argued that *taufen* and *amad* meant immerse. Now, whatever may be the right idea of *tief* or of *taufen*, as I said, the point is—*what idea did these translations mean to convey by their translations?* That is the point. A. Campbell, “Christian Baptism,” p. 192, admits sprinkling was in use in “the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries” in Germany, and says: “Erasmus (A. D. 1516) observes, ‘with us [Germans] [they] have the water poured on them; in England they are dipped.’” Conant utterly distorts all truth on the Teutonic versions. The versions of 1473–75, Lower Saxon, and Augsburg, 1473–75, were not from the Greek; yet Conant quotes them as translations of the Greek—“The Greek word is translated,” etc., and then gives those two as the first versions added. That is candor, indeed. Yet they have it *taufen* and *waschen*.

But the brother says *amad* means, in the Syriac, to stand up. Mr. Gotch argues against it. The “Millennial Harbinger,” of September past, quoting from Mr. Lindsay, also denies it. I can not find a lexicon which so defines it, but I am not here to deny it. If it means “to stand up,” it does not mean to immerse, or to stand up and be laid down in the water, as he would have you believe from his speech of

yesterday. I can not find any place in the Syriac where the word means to stand. I do find in "Bibliotheca Orientalis Assemani," tom. i, p. 47, a quotation from the famous Ephraim Cyrus, of the fourth century, where he quotes Titus iii: 5, *λουτρον* (*loutron*), "washing of regeneration," and it is quoted—*washing—amad—vamado*, "and washing," etc. Then, I read from the ancient Syrian Council that they, in so many words, enumerated "*sprinkling, washing, and immersion*" under *amad*. These facts settle the whole matter beyond cavil. The lexicons define it by wash. No place is found where it means "to stand up," or to stand; but wash is the universal meaning given to it. This can be done by sprinkling, as the religious washings of the Old Testament were performed, or by pouring, or by immersion.

Now, my friends, look at these facts. All these ancient translations define *βάπτω* by *to sprinkle*; and they translate it in all the different languages by *sprinkle*. *Βαπτίζω* is rendered *sprinkle* by the earliest of the fathers, by ancient Greek copyists, by the most learned of all lexicographers, and native Greeks. As my brother has told you, he can find plenty of places in *classic, i. e., heathen*, Greek, where it means *to drown, to sink, to make drunk, etc.*, but the baptism of the New Testament conveys not THAT idea. I will, in my next argument, take up the word *immerse* in detail; for I want to get all the facts into the arguments of to-day.

We saw yesterday that the oldest translation of the Bible in the world renders *tabhal* by *to sprinkle*. We saw also that the word in the Chaldee means to *sprinkle and pour*. We saw that the word was translated by the oldest Latin translators of the second and fourth centuries by *to sprinkle*. We find also that *baptidzo* is rendered, by Euthymius and nine ancient manuscripts, *rantidzo*, to *sprinkle*. We find also that *bapto* was rendered *sprinkle* by the Latin and Greek fathers, and the Sahidic, Basmuric, and Syriac translators, by the German and Lusitanian; and for fourteen hundred years not a single translation of the Bible rendered *baptidzo* by *dip, immerse, or plunge*; and not a single one rendered *tabhal*, or the Chaldee word, *tzeva*, by *dip, immerse, or plunge*, while, on the contrary, they are rendered over and over again by *sprinkle*. Do they not support my cause?

MR. WILKES' EIGHTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

By the blessing of our gracious Father in heaven we are permitted to meet this morning under circumstances favorable for investigating the truth of God.

I desire to notice a few matters left over yesterday evening, and then I will proceed to my more regular address.

We have had much to say in regard to the meaning of *taval* in the Hebrew and *seva* in the Chaldee. I propose to refer to *taval* and its meaning *once* more. There is a place in the Scriptures, found in Leviticus xiv: 15, 16, in which we have the three several actions of pouring, dipping, and sprinkling, in the same general transaction, and, therefore, we have the three words that represent these acts in the Hebrew, in which case it would seem to me that we should have a favorable opportunity of noticing the distinction between those words, and, therefore, of observing the specific idea belonging to each of them. I will now read the passage, and then present my points: "15. And the priest shall take some of the log of oil, and pour it into the palm of his own left hand: 16. And the priest shall dip his right finger in the oil that is in his left hand, and shall sprinkle of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord." Now, in the fifteenth verse we have it stated that the priest shall "*pour*" of the oil into the palm of his left hand. There we have the Hebrew word *yatsak*, to pour, and in the Septuagint we have *epikeo*, to pour upon. In the next verse it is stated, "And the priest shall *dip* his right finger into the oil that is in his left hand." For "*dip*:" we have *taval* in the Hebrew and *bapto* in one of its forms in the Greek. In the latter part of the verse it is stated, "Shall *sprinkle* of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord." In the Hebrew we have *nazah*, to sprinkle; and *raino*, to sprinkle, in the Greek, so that we have the three Greek words distinct from each other; one for *pouring* on, one for *sprinkling*, and one for *dipping*. We also

have three distinct Hebrew words, and by that means we are enabled to see the precise meaning of *tával*, *yatsak*, and *nazah*, to be, to *dip*, to *pour*, and to *sprinkle*. That will suffice on the Hebrew.

My friend insists that *tával* means sprinkle. It occurs sixteen times in the Bible, but never in the sense of sprinkle.

I now call your attention to the meaning of the word *tsēva*. The word *tsēva*, my friend thinks, means to sprinkle. I think not. Gesenius, in his Hebrew lexicon, says it means "to dip," and Davidson, in his, says it means "to dip." I have a remark to offer, made by Prof. Stuart, of Andover, a distinguished authority. In regard to the word used to translate *baptizo*, etc., in the Peshito-Syriac version, he asks:

"How does this translate the word in question? Only and always by *amad*, which corresponds (in point of form) to the Hebrew *amad*, the Chaldee *amad*, and the same word in the Arabic. This is a very remarkable circumstance, for the Syriac has a word, *tsēvd*, like the Chaldee *tsēvu*, and the corresponding Hebrew *táva*, which means to *plunge*, *dip*, *immerse*, etc." "Stuart on Baptism," p. 155.

That must suffice for *tsēva*.

I now propose to present to you a few other lexicons that I did not present yesterday, which define the word *baptizo*. I have in my hands Grove's "Greek and English Lexicon." On page 110 I find: "Βαπτίζω f. ἰω p. βεβάπτικα (fr. βαπτω) to *dip*, *immerse*, *immerge*, *plunge*; to *wash*, *cleanse*, *purify*, to *baptize*, to *depress*, *humble*, to *overwhelm*. Βαπτίζομαι, to *wash one's self*, to *bathe*, to *sink*, *faint*, *be dejected*." I have also Schrevelus' Lexicon. On page 94 I find: "Βαπτίζω; *baptizo*, *mergo*, *abluo*, *lavo*. Βαπτισμα, ατος, το; *immersio*, *inctio*, *baptisma*," which I translate, to *immerse*, to *cleanse*, to *wash*, *immersion*, *dipping*, *baptism*.

Again, I have Robinson's Greek and English Lexicon, which, on page 117, says: Βαπτίζω f. ἰω (βαπτω), a frequentative in form, but apparently not in signification; to *dip in*, to *sink*, to *immerse*. . . . In N. T.: 1. To *wash*, to *lave*, to *cleanse* by *washing*. Mid. and pass., aor 1, in mid. sense, to *wash one's self*, i. e., one's hands or person, to *perform ablution*. Also on page 119, same book: Βαπτισμα, ατος, το (βαπτίζω) pr. any thing dipped in or immersed.

I have also the "Analytical Greek Lexicon" of Bagster & Sons, which says:

Βαπτω, to *dip*, to *dye*.

Βαπτίζω, fut. ἰω, aor. 1, εβαπτισα, pr. to *dip*, to *immerse*; to *cleanse* or *purify* by *washing*; to *administer* the rite of *baptism*, to *baptize*.

Βάπτισμα, ατος, το. pr. *immersion*; *baptism*, ordinance of *baptism*.

Βαπτισμος, pr. an act of dipping or immersion.

Also Liddell & Scott's "Greek and English Lexicon," which gives, on page 260 :

"Βαπτίζω: to dip repeatedly; of ships, to sink them. Pass, to bathe. II. to draw water," etc.

"Βαπτισμα, ατος, το. That which is dipped," etc.

I now come to the question of the Syriac. I stated that the book of Revelation was not in the old Peshito-Syriac. I never asserted that there was no ancient translation of the book of Revelation into Syriac. But the weight of my friend's argument rested on this hypothesis, that the book of Revelation belonged to the old Peshito-Syriac, because there is no other Syriac translation, ancient or modern, worth knowing, but the Peshito-Syriac, except the Curetonian, which is older than the Peshito, so that, to make his argument of any force, he must show that his own old Peshito-Syriac had the book of Revelation in it. That is the point. By the way, the book of Revelation is not in his Vatican manuscript, from which he read, either.

I now propose to bring the authorities from which I made the argument yesterday evening. I will read from the same work my friend had, "Hug's Introduction to the New Testament," page 203 :

"As we have already mentioned, the Apocalypse, too, is wanting in MSS. of the Peshito. At least, that which appears at the end of some editions of the Peshito is certainly no part of this version, as is evident from its internal character. The mode of translation resembles rather that of the four Catholic Epistles just mentioned."

Also from page 204 :

"The present printed Syriac version of the Apocalypse formerly belonged to the younger Scaliger; from him it went to the library of Leyden University. From this MS. it was published by Louis de Dieu, from whose preface the description of it given above was extracted. The text was afterward incorporated into the Parisian and London Polyglots, and has been appended to some of the editions of the Peshito."

And again, on page 202 :

"So far as it is known, all the MSS. of the Peshito, one alone excepted, contain only the following of the Catholic Epistles, viz : that of James, the first of Peter, and the first of John, i. e., four less than the Greek MSS. The Apocalypse likewise is wanting. The four other Epistles in the Syriac version, the second of Peter, second and third of John, and Jude are not by any means on a

level with the Peshito, either in the mode of representing the original in a foreign tongue, or in its other characteristics."

I now present you an extract from the distinguished author, Dr. Smith. In his "Bible Dictionary," vol. iii, p. 1632, he says :

"There is no sufficient reason for supposing that this version ever contained the four Catholic Epistles and the Apocalypse, now absent from it, not only in the printed editions but also in the MSS."

I next refer to the appendix to Mr. Murdock's translation of the Syriac, page 490 :

"The Peshito version embraces all the canonical books of the New Testament, except the second Epistle of Peter, the second and third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse."

I now offer you a passage from the distinguished Thomas Hartwell Horne. In his "Introduction to the Critical Study of the Holy Scriptures," page 271, vol. i, he says :

"The Syriac version of the New Testament comprises only the four Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul (including the Epistle to the Hebrews), the first Epistle of St. John, St. Peter's first Epistle, and the Epistle of St. James."

On the same page, and on the other side, notice that the book of Revelation is not found in the Peshito-Syriac. . It reads as follows :

"There is also extant a Syriac version of the second Epistle of St. Peter, the second and third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse, which are wanting in the Peshito; these are by some writers ascribed to Mar Abba, primate of the East, between the years 535 and 552. The translation of these books is made from the original Greek; but the author, whoever he was, possessed but an indifferent knowledge of the two languages."

I will read once more from the distinguished Kirro, as edited by Professor Alexander; vol. iii, page 917, of the "Cyclopedia of Biblical Literature:"

"II. L. de Dieu first published the *Syriac Apocalypse* from a MS. formerly in the library of the younger Scaliger, and afterwards in that of the University of Leyden (Ludguni Batav., 1627, 4to); reprinted with a Latin version and notes in his *Critica Sacra*, Amsterdam, 1693, fol. What version this MS. contains, or to what age it belongs, is very uncertain. The subscription to the MS. says that it was written by Gaspar from the land of the Indians. Another MS., at Flor-

ence, written by Gaspar, states that it was copied in 1582 from an autographic copy of Thomas of Harkel (see White's preface to the Philoxenian edition, p. xv). It may be part of the Harclean recension of the Philoxenian, as Ridley, Storr, Michælis, and Bertholdt think. But it is of an inferior type. It has fewer Greek words than the Philoxenian, several compounds are not expressed, the Syriac orthography is followed in proper names, and the version is, on the whole, not so literal. The translator has made many blunders. Hence, we are not inclined to believe it a part of the Philoxenian. Its critical value is small."

Now, the argument which I make from these facts, is this. It is known that this Peshito-Syriac, which is allowed to be a weighty authority and of great value, had not the book of Revelation in it, and therefore any argument made from that stand-point on the book of Revelation is fallacious. It is not denied that there were versions of Revelation made by some one now unknown, into the Syriac language; but whenever and by whomsoever they were made, it is at least a known fact that, so far as we have the manuscripts of versions of these parts of the New Testament, they are regarded as uncritical and not of great value.

I now wish to read some lexical authority on the meaning of the Syriac word *amad*. My friend says it does not mean "to stand." He accused me of having said so. I said, *originally*, and *primarily*, and *etymologically* it means *to stand*. It does mean *to stand* in that sense; and if he wishes authority for that, I cite him to the lexicon of Gesenius, who says so, and builds an argument on that fact. Michælis adds, in that work, "perhaps, because the person to be baptized *stood* in the water." It was for that reason, he thinks, the Syrians selected that word to represent the word in Greek for baptism.

Mr. Stuart says that it, primarily, means *to stand*, or *stand firm*; therefore, he concludes that the word means "to confirm, or make firm." Mr. Rice takes the same position, I think, in his debate with Mr. Campbell. The fact is, there is no one, that knows any Syriac, who does not know that *amad* means, *primarily*, *to stand*. But my friend says it does not mean that in the Syriac literature we have. I think it is true that it is not found in the New Testament in that sense. But what *does* the word mean in literature? We shall see. There is one thing clear; whatever it does mean, there is *one thing it does not mean*, which it can not mean, and that the lexicons do not make it mean, and that is, "to sprinkle, or pour;" and that is the very thing my friend has to prove here, or he is a failure. Recol-

lect, he says "the sprinkling or pouring of water upon a proper subject, by a properly-appointed person, is Christian baptism." There is no need of "piling on" literature. There is no lexicon that says a single word about sprinkling or pouring being a definition of *amad*. What does the word mean? I read from Mr. Gotch, p. 127, "Bible Question:"

"We must, therefore, appeal to the use of the word. On this point the lexicons are decided. Castel and his editor, Michælis, Buxtorf, and Schaaf, are all unanimous. The first gives the following meanings: 'Ablutus est, baptizatus est. Aphel, immersit, baptizavit.' Buxtorf gives 'Baptizari, intingi, abluï, abluere se. Aphel, baptizare.' Schaaf: 'Abluit se, ablutus, intinctus, immersus in aquam, baptizatus est. Ethpeel, idem quod Peal. Aphel, immersit, baptizavit.'"

I will now read from the "Manual on Baptism," prepared by Mr. G. S. Bailey, of Chicago, pp. 45, 46:

"1. MICHÆLIS, in Lex. Syr., Gottingen, 1788: To bathe, baptize, immerse.

"2. SCHAAF, Lex. Syr., Lyons, 1708: To bathe one's self; to bathe, dip, immerse into water, baptize.

"3. GUIDO FABRICIUS, Lex. Syr., Chal., accompanying the Antwerp Polyglot, 1592: To baptize, dip, bathe.

"4. SCHINDLER, Lex. Penteglot, Hanover, 1612: To baptize, immerse into water, dip, bathe.

"5. BUXTORF, Lex. Chal. and Syr., Basle, 1622: To baptize, dip, bathe, bathe one's self."

I have a half dozen others here, which I might read, all to the same purpose, and containing not one word about sprinkling or pouring. Whatever else these Latin words, which I have quoted, may mean, they signify nothing about sprinkling or pouring, and, therefore, nothing to my friend's purpose. Almost all, or, at least, more than half of the lexicons quoted, do give *bathe* and *cleanse*; but *not a word about sprinkling or pouring* can my friend find in these lexicons as a definition of *amad*.

I wish to notice some few words of my friend's last speech. He says Mr. Campbell takes the position that *any one* meaning of a word may be put in the place of the word where it occurs and make sense; and he is "going to show that." I believe I will wait till he does attempt to show it before I reply.

He says the Vatican translation of *baptizo*, in Mark vii: 4, is *ran-tizo*. I have no reply to make to a criticism of that sort! He says

bebammenon is the true reading of Revelation xix: 13. I have no controversy about that. I stated that there were very ancient manuscripts—as the Sinaitic Codex—that have *perirerammenon* (to sprinkle) in that place. But whatever value may be attached to the Syriac translation, it *might* have been made from a manuscript that had in this verse the word for sprinkling. And if *that* be true, he has not demonstrated that the translation was from *bebammenon*; and if he had *proven* that it was, still he is, in that case, dealing with a word that God Almighty never employed to designate the rite of Christian baptism. I thus bring to a conclusion our remarks upon this subject.

I did not say that there was no translation of the book of Revelation into the Syriac, made very early; I said nothing about that. Verily likely there was in the sixth or seventh century; but it was not in the *Peshito*. My friend says that one of the apostles, Thaddeus, made “the translation” into the Syriac, and that he has very high authority for this statement. I believe I will not dogmatically deny that. I do not, however, think he is correct. To speak mildly, I think he is *mistaken* in that case, and that he hangs his faith, in this case, as he does his faith that “sprinkling is baptism,” on a *very slender thread, indeed*.

My friend says that for fourteen hundred years there was not a translation made that gives immersion as the meaning of *baptizo*. I will state that, during fourteen hundred years there were a great many versions—as the *Peshito-Syriac*—that translated *baptizo* by a word that means immersion, as we just now learned from the highest authority. The word *baptizo* was transferred, in the *Italic*, and also in Jerome’s “*Vulgate*,” by men—as Jerome, for instance—who *immersed*, as he says, with a trine immersion; and he says the same thing of others who belonged to the church in his time. From this you can see that he must have understood the word to mean immersion. More than that, my friend can not find, in *any version*, a translation of a plain passage, where the rite of baptism is spoken of, where the word *baptizo* or *baptisma* is translated by a word that means to *sprinkle* or to *pour*. And to show you that he has NO SETTLED CONFIDENCE that it can be, or that it ought to be done, I say that he can not find a passage where the rite of Christian baptism is spoken of in the New Testament Greek, where he will translate the word *baptizo* or *baptisma* by the words *sprinkle* or *pour*, and risk his reputation on it. He *can not find* the rendering in a respectable translation, nor will he translate it so himself; and, therefore, I have no confidence in that scholarship

or that logic which brings him to the conclusion to which he *seems* to *desire to come*.

I now intend to pursue another line of argument. Coming to the New Testament, with what light we have—the current meaning of the word for one thousand years, five hundred years before and during the days of the Savior and the apostles, and for five hundred years afterward among the Fathers; and having found that the word *baptizo* means “to immerse,” and that it *never* means to “sprinkle” or “pour”—I again raise the question, What did our Lord mean when he said, “Go, teach all nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father,” etc.? What did he intend the apostles should do when he said, “baptizing them?” Did he design that they should *sprinkle* “them?” I present this as a rule, that we are *compelled*, in a given passage, to accept, as the meaning of a word, its *current meaning*. Now, whether or not I have shown that there is *no* other meaning than immerse, or its equivalent, for *baptizo*, there is one thing I have shown beyond *all* controversy, which is, that *baptizo* *currently means* “to immerse,” and that it did so mean *at the time*, and *before* and *after* the Savior gave the commission, “Go, teach the nations, baptizing them.”

MR. DITZLER'S NINTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I will remark that, as over and again the brother has charged that I did not read Davidson rightly or quote him correctly—

Mr. Wilkes.—You did not.

Mr. Ditzler.—You implied that much on the word *tzeva*. Mind you, I gave the original צָבָה (*tzabha*), a Hebrew word; but I founded my facts on the *Chaldaic*. Here is Davidson's definition—*tzeva* (*Chaldaic*), “to wet, to moisten.”

Mr. Wilkes.—First definition?

Mr. Ditzler.—Yes, that is the FIRST definition, and the ONLY one. Now, on *tzabha*, the Hebrew word, he gives “to dip in, to plunge, to dye;” but *tzeva* is a *Chaldaic* word, which he defines, “to wet, to moisten,” just as I have read it all the time. Now, as I said yesterday, you can wet or moisten any thing by sprinkling or pouring, as the case, occurring in Daniel, of the baptism of Nebuchadnezzar's body by the dew of heaven shows. The brother quotes Gesenius and others to prove that *tzeva* means to dip, plunge, or immerse. The book of Daniel is the only place where we find this word *tzeva* in all *Chaldaic* literature; and, therefore, it is the only place from which lexicographers can learn its meaning. The body of Nebuchadnezzar was wet with the dew of heaven. How could Moses Stuart, or any other man, prove it meant to dip or plunge when there is no evidence in the world that his body was dipped or plunged into the dew of heaven? The truth is, Moses Stuart never examined the word in all his life. Why, he did not know that it was the *Chaldaic* word in Daniel where the Greek is βάπτω, nor of it in Luke vii: 38 and 44, nor in any of the places I have adduced. Stuart makes his main argument for sprinkling from Daniel iv: 30, verse 21 rendering it βίβλην (*βάπτω*) by “to moisten, wet, bedew,” and urges that hence βαπτίζω had that meaning, as their roots were one, and hence says: “Both the classic use and that of the Septuagint show that *washing* and *copious*

affusion are sometimes signified by the word."—Bib. Rep., 1833, p. 308, 318. The Syriac word there is *tzeva*, and translated by the Itala and Jerome, CONSPERGATUR (SPRINKLED). I read you from an old Syriac history, and will reread it: "Bibliotheca Orient., 1, 2. Bar-Sabæ received his name from having his garments *baptized* with his own blood in martyrdom. *Veh tzebha haro nachtho, dhanpheshek bhadhmo olhaknumeh lebhusho. Ipse vero animæ suæ vestes proprie cruo* TINKIT. And he indeed baptized his garments with the blood of his own body (*lit. life*)."

Moses Stuart never saw these examples, as I have the honor of being the first that ever brought them to notice, as also so many other of the facts already adduced.

Now, how could *tzeva* mean *immerse, dip, or plunge* in either of these cases? *What* is it to *dip* a man? *What* is it to *plunge*—to immerse a man, especially in their sense of those terms? Look at it. Was Nebuchadnezzar plunged? Were the feet of Christ dipped, immersed in the woman's tears? *How* could it mean plunged? Was the man suspended on the cross *plunged* into his own blood? Was he dipped, submerged in it?

But how my brother labors over Revelation xix: 13! He could not meet the point I read from the Syrian Church. He is dumb before the facts I adduced—confounded, lost. He says I said the apostles translated the Peshito-Syriac. I said nothing of the kind. I said the Syrian Church held so, and that many learned men believed so; but I did not say it was so, for I do not know. Then the brother has had a great deal to say about scholarship all through this debate. You can bear me witness on that point that I have said nothing on the subject. Now, if I had *five or six men* assisting me in Hebrew and Syriac, though not knowing a word of the latter, quoting to me from time to time, and if frequently, when matters of importance came up, I could not reply until I consulted my *sanhedrim*, he might consistently harp on these things; but as I have done nothing of the kind, it would be well for him to spare the pains. But again, on the word *amad* he reads from Gotch's primer or little composition to prove it means immerse. Then he says it means to stand up, also. Well, I read from the son-in-law of Mr. Campbell, in the "Millennial Harbinger" for September, 1870, page 515. The writer there professes to give from Mr. Lindsay, who was a learned man, indeed, very far superior to Gotch, these words, as an abridgment of Lindsay: "Now, the word *amad* signifies, in Hebrew, to *stand*, and some advocates of sprinkling

regard such a posture as a proof against *immersion*. Such advocates seem *entirely ignorant of the Syriac language*, as the word in it NEVER signifies to stand. The same occurs in Arabic, but never to stand." Now, what does Gotch say? "Now, with regard to the etymology of the word [*amad*], it is readily conceded that, from that, IMMERSE CAN NOT be proved to be its meaning."—132. A. Campbell derides the very idea of it meaning "to stand, stand erect." He ridicules the idea that βαπτίζω should be rendered into such a meaning "by the Savior in his native Syro-Chaldaic language."—"Ch. Baptism," 135.

I do not know whether it is so or not, for no man can know *certainly* as yet. We can only argue from analogy. My own opinion is, that the root of the Syrian and Arabic is *am*, אִם.

1. I have counted five hundred and eight places in the Hebrew Bible where *amad* occurs, always to stand, or the slightest variations of that idea. *Stand* is in all of them.

2. I am struck with the fact that *amad*, though it occurs a great many times in Daniel, never occurs in the *Chaldaic* part at all, but is confined to the first, eighth, and to close, but not in the Chaldee from ch. ii: to vii. Yet *stand* often occurs there, but *amad* is not used.

3. It never has the meaning in Chaldee, Syriac, nor Arabic, so far as an instance can be produced. That all admit. It is solely because the two words are spelled alike that men assumed that their roots were one.

4. All scholars now admit that *such accidents* are no proofs, unless kindred meanings appear. No such thing appears here.

5. Now, in all the kindred tongues baptize has the root, אִם, which, according to the vowel pointing, is *am*, *om*, *um*, etc. Now *am*, *om*, means to moisten, to wet. It means *water* also, the sea in the Egyptian tongues. אִם, *ami*, in Arabic, means *fluxit*, to flow, *amad*, root *am*, means clouds, from moisture, rain. It means thence to pour down rain, etc. Hence *amada*, baptize, in Arabic, means "the being wet with rain." See in my second and third addresses on this proposition. If *mad* be assumed as the root it has quite the same meaning, being applied to the flowing of water, the tides, etc. But if it does mean to *stand* in Syriac, Arabic, etc., then Gesenius is right when he says it is so used, because among the Syriac Christians they *stand* in the water to be baptized. I shall have use for this directly. One thing is true any way: *Nothing on earth can be more antagonistic—more opposite—more absurd, therefore, in conception than "STAND UP," "STAND ERECT," as amad in Hebrew means, and dip, stand up, and being*

PLUNGED. What can be more opposite than **STANDING** and **PLUNGING**?

As to the word *tzeva*, *tzebha*, or *sabha*, as variously pronounced, we have the same in Arabic, and the root is *sava* or *tzeva*. I have read where *all* the lexicons, *without exception*, define it *pour*, pour out, flow, the fall of rain, the dripping or staining of the juice of grapes. The sap dripping out of a tree also applies to it. Immersion is out of the question in such a connection, and these are the root meanings of the word. Now, here *amad* signifies, in Arabic, being wet with rain; therefore it must come from the root which implies the falling of rain, the pouring out of rain. Hence, in Syriac, to *wash*, as the effect of water falling or being applied. I believe that is the true origin of the word, but if it be not, then the only other supposition is the idea of standing to be baptized.

There is another Arabic word which I have not noticed so closely yet, from which baptism is translated a number of times. It is *ghasala*. This is the baptism spoken of in Mark, Luke, and by Paul, where *baptidzo* and *baptismos* are used. Now, this word no one ever contended meant to immerse, and it occurs in Mark vii: 4-8; Luke xi: 38, and Hebrews vi: 2, and ix: 10. Golius defines it, "1. *lavit, abluit*. 5. *diligenter lavit perluitque*, to wash, to cleanse, wash diligently, cleanse thoroughly." Freytag, Kosegarten, etc., give the same, as well as Catafago. Catafago gives it, as all others do, to wash.

Catafago gives the noun also, *ghassal*, "one whose business it is to wash the bodies of the dead." Now, here *baptidzo* is applied to a word which means to wash a body, the application of the water to the subject, and of the three words in Arabic, from which *baptidzo* is translated, two mean sprinkle, and the other to pour or wash in any way but immerse.

On what he says on the Peshito-Syriac I read a little further from Murdock, Appendix ii, p. 496: "The opinion that they (Revelation, 2 Peter, etc.) belong to the Philoxenian version, is equally objectionable, for the style of these books coincides more with that of the *Peshito* than with that of the *Philoxenian*, though differing from both. . . . Besides, they are actually quoted by *Ephraim* (or Ephrem) *Cyrus*, in the middle of the fourth century, or more than two hundred years before the Philoxenian version was produced." But I consider it a waste of time to dwell longer on a point already established beyond the power of question. This is far superior to the authority he has read so much.

And now I will read from *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, which, on page 241-2, tomus iv, gives a detailed history of the whole, and how they baptized persons in the Syrian Church. This will throw still further light on the subject. § ix he heads with רמעימדתא, *dhe-mamudhitho*, or *tekso dhamadho kadhisho*, the order of Holy Baptism. I will give you the details as I glance along over them in order, for it is far too long to read. They begin the baptismal service by a "Pater Noster," or repeating the Lord's Prayer. An oration is delivered. Then the priest *lays* his hand on their heads, repeating the Psalm: "Stretch out thy right hand, O Lord God," etc., and seals them with the grace of baptism. Then some services are gone through with, and, having sealed them, "they enter into the baptistry," saying, "Pour upon us, O Lord." Now discourses are delivered, songs sung, Pater Nosters repeated, when they say, "The voice of the Lord is upon the waters," twice, AND POUR THE WATER (for baptism) INTO A BOWL. Oration. It would tire you now to read half their ceremonies while the man or woman, as the case may be, stands there, perhaps waist-deep in the baptistry, awaiting the baptismal act. The water for it is poured into a bowl. After this they sing, read, pray, deliver orations, pour oil on the altar, then pour oil on them; they immerse them in the water of the baptistry, and pour oil on the water of baptism; then finally the priest seals him, and "he is baptized standing in front of the altar."

Now, whenever my brother's church finds *immergit* they conclude the baptism was by immersion. Here the Syrian Church immerses, or sinks the man partly down into the water, and then he stands about half an hour while the ceremony is said over him. These services are performed while he is *immersed*, but that he is half an hour *under* the water my brother will hardly contend.

This was the practice of the largest part of the Oriental Church. They simply placed the candidate in the water; infants were placed over it; children, at times, in or over it, and baptized. From the same volume, p. 260, I will translate another account. I have nothing to do with the absurdities of their practices. We are showing that the Syrians do not practice immersion, as they teach, and that the facts will throw light on the word. I read: "When Christ the Lord was baptized in Jordan, say Simeon the Presbyter, and John Zugbi, John the Baptist filled a little vessel with the water that flowed from his sacred body [was that immersion? He stood in the water; it was poured on him—'flowed down his sacred body'], and

preserved it until the day he was beheaded, when he delivered it into the custody of his disciple, John the Evangelist. To this same John the Evangelist, they add, when Christ instituted the eucharistic supper, and distributed a part to each of the apostles, he gave a double portion; the rest of which he took, and delivered in the same way as the other—in a little vessel of water. And, afterward, he poured into this same vessel the water which flowed from the side of Christ when hanging on the cross; and the blood that flowed from his side he mixed with the eucharistic bread. This, they say, was the leaven of the Eucharist, **THAT THE LEAVEN OF BAPTISM.** *For the apostles, after they had received the Holy Spirit, before they went forth into all the world to preach the gospel, divided this water and eucharistic bread among themselves, which they were to use as an element in administering baptism."*

Now, if they baptized by immersion, how could they take a bottle of water and use it in the churches as an element for baptizing? Tell me that who can. These are the records of the Syrian Church, running through ages. Yet, whenever men of my brother's belief read the word *immersit*, they conclude the *baptism* was by immersion, whereas it meant to sink, immerge them in the water; to be baptized by affusion, as we speak of a ship sinking, or the sinking of a steamboat, when they go down only a few feet. The word *immergo* may be applied to that which goes to the bottom; but, literally, it does not imply complete submersion. *Mergo* is constantly used as a word when partial sinking occurs. But we have further facts still from these old records. I read again from "*Bibliotheca Orientalis*," tom. iii, p. 357, of the seven kinds of baptism. As I have no translation of this ancient language, I will translate as I go: "*Al mamudhitho.* There are seven kinds of baptisms recorded. 1. The well known baptism in common with us all, that is to say, *washing*. 2. Legal baptism, that is, *purifications according to the law of Moses*. [These were all sprinklings.] 3. Baptism according to the tradition of the elders, viz., the washing of cups, brazen vessels, couches, etc. 4. The baptism of John. 5. Baptism of Christ, etc. 6. Baptism of *blood*—*moro ve mamudhitho aith li dhemad*—I have a baptism to be baptized with, etc. 7. Baptism of *tears*—*mamudhitho dheme*." That of blood is then explained—that of martyrdom where they were crucified.

I now read from Eusebius' "*Ecclesiastical History*," written in the first half of the fourth century, detailing the history of the church from the days of Christ to A. D. 324, Bk. iii, ch. 23. A backslider

is overtaken by John the Evangelist; reclaimed; and it says: "Then, trembling, he lamented bitterly, and, embracing the old man (John) as he came up, attempted to plead for himself with his lamentations, as much as he was able; *as if baptized a second time with his own tears*, and only concealing his right hand." So the old Latin copy, also, "*lachrymis denuo baptizatus est*," is, baptized a second time with his tears.

Chrysostom: "And as those who are baptized are washed with water (*τοῖς ὕδασι*), so those who are martyred are washed (*λοιοῦνται—louontai*) with their own blood—*αἵματι*." Here they are represented as washed with blood as they were with water. But the blood was *shed upon them* in crucifixion, etc.

John of Damascus, speaking of baptism, reckons seven: "Seventh, that which is *by blood and martyrdom*, with which Christ himself for us was baptized—*τὸ δι αἵματος καὶ μαρτυρίου*. Here, Christ's blood shed on himself in crucifixion is baptism. So, all whose blood in martyrdom falls on them are baptized.

Hilary speaks of the baptism: "That which by suffering of martyrdom will wash away (sin) with devoted and faithful blood."

Athanasius, fourth century: "For it is proper to know that, in like manner, the fountain of tears by baptism cleanses man." Again: "Three baptisms, cleansing away all sin whatsoever God has bestowed on the nature of man. I speak of that of water; and, again, that by the witness of one's own blood; and, thirdly, that by *tears*, with which, also, the *harlot was cleansed*."

Now, here we have the baptism of tears, where the falling tears of their eyes baptized them. Where is the dip here? Where is the *immerse*? Show us the *plunge* here. They say you can substitute the true meaning of a word wherever that word occurs. Here numbers are baptized *with tears*, the posture given—*standing*. Where is the *plunge*? Others, and there are thousands of them, too, are said, in Greek, Latin, and Syriac, to be baptized *with their own blood* in martyrdom. How could they be *immersed* into, plunged into, the little blood that poured from their pierced sides? Their blood was *shed out*, and *fell upon*, sprinkled, their bodies; and *all the fathers of the church* call it baptism. Nay, they said it answered the place of baptism of water, being much more efficacious, indeed. Yet they claim that they can substitute immerse wherever *baptidzo* occurs, and make sense. Conant quotes Stourdza to prove that "it signifies, literally and always, to *plunge*."—P. 151.

Now, if I have time, I want to analyze Conant and his use of the Greek Fathers.

Mr. Hopson.—You have three minutes yet.

Mr. Ditzler.—I will not have time now, and I will take up some other matters. My brother does not take up the German and Itala, the Vulgate and Lusitanian, translations; and though Rev. xix: 13 in the Peshito-Syriac troubles him a great deal, he is forced to admit that it is ancient. We have the gospel of Luke in this ancient Peshito-Syriac, in which occurs the language of the Savior, as I read it to you yesterday, “My feet hath she baptized with her tears.” From my reading, you see that *amad* is not used there, but *tzeva*. My brother argues, from Moses Stuart, that *tzeva* means to plunge, when Stuart never examined the question in the Syriac at all. He (Mr. Wilkes) gives dip as the meaning of *brecho*, which never means to dip or plunge. It is thus defined by Liddell & Scott’s “Greek Lexicon:” “To wet, moisten, sprinkle, rain on.”

Now, the Peshito-Syriac has, “My feet hath she baptized with her tears,” which shows clearly that there is no dip, plunge, or immerse in the word; and all the ancient translations made, either in the apostolic age, or nearest to it, render it the same way. If it meant immerse, dip, or plunge, how could they render it by the word sprinkle as they do? No; *there is no dip, plunge, or immerse in the word.* But, as I said, *for fourteen hundred years no translation ever rendered tabhal or baptidzo by immerse or plunge.* Has he shown the contrary? Castell’s and Schaaf’s Syriac lexicons give *abluo, lavo*, to wash, to cleanse, as the meaning of *amad*; *lavit*, wash, for *secho*; *lotio, ablutio*, washing, cleansing, etc. How can he get immerse out of it? Then the ancient Syrian Council, that discussed the Trinity, form of words to be used, etc., say it is not true baptism, no matter how performed, whether by sprinkling, washing, or immersion, unless it is in the name of the Trinity. How could they bring in *sprinkling* and *washing* as *contradistinguished from immersion*, if *amad* did not imply them also? You see the truth is made out that sprinkling and pouring were the general actions by which they baptized in the apostolic age. Then we have the Peshito-Syriac translating *tabhal* by *sprinkle*, never by immerse. The Septuagint translates it stain, where it was by sprinkling. The Itala and Vulgate, second and fourth centuries, render baptize, in Chaldee, by sprinkle, never by immerse or plunge. Two of the most ancient of all copies of the Greek New Testament, fourth century, translate βαπτίζω, sprinkle. Seven later ones,

and Euthymius, render it sprinkle. Five of the oldest versions of the Bible in the world render βαπτω (*bapto*) sprinkle. Two of the best modern ones, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, render it sprinkle. Irenæus, Hippolytus, and Origen render it sprinkle. None of them render it immerse. Mr. Campbell says, Carson says, Gale says, βαπτω and βαπτίζω are the same in meaning. Then we have the Peshito rendering *tabhal* baptize, by *secho*, wash, *tamash*, moisten, wet, wash, *amad*, wash. The Arabic by one word always, to sprinkle, affuse, or pour out; another, to shed down water, as rain; a third, to wash. Therefore, I have proved that sprinkling and pouring are proper actions in practicing baptism.

MR. WILKES' NINTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My friend attaches very great importance to the translation of Jerome's vulgate, and he seeks, through that medium, to ascertain the meaning of the words which Jerome translated.

What did Jerome say about baptism? In his comment on the Epistle to the Ephesians, book ii, chapter 4, he says: "And thrice we are immersed, that there may appear one sacrament of the Trinity." I will give you the Latin of it that you may see I do not misquote it: "*et ter mergimur, ut Trinitatis unum appareat Sacramentum.*" He includes himself among those who were immersed, and others. There is no doubt as to what *mergimur* means; whatever doubt there may be in regard to *tingo*, there is none about this word.

The mode in which my friend argues is this: "We may *moisten* any thing by baptism, *baptizo*, and we may moisten any thing by sprinkling, *rantizo*, that is, by "baptizing or sprinkling;" therefore, since sprinkling is equal to moistening, and since baptism is equal to moistening, it follows that baptism and sprinkling are the same thing or equal to each other, or that sprinkling is Christian baptism. If my opponent is far enough advanced in logic to see the fallacy in that effort he will not make it again; but if he is not, and is too old to learn, we might as well stop the controversy just here.

Again, he says I ought not to be so excited. If I have been excited, I admit that I ought not to have been; and if I have been, the report will show it, and the spectators will know. It may be that my friend thought I was, and there may be a reason why he thought so; what that reason is I leave you to guess; I will not state it; I may say, perhaps, that the drunken man thinks every other man is drunk. He says I ought not to be excited since I have three or four brethren to help me, some in the Hebrew, some in the Latin, and some in the Greek, and that sometimes we go off and hold consultations. Does that irritate my friend any? I wonder whether his mind is not brood-

ing over the real circumstance that the Rev. Drs. Rivers and Robinson, Prof. McCown, and others were to be his associates in his investigations, and *they are not here!* Has his remark any allusion to that circumstance? If so, he can explain further; if not, he knows it. In either case it makes no sort of difference to me. Not only did I publish in the city papers the fact that these young men would stand here with me, but he made a similar publication. If my friends do not always hand me the correct Latin, Greek, or Hebrew, Mr. Ditzler is at liberty, and is the very man to find it out. These young men are my brethren; they sit with me, and sometimes, at night, we talk about these matters; sometimes we talk in the morning, and sometimes we consult *a little* at the table about them, and we published, in the city papers, our intention to do so. My friend *expected* that arrangement, and if it now irritates him I can not help it; "it is his funeral," not mine.

I now invite your attention to a fact that will appear in the report which will be made verbatim, except mere grammatical and rhetorical changes. It will appear that my friend opposes—strenuously opposes—immersion. Any one, on coming here and listening for an hour, would go away and say that I am affirming immersion and my friend is denying. It makes very little difference in *this* investigation whether immersion is baptism or not. Suppose, for example, that immersion is not baptism? Let us have that understanding, from this time forward, if you choose, and let it be understood that our present proposition, as affirmed by Mr. Ditzler, is, that "the sprinkling or pouring of water upon a proper subject, by a proper administrator, is Christian baptism." Now, in view of *that* proposition, let us eye closely the proofs which he brings and the positions I take. With *that* understanding I am willing to leave the question with the record and with those who hear us.

What does my friend say, or what *can* he say, in favor of the proposition that sprinkling is, ever was, or can be, baptism? What does he say? Any thing? I want him to make a catalogue here or somewhere of the best things he can say to show that the *current, ordinary* meaning of *baptizo*, or *baptisma*, is to sprinkle or to pour, either the one or the other, or both. Why, bless you, if he were to draw up his catalogue of pertinent evidence and hang it up there before you, it would appear *thinner than Pharaoh's lean kine*. But he has it not to bring, and he can not, therefore, bring it. I will pursue this course: I will *reply* to what I think deserves reply; then I will proceed to offer

disproofs. My friend understands what that means. In other words, I will attempt to establish, affirmatively, a proposition incompatible with, and the contradictory of, his; that being established, his is false.

With what we have now learned of the meaning of the words *baptizo* and *baptisma*, I come to investigate its use in the New Testament. If my friend will never come to the New Testament I will. Before I do that, however, I have one reading from the Old Testament—the Septuagint Old Testament. It is a very late work, issued by Bagster & Sons, with a translation of the Greek, and was printed in 1870. My friend wants a translation that has “*dip*” for *baptizo*; I will read it to him:

“So Naiman went down and dipped himself seven times in Jordan, according to the word of Elisai: and his flesh returned to him as the flesh of a little child, and he was cleansed.”—2 Kings v: 14.

I will now give him another. I have a version of the improved Greek text by Thomas Sheldon Greene, of London, one of the brightest and most distinguished scholars on the European continent. The translation is by himself, and shows us not only what the genuine Greek text is, but what is the genuine English of that Greek. I read from Mark, seventh chapter, fourth verse, that controverted passage:

“And coming from the market-place, they do not eat unless they dip themselves: and there are many other matters which they have received to hold, dipping of cups, and jars, and brazen vessels, and couches—and the Pharisees and Scribes ask him: Why do not thy disciples walk according to the tradition of the elders, but eat their bread with defiled hands?”—“Twofold New Test.”

Remember, that was translated by a man who believes that sprinkling is right; at least, he belongs to the English Episcopal Church. The same author, on Luke xi: 38, commencing with the thirty-seventh verse, translates as follows:

“And as he spoke a Pharisee asked him to dine with him, and he went in and lay down. 38. But the Pharisee on seeing it, wondered that he had not dipped before dinner.”

I present you with these two passages now; more anon.

I now proceed with the first chapter of Mark, ninth and tenth verses, which in the common English version read thus:

“And it came to pass in those days, that Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan. And straightway coming up out of the water, he saw the heavens opened, and the Spirit like a dove descending upon him.”

The point I make on this passage is, that the Savior was baptized by John, and that he came *up out of the water*. Since he came *up out of the water*, I argue that it favors immersion, and that it is *inconsistent* with the idea of sprinkling or pouring. My friend knows very well that, when he baptizes, *he* does not take them down "into the water;" he knows that he would not do that; that it would be unreasonable. But he must see very clearly that the Savior and John the Baptist would not have gone down into the water, and come *up out of the water*, as they did, to do that which could have been not only as well, but better and more conveniently done, without it.

Whenever my friend will show, by his own practice and that of his church, that sprinkling is reasonably done, that reason demands that, in sprinkling, a man must go down into the water, and *come up out of the water*, I will allow, as far as he has evidence to that effect, that this passage is not very strong against him in this controversy. But there is a circumstance here that makes the passage still stronger in my favor.

It is stated that John the Baptist baptized in the wilderness, also that he baptized in the Jordan; and that he baptized in the *river* Jordan; it is also stated that he baptized in the *water* of the river Jordan; and again, that he baptized *into* the Jordan. Now, you can see very well how all this is true. The water was in the river, or was the river, and the river was the Jordan, and the Jordan was in the wilderness; therefore, when the Savior was baptized in the water of the river Jordan, he was baptized in the wilderness also.

But, mark again: It is stated that he was baptized *into* the river; it is not stated that he *went down into* the river to do the baptizing; that is not said; but the statement is, that HE WAS *baptized* into the river; baptized him, *eis*, the Jordan. Now, notice; we have him "*baptized into*;" for my friend told you, as he was obliged to tell you, that *eis* currently, commonly, and properly means *into*. It is a preposition that accompanies forward motion; a motion of forward tendency always. It never looks back; is never retrospective; but prospective, always looks forward. His baptism was *into*; looked forward; *into the river*. The word *eis* includes the idea of inness and of motion into a place or state, whereas, *en* includes the idea of inness, but omits the idea of motion.

Now, the Savior was baptized into the water of the river of Jordan. That is on the one side; but, on the other side, it is stated that he

came up out of the water; and the very strongest word in the whole Greek language that could express his *going into* the water (*eis*) is used; and the very strongest word in the entire Greek language that could be employed to express "out of" (*ek*) is also used in the correct Greek text. It is true, and I will not attempt to disguise it, that, in the common text, called "*textus receptus*," *apo* is used instead of *ek*; *ek*, however, is the true reading, and *apo* is not. Let me give you a short history of that:

"The *received text* of the Greek Testament is that of the second Elzevir edition, published at Leyden in 1633, and founded on a collation of the third edition of Robert Stevens (1550), which itself was founded on the fifth edition of Erasmus (1535), with Beza's editions."—See Prolegomena, Alford's "Greek New Testament," p. 73.

This Elzevir edition was made, then, in 1633. At the time of the making of that edition—which is our "*textus receptus*"—there was no manuscript dating back further than the tenth century, accessible to those who made it. They had not in their hands the Greek Vatican manuscript which my friend has; nor the *Sinaitic Codex*, which is, perhaps, the oldest and most accurate of the manuscripts; nor the Alexandrian manuscript, which stands third in the catalogue of ancient and important manuscripts; nor had they any of the great and weighty manuscripts in their hands when they made this "*textus receptus*."

According to all the late authorities, *ek* belongs, of right, to the text in Mark i: 10, and not *apo*. If *eis* is on one side of the Savior's baptism, and the Jordan is between, and *ek* is on the other, we have this: Jesus was baptized *into* the Jordan and came *out of* it. The Savior came, *epi*, to, the Jordan; he came, *pros*, to, John; he was baptized, *eis*, into, the river Jordan, into the water of that river; and then, on the other side of baptism, he came, *ek*, out of, the water. If he was not immersed, that thing can not be expressed in Greek; it is impossible.

The Savior was, then, immersed.

Now, till my friend shall tell us what he has to say on this subject, after giving you a few authorities upon which I rely, for the presence of *ek* in this passage, I will pass it. Tregelles reads *ek* in this passage; Tischendorf also; and Alford, Greene, Bengel, Lachman, and Meyer do also. Lange, I quote, as most likely for it, and Griesbach favored it. Thus I have nine of the very highest authorities, exhausting,

almost, the entire catalogue of *great* authorities, in favor of the now commonly acknowledged Greek reading. When I give you Tregelles, Alford, Tischendorf, and Greene, for a Greek reading, I may well defy the world beside; I care not what any body else may say. They unite in declaring that *ek* belongs to this text, and that *apo* is not the word Inspiration used. This was noticed as far back as the days of Griesbach, who lived in 1745. He favored, as is well known, the reading of *ek* in this passage, and since the attention of that distinguished scholar was drawn to this passage it is put in the text of Mr. Greene, which I have here, and of Mr. Alford, which I have in my room. It is in the text of Tischendorf, which my friend has here. It belongs to the text—to the genuine inspired text—of the Lord Jesus Christ. To deny it is damaging to the man who does so. To admit it carries my argument that the Savior, when he was baptized, had some reason for being put or baptized *into* the water, not that he *went* down into the water *to be* baptized. The baptism was a subsequent thing. The Savior was the subject of the baptism, and the action took *him* into the water. It is not said that he *walked* into the water; it is not said that he simply *went* into the water, but it is declared that John *baptized* him *into* the Jordan, and then he came, *ek*, up *out of* the water, and the heavens were opened; and God broke the silence of the past and announced the great central fact in our holy religion, that **HE** was **HIS** well-beloved Son.

I call your attention now to Mark vii: 4, and to Luke xi: 38. I have read from several most distinguished lexicons, including Parkhurst, Schleusner, and others, which quote these passages and translate them “immerse,” and I propose now to direct your attention to the law in regard to persons who had been to the market-place, and who might have touched dead bodies and thereby become, ceremonially, unclean.

In reference to what was done I declare that those ceremonially unclean—no matter what the cause—were not clean till they had bathed their *whole flesh*. It is not always stated that the whole flesh was bathed, but they bathed themselves. In several instances, however, it is stated that they bathed their entire flesh, or bodies, in water. If you will turn to Leviticus xv: 16, you will find that persons offending in a certain way and becoming, thereby, ceremonially unclean, were required to wash their *whole flesh* in water. So my friend's Latin version reads on that passage, at least mine does. They were required to wash their whole flesh—“*omne corpus suum*”—in

water. It reads so in the Hebrew, it reads so in the Septuagint Greek, it reads so in our common English version. I presume *that was an immersion*.

If my friend will turn to Leviticus xvi: 4, he will find that Aaron, before coming in before the Lord, was required to bathe all his body in water; not a part, but the whole.

Again, allow me to call your attention to the "Manual of Baptism," by Mr. Bailey, page 287, where we have collected together authorities on this subject. I read from this work merely for the sake of convenience:

"Leviticus xi: 32: And upon whatsoever any of them (unclean animals) doth fall, it shall be unclean, whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skir, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be wherein any work is done, *it must be put into water*, and it shall be unclean until the even, so shall it be cleansed."

On page 288 we have the testimony of Rabbi Maimonides, one of the greatest lights in the Jewish Church, so Dr. L. Kleeburg told me a few days ago:

"Wherever in the law, washing of the flesh or clothes is mentioned, it means *nothing else* than dipping of the whole body in a laver." [Dr. Kleeburg, the Jewish Rabbi of this city, told me the same thing.] "For if a man dips himself all over, except the tip of his little finger, he is still in his uncleanness. Every one that is baptized [as they were on coming from the market] must *immerse the whole body*. In a laver which holds forty *seahs* [about one hundred gallons] of water, every defiled person dips himself, except a profluvions man; and in it they dip all unclean vessels. A bed that is wholly defiled, if he dip it part by part, is pure. If he dip the bed in the pool, although its feet are plunged in the thick clay at the bottom of the pool, it is clean. What shall he do with a pillow or bolster of skin? He must dip them and lift them out by the fringes."—Adkins, p. 108.

I read again from page 291:

"DR. H. A. W. MEYER, in his Manual on the Gospels of Mark and Luke, says: 'The expression in Mark vii: 4, is not to be understood of the *washing of the hands* (as interpreted by Lightfoot and Wetstein), but of the *immersing*, which the word always means in the classics and the New Testament; that is here, according to the context, the taking of a bath. So Luke xi: 38. *Having come from the market*, where, among a crowd of men, they might have come in contact with unclean persons, they eat not without having first bathed themselves. The representation proceeds after the manner of a climax; before eating they *always* observe the washing of hands, but [employ] the *bath* when they come *from the market* and wish to take food.'—Chase, p. 95."

I will now read from Buxtorf, a great authority with my respected friend :

“On the contrary, those who had departed from the house washed in a bath, or, at least, *immersed* their hands in water, with the fingers distended.”—B. Fuller, p. 48.

My next argument, in favor of the fact that the apostles and the Savior immersed, is founded on John iii: 5. It is said by the Savior: “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God.”

Moderator.—“*Time is up.*”

MR. DITZLER'S TENTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I will notice a few points made by my brother, and then proceed with my argument. He seems to think we have been brooding a little over his having certain helps and aids, and my not having those present that were named as having been selected by me. I may remark that I agreed that we should have these persons as proposed by him, not that I thought them necessary, but simply as a compliment to him; and without consulting the persons, I had several placed upon my list. Dr. Stuart Robinson wrote me that he was compelled to be absent from the city during the greater portion of the debate, and could not be here; also Prof. McCown, who was my former teacher, in 1852-5—he was compelled to be in his school a great part of the time, but told me personally he would be at the debate if possible, and wrote to that effect; also Dr. Rivers has been unwell, so much so that he could not preach on last Sabbath, but has been here as much as possible. But all of this is a compliment to me, inasmuch as my friends considered that I did not need any help, and I felt that I did not. I have told my friend formerly that I was very much pleased that he had these helps, for some of them write criticisms on Greek and Latin, which I have my fun with at leisure moments; several of them are profoundly (?) versed in these matters—so they would make believe—and I consider them as indorsing him. I tell my friend that I congratulate him that this is so.

My brother is already coming to the baptism of the Savior and the Jordan. I will come to those matters to-morrow. He is surprised that I do not come to the Jordan and the wilderness, and would impress you with the idea that I am not in the *Bible* with my argument, while he is treating of the Savior's baptism. The truth is, I have been in the *Bible* all the time, with the exception of ten or fifteen minutes, and the time I devoted to the lexicons which were *founded on the Bible*. Sometimes I am using the Peshito-Syriac, the best translation

of the inspired writings in the world. Sometimes I am using the Hebrew, the very language in which God wrote; and sometimes I am in Greek, the language in which nearly all, if not all, of the New Testament was written. So I am in the *Bible* all the time, while he has been ranging around outside of the Bible, and among people altogether destitute of the Bible or the Christian religion. Which is most consistent?

And now I take up the word *immerse* in Greek, and, that you may see what is the true idea of it, I will repeat some facts. Wahl, Greek Clavis New Testament, defines *βυθίζω*, *demergo*, sink, sink down: Stokius, *mergo*, *demergo*—same; *ποντίζω*, sink, they define the same way, as well as *καταποντίζω*—rendered by Schleusner, etc., *demergo*, *submergo*, *immergo*, sink down, under, in. Native Greeks define it by *βυθίζω*, *καταβύω*, never by *βαπτίζω*, sink, sink down. Now, *immerse*, simply, and literally, and *always*, means to sink, sink in. That is the *English*. These Greek words correspond to it exactly. *Katapontidzo*, which is *immergo* in Latin, occurs in Matt. xviii: 6, where the millstone should be “hanged about his neck, and he *drowned*, *καταποντίζω*, sunk [and as a consequence], drowned in the depth of the sea.” Luke v: 7—ships “began to *sink*”—Greek, *βυθίζεσθαι*, to be immersed. Vulgate and all Latin renderings are *mergerentur*, *demergerentur* that I have examined. 1 Tim. vi: 9—*buthidzo*, drowned, sunk; Matt. xiv: 30 in a former speech.

Again in Exodus xv: 5 we have this language recorded: “They sank into the bottom as a stone.” The Greek is, *κατέδυαν εἰς βυθον ὡσεὶ λίθος*, *katedusan*, etc. They were immersed, sunk down. The English is sink; the Latin is immerse; the Syriac is *siuk* as a stone; the Hebrew is *tabha*, the word I told you meant immerse, not *tabhal*. We have the Hebrew word immerse, the Greek word immerse, the Latin word merse, and all the facts show they went to the bottom. Exodus xv: 4—“Pharaoh’s chariots and his hosts hath he cast into the sea; his chosen captains also are drowned [*submersi sunt*] in the Red Sea.” Again, in the tenth verse: “Thou didst blow with thy wind; the sea covered them; they *sank as lead* in the mighty waters.” They sank as lead in the turbulent waters. Here we have the word *δυο*, *tabha*, which means really to sink in completely. So in Psalm lxix: 6—*demersit*, sink.

Tertullian represents Peter as “*immersed* (*immergo*) enough when he walked the sea.” Now he has demanded us—they all constantly call on us to translate *βαπτίζω* into the *English*. Why do you not

translate it into English? They have filled the land with the cry. Now, why do *they* not render it into English? Why do they not apply their own rule? Do *they* translate it into English? *Not a word of it.* Immerse is purely a *Latin* word anglicized by turning an *i* into *e*. *Sink* is the English. Why do they not render it *sink*? "In those days came John the Sinker, sinking in the wilderness." Now, a thing is *sunk*, immersed, *only while it is UNDER the element into or under which it is mersed or sunk.* The moment you take it out it is *not immersed.* If you take a rock or any object and hold it under water, or in the water, it is immersed. But the moment it is lifted out it is *not immersed.* The moment a fence, a ship, a man sinks partially down in water, a fence or horse in mud, they are immersed while so sunk. But is this the meaning of βάπτισμα, baptism, in the Bible? You may sprinkle water on him—he is sprinkled while water is falling on him, but when it ceases to fall he is not sprinkled. But a man is *baptized*, and ever afterward he is a baptized man. He *was* immersed, or sprinkled, or water poured on him, as the model *act* of his baptism, but he is not immersed, is not sprinkled, when I meet him thirty years afterward, but he *is* baptized. There is that in *baptism* in the New Testament that neither sprinkle, pour, nor immerse *can* possibly express. In a few places, such as Judith xii : 7 ; Luke xi : 38 ; Mark vii : 4, βαπτίζω is rightly translated sprinkle. But those were more particularly the Jewish ceremonial baptisms. But it is right to transfer the word, because it has a force, as the most learned immersionists have often admitted, that no other word *can* convey. Immerse never can convey the remotest idea of βαπτίζω. *Sink* express baptism! How absurd!

Now, in 1 Tim. vi : 9 ; Matt. xviii : 6, drown—Latin, *submersi*—sunk, classic Greek, we have seen from his own readings from Conant, and from A. Campbell, as read by myself and their favorite lexicons, expresses by *baptidzo*. So sink, Luke v : 7 ; Matt. xiv : 30, classic Greek expresses often, nay, constantly, by βαπτίζω. But *baptidzo* is *never* so used in the *Bible*. Then, as the *Bible* *never* uses βαπτίζω for *sink*, for *immergo*, where all see sink, *immergo*, is implied and absolutely certain, why render βαπτίζω by the very meaning *never conveyed by it in a single place in the Bible*? We saw how the Latin *mergo*, *immergo*, was used. Now let us try the *English*, *plunge*. Does it express *definite* action? And is that definite action always equivalent to dip, immerse, as immersionists assume? I read in Shakespeare: "Accoutered as I am, I *plunge* me in." He throws himself into the river to *swim*, *not*

to *sink*. "But, no, he plunged (the Rubicon)." Did he dip or sink himself? A horse plunges, when we ride him, at times. A. Campbell, "Ch. Baptism," p. 421, says, "The affrighted steed, in frenzied mood, *plunging* in the desert," etc. Constantly dip occurs where no submergence is implied. So neither dip, plunge, nor sink (immerse) serves to satisfy our opponents. You see the folly here of rendering βαπτίζω by *dip*, *plunge*, or *immerse*. Even were these its proper actions, still it would be folly, since they only express *the action meant* by the word if it implied immersion, and that *action* is only a *part* of what is implied in Christian baptism. Again: every translation made for sixteen hundred years either transfers it or renders it into a word that was understood just as we do it, or by one that meant sprinkle and pour. *Not one* rendered it immerse. [See twelfth speech.]

I showed Conant's renderings—*submerge*, *immerge*, *dip*, *plunge*, *imbathe*, *overwhelm*, *whelm*, *immerse*, *endure*, *undergo*. Yet Conant, p. 89, says: "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." He states, same page, that "the word βαπτίζω (*baptidzo*) is also used where a living being is put under water *for the purpose of drowning*, and, of course, is left to perish in the immersing element." That is true of classic Greek, as he demonstrates. *But it NEVER so occurs in ALL GOD'S WORD.* But, if it means "simply to put in or under water," which is his eleventh rendering, why not always so render it and be uniform? Why not so render it in the New Testament? Now, to test Conant's faith (and Campbell uses almost the same language), look at his consistency. He says βαπτίζω "means simply *to put in or under water.*" Yet he did not, and dared not, so render it in a single place in the whole Bible. Just think of that! And now what becomes of all the arguments of A. Campbell about the last syllable of βαπτίζω, ζω (*dzo*), bringing the candidates out again, and *dunai*, sinking them to the bottom to perish? Conant utterly demolishes all A. C.'s favorite criticisms, found p. 124, of his "Ch. Baptism," 77, 78 of his "Debate." But Conant has two hundred and thirty cases eliminating the fourteen New Testament ones, as involved in the controversy more directly; and, of the five Old Testament translations, one is rendered *whelm*, two *plunge*, two *immerse*. Now, if it is always *immerse* in the New Testament, why not so in the Old Testament. Again, of the two hundred and thirty examples given, it is rendered *immerse* only one hundred and seven times, leaving one hundred and twenty-

three examples against his own argument. From page 43 to page 82 he has it whelm forty-five times, overwhelm eight times, immerse only ten times. Though the overflowing implies submergence, it is no act corresponding to *their* idea of baptism, the putting of persons *under* water and *taking them out* again. Mr. Alexander Campbell renders it, on pages 127, 30, *sink, dip, plunge, immerse, drown, merge, immerge, overflow, drench, overwhelm* (other words), *undergo*, endure, administer. He renders *baptidzo* by thirteen different renderings. Why do they not apply their own arguments to the translations of the New Testament? Because, if they prove any thing, they prove *entirely too much*. They are very inconsistent. In Mr. Conant's classical argument, you will find he says "The ship is submerged," βαπτίζουτων, and wanting little of *sinking*—"καταδύλαι, of being immersed," (p. 18); a "sword is *imbathed*," where the sword struck the neck of Cleobulus, II. xvi: 333 (p. 21); "did not *plunge* in the sword into his *neck*" to "sever that hostile head;" (22) that "the *immersed* ship . . . is saved is of the providence of God;" (23) "he *plunged the whole sword into his own neck*" (33) "again immersed it into breast milk (εις γαλα γυναικός) of a woman;" "mass of iron, red-hot, is *plunged* in water," "plunge the sword into the enemy's *breast*" (37), etc. Not one in ten of these and other examples are rightly rendered, yet they show the desperateness of their cause. He grossly perverts; e. g., example 71, p. 34: "The mass of iron, drawn red-hot from the furnace, is *plunged* (baptized) in water." Now he leaves out the word *smiths* in his own Greek, puts *in* as if *in* were in the Greek, or rather *in* before the accusative, none of which is there. "Since now the mass of red-hot iron, being drawn out of the forge or furnace *by the smiths*, is baptized WITH water"—βούρει βαπτίζεται—dative of instrument. It is a mass so large that a number of smiths have to pull it out, and in such cases it is not plunged into the water in *any* instance.

I now take some of Conant's examples where sprinkling is admitted, yet where he seeks to hide it in the translations. Page 110, "Baptizein," he gives us an extract from Theophylact:

"The word BE IMMERSSED (BE BAPTIZED), signifies the abundance, and, as it were, the riches of the participation of the Holy Spirit; as also, in that perceived by the senses, he in a manner has who is IMMERSSED (BAPTIZED) in water, *bathing* the whole body, while he who simply receives water is not *wholly wetted on all places*."

The Greek is: baptized in water, i. e., standing in water, ἵδων τὸ

σωμα βρέχων, *wetting the whole body*—or, if you please, “immersed in water,” etc., but note the next. Why thus be *in* the water while baptized? He gives the reason: He absorbs more of the efficacy of the Spirit, “while he who **SIMPLY RECEIVES** the water (*i. e.*, is *sprinkled* or *poured*), is not *wholly*, *ὕγρηνόμενον* (*hugrainomenou*), water sprinkled—sprinkled with the water *on all parts*.” The word is compounded of *ὕγρος*, *i. e.*, *ὕδωρ*, water, and *ραίνω*, to sprinkle.

Again, page 106, he quotes Chrysostom, the learned Greek of the fourth century: “Chrysost. in Epist. ad 1 Cor. Hom. XL. 1. (*ed. Montf. vol. x. p. 379.*) Τὸ γὰρ βαπτίζεσθαι καὶ καταδύεσθαι, εἴ-τα ἀναδενεῖν, τῆς εἰς ὕδωρ καταβασεως ἐστὶ συμβολὸν καὶ τῆς ἐκείθεν ἀνόδου” For to be **IMMERSED**, and to *sink* down, then to *emerge*—*baptidzesthai kai kataduesthai eita anadeuein*. Now, here, to hide the truth, C. renders the Greek word *immerse*—*kataduo*—by *sink*, the English of *immerse*, and the *baptize* he renders into the *Latin* of *sink*—*immerse*! Literally, the Greek runs: “For to be *baptized*, and to be *immersed*, then to *emerge*, is a symbol,” etc., p. 104. “For as he who sinks *εὐδύειν*, down in the waters, and is **IMMERSED**, is surrounded on all sides by the waters,” etc., Conant’s rendering. The Greek is: “For as he who is *immersed in the waters*, *ἐνδύνων ἐν τοῖς ὕδασι καὶ βαπτίζομενος*, and is *baptized*,” etc. That is, *the immersion* is separate from the *baptism*. 120–21, “Et ter immergitur.” And thrice immersed (only) *one* sacrament—baptism. Did it take *three* immersions to make *one* immersion? Are *three* immersions only *one* immersion? They are, if Conant, Carson, Campbell, and Mr. Wilkes are right. Here those ancient Greek writers admit that baptism may be performed by affusion, and the only difference made between immersion and affusion, is the belief that immersion has more of the Spirit, as the Spirit brooded over the water in the time of the creation, and therefore they believed that those who were immersed, got more of its virtue of the Spirit, than those who are sprinkled, and are not wet all over; but its value is equally admitted.

I read from Tertullian of the second century, vol. i, “De Baptismo,” translated and edited in Scotland, by Drs. Alexander Roberts and Donaldson, p. 232: “So that from the very fact, that with great simplicity, without pomp, without any considerable novelty of preparation, finally, without expense, a man is dipped in water [here he is *immersed* in the water, preparatory to baptism], and amid the utterance of some few words, is *sprinkled*, and then rises again,” etc. Tertullian says, “How mighty is the grace of water!” “All waters,

therefore, . . . do, after invocation of God, attain the sacramental power of sanctification. . . They *imbibe*, at the same time, the power of sanctifying."—Ch. iv, *ibid.* Yet says Tertullian, "Not that I deny that the divine benefit . . . is, in every way, sure to such as are on the point of *entering the [baptismal] water*; but what we have to labor for is, that it may be granted us to attain that blessing; *for who will grant to you, a man of so faithless repentance, one single SPRINKLING of the water whatever?*"—Of repentance, ch. vi, 267. Hence, "De Baptismo," ch. xii, p. 246, he says, when meeting the argument urged that the apostles were not baptized, and, therefore, it was indifferent: "Others make the suggestion—forced enough, clearly—'that the apostles then served the term of baptism when, in their little ship, they were SPRINKLED and covered with the waves; that Peter himself also was *immersed* enough when he *walked on the sea.*' It is, however, as I think, one thing *to be sprinkled* [as were the eleven], or *intercepted* by the violence of the sea [as was Peter]; another thing *to be baptized in obedience to the discipline of religion.* . . . Now, whether they were baptized in any manner whatever, or whether they continued unwashed to the end—*illoti*," etc. 1. Here, though they "*enter the baptismal water,*" yet they are baptized by sprinkling. 2. He grants that if the sprinkling the eleven had, and the partial sinking of Peter, had been *sought*, had been desired on their part, it would have been baptism; all it wanted was the concurrence of their minds. 3. Sprinkling is equivalent to *lavo*—wash; unsprinkled—*illoti*—unwashed.

All this is further confirmed by the ancient pictures engraven in the statuary of the churches of the fourth to the tenth centuries. In the ruins of old churches many representations of baptism are given, and especially of our Savior. It is always represented as an affusion—the water being poured on his head by John. In some, he is represented as standing in the water; in others, as standing near by the river, and John is pouring the water on his head. Mr. A. Campbell gives an account of these, dating his earliest A. D. 401. Dr. Ed. Robinson has shown in his "Biblical Researches in Palestine," ii, 182; iii, 78, that the baptismal fonts dug up from the ancient ruins of Tekoa and Gophna, going back to very ancient times, are not large enough to immerse grown persons in them at all; yet these were the baptisteries in which they stood to receive baptism.

I now give the facts of an important argument that has been greatly abused—Origen's baptism of the altar, 1 Kings xviii: 31–35, 38:

“And Elijah took twelve stones, according to the number of the twelve tribes of the sons of Jacob, unto whom the word of the Lord came, saying, Israel shall be thy name: and with the stones he built an altar in the name of the Lord; and he made a trench about the altar, as great as would contain two measures of seed. And he put the wood in order, and cut the bullock in pieces, and laid him on the wood, and said, Fill four barrels with water, and pour it on the burnt sacrifice, and on the wood. And he said, Do it the second time. And they did it the second time. And he said, Do it the third time. And they did it the third time. And the water ran round about the altar; and he filled the trench also with water. . . . Then the fire of the Lord fell, and consumed the burnt sacrifice, and the wood, and the stones, and the dust, and licked up the water that was in the trench.”

Now, Origen, born A. D. 185, the most learned and profound of all the Greek fathers, commenting on John i: 24, shows why Christ did not baptize, and says, “How came you to think that Elias, when he should come, would baptize?—οὐδε τὰ ἐπὶ θυσιαστήριον ξύλα, κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ Αχαὰβ χρόνους, δέδιμνα λουτροῦ ἵνα εκκαυθη ἐμφανέντος ἐν πυρὶ, τοῦ κυρίου, βαπτισαντος— who did not baptize the wood upon the altar in the days of Ahab, although it needed purification or cleansing (*deomena loutrou*) in order that it might be burned when the Lord should be revealed by fire; for this was ordered to be done by the priests.”

To the same effect speaks St. Basil, A. D. 310: “Elias showed the power of baptism on the altar, having consumed the victim, not by fire, but by water . . . when the water . . . was for the third time poured on the altar, the fire began. . . . The Scripture hereby shows that through baptism he that,” etc. So write several other fathers.

Now, notice, 1. It was the wood upon the altar Origen speaks of as being baptized. 2. He says the priests did the baptizing, not Elias. 3. How did the priests baptize the altar? The passage, 1 Kings xviii: 33, says they “poured it on the burnt sacrifice and on the wood.” The water was poured on the wood. Origen says they baptized the wood upon the altar. Now, where is the dip? Did they dip the wood into the “barrels of water?” Did they plunge the wood into the poured water? Where is the immerse? But Mr. A. Campbell, following Carson, etc., suggests that twelve barrels of water overwhelmed the altar—submerged “as it were” the altar. But where is the dip, the plunge, the immerse, even if that were true, though it is utterly untrue and monstrous?

Now, let us examine the neglected facts of this case, which Rice and our writers failed to note. 1. What is known now as a barrel was unknown in that age of the world. 2. It was in the long drought,

when water was scarce—on the top of Carmel. 3. An altar was built of *stone* first, on the top of the mountain. Timbers were placed on the altar of stones. An ox was laid on the timbers. How could even twelve barrels, only *four* of which were poured on at a time, when they stopped to fill them from where they could get it, overwhelm to submergence such a mass on such a place? 4. כַּדִּים (*kadim*) never means barrels in the world. It is plural of כַּד (*kad*). (1.) It is not defined barrel by any Hebrew lexicon I ever saw. (2.) It is not translated barrel in any I ever saw, except our English versions. The Septuagint has it ἰδρύας ἰδύρας—water-pot, pail, bucket. Gesenius, Fürst, all lexicons define it “*bucket, pail, both for drawing water and carrying it.*”—Gesenius. (3.) It is only rendered barrel in one other place in the Bible, 1 Kings xvii: 12, 14, 16, where the woman had her hand full of meal hid. It was no barrel. It is rendered pitcher in all other places, as you will find in Ecces. xii: 6, “pitcher be broken at the fountain;” Gen. xxiv: 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 43, 45, 46, where Rebekah draws water out of the well with one; Judges vii: 16, 19, 20. These are its only occurrences in the Bible. 5. The little trench dug around the altar had to be filled with extra water, v. 35. Had the altar been so overwhelmed, it would have filled the little trench. It held סַבִּיב (*shabiv*), one and a half peck measure. 6. *Dust* was found beneath the altar after the water was poured on. The fire licked up the very dust—עָפָר (*aphar*), “*dust, dry earth;*” Gen. ii: 7; xxvi: 15; *fine dust*, Ps. xviii: 43; Josh. viii: 6; Joel ii: 12, etc. Yet A. Campbell urges, “*Debate,*” 164, that “*immersion of the altar and the offering too,*” was “*the effect*” of pouring “*twelve barrels of water upon the altar and filling the trench.*” He pretends that the overflowing water filled the trench! What became of the *dust*? How came it to still remain *dust*? Here, then, the pouring of four pitchers of water on the wood upon the altar Origen calls *baptizing the wood*, not the altar. Basil calls it *baptizing the altar*—“*when the water was for the third time poured out on the altar.*” The other fathers call it *baptism* also, especially Gregory Nazianzen, who gives the true idea of the Hebrew text, and verifies a discovery I made long since, and used in all my *debates* since 1865, though but recently I saw his confirmation of my view. He shows that the water was “*cast (poured) over it from water-pots.*” He calls that *baptizing the altar*. Such are the facts—how will he evade them?

[*Time expired.*]

MR. WILKES' TENTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My friend says that I have already come to the Jordan, and he notifies you that he will not be there until to-morrow. I have heard a little story like this: "Jordan is a hard road to travel." I suppose that is the reason my friend is *slow* in getting to the Jordan. It is where our Lord was baptized, and where John was baptizing. I supposed that would be a very good place to go in order to examine this question. But my friend says he will not go to the Jordan until the last day of this discussion.

He tries very hard to prove that *mergo*, *immergo*, *demergo*, *enduno*, and *katauno* mean to sink. I believe him. I will save him trouble on that subject by telling him that I know that these words mean to sink, or that they include that idea. I understood him, however, that they do *not* mean to *immerse*, or include that idea. If he meant that, I take issue with him. He asks, "Why was not *enduno* or *katauno* used by the Savior if immersion or sinking was meant?" The Savior knows best about that. He employed *baptizo* instead of either of those words, and besides, these words require or imply the idea of submergence, as I have said.

My friend is very hard on Dr. Conant and on Mr. Campbell. I would like to know how *he* would render *baptizo*. What does *he* say the current meaning of *baptizo* is? I ask him now, and will let him answer in his next speech, What is the *current* and *ordinary* meaning of the word *baptizo*? What meaning would he give it in some prominent passage in the New Testament where the *rite of baptism* is spoken of? *He will never answer that question!* This road will be as hard to travel as the Jordan road. What is the current meaning of *baptizo*? To sprinkle? To pour? Will he say so? What is the meaning of *baptizo* in some prominent passage of the New Testament where the rite of baptism is spoken of, or where it is said to have been performed? Will he answer? Never, "in the *whole* world," I think. I

remark that the idea of action is in the word *baptizo*, but *only so far as* action is necessary to a state of submergence, or burial, as Paul calls baptism. Action, either of the baptizer or the baptized, does not necessarily belong to the word, yet it is always present, and is always employed in the use of the word in the New Testament; but even there it is necessary, only that the party may be brought into a state of submergence. As Paul says of baptism, in Romans, sixth chapter, it is a burial. Neither is it necessary to determine, in order to feel sure that we have a baptism or an immersion, whether that which is immersed *comes up* or not. It is immersed; it is baptized, whether it rises or not. But, from its *use in the New Testament*, we learn that, as Paul in writing to the Colossians says, we are buried with Christ in baptism, wherein "we are risen with *him*." And then, in the baptism of the eunuch, we have it stated that he, being baptized, came "up out of the water." And in the baptism of the Savior it is stated that *HE* was baptized *into* the river Jordan, and that he *came up out of the water*. The Bible makes ample provision for bringing out of the water those who have been baptized. As Dr. Conant says, the bringing up out of the water is not necessarily implied in the meaning of the word.

My friend has come to the pictures at last. I used to feel very proud, when a boy, when I had gotten as far as the pictures. My friend intimated that he had not finished his picture-and-coin argument. As he has not, I believe I will wait until he does; and then I will endeavor to show some pictures too. I will show pictures against pictures; and then I will also show that the whole thing is out of order. We will see whether or not the reporters are able to take these pictures down.

The case of Origen, who says the prophet ordered water to be *poured* upon the altar, is introduced. "It," says Mr. D., was baptism. I have a little particular talking to do here, to which I invite the special attention of my opponent. Origen, he says, calls it a baptism. Calls what? *Pouring*? No; not that. What was the baptism? Unless my brother proves that Origen calls the pouring baptism, it is not established, even according to Origen, that "the sprinkling or pouring of water upon a proper subject, by a proper administrator, is Christian baptism." Can he do that? I prophesy not. There is no evidence anywhere that the *pouring* was the baptism; none, "in the whole world." It is very much easier to throw out an objection (which my friend is continually doing) than to answer one. A

man can throw out as many objections in a speech of half an hour as can be answered in a day. Here are the facts. The prophet raised the question as to whether Jehovah was God, or whether Baal was God. He proposed to settle or determine the question in this way: He directed the false prophets to build an altar and place their victim on it, and then to pray to their God; and if their God should answer by fire, then he was the true God; and if Baal was God they were to serve him. Then, said he, *I will build an altar, and I will place a victim upon it, and I will pray to my God; and if he answers my prayer by sending down fire and consuming the offering, then Jehovah is God.* They agreed to make this test. The false prophets built their altar, and laid their victim on it, and prayed nearly all day. They prayed very long and very loud. God's prophet derided them. He told them to pray louder; that, peradventure, their god was asleep or on a journey. And they did pray loud and long; and they lacerated themselves; but yet their god did not answer by fire. Then God's prophet built his altar, and laid thereon the wood and the victim. He took pains to make the demonstration complete; therefore, he required that large quantities of water should be poured on the altar, to make it certain that there was no fire concealed there, thereby making the test a fair one, a decisive one. He required them again to pour on water—and again—until the water ran all around and filled the trench, and the altar was baptized.

I have stated that the action is not the baptism, nor is it essential to the idea of baptism, though some action is always necessary; that is, such an action as will bring the baptized party into a state of burial or submergence, as the Bible requires. Now, that altar was overwhelmed. My friend says it was on the top of a mountain, and there was nothing to confine the water around the wood. I know that; but, nevertheless, it was baptized. It is not at all uncommon for us to speak of a man or thing that is greatly wet as being overwhelmed in water; as being baptized with water. A man comes out of the rain, and we say he is *drenched*. It is a figurative use of the term, I grant, and it means an overwhelming. That altar and that victim were as drenched, or as wet, or soaked with water as a person or thing that had been literally baptized or immersed in water. This is Origen's idea. The baptism, then, did not consist in the *act* of *pouring*; but it consisted in the complete saturation or wetting of the altar of God. The *water* was *poured*. These are the facts in the case. So Origen does not preach that sprinkling or pouring is baptism.

I call your attention, briefly, to another matter, which I hope it will not be necessary to refer to again—the question of Syriac. I would not notice it at all, but as our remarks are to go to the world, I deem it necessary that we place on record such facts as will have a bearing on the point in controversy. I have in my hand a Syriac Grammar by Uhlemann, with a lexicon attached by Hutchison, printed as late as 1855. He has the word *amad*, and defines it. *Amad* is the word in the Syriac language for to baptize. He says it means “to suffer one’s self to be dipped, to suffer one’s self to be baptized.” But I will quote immediately from the work itself:

“*Amad*: To suffer one’s self to be dipped, to suffer one’s self to be baptized.”

“*Amodo*: Dipping, baptism.”—Uhlemann’s “Syriac Grammar and Lexicon,” page 359.

I will now call your attention to a remark made by Ephraim Cyrus, a native Syrian, who lived in the fourth century. He uses the word *amad* frequently with reference to Christian baptism. The connection in which it stands implies that he understood by it immersion. On page 130 of “Bible Question,” Mr. Gotch says:

“Ephraim Cyrus, who lived in the fourth century, uses the word frequently, and, as far as I have been able to discover, always in reference to Christian baptism. In many cases, the connection in which it stands, implies that he understood by it, immersion; as, for example, in a hymn in which he speaks of the Spirit and fire visible in different parts of the life of Christ: ‘Behold the fire and the Spirit in the river *in which* thou wast baptized!’ This, however, might be explained, according to Dr. Henderson’s hypothesis, of a ‘person’s taking his station at, or *in*, the water.’ The following instance, however, is explicit, and seems liable to no such exception. Speaking again of Christ, he says: ‘How wonderful is it that thy footsteps were planted on the waters; that the great sea should subject itself to thy feet; and that yet, at a small river, that same head of thine should be subject *to be bowed down and baptized in it!*’ . . . which seems to admit of no other sense than that, as the sea was placed under his feet, so his head was placed under the river.”

I have another question to ask my friend. He says he never immersed any body. But some of his brethren do; and I believe he told me once, and I think he will not deny it now, that he *would* himself immerse a person. If he would do it, I would like to know what authority he has for it? He is trying to prove to you that there is no authority for it “in the *whole* world,” and yet he would do it. Not only that, but when he does it, I suppose he lifts up his hand and says:

“In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ I baptize you.” What does he do? He immerses a party, calls it baptism, and finds a way also to raise him out of the water, I suppose; but, mark you, he does it in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Does he do that thing without feeling in his soul that he has *authority* for it from that Christ whose name he invokes? Certainly not. I can not think it. If he feels that he has authority from Christ to do that act, I wish to know what that authority is. Is it in the Bible? If so, where? Let us have that passage, and let us have from him a translation of the Greek of it into plain English, so that I may be able to put my finger upon the passage in the Scriptures that teaches the practice of immersion. He seems all the while and every-where, and always, to deny that there is any authority whatever for immersion. While he is finding that passage, I wish him to find another passage, one that gives us authority for *sprinkling*; and I want him to translate it, if he has in his soul any confidence that *sprinkling* is right, and that it is the meaning of *baptizo* in that passage. If to sprinkle is not the meaning in *any* passage, he has *no* authority for sprinkling. I want him to find the passage where he has authority for sprinkling, and let us see him translate it. *He will never do it—NEVER.*

I wish now to remark that Jesus and John preached every-where, as we read in Luke, third chapter and third verse, where it is said “he came into all the country about the Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins;” with which compare, John third chapter and twenty-second verse, if you please, where it is said Jesus “*tarried and baptized.*” The point I make is, that the preaching was done every-where; but when they went out to preach and *baptize*, they went where there was water, and there tarried. They needed water to baptize. The Savior did so in his own case, and John did also. I will examine these matters more fully as I proceed.

I now call your attention to John, third chapter and fifth verse: “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God.” I ask, does “*born of water*” here mean baptism? The answer is, Yes. As authority for that, I read from Alford. He says:

“There can be no doubt, on any honest interpretation of the words, that *γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος* refers to the token or outward sign of baptism—, *ἐκ πνεύματος* to the thing signified, or inward grace of the Holy Spirit. All attempts to get rid of these two plain facts have sprung from doctrinal prejudices, by which the views of expositors have been warped.”—Alford’s “Greek Testament,” p. 643.

That is to say, every man (and, mark you, Alford was himself on my friend's side of this controversy)—every man who interprets otherwise than that “born of water” means baptism, is brought to that conclusion by party prejudice, and not from any fair exegesis of the phrase or of the words.

Again, as proof that water baptism is meant here, I read from Dr. Wall, “History of Infant Baptism,” vol. i, p. 69 :

“And, thirdly, because we see by it, that they understood that rule of our Savior, ‘*Except one be regenerated [or born again] of water and the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God,*’ of water-baptism; and concluded from it that, without such baptism, no person could come to heaven. And so did all the writers of these four hundred years, not one man excepted.”

On the same point, I read from page 147 of the same volume :

“There is not any one Christian writer of any antiquity, in any language, but what understands it of baptism. And if it be not so understood, it is difficult to give an account how a person is born of water any more than born of wood.”

My point in this case is to show that born of water means baptism. I quote, also, Bengel, who says water baptism is meant. Stuart, on page 163, says the same thing. Barnes says by born of water is, evidently, meant baptism; and every body for centuries says the same thing. Wesley, Bloomfield, Macknight's “Harmonies,” Cyprian, the Episcopal Prayer-Book, the Methodist Discipline, the Presbyterian Confession of Faith, all agree that the phrase “born of water” means baptism. “Except a man be born of water,” that is, be baptized. Now, I ask, if “born of water” is a figurative expression for baptism, what is the literal thing? In order to understand a figure, of course we must refer to the fact. That there is an analogy between a natural birth and immersion, no one denies; but that there is any analogy, such as would justify the use of the figure, between *sprinkling* or pouring, for baptism, and a birth, no one will contend. And as the figure and the fact must correspond, in some striking particular, else the fact will not illustrate the figure, it follows that sprinkling or pouring can not be meant here; for that there is clearly an allusion to rising *out of the water* is plain to my mind; and so all the Fathers understood it.

I proceed, then, with my next proof. I turn to John, third chapter, twenty-third verse, where we have a statement that John was baptizing at Enon, near to Salim, because there was much water there.

The first fact that strikes my mind is, that the baptizing was done at Enon, near Salim, *because there was much water there*. That is a circumstance harmonizing with the practice of immersion, but altogether unnecessary to have been mentioned if the practice of sprinkling or pouring had been then in existence. It would not have been logical or accurate, if it had been the custom to sprinkle or pour, to state that the *baptizing* was done there, *because there was much water there*. For sprinkling or pouring might as well have been performed elsewhere without the presence of *much* water. The passage is inconsistent with the idea or supposition of sprinkling or pouring, and is perfectly compatible with the idea of immersion. Now, Bengel says on that verse: "Ænon—from אֵנוֹן , a fountain. . . Much—as the rite of immersion required." Alford says: "Ænon. The name אֵנוֹן is an intensive form of אֵן , a fountain, which answers to the description here given. Both places were west of the Jordan. See v. 26, and compare ch. i: 28."—Alford's "Greek Testament," p. 651.

In regard to that same passage, establishing the fact that there was *much water there*, and that the apostle who gives us this information is correct when he says the place was selected for baptizing *because there was much water there*, I will read from another authority, Dr. L. Coleman's "Historical Text-book and Atlas of Biblical Geography:"

"On Ænon. Dr. Barclay has recently discovered a remarkable assemblage of fountains and pools on the margin of the desert beyond and below the Mount of Olives, six miles north-east of Jerusalem, which seem to satisfy the conditions of the narrative, and give, at last, a fixed position to this floating, uncertain locality. In one of his excursions in the wild, rugged wilderness east of Olivet, Dr. Barclay discovered a delightful, grand, and fearful wady, shut out from all the world by rocks and precipices, which tower heavenward to 'a sublime height.' From the base of these flow many waters from different springs, which, being united, form a powerful stream, and become the head-waters of the Wady Kelt of the desert, the cherith of Elijah the prophet (1 Kings xvii: 3-6); 'and surely a more admirable place of seclusion could nowhere be found. Some of its yawning chasms are absolutely frightful to behold.' One of these springs is a syphon spring, occupying about twelve minutes in its ebb and flow, disappearing three minutes, then gushing out in a volume sufficient 'to drive several mills.' At the distance of a mile or two above are various pools, varying in depth 'from a few inches to four fathoms or more,' and 'supplied by some half dozen springs of the purest and coldest water, bursting from rocky crevices at various intervals.'"

On the same page, below, I read once more :

"One of the wadya, within a mile and a half of this place, bears the name of Salim, Shalim, Saleim, etc.; but, without insisting on this coincidence, or detailing the author's course of argument, we accept his conclusions and rest with him in an 'assured conviction that this is, indeed, no other than the Enon, near to Salim, where John was baptizing, because there was much water there.'"—Coleman's "Historical Text-book and Atlas of Biblical Geography," pp. 268, 269.

We have here, then, the confirmation, from actual observation, of the fact that there was much water there; and the divine record says that the place was selected for baptism because there was much water there—a circumstance, as I have said, entirely harmonious with, and demanded by, the idea, and on the hypothesis that immersion was practiced then; but altogether without reason if sprinkling or pouring was practiced.

Again: We have an account in the eighth chapter and thirty-eighth and thirty-ninth verses of Acts of the Apostles, of the baptism of the eunuch, which allow me to read:

"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 thy 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."

Now, let us notice these facts. It is stated that they came "upon a certain water"—*epi to hudōr*. It is also stated that they went down both, (*eis to hudōr*)—"into the water."—My friend argued, on the first chapter and fourth verse of Mark, and on the second chapter and thirty-eighth verse of Acts of the Apostles—and argued correctly—that *eis* means *into*. I hope I will be allowed to avail myself, here, of his logic and his statement.—They then both went down (*katebesan*, meaning *to go down*—"eis to hudōr" into the water). They are both in the water, are they not? They had both come *to* the water. Then they went *down into the water*. Now, they are *in* the water; and, to make the matter all the more specific and lifelike, it is said, they *both* went into the water, and then he baptized him. Then it is said, they came, *ana*, "up," *ek*, "out of," the water; which shows that they went into the water. So that, on the one side, we have them going, *kata*, down, "*eis*," into, the water; then we have the bap-

tism ; then when we have them coming, *ana*, up, *ek*, out of, the water. There is a word for coming out of, “ *ek*,” and for into, “ *eis*.” Therefore, we have circumstances and facts surrounding this case in such a manner that, if it be possible to prove that a man ever went *into the water* and came *up out of the water again*, this passage proves it. For what was this done? If not for immersion, there is no sense in the passage. All the facts in this case harmonize with the hypothesis that Philip immersed the eunuch ; but they are wholly inexplicable if the eunuch was sprinkled or poured.

MR. DITZLER'S ELEVENTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

My brother has got to Philip and the eunuch, and, therefore, he is through, and the rest of the time he must go back and repeat over again. I will attend to the case of Philip and the eunuch in due time. But in the meanwhile there is something strange in their mode of proving every thing about immersion. For example, in a land where springs were so scarce that every rill a hundred yards long, and every spring that issued forth as thick as your finger almost, had a name, and wells and good springs were valued as historic inheritances, and towns named after little springs, they find plenty of water for immersing the eunuch even in the driest and least watered of all parts of the land; find plenty of water in every Jewish house in all Judea for immersing daily, where the law of Moses required that at once the water be poured out if only touched by any one ceremoniously unclean, not to say it would be doubly so if one immersed himself in it, and the vessel was to be purified seven days ere used; I say, they have no trouble to find water in every house in Judea, and conveniences for immersion to save their cause, and plenty of deep holes, deep streams, and bathing places every-where, yet have all the land in the next breath going all the way to Jordan to get water enough with which to be immersed. Nay, the Jews daily baptized themselves, Mark vii: 4; Luke xi: 38; Ecclesiastes (Sirach) xxxi: 30; Tobit ii: 3-5. If they came from the public place, if they touched the unclean, if they touched any dead body, if they ate a meal, and various other things necessitated it, they baptized. So, to meet this, the immersionists have to have plenty of water in every house in Judea, every house in Jerusalem, or their case is ruined. Then, if they had so much water every-where, why did they go to Jordan to get enough to be immersed? There is something wrong here. Either the baptisms of the Jews were sprinklings, else John had no need of Jordan for purposes of immersion. But it is not strange that John had to go all the way to Enon

to find water enough to baptize any body. It is strange that the Jews had plenty of water to immerse all over the land, and that John had to go to a place which, for *eighteen hundred years, nobody could find until a brother of his church, Dr. Barclay, found it!* I will have fine fun on that to-morrow. But how would "I translate *baptidzo*?" I would do just like the Savior and the apostles, and all the great translators for the first fifteen hundred years of the church, did. They would use the words, "I baptize;" I would render it sprinkle, in Mark vii: 4, just as two of the best manuscripts in the whole world have rendered it. The Sinaiticus and the Vatican, two of the oldest and best copies of the Greek New Testament on earth, he himself being judge, both have, in Mark vii: 4, *rantizontai*, sprinkle. Then we have nine manuscripts, two of the best in the world, and Euthymius, that have translated the Greek copies of the New Testament *baptizontai*, by *rantizontai*, to sprinkle. Now the brother admits, in his last speech, that the classic Greek does not prove the Bible meaning of *baptidzo*, and is compelled, therefore, to go to Colossians ii: 12; Romans vi: 3, 4, and many other places, to show its meaning in the Bible. Now, what becomes of all the array of Greek lexicons he has brought up here for two days? Why, he has turned back on his own record, and throws away all the Greek he paraded here for two days. I knew he would have to do it, and, therefore, paid but little attention to it. I would not waste time with it.

But the pictures. Those pictures are troublesome. They seemed to give Mr. Campbell a little trouble. To show you their importance I will read you what Mr. Campbell says on the picture subject, on page 419, 420, "Cb. Baptism:"

"But, besides the argument in favor of infant baptism, deduced from the family baptisms alluded to, we have no less than twelve pictures on the subject, collected from the vestibules and domes of the Greek and Roman Catholic churches. The first is that of the baptism of Christ, placed at the entrance of the great church at Pisa. Pisan tradition says this marble ornament was carried from Jerusalem by the Crusaders, about the commencement of the twelfth century. The Baptist stands with his hand upon the Savior's head. The second is the baptism of the same subject in Jordan, taken from the church on the Via Ostiensis at Rome. The door which it covers is dated 1070. The third is from the door of the church at Beneventum, in Italy. Here Jesus is standing in a bath up to the middle, and the Baptist is pouring water on his head. The fourth is that of Jesus standing in the Jordan, with the Baptist pouring water, in streams, on his head. There is a centerpiece in the dome of the baptistery at Ravenna, A. D. 454. Here the Baptist stands on the bank of the river, pouring

water out of a shell on the Savior's head. Over his head is a crown of glory, and a dove, personating the Holy Spirit, descending from heaven to his person. The fifth is a representation, in Mosaic, of the Savior's baptism in Jordan. Here, again, a *patera*, or a shell, is employed in pouring water on his person. This stands in the church in Cosmedin, at Ravenna, erected A. D. 401. The sixth is a representation of a bath, or baptismal font, standing in the baptistery of Constantine, in Rome, near the Lateran. This is too shallow for immersion. The seventh argument is the baptism of a heathen king and queen, in a family bath at Chigi, near Naples, with a priest standing as if taking aim at the king's head, with a pitcher in his hand, A. D. 591. The eighth proof is that of a kneeling candidate, with a priest holding a vase, or pitcher, at his head. He seems to be on the dry ground. The ninth is that of a boy, unclothed, receiving a stream from a pitcher. This is found in Rome, though the work of a Greek artist. The tenth is Laurentius, in the church of St. Lawrence, in Rome, or near it—*extra muros*—receiving a stream from a vase. The eleventh, that of Constantine the Great, Emperor of Rome, being immersed in a bath; but also receiving a stream of oil or water falling upon his head from a vial, held by a long-robed priest. The twelfth is that of Jesus Christ, baptized by John in the Jordan, standing on the bank, with one hand on or near to his head."

Now, how does Mr. Campbell meet all this? Here is his reply. I will read the whole paragraph:

"In the next place statuaries, sculptors, and painters are always fond of *catering to public taste and fashion*, and will make to order any number of marble or other ornaments, just as Mr. Sartain, in his pictorial magazine, or as printers do in the family Bible—make such representations of angels, men, and costumes, as will command the highest admiration, secure the largest sale, and the most liberal price."—P. 420.

Now let me ask—How on earth could those sculptors, artists, painters, etc., "*cater to the public taste*" and secure the "highest admiration," etc., etc., if the whole public and private taste and fashion then was *immersion* in their sense of immerse? A child can detect the sophistry. In the same volume, pages 191, 197, 200, Mr. Campbell tries to prove, and asserts over and over again, that during *all* the ages that he acknowledges these representations were made in, practiced nothing but immersion save in a few cases of dying and sick persons! East, west, north, and south, "the whole world immersed, with these few exceptions, for thirteen hundred years."—P. 200. Yet he turns right round, and, to destroy the force of these "pictures," urges that when all artists in those centuries represented baptism as an affusion of water on the persons, they were "*catering to public taste and fashion.*" Yet that is as consistent as any argument he ever made.

But the altar. He says they poured on the water till it ran around and filled the trench. *That is Mr. Wilkes.* Now, I will read from the *Bible*, "And the water ran round about the altar; and HE FILLED THE TRENCH ALSO WITH WATER." Now, had the water been as abundant as he says, it would have of itself filled the little trench. Yet they had to pour in *extra* water to fill up the trench. The Bible says he poured the water on the wood and on the victim also; and Origen says it baptized the wood upon the altar. So says Basil also. There was no dipping, no immersion, no overwhelming, no plunging. The word in the Hebrew is not a barrel. The truth is, such a thing as we call a *barrel* was unknown in those days. There is no word in that language to correspond with it. The word is always rendered pitcher, and כַּד (*kad*), every-where except in this one case and one other—where the measure of meal was hid in the harrel. The pitcher with which Rebekah drew the water out of the well is expressed by the same word. Then there was simply twelve pitchers of water poured upon the wood and the sacrifice. There was an altar built of stone, on the top of a mountain, timbers laid upon the stone, and a bullock divided and laid upon them; and then the water was poured upon the victim and upon the wood. Twelve pitchers of water could not submerge or overwhelm this altar; yet the fathers speak of it as a baptism, and Origen is especially clear on the subject.

But he now takes up the Syriac. By the help of his brethren he has introduced Uhlemaun's excellent grammar. For twelve years I have studied it. *Hutchison* has attached a primer to it as an appendix to aid beginners, with a little glossary defining a few words found in the brief lessons. The idea of introducing that little *Appendix* to Uhlemaun's Grammar as *Uhlemaun's*, is rich. There is no Syriac lexicon in the world that so renders it. They give it *immergo* in the *Aphel* form, and there *baptidzo* does not occur, as I have shown you. Yet he would quote that primer appendix to show you the meaning of a word that he is here to discuss. Then he read a passage from the Syriac, a hymn of Ephraim Cyrus, which I will also translate. I give you now Gotch's translation of it: "And that yet at a small river that same head of thine should be subjected to be bowed down and baptized in it." I will give you the original, as this is the only thing a Gotch could get up on *amad* as affording any hope: *Rishoch hevo dherreken vamad bheh le nahro yavero yeshthabhad*—And that yet at a small river that same head of thine should bow in subjection to be

baptized by it. Literally, should subject itself to bow and be baptized by it, *i. e.*, with its waters. Notice, 1. He was baptized *at the river*—*le, AT, nahro*, the river—not *in* it. This phrase *never* means *in the river*. Had it been *possible* to force that on it, Gotch would have done so. 2. As *he* was not in the river, his *head* could not be immersed in it unless *he* was in the river. 3. If his *body* was *immersed*, why only speak of his *head* as being subjected to the water and baptized? 4. The point is, that as the waters of the *sea* were quelled, stilled, and settled down—the uplifted waves sank down, as it is poetic language, a hymn—and submitted to be trodden on by Christ's *feet*, so now *he* bows his head in meek submission to the water of a small, insignificant stream. He allows it to be poured upon *his* head. It is decidedly against immersion. It settles the point that they believed he was baptized *not in the water*, but *at the river*, the water poured on his *head*. Give me a little more of Gotch's Syriac, Brother Wilkes.

I now proceed to give further illustrations from the early fathers.

AMBROSE: To the baptized he said, "Concerning which [white robes of innocence] the prophet said, 'Thou shalt sprinkle me with hyssop, and I shall be cleansed. Thou shalt *wash* me (by sprinkling), and I shall be whiter than snow—*adsperges—lavabis*.' *Qui enim BAPTIZATUR, et secundum legem*—For he who is *baptized*, both according to the law and according to the gospel is made clean; according to the law, because Moses, with a bunch of hyssop—*adspergebat sanguinem agni—sprinkled* the blood of the lamb." In this case, sprinkling the blood of the lamb was the *only* act. Again: "Unde sit *baptisma* nisi de cruce Christi?" (Vol. i, 356.)

TERTULLIAN: "These two baptisms (*duo baptismus*) he poured forth from the wounds of his pierced side." (357, Paris, 1634.)

ORIGEN, on Luke xii: 50, "For Christ shed his blood for our redemption. . . For it is the baptism of blood alone—*baptisma enim sanguinis*—which renders us more pure than the baptism of water (*b. a.*) . . . I have a baptism," etc. You see, therefore, that he calls *the shedding of his blood* baptism—*profusionem sanguinis sui baptismum nominavit*.

AMBROSE, fourth century, says: "Multa sunt genera baptismata, sed unum baptismum clamat Apostolus. Quare? Sunt baptismata Gentium, sed non sunt baptismata. Lavaera sunt, baptismata esse non possunt. Caro (the body) lavatur, non culpa diluitur, inno (nay) in illo lavaero contrahitur. Erunt autem baptismata Judæorum, alia

(*sum*) *superflua*, alia in figura (typical).—There are many kinds of baptisms; but the apostle says there is (hut) one baptism. Wherefore? There are baptisms of the Gentiles, but they are not baptisms. Washings they are, baptisms they can not be. The body (flesh) is washed (it is true), but guilt is not removed. Nay, it is thereby contracted. But there are baptisms of the Jews, some superfluous, others typical.”

CYRIL, of Alexandria, on Isa. iv: 4, “When the Lord shall have washed away the filth,” etc., says: “Βεβαπτισμεθα μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἐν ὕδατι γυμῶ, ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ σπόδῳ δαμάλεως ἐρραντισμεθα κ. τ. λ.—For we have not been baptized with mere water, neither indeed have we been sprinkled with the ashes of an heifer for the purifying of the flesh alone, as the blessed Paul says; but with the Holy Spirit, and with a divine and mentally discerned fire, destroying the filth (*βύρους*) of the violence within us, and consuming away the pollution of sin.”

CYPRIAN, in ten or twelve different letters before me, reiterates that “those who come to us from the heretics are not *rebaptized*, but baptized.” He denied that a heretic *could* baptize.

LACTANTIUS, 325, says: “Sic etiam gentes baptismo, id est, purificet roris *perfusione* salvaret—So likewise he might save the Gentiles by baptism, that is, by the sprinkling of the purifying water.”

The learned Jerome says, on Ezekiel xxxvi: 25, “So that upon those that believe and are converted from error, I might pour out the clear water of baptism.”

The Centuraters tell of a font “out of which *baptizato aqua super-fusa*—the water is poured upon those to be baptized;” that this baptism, where the Spirit is operative in it, is superior to either the mere washing with water or sprinkling with the ashes of the heifer—both are baptisms contrasted with Christian.

CYRIL also considers (on Isaiah i: 16) Lev. viii: 6, 7, baptism, where it is “*sprinkle water*,” etc.

AMBROSE: Unce sit baptismum nisi de cruce Christi? (i: 356).

TERTULLIAN: “These two baptisms—*duo baptismus*—he poured forth from the wound of his pierced side.”—Paris ed., 1634, p. 35-37.

JOHN OF DAMASCUS: τὸ βάπτισμα δι’ αἵματος καὶ μαρτυρίου ὃ καὶ ὁ χριστὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐβάπτισατο. The baptism of blood and martyrdom, by which Christ suffered himself to be baptized for us.

ORIGEN and ATHENASIUS, the same.

ORIGEN on Luke xii: 50: “For Christ shed his blood,” etc. For it is the baptism of blood alone that renders us more pure than the baptism of water—*baptisma aquæ*. “I have a baptism,” etc. You

see, therefore, that he called *the shedding of his blood* baptism—*profusionem sanguinis sui baptismá nominavit*.

“So that he, expecting to die, asked to receive the water baptism. And he baptized him by sprinkling in the couch where he lay—*ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ κλίνῃ ἣ ἐκεῖτο περιχέθεντα δῆθεν ἐβάπτισεν*.—Ruth's Reliquia, Sacrae, iii, 489, Nicopheros.

AMBROSE baptized Theodosius the Great on his death-bed.

HILARIUS: *There are not wanting daily sick persons who are to be baptized.*

The Præter Ariontheus was baptized on his death-bed, Basil concurring.

CLODOSIUS, king of the Franks, 499, was baptized by sprinkling.

GENNADIUS, 490, said the person to be baptized was—*vel adspersitur, vel intingitur*—either sprinkled or dipped.

The Copts and Abyssinians baptize by sprinkling or pouring on the persons, who stand or kneel in water.

The Monophysites (fifth century) and Nestorians or Chaldeans baptize by pouring the water three times on them.

Ἐί τις ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος μὴ τρία βαπτίσματα μιᾶς μῆσεως ἐπετελέσῃ ἀλλὰ ἐν βάπτισμα εἰς τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου δίδωμεν, κακαίρεισθω. Apostolic Canon.—If any bishop or presbyter shall not perform three immersions (*baptismata*) in one initiation (or rite), but one given baptism into the death of the Lord, let him be deposed.

ZONARES (twelfth century), to keep people from misunderstanding this, deemed a note necessary to explain that *here βαπτίσματα* was not used in the *ordinary* sense, but as equivalent to *καταδύσεις*—*immersions*, and *μῆσαι*—the *rite* as a *whole*, whereas *βάπτισμα* ordinarily expresses the *rite*—*τρία βαπτίσματα ἐνταῦθα τὰς τρεῖς καταδύσεις φασὶν ὁ κανὼν ἐν μιᾷ μῆσει, ἦτοι ἐν ἐνὶ βαπτισματι—tria baptismata*—the Canon here means *three immersions* in one initiation, that is, *in one baptism*. Now, had *baptisma* been ordinarily *immersion*, why should the learned Greek tell us: 1st. That *in this place* it *did* mean immersion? 2d. How could he say *three immersions* are only *one* immersion?

THEOPHYLACT: *βάπτισμα ὡπερ διὰ τῆς καταδύσεως θάνατον οἶτω . . . τυκοῖ*.—As baptism by immersion shows forth the death of Christ. Again, *ἐν τρισὶ καταδύσει τοῦ σώματος ἐν βαπτισμα*—by these immersions of the body he gave one baptism to his disciples, etc.

BALSAMON deemed this worthy of explanation: *τὰ δὲ βαπτίσματα ἐνταῦθα ἀντὶ καταδύσεων ὑποληπτέον μοι*—“to me it seems baptisms are here taken for *immersions*.” Here again *baptismata* are to be understood as equivalent

to *kataduseis*—immersions. It is, in both instances, put in the plural form, *baptismata*—not *baptisma*, baptism.

I now come to the baptism of the celebrated Novatian, about A. D. 251, given in Eusebius' "Ecclesiastical History," book vi, ch. xliii, p. 401, § 15: "Recensuit Edwardus Burton, Oxonii," etc., 1838, vol. i: "ὡς γε ἀφορμὴ τοῦ πιστεῦσαι γέγονεν ὁ σατανᾶς, φοιτήσας εἰς αὐτὸν καὶ οἰκῆσας ἐν αὐτῷ χρόνον ἰκανόν. ὃς βοηθούμενος ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπορκιστῶν, νόσῳ περιπεσὼν λατρεῖν, καὶ ἀποθεῖσθαι ὅσον οὐδέπω νομιζόμενος, ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ κλίνῃ ἣ ἴκειτο, περιχυθεὶς ἐλάβεν εἰ γε χρὴ λέγειν τὸν τοιοῦτον αἰληθέναι.—To him, indeed, the origin (or author) of his profession (*pisteusai*) was Satan, who entered into and dwelt in him a long time; who, being assisted by the exorcists, while attacked with an obstinate disease, and being supposed at the point of death, received it [baptism] in the bed on which he lay, by being sprinkled—if, indeed, it be proper (*chræ*) to say that (*ton toiouton*) such [a wicked] person received baptism."

Now, note carefully: 1. No doubt is thrown on the *mode* of his baptism. "He received it"—*elaben*. 2. It was by sprinkling. 3. When he recovered they never *rebaptized* him at all. Had any doubt existed as to the *mode*, they would have rebaptized him on recovery. 4. If baptism is *immersion*, how could they say "he received IMMERSION by being SPRINKLED?" Even were we to violate all grammar and the history of the case, and say doubt was expressed, as immersionists have claimed by garbling the language and *suppressing the main part*, yet it leaves them in ruins still, for, we ask, *how* could they say "he received *immersion* by being *sprinkled* in the bed on which he lay?" That you may see how they quote this, I will quote W. Scott's "Evangelist," vol. i, p. 226. He was one of the originators of the so-called reformation: "He received baptism, being sprinkled with water on the bed where he lay, if that can be called baptism." Here a man claiming to be a reformer deliberately suppresses part of the language, garbles the rest, mistranslates the rest, changes both the Greek and English punctuation, all to serve a purpose.

A. Campbell is no better. Here is his version of it—"Christian Baptism," 1853, p. 189

"And with whom should we more naturally commence than with the father of ecclesiastical historians, Eusebius himself?

"Novatus, being relieved thereof by the exorcists, fell into a grievous distemper; and, it being supposed that he would die immediately, he received *baptism*, being besprinkled with water on the bed whereon he lay (if that can be termed baptism); neither when he had escaped that sickness did he afterward receive

the other things which the canon of the church enjoineth should be received; nor was he sealed by the bishop's imposition of hands, which, if he never received, how did he receive the Holy Ghost?"

Here he makes it *the baptism*—i. e., its *mode*, that is put in doubt by the words *χρῆ λέγειν τὸν τοιοῦτον*, etc., if it be proper to say that *such a person*—referring to his being aided by the devil, etc., just narrated—*received* it! Did ever any man so pervert facts, and grammar, and lexicography, and history? But Campbell tries his hand again. In same book, page 191, two pages after the other, he says:

"Novatian, as before shown in the histories quoted, *had water poured all over him in a bed*. This happened not earlier than A. D. 251, probably 253. (Eusebius, p. 114.) About eighty years after this time, when other sick and feeble persons were preferring this method introduced by Novatian, so far as all authentic records inform us, a decree was issued, called 'The Twelfth Canon of the Council of Neocæsarea,' against such pourings, inhibiting persons so poured upon from any participation in the honors of the ministry or priesthood."

Now, in one place he was *sprinkled*, says Mr. C.; two pages on he changes it to pouring all over him, though there is not a word in all the history of the world about it, save in such modern works as these. He takes that from the same record just given. But my brother adopts this same view—did in a former debate. Now, he was baptized by sprinkling, on his bed, *because* he was *sick*. Would it be *healthier* to pour water all over him, so as to be almost an immersion, and answer for immersion, and let him lay there and—well, I forgot; they define βαπτίζω, by "*to soak thoroughly*" ("Ch. Baptism," 124.) Commend me to such physicians, who think it safer to deluge a sick man in his bed, and leave him "*soaking*" there a week, rather than immerse, rub him dry, and put him back in bed; yet such is immersion logic. Now, all this is taken from such miserable perverters as Robinson, the Baptist historian. It is wholly untrue that that Neocæsarean Council prohibited their orders *because* of the *sprinkling*, but because that, coming to repentance on supposed *dying beds*, they believed their repentance was not a settled principle, nor their faith. Hence, here is the decree:

"The Council of Neocæsarea, which met some eighty years after Cyprian and the council of sixty-six bishops had declared their belief, that baptism by sprinkling or pouring is valid and scriptural, uses the following language:

"He that is baptized when he is sick, ought not to be made a priest (*for his coming to the faith is not voluntary, but from necessity*), unless his diligence and faith do prove commendable, or the scarcity of men fit for the office do require it."

Now, here it is perfectly clear what is the real and *only* point raised in those Councils. Yet, immersionists have published and proclaimed over all the land just the reverse, viz., that it was *the mode of their baptism* that was questioned. Such an abuse of facts is simply monstrous. Why, had it been the *mode* that was in question, could they—would they not have decreed that it was *not* baptism? Would they not have *rebaptized* them, as heretics rebaptized, *but always by the same mode as their enemies*, those who came from orthodox parties to them? And yet, such are the props and resorts of my brother's party.

I now read from Clemens Alexandrinus, A. D. 190, a Greek father of great eminence :

“Αγνεΐα δὲ ἐστὶ φηρνεῖν ὄσια· καὶ δὴ καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἶη ἂν καὶ ἡ ἐκ Μωϋσεως παραδεδομένη τοῖς ποιηταῖς ὡσὲ πως.

“ Η (ἡ) δ' ὑδρηναμένη καθαρά χροὶ εἶματ' ἔχουσα. (Odys. iv, 757.)

“ Η (ἡ) Πηνελόπη τὴν εὐχην ἔρχεται.

“ Τηλέμαχος δέ, . . .

“ Χεῖρας νυφάμενος πολίης ἄλος, εὐχετ' Ἀθήνη. (Odys. ii, 261.)

“ Ἔθος τοῦτο Ἰουδαίων, ὡς καὶ τὸ πολλὰρις ἐπὶ καίτῃ βαπτίζεται.

“ Ἴοθι μὴ λουτρῶ, ἀλλὰ νόφ καθαρός.”—Clemens Alex., i, 1352.

I will translate this important passage literally, by the most rigid rules of the Greek: “But purity is to think purely. And, indeed, that may be (considered) the image of baptism (*eikōn*, image, not *σύμβολον*, a symbol), which was handed down from Moses (taken out of the law of Moses), to the poets, thus: ‘Having *besprinkled* herself with water, having on her body clean garments (Odyssey of Homer, iv, 759), Penelope comes to prayer.’ ‘But Telemachus, . . . having washed *his hands* at the hoary sea (genitive case without preposition), prays to Minerva.’ *This custom* (not *νόμος*, law, but *custom—ethos—practice*), of the Jews, as they also often baptize themselves upon a couch, is well expressed, also, on this wise, *καὶ ἐκεῖνα*, in this manner: ‘Be pure, not by washing, but by thinking.’” Now, notice:

1. Clemens held that self sprinkling was the likeness or similitude of the Mosaic baptism; *υδρηναμένη*, is compounded of *ὕδωρ*, water, and *ραῖνω*, *raino*, to sprinkle. Liddell & Scott define it, “To pour water over one's body, to water, to sprinkle with water.”

2. Washing the hands at the sea—with water from the sea—is an image of it.

3. “This custom of the Jews, as they often baptize upon a couch,

is, in truth, well thus expressed: 'Be pure, not in respect to washing, but in respect to your mind—thinking.'" Penelope sprinkled herself with her clothes on.

4. *Νίπτω*, wash hands, *παίω*, sprinkle, *λούω*, wash, and *βαπτίζω*, baptize, are all interchanged as equivalents. These are facts that he can not evade. On the couch—*ἐπὶ κλίβῳ*—is dative case, and can not have any foreign meaning.

I now quote Sozomen's "Ecclesiastical History, ch. xxvi, pp. 282, 283, 284:

"CHAP. XXVI.—EUNOMIUS AND AETIUS, THEIR LIFE AND DOCTRINES.
OPINIONS FIRST BROACHED BY THEM CONCERNING THE RITE OF BAPTISM.

"About this time, Eunomius, who had succeeded Eleusius in the hishopric of Cyzicus, and who presided over the Arians, devised another heresy, which some have called by his name, but which is sometimes denominated the Eunomian heresy. Some assert that Eunomius was the first who ventured to maintain that baptism ought to be performed by immersion, and to corrupt, in this manner, the apostolical tradition which has been carefully handed down to the present day. He introduced, it is said, a mode of discipline contrary to that of the church, and endeavored to disguise the *innovation* under the cloak of a grave and severe deportment. He was very eloquent, and delighted in disputations and conferences. The generality of those who entertain his sentiments have the same predilections. They do not applaud a virtuous course of life and conduct, or charity toward the needy, *unless exhibited by persons of their own sect, so much as skill in DISPUTATION, and the power of triumphing in debate over the arguments of an opponent.* Persons possessed of *these* accomplishments are accounted religious and virtuous. Others assert, I believe, with greater appearance of probability, that Theophranes, a native of Cappadocia, and Eutychus, both zealous propagators of this heresy, seceded from communion with Eunomius during the succeeding reign, and introduced *heretical doctrines* concerning the rite of baptism: they taught that baptism ought not to administered in the name of the Trinity, but in the name of the death of Christ.

"But whether it was Eunomius, or any other person, who first introduced heretical opinions concerning baptism, it seems to me that such innovators, whoever they may have been, were alone in danger, according to their own representation, of quitting this life without having received the rite of holy baptism: for if, after having received baptism according to the ancient mode of the church, they found it impossible to re-confer it on themselves, it must be admitted that they introduced a practice to which they had not themselves submitted, and thus undertook to administer to others what had never been administered to themselves. Thus, after having laid down certain principles, according to their own fancy, without any data, they proceeded to bestow upon others what they had not themselves received. The absurdity of this assumption is mani-

fest from their own confession; for they admit that those who have not received the rite of baptism have not the power of administering it. Now, according to this opinion, those who have not received the rite of baptism in conformity with *their mode of administration*, are *unbaptized*," etc.

You can not fail here to notice *the fighting* proclivities of immersionists, in all ages.

MR. WILKES' ELEVENTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen :

I notice, first, what my friend said with regard to the baptism of Novatian. My views on this subject, and the history of the facts in the case, are on record; but, in order to refresh the minds of our hearers, and to repeat my statement, in connection with what my friend has said about the case, I read again, from the history of Mosheim, the history of Christiauity for the first three and one-fourth centuries, vol. ii, p. 62:

"It was altogether irregular and contrary to ecclesiastical rules to admit a man to the priestly office who had been baptized in bed; that is, who had been merely sprinkled, and had not been wholly immersed in water in the ancient method. For by many, and especially by the Roman Christians, the baptism of *clinics* (so they called those who, lest they should die out of the church, were baptized on a sick bed) was accounted less perfect, and, indeed, less valid, and not sufficient for the attainment of salvation."—Mosheim's "Historical Commentaries," vol. ii, p. 62.

Now, mark you, he says those who had been "*merely sprinkled,*" or "*had not been wholly immersed in water in the ancient method.*" The invalidity and the objection in that case was not to a man's being baptized when sick, but to his being "*merely sprinkled;*" and it was called clinic baptism, or sick people's baptism; a baptism *allowed by the church* in such cases, and in *such cases only*. The baptism thus performed was not regarded as *valid* by many, nor sufficient for salvation, because it was *merely sprinkling*, and was not immersion "*according to the ancient method.*" Nothing more specific or satisfactory than that is demanded, or possible.

My friend said there were three immersions for fifteen hundred years. I must admit that there were three immersions for a long time. From the time of Tertullian, commencing with the third, to about the fifteenth century, there were three immersions, from which there

was not, in many places, much variation, except in the case of sick persons and persons very delicate and not able to bear an immersion, or where there was not enough water to be found in which to be immersed. But this fact tells, in tones louder than thunder, that *immersion* was the practice, *and not sprinkling*, which he has engaged to *prove* is baptism. My friend (who has a mania on the subject of finding proof against immersion) forgets all the while that before God, angels and men he has to prove that *sprinkling* is baptism, about which he says nothing. I insist, if he believes sprinkling is baptism, that, like a man, he should walk up with a passage of Scripture, and say: "Here I stand. Here is the baptism I advocate. I rely upon *this*. Here I live; or, here I die," and thus sustain his proposition. Is there, on his part, any thing like an effort of that sort, which we should expect from a Christian gentleman who had pledged himself to an intelligent people to demonstrate that "the sprinkling of water upon a proper subject, by a proper administrator, is Christian baptism?" I am of a different opinion. The fact that there were *three immersions* for so long a time is not against immersion. It rather stands thus: They not only believed in immersion, but they believed *very much in it*; so this fact is far from being an argument on his side. It is even further from *his* position than if they had immersed only once. And the circumstance that they were immersed in a nude state is still worse for his cause, as Professor Stuart, a distinguished and very candid writer on the subject in question, says. It must be confessed, that the circumstance that they baptized in a nude state is evidence still stronger of their conviction that immersion was right, than it could be proved to have been, if they had not been immersed in a nude state.

What does my friend mean? Does he mean, if possible, to throw a little disgrace over the practice of immersion? Does he mean to impress upon his own brethren the idea that we are to *avoid* immersion? that we are not to bury people in baptism, as Paul said he was, when he was baptized? Does he mean that we should avoid it because there is some indecency attached to it? I will show, in due time, that that has had *much* to do with *changing* the practice from immersion to sprinkling. I will not only show you, from the highest authorities, that the primitive practice was immersion, but that it was *deliberately* and confessedly changed. They made the change for *convenience*. They reasoned that God loves mercy more than sacrifice; and that, where the country is cold, or the parties are weak, or deli-

cate, or "*fond*," the church has the right to change the mode, maintaining, as they subsequently said, the substance of the thing. But much on that subject to-morrow, the Lord willing.

Again: My friend says I hold that we are to baptize in the name of the death of Christ. Where he got that idea from I do not know. I never, in my whole history—not very long nor very valuable, I grant—even heard of any one being baptized in the name of the death of Christ, one case only excepted. Paul says we are baptized *into* the death of Christ, but as to being baptized *in the name* of the death of Christ I know nothing. Again, he says the Jews baptized on their couches. He says he has the proof of it. I do not believe it. That matter has been before my eye for a long time, and it has passed under a rigid examination; and I here state that I think my friend is mistaken in his translation of the Greek of that passage. The Jews did not baptize *on their couches*. I know what "*epi koite*" means. That is the Greek of what he translates into English incorrectly. Whenever he attempts to *prove* to this people, instead of merely asserting it, that the Jews baptized "on their couches;" and whenever he manifests such *confidence* in his position on the question as to show that he risks his cause on it, even in part, then I will reply. Till then I simply deny that his *position* is susceptible of proof. Suffice it to say, now, it does not mean that they baptized *on their couches*. It means they baptized "*after the couch*."

My friend says, Ambrose held—a certain thing, which I have now forgotten, which, indeed, I did not catch exactly at the time, and, therefore, I can not state precisely what he said. But here is what Ambrose did say:

"Interrogatus es: Credis in Deum Patrem omnipotentem? Dixisti: Credo; et mersiti, hoc est, sepultus es."

Meaning and use of, "Baptizein," by T. J. Conant, D.D., p. 117. Which I translate:

"Thou wast asked, 'Dost thou believe in God the Father Almighty?' Thou saidst, 'I believe;' and then thou didst sink down, that is, wast buried."

No doubt, he said this in allusion to the ancient practice, as Mr. Wesley says, of baptizing by immersion.

My friend says I only gave him Gotch's translation of Ephraim Cyrus' language. Then he proceeded to show us, by an extensive

array of learning and facts, that it ought to read "at the river." Once he admitted that Mr. Gotch said "at the river;" and then, just as though Dr. Gotch had not said it, he proceeded to demonstrate that it ought to read "at the river." Let me read again from Dr. Gotch, page 131: "How wonderful is it that thy footsteps were planted upon the waters, that the great sea should subject itself to thy feet, and that yet, at a small river, that same head of thine should be subjected to be bowed down and baptized in it!" Dr. Gotch says it was done "at" a certain "river," just as I first read it. My brother remarked that they baptized "at a certain river" and at a certain place. So Ephraim Cyrus tells us, it was down "at a certain river," and that HIS head was "bowed" when he was "baptized in it." *Though his feet had been enabled to walk upon the waters of the sea, though the sea had failed to allow him to sink into its waters, yet now HIS "head was bowed down and HE was baptized in a small river."* That is immersion. There is no sprinkling or pouring taught there.

But my friend says I quoted from a *primer* when I quoted the definitions of AMAD, from Uhlemann's Grammar. Let us see about that. He defines the word: "To suffer one's self to be dipped, to suffer one's self to be baptized." My brother says that is a *primer*. Here is some of the handsomest classic language known to me in English—"a little *primer* thing!" He must say it is a "little *primer* thing." Suppose I were to get his "Methodist Discipline," a much smaller "*primer* thing" than this, and hold it up before this audience and expect them to feel a contempt for it, simply because it is a "little *primer* thing!" Or is it his theory that small men read small books and great men read great books? What is his view? Professor Greene, Professor of Oriental Languages in Princeton, is one of the most distinguished men in the United States. He put forth a work on Hebrew smaller than this. But is it a proof that a man is small, or that the thing he may have said in a small work, adapted to learners, or beginners, is not true because his book is small? Surely not. This is a distinguished man, though he has written a book leveled down to the comprehension of such men as my friend Mr. Ditzler, and myself. What he says is not the less true because it happens to be said in a grammar or in a small book. You will observe that I have brought a Syriac lexicon which gives us as the definition of the verb, *amad*, to "dip." He has brought *no work* that gives to *sprinkle* or to *pour* as a definition of this word. That is not the only one I have. I

have read from several others. I have Buxtorf, that gives "*intingi*" as a definition of "*amad*." I have read from Schaaf, "*intinctus*," and, also, "*immersus in aquam*." Castel gives "*immersit*." Thus I have definitions from the very highest authorities in my favor. My friend said "Schaaf is the best authority on this question in the world." From him I have it that the word *amad* means to immerse. I find immerse as a definition of *amad*, and though my friend is in the affirmative, and I in the negative, he finds no authority for sprinkling. He is trying to prove that it means to sprinkle, and yet he brings no lexicon of the Syriac language that gives pour or sprinkle as the definition of *amad*. There is no such definition to be found in any lexicon. Those who are informed know he is not to be blamed for not adducing any authority. He has brought, as it is, more than I expected he could produce. He has done all that a man could possibly do, indorsed as he is by his people as their champion, but not one single word has he brought from any lexical authority in support of the idea that *amad* means sprinkling or pouring.

Dr. Conant made a *small* grammar, yet my friend allows that he is a distinguished man.

I asked him to translate. He said he would not translate; said he, "I will not do it;" I will translate as the fathers did. They said *baptizo*, as in Jerome's version and in the *Italic*; they used the Greek word, Latinizing it, as we Anglicize it." This I told my friend before, but it is just as patent to the reader of ecclesiastical history as any other fact, that they employed the transferred, or rather adopted, word in the sense of immerse, though Mr. Ditzler seems constantly to deny it. He says they immersed three times in a nude state. He knows they took the Greek word and Latinized it in their translations. Jerome says the people were immersed. He knows the word was accepted as meaning to immerse, just as he knows they did immerse. We have Anglicized immerse from *mergo* or *immergo*. It is not necessary for us to give a definition of this word now. We know what it means, we are agreed about that; but about what *baptize* means, we are divided. The question, how it came into our version is a matter of no consequence. As we are divided on the meaning of baptize, I want my friend to select some other language that will describe unambiguously the thing that is done when a man is baptized. To say *baptize*, does not translate the Greek word at all. To prove this, suppose that in Dr. Rivers' church, next Sunday, it were announced, after service, that a man was baptized in the church by him, how

would you know what was done? You could not know. He sometimes immerses, sometimes *pours*, sometimes *sprinkles*, and *sometimes*—for the thing is becoming attenuated and is growing beautifully less—he merely *touches* the moist finger to the forehead. I say this that I may be true to history and to the facts in the case.

When, therefore, it is announced that some one is to be baptized, what is to be done? You do not know. In order that my friend may show us what he really does mean by it in a given passage, I ask him to translate it in unambiguous terms. He says he will not do it. He translates, he says, “as the fathers did.” But when the fathers put *baptizo* into their translations there was no controversy about its meaning; now there is. I want my friend to tell us in plain language what *baptizo* does mean. But he will not do it. *He ought to do it.* He ought here to give us light upon the subject. I will tell you the reason why he will not. If he were to translate *baptizo* in any prominent passage into English by the word immerse, it would ruin him in his church. If he should translate it sprinkle, he would not have the decent respect of a *scholar* on the continent of America. He would not be worthy of any respect, and, therefore, he can not, he dare not, translate. He is just between two difficulties, and he will face neither of them. I insist that it is his *duty* to tell us what the word means in any given case. *I*, if put to the test, will *try*, though in some cases I may not translate well, yet I will try, at least, to translate. It is a singular fact that *baptizo* is not translated to sprinkle, by any man in Europe or America who even *believes in* and practices *sprinkling*. In several instances the most distinguished men translate the word unhesitatingly “to dip,” as does Thomas Sheldon Greene, but never to sprinkle. Such a translation can not be found. The works of distinguished men stand before us as silent as the grave with regard to sprinkle for baptism, for immersion is the true translation of the word. Sprinklers are not consistent, nor are they by any means all satisfied. It would be better, as a distinguished gentleman of this city once said, that we all immerse. “It was,” as Dr. Stuart says, and, as Bishop Smith once said, “undoubtedly the ancient custom.” Bishop Smith, if I am not mistaken, was candid enough to say in substance, that the immersionists have the advantage of the sprinklers, that *all* could conscientiously immerse, but *all* could not sprinkle; hence, if a union is ever effected, and the discussion of this question ever ceases, all parties must come to immersion, especially because that was the ancient practice; but we are not willing, says the bishop,

to do it. And hence we stand divided where we might and ought to be together. I can not sprinkle because God, as I think, has not authorized it. My brother can immerse. I do not know what his authority for it is, but he says he can immerse. If we were willing to stand upon that which we both feel to be authorized by the word of God, we need never to have had any controversy on this question.

Again : My friend says "we will have fun to-morrow." I have no promise of that sort to make. We have souls, and they are to be judged at the last day. I propose not to turn this controversy into a farce. I do not promise any fun. I promise to attempt to prove that my friend is wrong, as far as I can, or rather, I promise to show that he *can not prove* he is right; but so far as fun is concerned I promise nothing. Indeed, my friend promises very much on to-morrow. He intends "to go to the Jordan." I tell him, in all seriousness, Jordan will be a "hard road to travel" when he goes there. If he can make fun out of the sacred ceremony of Jesus' bowing his head under those sacred waters, as Ephraim Cyrus says, and being baptized in the Jordan, then let there be fun.

I will present one other argument which I do not hold as conclusive, but only suggestive. It is from Acts of the Apostles xxii : 16 :

"And now, why tarriest thou? Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord."

The word is in the Greek in the middle voice, and means substantially, "have thyself baptized." "Arise and have thyself baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling upon the name of the Lord." The baptism, in that case, was the washing. That we have by divine prescription, but a sprinkling or a pouring is neither of them a washing. Immersion is a washing. Therefore sprinkling or pouring can not be meant in this case, but immersion may be meant. That is as far as I press this passage now.

Again : I quote Ephesians v : 26 :

"That he might sanctify and cleanse it [the church] with the washing of water by the word."

All parties allow that "the washing of water" has allusion to baptism, or that it is baptism. It is called a *washing*, because it has allusion to the *Jewish* washings, which I have shown you from the very highest authority among the Jews (*Maimonides*) were immer-

sions. Therefore, as the "washing of water" here signifies baptism, and as this washing is an allusion to the Jewish ablutions, for cleansing, it must have been an immersion or bathing of the whole body.

I will present, in the morning, more fully, as I, perhaps, may not have time to-night, an argument from Romans vi: 3, 4, and Colossians ii: 12. I read first from Rom. vi, commencing with the first verse:

"What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound? God forbid: how shall we that are dead to sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? Therefore we were buried with him by baptism unto 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."

Now, here is a baptism. It is declared to be a *burial*. It is also declared that we are "raised up" again. I before mentioned that when we came to the Bible argument I would show you that there was in baptism a raising up, or coming out of, as our Savior came up out of the water, when he was baptized, and this was true, also, of the eunuch. Paul says, including himself and the Roman brethren, "We were buried with Christ in baptism." They were buried in their baptism into the blessings and benefits of the death of Christ; and having been buried they were raised up again, to walk in newness of life. There was a *burial* and *resurrection* in their baptism which are not found in pouring. Therefore, sprinkling or pouring can not be the baptism mentioned here. But both, a burial and resurrection, are found in immersion. Therefore immersion must be the baptism which Paul speaks of in this passage.

MR. DITZLER'S TWELFTH ARGUMENT.

FRIDAY, December 23, 10 A. M.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

My brother has read Mosheim on the baptism of Novatian and the clinics, and the substance of his argument was to the effect that they were rejected from orders *because they were sprinkled*. That statement has been made many times, and as often corrected. And he says it was called "*ecclesiastical baptism*" because *allowed* by the church! This has been corrected by learned men sufficiently for my brother to stop making such absurd declarations. If they will read Cyprian they will find that persons baptized by heretics were held to be *unbaptized*. In the works of Cyprian before me, vol. i, pp. 250, 253, 254, 260, and various other places, he declares that all persons baptized outside of the church had not ecclesiastical baptism, but were "polluted with profane water," "with adulterous and unhal- lowed water," "stained among heretics" (*tingo*), etc. True baptism was "ecclesiastical baptism," and any baptism "outside," as he terms it, was profane and could not convey the Holy Spirit. He quotes the prophet on "deceitful water" as proof, and urges that the true baptism, whether by sprinkling or not, conveyed the Spirit and grace of God in it; but that no heretic could give the Spirit, therefore he could not baptize. Cyprian quotes Ezek. xxxvi: 25, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you;" Num. xix: 8, 12, 13, "Because the water of separation was not sprinkled on him," etc., to show that "sprinkling" "prevails equally" with washing or immersion. "Nor ought it to trouble any one that sick people seem to be (simply) sprinkled or affused," etc., that is, are not permitted to stand in the water while baptized.

They take such passages as Mr. W. read yesterday, when he dis- connected them, and gave them the reverse meaning conveyed by Cyprian.

Now, if it was as Mr. Wilkes pretends; if the validity of sprink-

ling was the point in question, would, 1, the bishops have baptized them? If baptism was necessarily IMMERSION, would they have sprinkled them, saying, "I immerse you?" How absurd! 2. If that was the issue, would they not have at once ordered such sprinkled persons to be immersed? Would not Novatian have been immersed on recovery, if his baptism was in doubt as to mode? 3. Would learned men who knew well the Greek language, gravely discuss this question, IS SPRINKLING IMMERSION? Think of it. Yet such are the absurdities my opponent is driven to. 4. But I read you the decision of the Neocæsarean Council [see pp. 591-92], where all his assumptions are utterly refuted, and it is shown that it was only because they feared their receiving baptism "was not voluntary," but the result of a slavish fear, not love of Christ and devotion to his cause. 5. We saw that Eusebius' account settled the whole matter. He says that Novatian "received baptism." He then doubts if such a wicked person as he was could be properly regarded as capable of receiving it at all, "if it be proper to say that such a person as he could receive it—baptism." [See pp. 590-91, where I quoted all the passages.] My brother's expression about *epi* — is rich. Where can he find it having the meaning he gave it? Nowhere at all.

On the baptism of the Savior in the hymn of Ephraim Cyrus, which we gave in full before [p. 586], Mr. W. is equally unhappy. As he can not meet the facts we gave, we simply retranslate it: "And that yet AT a small river [not *under* it—*le*, at] that same head of thine should be subjected to be bowed down [literally, bowed—*rekan*, inclined] and baptized at or *with* it," *i. e.*, with *its* waters.

Now, in the first place, Gotch says it was "at the river," and not *in* the river. If he bowed his head in the waters, it certainly must have been *in the river*; but it was "AT the river." Then the word "*in*" is not in the Syriac at all, as I will show. The meaning is this: that as the waters submitted to the feet of the blessed Savior, so he, when baptized at the river, meekly bowed his head and submitted it to the waters of the Jordan. It merely implies that the waters of the Jordan were used as an instrument of baptism on his head.

Now, my friends, there is another point I desire to make clear. I have shown you that the radical word in the Greek is *bapto*. We have no clew to the religious Greek literature as to the meaning of this word except what we have in the corresponding facts. It had been used at least hundreds of years before we had any literature on the subject. . It originally implied to stain or sprinkle, and from the

staining the idea of immersion was derived. We find that words meaning to sprinkle, drop, come to mean to stain, dye, and then to immerse. There is no question in my mind that at first the word *bapto* implied to moisten, to stain by sprinkling, or in any other way whatever. From that would most naturally be discovered the art of *painting*, as we see it means. The art of staining would naturally lead to the discovery of coloring in any way—thoroughly coloring, dyeing. Hence, diluting the dyeing matter in liquids, or collecting dyeing juices or liquids, they would soon discover the art of dyeing by dipping and by continued submergence. This would soon become its most general use as a *secular* word, and accounts for all the facts already adduced in its secular use as a profane word. The Arabic and Syriac, and Hebrew *tzeva*, *tzava*, Latin *tingo*, Syriac and Hebrew *kechal*, fully corroborate this, as well as *tabhal* and many other words. As it originally implied sprinkling, we see that in religious literature it always retained this meaning in *baptidzo*; for *baptidzo* simply puts one into the condition of *bapto*. *Bapto* implies sprinkling, and hence *baptidzo* puts one into the condition of *bapto*.

I have an argument on the baptism of Judith, to which my brother has already referred; but I may only touch it briefly. Now, the preposition *epi tas pagas tou hudatos*, shows that she could not have been immersed. She baptized herself—ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος—at the fountain of water. There was no immersion there. The fact that she was baptized in a camp shows she was not immersed. The facts show us, as we have seen, that guards of soldiers were placed around this fountain; and is it supposed that this modest and good woman, though a brave one, would go before those rude soldiers and prepare herself for immersion in the water? But let us examine the Jewish washing or baptism in detail. This requires us to notice the **BRAZEN LAVER.**

In Ex. xxx: 18-21; xl: 30-32, we read of the laver that stood between the altar of burnt-offerings and the door of the tabernacle, of which Mr. A. Campbell speaks, as quoted in our former proposition. [See pp. 224, 225.] The water of this laver was used for both washing the meats of sacrifice and the priests for purification. Of Aaron and his sons, Ex. xxx: 18-21, "And נחצו [רחצ, *rachatz*, wash], καὶ νίψεται [νίπτω] ἐξ αὐτοῦ—and shall wash their hands and their feet (*ek*) from or out of it." Ex. xl: 30, "Νίπτονται ἐξ αὐτοῦ (v. 31) ἐνίπτεται ἐξ αὐτοῦ—shall wash out of [or from] it"—"washed their hands and their feet *thereat*"—*out of it*. In verse 12, Moses

"washed them with water." Now, 1. All agree that these washings were what Ecclesiastes (Sirach) xxxi: 30; Judith xii: 7; Heb. ix: 10; Luke xi: 38, call baptizing—expressed by βαπτίζω (*baptidzo*), and *baptismos*, the noun.

A. Campbell's "Christian Baptism," 166, 167, 176, 177, 197, 174, have been already quoted [see p. 224]. Again he says, "The diverse washings of cups, etc., and things mentioned among the traditions of the elders and the *institutions of the law* were for *ceremonial cleansing*. Hence by IMMERSION."—"Ch. Bap.," v, 401. In the "Ch. Baptism" just named he repeats it over and again that the washings, λούω, νίπτω, referred to in Exodus, Leviticus, etc., were *always* immersions. Again, says he, "And the laver—filled with water . . . in this laver . . . the priests *always* washed themselves before they approached the sanctuary." "This vessel was called in Greek, λουτήρ, and the water in it λουτρον. . . Paul more than once alludes to usage in the tabernacle in his epistles, and once substitutes Christian *immersion* in its place," *ibid*, p. 406. "Ch. Baptism," v, 401, 402, quotes Heb. x: 22, "Clear water, or bath of regeneration."

2. A. Campbell, "Christian Baptism," 154, 157, 158, urges that ἀπό, and especially ἐκ, as well as Conant, "help out of the water," as joined with βαπτίζω. If it helps out, means out of, as opposed to into, as all agree, then it shows these persons never could have washed or immersed themselves *in* the laver. For they washed—ἐκ, before vowels written *ex* (εξ)—*out of* the laver. These washings, *all* agree, were *baptismoi*—*baptismus*.

3. This was absolutely necessary. Would they immerse their whole persons in the same water where they immersed the sacrificial meats, parts of which the priests ate? And, *vice versa*, would they immerse themselves for purification in water made filthy and impure by meats washed *in* it?

4. In every instance in the Bible that I have seen, and I aimed to examine *all*, it is *washed* (ἵδατι—*hudati*) with water in the Greek; only once out of scores of instances as ἐν ᾧ.—*en hudati*, where it is put for ἵδατι.

5. To wash or besprinkle a part of the body was called washing "the whole body." Lev. xv: 5, λουσεται (λούω) ἵδατι—*λουσεται τὸ σῶμα ἵδατι*.—wash with water, wash *the body* with water—is equivalent to v. 16, λουσεται ἵδατι πᾶν τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ—wash the *whole body* with water. So xvi: 24 is the same exactly—"wash the whole body with water." xv: 11, wash the body with water. In the original it is all "*with water*."

Num. viii: 7, shows *πᾶν τὸ σῶμα*, the whole body, *i. e.*, the face; xix: 7, 8, "wash the body with water;" v. 19, "wash with water." Hence, John xiii: 5-10, when Christ washed the *feet*, he said, "If I wash *thee* not." V. 10, "*he that is washed.*" Yet only the feet were washed. So, Matt. xxvi: 6-12, pouring oil on the head was called anointing "the body"—"my," etc. Job ix: 30 the same.

6. If any thing was put in the water for cleansing, ceremoniously, the water was made unclean thereby. Lev. x: 34 tells us vessels made unclean of some kinds had to be broken. xv: 34-36; Num. xix: 21, 22, tell us any water was unclean, and not to be used if but *touched* by an unclean person, *i. e.*, one ceremoniously unclean. Hence, no Jew or priest dared immerse even his finger in the laver, not to say his body, if he needed purification. The Jewish writings and histories tell the same. "If, therefore, the waters that went above the juncture *return* upon the hands, *they* are unclean."—Alep. 38, "Horæ Heb.," Lightfoot, ii, 417. Hence, *no Jew ever dared immerse himself in the laver.*

7. The laver in Solomon's temple for the same persons (see 1 Kings viii: 38; 2 Chron. iv: 2) was ten cubits in diameter, five (5) cubits, *i. e.*, eight and three-fourths *feet deep*; bulged below the brim, and held, according to Josephus, three hundred and seventy-five forty-gallon-barrels of water. Immersion in it was absolutely impossible in all practical senses. No arrangement was made to get up into it at all. By machinery the water was forced or conducted into it; by apertures or cocks let out below, *at* which they washed. It would be a sublime scene to witness the priests, in open view, where all males and females passed, climbing up over that high laver, or brazen sea, nearly nine feet deep, tumbling into it, all of whom would drown unless good swimmers. Of course, they kept their garments all on, plunged in with them on, as it was in the most public place. Such are the monstrous absurdities immersion teaches.

8. The second temple, like the tabernacle, had but the one laver for both priests and washing meats. At first there were but two outlets to this below, afterward twelve, as had been in the great one of Solomon's temple. See Brown's "Antiquities," ii, 139-141; Kitto, article "Laver." "The basis of it was so contrived as to receive the water which ran out of the laver at certain spouts. At these spouts the priests washed their hands and their feet before they entered upon their ministry. For if they had put their hands and feet into the laver, the water would have been defiled by the first man

that washed therein. And the sea of brass made by Solomon was so high that they could not put their feet into it. The Talmudists tell us there were twelve spouts or cocks, in the form of a woman's breast, to let the water out of the laver, so that the twelve priests, who attended upon the daily sacrifices, might wash there together."—Bishop Patrick, on Ex. xxx: 18, 19.

9. JOSEPHUS, "Antiquities," viii, ch. iii, § 5, 6: "The sea to be for the washing of the hands and the feet of the priests." "The brazen laver for purification, having a basin beneath of the like matter, whence the priests might wash their hands and *sprinkle their feet*."—iii, ch. vi, § 2. "The ten basins for washing entrails of beasts." "When he had sprinkled Aaron's vestments, himself and his sons."—"Antiquities," iii, ch. vi, § 6. Hence (John ii: 6) the jars that had six gallons of water each *for the purifying of the Jews*. Yet they *drank* out of them also. There could be no immersion here. Hence the emphasis of Num. xix: 7-30, "*because (ὅτι ὕδωρ ῥαντισμῶν οὐ περιέραντισθῆναι) water of sprinkling was not sprinkled upon him he is unclean.*"

1st. Now, Mark vii: 2 says the complaint was, certain disciples ate bread (ἐσθιόντας ἄρτους—food, bread or meat) with (κοινῶς—defiled, that is, ἀνίπτους) unwashed hands—uncleansed.

2d. "For the Pharisees and ALL the Jews do not eat except they wash their hands."

3d. Note that Luke xi: 38 calls this washing before meals *baptism*—πρωτον βαπτίσθη, which Christ at once calls *cleansing the outside*—καθαρίζετε τὸ ἐξωθεν, corresponding to the νίπτω, and opposed to the κοινῶς of Mark.

4th. Mark vi: 4 says, "When they come from the public place (ἀπὸ ἀγορᾶς), except they (βαπτίσωνται) baptize themselves, they do not eat."

5th. They baptize "cups, pots, brazen vessels, and couches (κλιῶν)." —Ezek. xxiii: 40, 41.

6th. V. 5 puts ἀνίσεις as opposed to βαπτίσωνται. They eat not except they baptize.—V. 4. V. 5, "with unwashed," etc.

Now, who believes that the Jews immersed every time they touched any thing dead; every time they ate; every time they came from the public place? No custom or law required it.

7th. Codex Vat., Codex Sinaiticus, and eight other manuscripts have for βαπτίσωνται, ραντίσωνται—*sprinkled* themselves, in Mark vii: 4.

8th. Tobit ii: 3-5 we have a case: "One of our nation is strangled and cast out—ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ—in the market."—V. 4. Tobit

took him away. "Then, before I tasted my meat, *I started up and took him away,*" etc. ; καὶ ἐπιστρέψας ἐλουσαμεν, καὶ ἔθιον τὸν ἄρτον μου ἐν λύπῃ — "and returning, I washed myself, and ate my meat in sadness." He did not immerse, yet he had touched a dead body, which required baptism. It was *rachatz* in Hebrew.

9th. Luke vii: 34-48 tells us Christ was to eat with "one of the chief Pharisees." When they "sat down to meat," where they always baptized, Christ says, "Thou gavest me *no water* (ὕδατος) upon my feet." That is, to pour or sprinkle water on hands or feet was to baptize one's self.

10th. Num. xix: 9, 11, 16, 19. It is a water of separation—*ῥαντισμοῦ*—of *sprinkling*. V. 11, "He that toucheth the dead body of any man shall be unclean *seven days*. He shall purify himself with it (*water of sprinkling*) on the third day, and on the seventh day he shall be clean." But if the water is not sprinkled on him he is unclean. *Why?* ὅτι ὕδωρ ῥαντισμοῦ οὐ περιεῖρῃαντισθη ἐν αὐτῷ, ἀκαθαρὸς ἐστὶ — *Because water of sprinkling was not sprinkled on him, he is unclean.* "On the seventh day he shall wash with water—*λοοσεται ὕδατι.*" In *no case* did he wash with water till the seventh day. A. Campbell admits he never immersed till the seventh day (*Debate*, 162). They never immersed *at all*. Tobit washed *at once*.

11th. JOSEPHUS: "When, therefore, any persons were defiled by a dead body, they put a little of these ashes into spring water, with hyssop, and, dipping part of these ashes in it, they sprinkled them with it, both on the *third day, and on the seventh*, and after that they were clean."—Ant. iv, ch. 5.

12th. PHILO: "Moses does this philosophically; for most others sprinkled with mixed water, some with sea or river water, others with water drawn from the fountains. But Moses employed ashes for this purpose; then, as to the manner, they put them into a vessel, pour on water; then (ἐκ τοῦ κρηματος βαπτωντας ὑσσόπου κλαδοῦς) they moisten branches of hyssop with the mixture, then sprinkle it on those (τοῖς καθαιρόμενοις) to be purified."

13th. CYRIL, of Alexandria, on Is. iv: 4, washed—יִהְיֶה. "We have been baptized, not with mere water, nor yet with the ashes of an heifer, but with the Holy Spirit, etc. We are sprinkled to purify the flesh alone; so says the blessed Paul."

14th. AMBROSE: "He who wished to be purified with a *typical baptism* (*typico baptismati*) was sprinkled with the blood of a lamb, by means of a bunch of hyssop," etc.

Sirach xxxi: 30, βαπτίζομενος ἀπὸ νεύρου. He that is baptized from a dead body (*i. e.*, after touching it), and toucheth it *again*, what is he benefited by his washing—τῷ λουτρῷ αὐτοῦ; Num. xix: 22: "WHATSOEVER *the unclean toucheth* shall be unclean." They dared not baptize a second time with the same water. Now we have a case that settles this whole question, so long contested. Horæ Heb. et Tal., iii, 292: "Benajah struck his foot against a *dead* tortoise and went down to Siloam, where, *breaking all the little particles of HAIL* ושבב he *baptized* himself." Here we have this whole issue settled. He could not immerse himself in a handful of water of melted hail. This settles the way they baptized to fill the Hebrew command in the Mosaic law where wash is so constantly used. Had they immersed themselves in the laver, the moment one immersed himself in it the immense quantity of water would have been emptied out, the vessel purified seven days, and refilled ere one could have baptized again at it. How absurd such an idea! Debate with Rice, A. Campbell says, p. 162:

"In some cases the water of purification was used by the unclean person himself. *But in all cases, FINALLY, he must bathe his whole person in water, for even sprinkling clean water, without a subsequent immersion, could not take away this legal impurity.*

"*Louo*, the word used in this case, is the word used among the Greeks to indicate *bathing*. Such, also, is its use among the Jews. Pharaoh's daughter is said to have *bathed herself in the Nile*. This *bathing* is represented by the word here used; and, therefore, indicates that the person *put himself under* the water in order to the consummation of the process of cleansing. Thus, after having this water of purification sprinkled upon them, like Judith of the Apocrypha, who washed herself in the camp at a fountain of water, he bathes himself," etc.

Alas for Mr. Campbell and his followers when they can thus write in the face of the facts just given.

I have already read you from Clemens Alexandrianus, A. D. 190, where, referring to Homer's allusion to certain one's washing, *louo*, "Penelope washed herself," ἵγραινω, sprinkled herself with water is the Greek, and comes to prayer. "Telemachus washed (*nipto*) from the hoary sea [see all this paragraph], prays to Minerva." Now, says Clemens, referring to their washing, where *louo*, *nipto*, and ἵγραινω, ἰδραίνω, *raino*, *raino*, sprinkle, and *baptidzo*, all interchange: "This custom of the Jews, as they also often baptize (*epi koutæ*) on a couch;" that is, as these did so before prayers, etc., so the Jews before their meals—as Christ, Luke xi: 38; Matt. xv: 2; Mark vii: 3, 4, show, was ex-

pected to do—haptized themselves. To this there is abundant historic proof also.

HERVETUS: "The Jews washed themselves not only at sacrifices, but also at *feasts*, and this is the reason why Clement says that they were purified or washed upon a couch," *i. e.*, a dining couch or triclinium. To this Mark refers ch. vii, and Matt. xv: 2. Tertullian refers to it when he says, "Judæus Israel quotodie lavat. The Jewish Israel washes every day."

8. THEOPHYLACT: "Deriding their foolish custom, I mean purifying themselves (*καθαρίζεσθαι*) before eating," etc., in Luke xi: 38.

The "Apostolic Const.," 66, alluding to a Jew, says: "Unless they baptize themselves daily they do not eat; still further, unless they purify (*καθαρώσιν*) with water their couches, and plates, and cups, and goblets, and seats, they will not use them at all."

9. John xi: 6: "Water pots, after the manner of the purifying of the Jews,"—six gallons.

ROBINSON'S Colmet: "So Pitts tells us (p. 24), 'The table being removed before they—the orientals—rise, a slave or servant, who stands attending with a cup of water to give them drink, steps into the middle (of the circle on the ground) with a basin or copper pot of water, something like a coffee-pot, and a little soap, and lets the water run upon their hands one after another, in order as they sit.'"

LIGHTFOOT: Horæ Heb. et Tal., ii, 417, 418, on Mark vii: 4: "That the plunging of the whole body is not understood here may be sufficiently proved hence; that such plunging is not used but when pollution is contracted from the more principal causes, . . . from an unclean thing, . . . *from the water of purification*," etc.—R. Solomon, in Relm. cap. 1. Horæ Heb. ii, 418. "Βαπτισμοί, washings applied to *all* these, . . . in respect of some things, of *washing* only, and in respect of others, of *sprinkling* only."—Horæ, etc., ix, 19, vol. ii. "There was neither need (of washing the whole body) nor was it the custom, before meat, but the hands only."—Lightfoot, Horæ, etc., iii, 118.

"When, therefore, any persons were defiled (with) by a dead body, they put a little of these ashes into spring water with hyssop, and, dipping part of these ashes in it, they sprinkled them with it, both on the third day and on the seventh, and after that they were clean." Josephus' Antiq., bk. iv, ch. 5.

CYRIL, of Alexandria, on Is. x: 4: "We have been baptized not with mere water, nor yet with the ashes of an heifer, but with the

Holy Spirit and with fire." "We are sprinkled to purify the *flesh* alone; so says the blessed Paul."

AMBROSE: "Per hyssopi fasciculum adaspergebatur igni sanguine, qui mundari volebat typico baptismate."—Apol. David, sec. 59. He who wished to be purified with a typical baptism was sprinkled with the blood of a lamb by means of a bunch of hyssop.

PHILO: "Moses does this philosophically, for most others sprinkled with mixed water, some with sea or river water, others with waters drawn from the fountains. But Moses employed ashes for this purpose. Then, as to the manner, they put them into a vessel, pour on water, then (*ἐκ τοῦ κρήματος βάπτοντας ὑσσόπου κλάδου*) they MOISTEN branches of hyssop *with the mixture*, then sprinkle it on those (*τοῖς καθαιρόμενοι*) who are to be purified."

Now, upon this subject, which my friend says Dr. Kleeburg thinks as he does—and he would have to bring a written statement to constitute it evidence—a subject into which Lightfoot examined thoroughly, he speaks clearly and says they were *sprinkled*. I will further name the fact that Ambrose baptized the Emperor Theodosius the Great, upon his death-bed."

TERTULLIAN: "At the sacred rites of Isis or Mithra they are initiated by a washing [*lavacro*]; they carry out their gods with washings [*lavationibus*]; they expiate villas, houses, temples, and whole cities by sprinkling with water carried around. Certainly they are baptized [*tinguntur*] in the Apolluarian and Eleusian rites, and they say that they do this to obtain regeneration, and to escape the punishment of their perjuries. Also among the ancients, whoever has stained himself with murder, expiated himself with purifying water. In view of these things we see the zeal of the devil in rivaling the things of God [*eum et ipse baptismum in suis exercet*] since he also practices baptism among his own people. What can be found like this? The polluted one purifies [*immundus emundat*]. . . . He will destroy, forsooth, his own work, washing away the sins which he inspires."—*De Baptismo*, 257, Paris, 1634.

CONSTANTINE the Great was baptized by sprinkling in his bed.

CLODIVIUS, 499, King of the Franks, was baptized by sprinkling.

GERMADIUS, of Marseilles, 490, said the person baptized was—*vel aspergitur, vel intingitur*—either sprinkled or immersed. Speaking of the preparation of a sinner, how he should mourn over his sinful unworthiness, he says: "For who will vouchsafe to you, so faithless a penitent, a single *sprinkle of any water*?"

JEROME, 385, in Ezek. xxxvi: 25: "So that upon those who believe and are converted from error, I might pour out the clear water of baptism."

SULPICIUS SEVERUS, 403, to the faithful: "Remember that thou hast, under the hallowed dew of the font and of the laver, been sealed with the chrism."

THE CENTURIATORS, quoting Socrates' Hist. Eccles. vii: 17, tell of a font "out of which (*baptizato aqua superfusa,*) the water is poured upon those to be baptized." Aqua. . . in mio alveo fuit. . . effluxere existimaret. alveo baptizterii, etc. . . aqua rursus penitus evanuit.—Soc. vii, 17.

CYRIL, of Alexandria, 424: "He will make the early and the latter rain to come down upon you as of old; . . . Joel ii: 24, 25. There has been given to us, as in rain, the living water of holy baptism."

In the fourth and fifth centuries, as well as in the third, there were many cases of baptism upon death-beds. Hence, says Tertullian—I read from the new translation of his work—"Amid the utterance of some words [the man] is sprinkled with water, and then *rises* again," etc. Hence, the apostles, if *voluntarily* "sprinkled," were baptized; nay, "whether baptized in *any mode whatever*."—P. 246. Now, inasmuch as they baptized persons daily by sprinkling, though the ordinary way was to merge them up to the waist and pour water upon their heads, in some cases, completely immersing them, in a state of *nudity*, that they might absorb largely of the Holy Spirit—though my friend does not believe in this—and the fact that these sick persons afterward recovered health, and were not immersed, shows that they regarded themselves as much baptized when sprinkled only, as those sprinkled while merged in water.

I will now take up what we call the New Testament argument. That is, the case of Philip and the eunuch, the baptism of Christ, and other kindred subjects. The prophets declare, Ezekiel xxxvi: 25: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and you shall be clean." All the Fathers habitually referred to this verse as proof that Messiah should baptize. So all Jews understood it. Isaiah lii: 15: "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations;" xlv: 3: "For I will pour water on him that is thirsty," etc., were constantly appealed to by them as a proof the Messiah would baptize. How could this be if it was *immersion*? Could you say we have the *proof*, the clear, prophetic declaration, that Messiah would *immerse*, for we read, "Then will I SPRINKLE clean water upon you; I will pour water

on him that is thirsty?" How absurd! John i: 25, "Why baptizest thou, then?" shows that all understood it thus. Lightfoot, "Horæ Heb.," and Talmud ii, 243, shows this also.

Immersionists have tried to break the force of Is. lii: 15—"So shall he sprinkle many nations"—with the Greek rendering, "astonish," or "sprinkle with astonishment," etc. Hengstenberg, in his "Chrystology," ii, 268-274, and Furst utterly destroy this silly evasion. The Hebrew is $\Pi\text{ז}$ (*nazzah*), future $\Pi\text{ז}$ (*yazzeh*). In Hiphil, as here, it *always* is to *sprinkle*, *never* any thing else. See Num. viii: 7; Lev. iv: 6, 17; v: 9; viii: 30; xiv: 51; xvi: 14, 15; Num. xix: 4, 18, 19. Hengstenberg says: "The verb *nazzah* occurs in very many passages, and signifies, *in Hiphil*, EVERY-WHERE 'TO SPRINKLE.'" No Hebrew scholar will question that in *this* day.

Matt. iii: 11: "I indeed baptize you with water. . . . He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." $\text{Εν υδατι. 'Εν πνευματι αγιω και πυρι. Ich taufe euch mit wasser.$

Mark i: 8: "I indeed have baptized you with water: he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." $\text{Εβαπτισα. . . εν υδατι. Aquá—mit wasser.$

Luke iii: 16: "I indeed baptize you with water. . . . He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." $\text{Εγω μεν υδατι. Aquá—mit wasser.$

John i: 31: "The same baptizeth with water." $\text{'Ει τω υδατι. Mit wasser.$

John i: 33: "He that sent me to baptize with water."

Acts i: 4: "John truly baptized with water." $\text{Εβαπτισεν υδατι. Aquá—mit wasser.$

Acts xi: 17: "John indeed baptized with water: but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost." $\text{Εβαπτισεν υδατι.$

Ex. xiii: 9: "With a strong hand." $\text{'Εν γαρ χειρι.$

Ezek. xvi: 9: "I have washed you with water." $\text{'Ελόνσα σε εν υδατι.$

Rev. xiv: 15: "Cry with a loud voice." $\text{'Εν μεγαλη φωνη.$

2 Pet. xi: 16: "Speaking with man's voice." $\text{'Εν φωνη.$

"Iron rod, that with it (*εν*) he should rule," etc.

Rev. vi: 8: "Kill with the sword" (*εν*).

"It signifies *with* in classical Greek, as well as the Septuagint or New Testament; and just in the same circumstances."—Carson, 122.

" 'Εν υδατι , pro. simple, υδατι , simply for υδατι ."—Koenaël's "Latin Commentary," in loc., Luc. iii, 16.

"Of the instrument, and man's not only . . . but where in Greek

writers the mere dative would be used—Rev. vi: 8; Luke xxii: 69, etc. The *price*, Rev. v: 9. 'Εν ἰω ἀμαῖτι.—Winer, 310.

1 John v: 6: "This is he that came by water and blood, Jesus the Christ; not (ἐν ἰω ἁμαῖτι) by water only, but (ἐν ἰω ὕδατι) by water and blood."

Is. iv: 4: "Ἐν πνευμαῖτι, with the Spirit."

I want to show you just how water baptism corresponds to the baptism of the Holy Spirit; for it is always represented as "shed forth," "poured out," "falling upon," and it is called baptism. Here, the shedding forth, pouring out, or falling of the Holy Spirit upon people is called baptism by John the Baptist, by the Savior, by Paul, by Peter, and by all the sacred writers; and if the pouring out of the Spirit is *spiritual* baptism, the pouring of water upon them is *water* baptism.

Acts xi: 15, 16: "And as I began to speak, the Holy Ghost *fell upon them*, as on us at the beginning. Then remembered I the word of the Lord, how that he said, John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost."

1 Cor. xii: 13: "For by one Spirit are we *all baptized*."

I. It was *with* water—water applied.

II. Its mode or action is illustrated by the Spirit's baptism.

Prophets all speak of the Spirit as "poured out," "shed forth," etc. (Ezek. xviii: 31; xxxvii: 5-14; Jer. xxxi: 33; Is. xxxii: 15; Prov. i: 23; Joel ii: 28; Luke xxiv; Acts i: 1-3, 33; x: 38, 44; xi: 15, 16.) 1 Pet. i: 12: "Sent down from heaven." (1 John ii: 20, 27, 28; v: 6, 7, 10; 2. Cor. i: 21; Acts iv: 27.)

It was "given," "shed forth," "poured out upon," "poured upon," "fell on them," "descended," etc. These are not acts of immersion. It was "*an anointing*." It is constantly called "*unction*," "*an anointing*." This is called *baptism* by Paul, John, Peter, and the four evangelists. The oil was shed *immediately* on the heads of the anointed. It represents the fall of the Spirit on them. The anointing was its chosen representatives, and βαπτίζω *designates* it.

MR. WILKES' TWELFTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I will notice a few matters in my friend's last speech, before I come to my regular disproof arguments. He states that the passage in the latter part of the fifty-second chapter of Isaiah, so much controverted, means sprinkle. "So shall he sprinkle many nations." That is the reading in our common English version. It is proper to say that, in the Septuagint, at that place, the translators who made their translation three hundred years before the Christian Era, from the Hebrew into the Greek, did not take that view of it. They used a word which means, to astonish. Gesenius translates that passage from the Hebrew as follows: "So shall he cause many nations to rejoice in himself," or language substantially that. We have the highest authority for supposing that sprinkle is not the translation in that passage. But whether it is or not, I waive controversy on that passage. I call my brother's attention to one of the highest authorities on this continent, and a very distinguished Presbyterian at that, Dr. Barnes. Commenting on that passage, he says:

"It may be remarked, that whichever of the above senses is assigned, it furnishes no *argument* for the practice of sprinkling in baptism. It refers to the fact of his purifying, or cleansing the nations, and not to the ordinance of Christian baptism; nor should it be used as an argument in reference to the mode in which that should be administered. *The kings shall shut their mouths at him.* Or, rather, kings. It does not refer to any particular kings; but the idea is, that he would be honored by kings."—Barnes' "Notes on Isaiah," vol. ii, page 264.

He refers to the Spanish translation, and, also, to that of Luther. Luther used a word in his translation, of which he afterward, in another place, explains the meaning. He says baptism means, in German, depth. He also says it means immersion, and that the ordinance ought to be performed in that way, as I have before read you. This *point* has, however, been already sufficiently discussed.

On Revelation xix: 13, Luther used another word; so does the Spanish version; so, also, do the Syriac and the Latin versions. The idea with the authors of these versions was, that *perirerammenon* was the correct word in this verse, and they, therefore, translate it sprinkle. They did not translate *bebammenon*, sprinkle. But if they did, it is still true that we have not in any manuscript, or translation, the word for baptism in that passage.

My friend says that sometimes, when oil, or other substance, is put upon a person, if only on the head, the *whole body* is regarded as anointed. He refers to the case of a woman's anointing the Savior's head with oil, as proof. He is a little inaccurate in his reading of that case. It is recorded by three of the evangelists, I believe, and I cite him the passages on that subject, that he may examine them. In Luke vii: 38, we have the account of it, where it is said she anointed his *feet*. In Matt. xxvi: 7, we have it said that the ointment was poured upon his *head*. In Matt. xxvi: 12, we have the account repeated, where it is said that the ointment was poured upon his *body*. "This ointment on my body," is the language used. She anointed his *head*; she anointed his *feet*; she anointed his *body*. It is not true, then, that this case of putting oil on the *head* affords an argument to show that anointing the head anoints the whole body; for the ointment was put on his *head*, and on his *feet*, and on his *body*.

My friend says that in a certain case, where a fluid was *dropped*, "*baptism* is used." Used for what? Does he say the dropping was the baptism? Does he say that *baptizo* was the word used? Is it not *bapto* in the text? One meaning of *bapto* is, "to stain," or dye. The figurative meaning of that word is, to dye; and, therefore, when blood, or other coloring element drops on a thing, it may be said to be dyed or stained; but the *act* of *dropping*, or sprinkling, or pouring, is nowhere called *baptism*.

In regard to Judith's case, I have a word to say. We are told, "the attendants of Holofernes brought her to the tent, and she slept until midnight. And she arose at the morning watch, and sent to Holofernes, saying: Let my lord give command, to allow thy handmaid to go forth for prayer. And Holofernes commanded the body-guards not to hinder her. And she remained in the camp three days: and went forth by night into the valley of Bethulia, and IMMERSSED [BAPTIZED] HERSELF, in the camp at the fountain. . . . [Note to above:]

"One of the oldest Greek manuscripts (No. 58), and the two oldest versions (the Syriac and Latin), read, '*immersed [baptized] herself in the fountain of water*'

[omitting 'in the camp']. According to the common Greek text, this was done 'at the fountain,' to which she went, because she had there the means of immersing herself. Any other use of water, for purification, could have been made in her tent."—Dr. Conant's "Baptizein," pp. 84, 85.

Let us mark the facts in this case. My friend says if she had gone out and immersed herself, it would have been *indelicate*. That point of indecency, I apprehend, has now, and has had, about as much force in this controversy as any thing he can mention. But we have it recorded that "her maid *went with her*." It is stated, in the second place, that she went out "*at night*." It is also stated that Holofernes, the commander of the army, gave his soldiers and his guard charge that they were not to interrupt the woman, and so she went *beyond the guards*. Then, of course, they could not have witnessed her bathing. Out beyond the guards, in the *night*, attended by her maid, she went to the fountain of water. The soldiers were commanded not to interrupt or molest her. Thus circumstanced, she baptized herself in the fountain of water. Might she not have immersed herself (it is the literal meaning of the word), just as the Jews, when they purified themselves, always immersed themselves, bathing their "*whole flesh*?" The Bible uses that language.

My friend said I would have to bring a written testimony from Dr. Kleeburg, to the effect that he used the language that I repeated as from him. I have no reply to make to that. The doctor's remarks were made in the presence of a number of gentlemen. If he wishes further testimony, let him ask Dr. Kleeburg, and the doctor will laugh at him for his ignorance.

Again, my friend says, in the case of a man's baptizing himself, after touching a dead body, it was baptizing *from* a dead body. That, he supposes to be out of harmony with immersion. But, I ask, if it could not be *immerse from*, could it be *sprinkle from*? The same Greek construction which would prevent me from concluding it to have been immersion would prevent his concluding it to have been sprinkling. In Hebrews, it is said, "having our hearts sprinkled *from* an evil conscience." All the authorities give that reference as an illustration of the *principle* here. "Heart sprinkled *from* an evil conscience!" *How can that be?* It means that the man baptized himself, and that he thus cleansed himself from the effect of having touched a dead body. According to the Jewish law, the man who had touched a dead body was required to immerse or bathe his whole flesh in water. (Lev. xxii: 6; Num. xxxi: 23.)

Again, my friend says if Jerome had meant immersion, he would have used *mergo*, etc., in his translation. He might have done so, it is true. But Jerome explains to us the sense in which he used the word *baptizo* transferred into his version. And he uses that word *mergo*, the very word my friend says he ought to have used if he meant immerse! I will read from Conant's "Baptizein," p. 120, "On the Epistle to the Ephesians:" "Et ter mergimur, ut Trinitatis unum appareat sacramentum—We are three times immersed." The very word my friend says Jerome ought to have used if he meant immersed, is the very word Jerome did use, in explaining what he did when he baptized. I conclude, therefore, that that point is settled.

Mr. Ditzler says clinical baptism, except in certain cases, is not called ecclesiastical baptism. Mosheim used the language, "*merely sprinkled*, and had not been wholly immersed in water in the ancient method." It was the charge against Novatian's baptism, that it was "sprinkling and not immersion after the ancient method." These are substantially his words. Neander, vol. i, p. 310, calls it ecclesiastical baptism, or baptism of the church, and clinic baptism; Dr. Carson called it so; and all the commentators that have spoken of it at all call it ecclesiastical baptism.

I now come to notice another matter briefly. I desire to look at a passage from Clement of Alexandria on this question, giving the translation of *epi koite*, which I will contend for, though I have really not contended for it as yet. I will read the passage carefully: "ἡ ὁ ἰδρωταμένη καθαρά χροῖ ἔματ' ἔχουσα. ἡ Πηνελόπη ἐπὶ τὴν ὑχλὴν ἐρχεται. Τηλέμαχος δὲ, χειρας νυφάμενος πολὺς ἀλὸς εὐχετ' Ἀθῆνῃ. εἶθος τοῦτο Ἰουδαίων ὡς καὶ το πολλάκις ἐπὶ κοιτῇ βαπτίζεσθαι."

Which I translate: "But having washed and put on clean garments, Penelope goes to prayer. Telemachus having washed his hands at the hoary sea, prays to Athenæ. As also this is a custom of the Jews, after the couch (*i. e.*, after coition), often to baptize themselves, or immerse themselves." (*Braden and Hughey Debate.*)

That is the passage where my friend says it is stated that they "used to baptize upon the couch" or "their couches." This is a delicate point. I do not remember exactly my friend's language. But, having washed and put on clean garments, Penelope goes to prayer. Telemachus, having washed his hands at the hoary sea, prays to Athenæ. As also this is the custom of the Jews after the couch, often to baptize themselves; it is "*epi koite*." Now, what was the custom of the Jews, in fact, *after* *koite*. If my friend will refer to Leviticus xv: 16, 17, he

will there see what it was *after which* they were required to baptize themselves, or bathe their whole flesh in water. The *koite* means, literally, I admit, the couch. It is in the dative case, and is preceded by *epi*. Now, *epi* before the dative sometimes, frequently, indeed, means *after*. Its literal sense is upon, when locality is described by it. It means upon, as one book, for example, upon another. But when *time* is the thing in question, and it is the thing in question here, it means *after*. We use *upon* in English constantly in the same sense. I go to the wharf in the spring time and I enter the boat. It is proper I should say: "The boat started immediately *upon* my getting on board." But in what sense in this case do I use the word *upon*? In the sense of *after*, of course, and it is correct. The discussion began immediately *upon* (*after*) our arrival, on the day appointed. We constantly use such language. It is just as current in the Greek language to use *epi* with its dative in the sense of *after* as in any other sense. It means, I grant, *upon*. But one thing coming *upon* another, with respect to time, comes always *after it*. That is, indeed, its primary sense. But what does *koite* mean? It means a couch, but its meaning is, in this case, slightly modified, as I have before shown.

I wish now to notice a matter in regard to Eunomius. It is said "some assert that Eunomius was the first who ventured to maintain that baptism ought to be performed by immersion, and to corrupt, in this manner, the apostolical tradition which has been carefully handed down to the present day."—Sozomen's "Ecclesiastical History," p. 282.

I observe that we have no language from Eunomius. There is no record of a word that he ever uttered. All we have comes from his enemies and persecutors. For proof of this I refer you to "Chambers' Cyclopaedia," under the head, Eunomius. I remark that Jerome lived *at that time*, and was then twenty-nine years of age.

Jerome and the church every-where, *at that time*, practiced immersion. That my friend will not deny. Again, this author (Jerome) says distinctly: "Thrice we are immersed that there may appear one sacrament of the Trinity." Hence this heresy, so called, could not have been *introduced*, for the first time, by Eunomius. It is not very clear what the point of heresy was, precisely, in this case. The controversy between them was concerning the Trinity, and it is probable that the difference, the point under controversy, was rather in regard to the question whether baptism was performed in the right *name*. It is said here that two of the heretics claimed to be baptized in the name

of the death of Christ, and would not be baptized in the name of the Trinity. It was a controversy concerning baptism, but not concerning the *act* so much as the *name* and authority and *formula* that should be employed in the transaction. I read from page 286, of the same work: "If any one desire more detailed information I can only refer him to the works on the subject, written by these heretics and by their opponents. I do not profess to understand or to explain these matters. That these heretical doctrines did not finally become predominant is mainly to be attributed to the zeal of the monks of this period, for all the monks of Syria, Cappadocia, and the neighboring provinces were sincerely attached to the Nicene faith."

My friend, in his speech, blustered through the Bible in his ordinary way, for he can pass through the Old Testament in about ten minutes, and through the entire New Testament in about five, though, by the way, he has seldom touched the New Testament at all. He loves Greek, and Hebrew, and the Talmuds, and things of that sort, things which the people can not understand, better.

My friend says there was not much, if any, water between Jerusalem and Gaza, where Philip went down into the water to immerse the eunuch. *He intimated this.* But there was an abundance of water there. I read from "The Land and the Book," by W. M. Thompson, page 310: "Then another question is whether Philip set out from Samaria or Jerusalem; most probably from Samaria, as I think, for he appears to have been in that city when he received the command to go. He would then have met the chariot somewhere south-west of Latrou. There is a fine stream of water called Murubbat, deep enough, even in June, to satisfy the utmost wishes of our Baptist friends." The author of the foregoing is a man who has spent twenty-five years in that country and traveled all over it; a man as familiar with it as my friend is with his farm. He is a *Presbyterian*, and this is what he says in regard to the water that he found on the road where Philip baptized the eunuch.

But again: My friend says Origen states that Elijah poured the water on the altar, and that it was baptized. Well, the water was poured upon the altar by the order of Elijah, and it was baptized. That is true. There was the wood and the bullock on the altar. For what purpose did they pour on water? For the purpose of demonstrating that there was no concealed fire there. So my friend must not make the amount of water too small; for, if he does, he will defeat the object which inspiration had in saying that the water was

poured on. The water must have been abundant enough to saturate the altar, the wood, and the bullock, else the purpose of pouring the water would not have been accomplished. If that was done, I claim it was, metonymically, a baptism. The effect of pouring was to wet the altar as effectually as if it had been dipped into water. I have a question for my friend. His difficulty is greater than mine. Origen speaks of that as *a* baptism. It is one baptism. But my friend says the pouring was the baptism. Suppose the pouring was the baptism. The prophet told his servants to pour on four barrels of water. First, one of them pours, and there is a baptism. Another pours, and there is another baptism. The next four barrels are poured, and the next. As there were *four* pourings, of course there were four baptisms. It is done again; and there are four other baptisms. And again it is done; so that if the pouring was the baptism, there were *twelve* baptisms. But Origen speaks of it as one. But it could not have been *one* if the pouring constituted the baptism. The altar, etc., was saturated just as if it had been immersed in water; and the state of saturation constituted the baptism. So with regard to the Savior's feet, when the woman wept copious tears on them. So, also, in regard to Nebuchadnezzar, when the dew fell so copiously upon him that he was, as it were, immersed in it.

The Savior said, "Go, teach all nations, baptizing them." He commanded something specific to be done. He had lying before him, then, the word for sprinkle, and for pour, and for wet. He had the generic word *louo*, which means to wash. He had *brecho*, which means to wet. If he intended to express a generic sense, he would have used the word *louo* or *brecho*. If he wished to intimate that they were to pour, he had before him the word for that. But he took *baptizo*, which I have shown you, in its whole history, means to submerge; it includes, at least, the idea of submergence. He selected that word, and hence he commanded that thing. And what must he have meant? If we are to accept words in their *current meaning*, their ordinary sense, then we are *compelled* to suppose that he meant that they should immerse.

My friend has not brought his picture argument up yet; and I will not introduce it just now. I have all the pictures with me, however, and shall be prepared to go into the picture argument when he does.

I now come to Romans vi: 4: "Buried with him by baptism into death;" "plunged into the likeness of his death." What was his

death, burial, and resurrection? He died, and was buried in the earth, as the Bible says. He was in the bowels of the earth three days and nights. On the third day he arose again. Our baptism is a figure of that. And that is precisely the point in the apostle's argument. He illustrates the fact that we ought not to sin, that grace may abound. For says he, "When we were baptized we were buried, and raised again unto a *new life*." Therefore, we ought not to sin, that grace may abound. Dr. Clarke, the greatest commentator in my friend's church, in his commentary, says: "It is probable that the apostle here alludes to the mode of administering baptism by immersion, the whole body being put under the water, which seemed to say the man is drowned; but when he came up out of the water, he seemed to have a resurrection." I am reading authorities from my friend's side of this question. Mr. Wesley says: "Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion." Dr. Barnes says it alludes to the ancient custom of baptizing by immersion. Lyman Coleman says, in so many words, that John's baptism was immersion. Macknight says, on this passage:

"For are ye ignorant that so many of us as have by baptism become Christ's disciples, have been baptized into the likeness of his death, have been buried under the water, as persons who, like Christ, have been killed by sin? . . . He submitted to be baptized, that is, to be buried under the 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."—Macknight on the Epistle to Rom., p. 85.

Chalmers and Conybeare speak, also, of this passage. Conybeare renders it:

"With him, therefore, we were buried by the baptism wherein we shared his death [when we sank beneath the waters, and were raised from under them]."

"NOTE.—This clause, which is here left elliptical, is fully expressed in Colossians ii: 12. This passage can not be understood unless it be borne in mind that the primitive baptism was by immersion."—"Life and Epistles of St. Paul," by W. J. Conybeare, vol. ii, p. 169.

MR. DITZLER'S THIRTEENTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen :

A great many little quibbles my brother has made I have no time to notice. I wish to get my matter in as far as possible, especially all the great leading facts, and omit many remarks I might otherwise make.

I have no time to give a detail of the impossibility of examining the cases of and immersing the three thousand on Pentecost, five thousand the next day, where evidently each one of the twelve apostles would have had only about eighty-six seconds on Pentecost and fifty-one seconds the next day, on the average, to immerse each man, allowing no time to find conveniences, water, rest, eating, etc.

1 Cor. x : 1, 2, compared with Ex. xiv : 19-21 ; xv : 1, 4, 5, 10, clearly show the difference between immersion as such and baptism. We have seen already that according to the Hebrew *tabha*, the Greek *κατίδυσαν*, the Latin *submersisunt*, the Egyptians were *all* IMMERSED, *not one of them was baptized*. Not one of our fathers was immersed, plunged, or dipped; they were *all* baptized.

The baptism of Paul—"stand up" is the Greek, and he baptized. And he stood up and was baptized—Acts ix : 18, "*Καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐβαπτισθη*—and standing up was baptized." Acts xxii : 16, "*Ἀναστὰς βάπτισαι*—stand up to be baptized," is the *literal* Greek. Baptize is in the *infinitive* mood—he *stood up to be baptized*.

Baptism of Christ, Matt. iii : 13, 16 ; Mark i : 10. "Jesus cometh (*ἐπι*) to Jordan, unto John, to be baptized." That is, "he came (*πρὸς*) to John at the Jordan, to be baptized of him." He did not come to John *in* the Jordan—but John (*ἐπι*, *ἐπι*) *at* the Jordan. "And having been baptized (*βαπτισθεὶς*) he went up (*εὐθὺς*) immediately (*ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος*) from the water." In a former debate, our first, Mr. W. contended with awful zeal that *apo* sometimes meant *out of*. But so overwhelming were the facts that he gave it *all up*, and rests the question entirely on the MSS. and texts that have *ἐκ* (*ek*), which

means *out of*, and *from*, both; ἀπὸ never means *out of*, in a single place in all the Greek of the whole world. He saw that in our Mount Sterling debate, and gave it up, out and out. Even the uncompromising Conant was forced to give it up. In his "Baptizein" he says, page 98, note: "It has been erroneously supposed that the same thing is stated in Matt. iii: 16, and Mark i: 10. But the prep. *from* (ἀπὸ) is there used; and the proper rendering is 'up from the water.' But here (in Acts) the prep. is ἐκ, *out from*, *out of*; and the only possible rendering is, 'came up out of the water,' into which (as just before said) they had gone down."

Now, Winer, Kuhner, Jelf, Robinson, and all modern critics show that ἀπὸ can not be applied to any case of going out of, to any case of envelopment, to any case where one object was in or under, and goes out, but only to cases near to, by, at, "not in" (Winer); ἀνέβη ἀπὸ, etc., "up from the water" (*Idioms*, 298).

At several places, Mr. W., to avoid the force of this, declared that Griesbach, Lange, and Bengel had ἐκ, when not one of them has it in the text. He is now bold enough to assert that Tregelles, Alford, and Tischendorf, etc., "exhaust criticism," and so settle this question in favor of ἐκ (*ek*). But Mark xvi: 15, *these very authorities* hurl from the text as a document written after Mark's death "by a subsequent hand," and they are joined by five critics to one of modern scholars, with the great Codex Sinaiticus, making it far stronger still. Yet he falls back on Elzevir, 1623, Mill, Scholz (though he marks it as "probably omitted"), and Lange. But Scholz, Winer, Bengel, the Elzevirs, Koenael, Stephens, Beza, Mill, Knapp, Textus Receptus, Theile and Hahn. Lange, Olshausen, Griesbach, and Conant, all have ἀπὸ in Mark i: 10. Surely he will not admit that Lange, Winer, Scholz, Mill, Conant, the great Bible-revision immersionist leader, and Griesbach are to be left out of the college of the greatest of critics. But were he to prove that it was ἐκ, it does not sustain him, since it means from, as well as out of, as all authorities agree. Again, there is no dispute as to Matt. iii. There all texts have ἀπὸ, which settles it that Christ was not immersed, did not go out of the water. While ἐκ would leave us no clew either way, proves neither his position nor mine, ἀπὸ settles it that Christ was not even in the water at all.

This brings us to ἐκ and PHILIP and THE EUNUCH. Does the fact that "they both went down into the water—both came up out of the water"—imply immersion? If so, "both" were immersed. But *Philip*

had to go down into the water to *immerse* him. Ah, so you admit *Philip* can go down into, come up out of the water, yet not be immersed! Why not the eunuch? A child understands that "in the water," "out of the water," do not imply submergence. "Come out of that water—what are you doing in that water?" "Why do you go into that water?" says the parent to a child playing in a branch, a wash-basin of water, etc. Who thinks of immersion? But I will examine it in the original.

Ἐκ corresponds to the Hebrew *min*, in the Bible.

Exodus ii: 5, *min hammaim*, ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος, etc., "for I drew him out of the water." Now, here Moses was in a basket, floating on the water, and there was not a drop of water about his person, he was not in nor under it. Yet the same Greek words are used—*out of the water*—with a much stronger verb, I drew him out of. Ex. xv: 22, eagle came up (ἀνῶ) from the sea. Ezra viii: 31, καὶ ἐξῆσαν ἀπο τοῦ ποταμοῦ. "And we departed from the river," where they had been "abiding three days" in tents, v. 15. Here both ἐκ and ἀπο occur to strengthen the thought, yet both together do not make it out of. The ἀνῶ is away, *direction*, as in the case of Christ, the ἐκ, put ἐξ for euphony before ἡ, indicates their departure from the river where they had their tents. But as Jordan is a place they think peculiar, may be we can go *ek* other rivers. Moses and others could depart *ek* the rivers in other places, but may be *ek* has a peculiar force as to the Jordan. Let us see. Joshua iv: 16, 17, 19: "Command the priests that . . . they come up out of Jordan, ἐκ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου." "Joshua, therefore, commanded the priests, saying, Come ye up out of Jordan," v. 19, same Greek. "And all the people came up out of Jordan, ἐκ τοῦ Ἰορδάνου." Not one of them was immersed. Here some three millions of people "came up out of the Jordan," who were "in it," yet "dry shod."

As to what my brother says, you will note that I often pay no attention to what *he* says I say, for you all hear and know I say not the things he constantly tells you I do. The records will show badly for him all through in these respects. Let us now examine *in*, *en*, and *eis*, *eis*, as Philip and the eunuch went down into, or *eis*, *to*, the water, and the people were baptized in Jordan as the *place* of receiving baptism. "Eis, to, into, in answer to *whither*."—"Buttman's Greek Grammar," § 447, p. 409. The profound Kuhner says: "In the direction *whither*; hence it is used of motion *into the interior* of an object, *up to, into the immediate presence of*; in general, to denote the *reaching a definite limit*."—(Italics his), p. 428, § 290. Its original idea is

motion *toward*, in answer to *whither*, as all critics now agree. Motion *toward* may result in arriving *at*, *up to*, hence it means *at*, *to*, *up to*, *at*, in presence of. It may result in penetration, hence *into*: or opposing, hence *against*; or *aiding*, hence it means *for*, in order to; maybe attended with a *mental* aim, hence *in respect to*, *in reference to*, as seen in the discussion on the last proposition. Hence Jelf, "εἰς 1. Local. An actual motion toward and into an actual object, *in*, *into*, . . . to the house of Menelaus," ii, 298. As almost every great critic, lexicon, etc., of modern date gives it *to* as the first proper meaning, I need not quote them. It frequently interchanges in the sacred text with ἐν used by the same speaker. It interchanges so often with ἐν, *to*, *at*, *upon*, that often where our Greek text has εἰς, Tischendorf, Alford, etc., have ἐν, and, *vice versa*, in their Greek texts, which shows that they are often one in meaning as to *location*. 1 Sam. xxix: 1: "And the Israelites pitched *by a fountain*." Greek, ἐν—Hebrew, *beayain*—Syriac, *beain*—Vulgate, *super fontem*. Were they *in* it? 1 Kings xvii: 3: "Get thee hence and hide thyself *in the brook* Cherith (*b'nachal*—ἐν τῷ χ), that is before Jordan." Was he hid under the water? Is. xxxvi: 2: "The king sent Rabshakch from Lachish (*εἰς*, *eis*) to Jerusalem;" not *into* it, as the city was not yet captured, and they remained by the potter's field. 2 Kings vi: 4: "The sons of the prophets came to Jordan (*εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην*—*into the Jordan, eis*.) and cut wood." Luke v: 4: "Launch out (*εἰς*) *into the deep*," *i. e.*, the ship. Was it immersed? Did the people cut wood in or under water? In Ezekiel i: 3; iii: 15; x: 15, 20, 22, *be* and *at* are interchanged constantly, *in* and *at* or *by* the river. Yet in neither case was the prophet in the water literally. "The same faces which I saw *in* the river, *by* the river." So we see εἰς, ἐν, and ἐν leave it all unsettled. They prove nothing either way.

IN JORDAN. Now we boldly affirm that it was simply a *physical* and natural impossibility for John to have baptized the immense crowds that came to him by *immersion* into the waters of the Jordan. We have seen that from the immersionist theory all the Jews had baptisteries in every house in Palestine, as they baptized themselves every day of the world. Hence, if this be true, John had no need to repair to Jordan to get water enough to *immerse* them. If not true, it ruins their whole theory, as it admits their baptisms every day were by *affusion*. Why did John baptize beyond, then at the Jordan, then later at Ænon near to Salim? Now note the following facts:

1. John at first did not baptize *at*, or *by*, or *in* the Jordan. The

multitude had not made the general rush; the mass had not yet come, so we read John x: 40, compared with John ii: 19, 25, 26; iii: 26: "And (Christ) went away again beyond Jordan (*πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου, εἰς τὸν τόπον ὅπου ἦν Ἰωάννης τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων καὶ ἔμεινεν ἐκεῖ*) into the place where John at first baptized, and he remained there. (V. 41.) And many resorted unto him . . . (42.) and many believed on him there (*ἐκεῖ*)." Here you see people believed on Christ, came to him, lived *in the place where* John baptized. He remained in the place and received the people *in the place* where John first baptized.

2. When news spread, and crowds—"all Judea," etc.—came to John's baptism, he had to go to the Jordan, where water sufficient could be had for the multitudes. The idea of John having to go into the hot, most unhealthy valley of Jordan, near Jericho, the place where *no mortal ever* lived; where town, village, and city never was built, to get water enough to *immerse* a man in is simply monstrous. We have to hold our camp and protracted country meetings, where only a few thousands are to be accommodated for seven and eight days, near creeks, large springs, etc., for the purpose of having enough water for animals, cooking, and all the uses of water. In a country so destitute as that was, and where, for daily ablutions, they had to use pure water, nothing less than a good stream would have accommodated the immense crowds.

3. The rushing crowd over, John goes to the high, healthy region of Ænon, where the springs there furnished a sufficiency of water.

4. It is simply preposterous to suppose that a man could have stood in any kind of water as long as the immersion theory requires John to have stood in the Jordan. No mortal could have stood it. But when you remember that,

5. The Jordan's rise—its head—is over three thousand feet above its mouth, and runs like a torrent, it becomes amazing that men should believe such a dogma. The *Mississippi* is only fifteen hundred feet higher at its head or rise than at its mouth at the gulf; yet it traverses three thousand one hundred and sixty miles, and falls a little over five inches to the mile. It flows from three to five miles an hour. The whole length of the Jordan is only one hundred and twenty miles—its windings two hundred. From Galilee to the Dead Sea it is seventy miles—directly only fifty, with six hundred and fifty feet descent, which makes nine feet and two-sevenths ($9\frac{2}{7}$) of a foot to a mile. The real fall is thirteen feet to a mile. That is, it falls one hundred and eleven inches to five inches in the *Mississippi*, or, in a

direct mile, one hundred and fifty-six inches to five, not counting the Jordan's winding.

Dr. Robinson, the most scientific and learned of all the travelers, and most relied on in all the civilized world, says, and shows, that the lower Jordan, with which we have most to do, falls an average of over ten (10) feet to the mile.

Dr. Wm. Smith, in his "Dictionary of the Bible," a high authority with our opponents, gives this summary of the Jordan. Following Lieut. Lynch's account, he gives: "The depression . . . of the Dead Sea below the Mediterranean Sea is 1,316.7, and 653.3 feet below Tiberias. The whole distance from the Lake El Huleh to the Sea of Tiberias is nearly nine miles, and the fall of the river is about six hundred feet." That makes its fall up there over sixty-six feet to a mile. In his article on Palestine, he shows that the valley and plane, over and through which the Jordan passes, is one hundred and fifty miles, including the Dead Sea. The head of the Jordan is 1,700 feet above the level of the Mediterranean; its mouth is 1,317 feet below it, making the fall of the Jordan in all "a height of more than 3,000 feet." Divide this by one hundred and twenty, and you have the whole average fall in feet, *i. e.*, twenty-five feet. Hence, Smith speaks of it as "*it rushes down its extraordinary descent.*"

Kitto: "It becomes turbid as it advances to the Dead Sea. . . . The water is . . . *always cool.*"

Lieut. Lynch, who traversed the entire Jordan, and whose statements none questions—indeed, he seems to be an immersionist—gives us an account of his descent in iron boats, one of which was destroyed by the violent current dashing it to pieces against obstacles: "The shores (seenued) to flit by us. With its *tumultuous rush* the river hurried us onward, and we knew not what the next moment would bring forth—whether it would *dash us upon a rock*, or plunge us down a cataract."—P. 255. This was the lower Jordan, where John baptized. They arrived at El Meshra, where John baptized. The banks are ten feet high, save at the ford, and the water is suddenly deep. Here he moralizes how "the Deity, veiled in flesh, descended the bank, . . . and the *impetuous* river, in grateful homage, must have stayed its course, and gently laved the body of its Lord."—P. 256. When pilgrims came to bathe, he anchored below them, "to be in readiness to render assistance should any of the crowd be swept down by the current, and in danger of drowning, . . . accidents, it is said, occurring every year."—Pp. 261, 265.

They went on, soon passed "a camel in the river, washed down by the current in attempting to cross the ford last night."—P. 266. In five minutes they "passed another camel in the river, the poor beast leaning exhausted against the bank, and his owner seated despondingly above him. *We could not help him!*"—P. 266. (Abridged Work, 170.) I should call that a swift current where even those seamen in iron boats could not stop to aid the man.

Of the upper Jordan, a traveler, writing in "Harper's," June No., 1870, says: "The river soon became a roaring torrent, in which no boat could live." It is told by Lynch, they often had to have their iron boats hauled around such places. Being assailed by a mob, "the current bore the canoe along too rapidly for them to keep up with it, but they cut across the *bend*," and so met it again.

All writers agree to this, and none but *Dr. Barclay*, a bigoted secretary of Mr. Wilkes' church, ever saw it otherwise. I read from Rabbi Joseph Swatz, for sixteen years a resident in the Holy Land, p. 49. He was a man of eminent learning, and gives "a Descriptive Geography, etc., of Palestine:" "The Jordan . . . is so rapid a stream that even the best swimmer can not bathe in it without endangering his life. In the neighborhood of Jericho [there is where John baptized], the bathers are compelled to *tie themselves together with ropes*, to prevent their *being swept off by the rapidity of the current*." Now note,

1. The Jordan is in one of the hottest valleys in the world, owing to its immense depression; yet,

2. Owing to the swiftness of the current, sweeping from the snow-clad mountains of Lebanon, three thousand feet above, its waters are very cool. It is, therefore,

3. The most unhealthy of regions—the *lower* valley where John baptized. No village or town ever adorned its banks. Smith states that pointedly.

4. Here is Smith's summary of the facts: "From its fountain heads to the point where it is lost to nature (empties in the Dead Sea) *it rushes down one CONTINUOUS INCLINED PLANE, only broken by a series of rapids, or precipitous falls.*" That is the Jordan. Where are those eddies and convenient places for immersing? Now, we have shown,

1. That it is one of the swiftest streams in the world, descending the steepest plane, and deepest, on earth.

2. It descends through the hottest valley in the world of that latitude, and, hence, unhealthy.

3. The water, coming from regions so high and cold above, is cold. Hence,

4. John left there as soon as the wants of the decreasing multitudes could be supplied with the springs of Ænon, a high, healthy region.

5. No man could stand in water to immerse as long as John is presumed to have stood in the waters of the Jordan.

6. Much less could he stand so long, so constantly, in water so swift and cold, where animal heat would at once be overcome. It is simply a scientific *impossibility*.

7. It is impossible that he could have, in so swift a stream, put men and women under the water without being exhausted at once, besides drowning half of them. When a steamboat runs eight miles, not to say ten, an hour, none but practiced persons can throw a bucket into the river, filling it, without danger. But here the stream is swifter far than that, and the size and weight of men far, very far, greater than the surface and weight of a bucket, and, therefore, correspondingly greater. It is physically impossible, therefore, that John could have immersed the multitudes had he been as strong as a giant.

As for Ænon, it means a place of springs, watery place. Light-foot's *Horæ*, i, 345, Kimchi: "A place of many springs or waters." "Ænon, in an intensive form, *ain*—a fountain."—Alford. Arabic: ". . . at the fountain Nun." Peshito: "John also was baptizing at the fountain Ion. For there were many waters there—*themayo*."

ENGLISH ARGUMENT.—And now, my friends—

I. Let it be remembered the church never questioned baptism by affusion, nor rebaptized sprinkled persons, for the first *fifteen hundred years* of the church—up to 1521, though tens of thousands occurred in the first centuries of the church.

II. The *action* of a thing is less than the thing itself. The *action*, therefore, can not be the *equivalent* of that of which it is *only a part*. Stabbing, poisoning, shooting, may result in *death*—in *killing*, in *murder*, may be the *action* or *means* of its accomplishment; but *as acts*, they are *less than murder* or *death*.

You may kill by shooting or by stabbing—shooting and stabbing are not the same acts—are different, but *death* may be accomplished as the result in *either* case. Hence,

The action of baptism is less than *baptism*, as a *part* is less than the *whole*.

How then can a *word*, by its simple force, express, *as an action*, the whole meaning of baptism?

III. The immersionists now, with Conant, are compelled to give up all those silly conceits so paraded by A. C., that ἵζω, ἀπὸ, and ἐκ, help out of the water, and admit that βαπτίζω, does not express *emergence*—does not bring them out, but leaves them *under*.

Then it is less, as a *word of action*, were immersion that action, than Christian baptism, or Jewish, and baptism as an *immersion*, is *more* than is included in βαπτίζω.

SPRINKLING.—1. *There is no instance of an immersion of a person religiously in the whole Bible*, though water is used in connection with persons for fourteen hundred years before Christ.

2. All God's services, as to purifications, cleansings of persons typically, were by *sprinklings*, as the main service, at least.

3. No purification was ever accomplished without sprinklings, so far as people were concerned.

4. All the typical cleansings of persons had Christ's blood as their object or meaning, and all were by *sprinkling*.

5. All atonement typical, was by *affusion* and *sprinkling*—*shedding* of blood, and *sprinkling* of the same. The water always used is called, all the time, ὕδωρ ραντισμοῦ (*hudōr rantismou*), *water of sprinkling*.

6. Leprosy, Lev. xiv: 7, 9, 14, 15, 18, 19; Ex. xxiv: 5, 6, 8; a house, Lev. xiv: 48-52; persons and things, Num. xix: 16-20; all were cleansed by sprinkling.

7. Hence, Christ's blood is a *sprinkling*. Heb. xii: 24; ix: 14, 22; x: 19, 22; 1 John i: 7; 1 Peter i: 2.

8. The first formal ordinance, after circumcision, was by sprinkling. Ex. xii: 1-7.

9. If baptism was *for remission*, remission was *never* obtained, save through *sprinkling*, typically or really.

10. If it be a washing away of guilt, it is a washing and renewing *shed* on us. Titus iii: 5, 6, 7.

11. If mode represents Christ's death, etc., that was by *affusion*. Matt. xxvi: 7-12. Κατέχεεν ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν, She poured it on his head. . . In that she hath poured this ointment, ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος μου, πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιάσαι με ἐποίησαν. "In that she bath poured this ointment upon my body, she did it in respect (or reference) to my burial." Now, there is the very word *burial*, ἐλάπτω, yet the shedding of oil on his head represented his *burial*; yet they ask if water poured on the head can represent *burial*. Here *pouring* represents *burial*.

12. Baptism is distinct from a mere act of immersion, sprinkling, or pouring.

If one (or any object) is put under water, or any liquid, he is *immersed the moment*, and by virtue of the act, in the instant of being put under. If that be Bible baptism, then every rock, stick, or animal, etc., that goes under water is baptized. Again, if immersion is baptism, emersion is not a part, nor necessary to it. That would destroy all the use of Rom. vi: 3, 4; Col. ii: 11, etc.

13. When *once* we are baptized, we are *always* baptized. We are only *immersed while UNDER the water*.

14. The very words habitually used among immersionists, when stating their own views in their own style, show how *they* would have made the Bible, and are not found therein as to persons.

Conant, 87, 89: "The general idea expressed by this word is, *to put into, or under water.*" "It means, simply, *to put into, or under water.*" A. C., "Debate," 162: "Put himself *under the water.*"

Can he evade the force of these facts? He sees and feels he can not. What has become of his classics? All lost—all gone. I knew he would give them up—repudiate them. Hence, I paid so little attention to them; though, by a brief but sufficient analysis of Campbell and Conant, and their inconsistencies, I showed how utterly absurd and untenable was their and his position. As for the Syriac, the gentleman is overwhelmed and lost. In the Arabic, Gotch brings no relief—we had flanked him, and cut off all supply of water. I deny, I deny, is all the cry he has left.

I would notice more of his strange and easily exposed turns, but time is too valuable to waste it in that direction.

MR. WILKES' THIRTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I would just remark that I have brought this morning a large book of pictures on baptism, and I expected to have exhibited them; but my friend does not pursue the picture argument, therefore I need not do it. I have abundant evidence in the pictures that immersion was very anciently practiced.

I wish to call your attention, first, to the rule on the subject of baptizing *with* water and baptizing *in* water. Sometimes the Greek construction is, baptizing *with* water, sometimes it is baptizing *in* water. I presume to say that they are both true, and that they are substantially the same. Mr. Winer, who is one of our highest authorities on that subject, holds this language in his New Testament Grammar, p. 412: "Sometimes we find in parallel phrases a preposition now inserted and now omitted; as, 1 Peter iv: 1. *παθόντος ὑπερ ἡμῶν σαρκι*, and immediately afterward *ὁ παθὼν ἐν σαρκι*.—Luke iii: 16; Acts i: 5 and ix: 16, *βαπτίζων ἰδατι*, but *βαπτ. ἐν ἰδατι*, Matt. iii: 11; John i: 26, 33. This difference in phraseology does not affect the sense, but each form of expression arose from a different conception: *πάσχειν ἐν σαρκι* means *suffer in the flesh* (body); *πάσχειν σαρκι* means *suffer according to* (as respects) *the flesh* (§ 31, 6). *βαπτίζων ἐν ἰδατι* signifies, *baptize in water* (immersing), *βαπτίζων ἰδατι*, *baptize with water*. Here, and in most other passages, the identity of the two expressions, *in* SENSE, is manifest; yet we must not consider one as put for the other. C. f. besides, Eph. ii: 1, *νεχροὶ τοῖς παραπτώμοσι*, but Col. ii: 13, *νεκροὶ ἐν τοῖς παραπτώμοσι*, 2 Cor. iv: 7, *ἐν ἡ υπερβολῇ τῆς δυνάμεως ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ κἀμὴ ἐκ ἡμῶν*, Matt. vii: 2; c. f., Luke vi: 38; 1 John iii: 18."

Winer says, whether *en* is or is not used before the dative of the element, the sense is exactly the same, and that the sense is "immersing." So that, whatever of authority there is in Winer, we have it on our side.

Again, my friend says the practice of immersing was common

at the time our English translation was made, in 1611; and he accounts, it seems, for the presence of so much evidence for immersion, in our present version, in that way. Whereas, I read from Dr. Wall, evidence ample, to show that, though the *law* was to immerse, as it still is, I believe, in the English Rubric, yet as early as Queen Elizabeth's time, the immense influence of some great men who believed sprinkling would *do*, was sufficient to carry the practice of *sprinkling and pouring* against the Rubric. So that, when our version was made, the ordinary practice was to sprinkle or pour.

My friend says our brethren of the immersing party have invented ways to screen people and themselves from the public gaze when they are about to immerse. Well, we still immerse though, and he does not. Suppose we do employ means of immersing *decently*, is there any harm in it? We do what God tells us to do. What objection has my friend to our doing that in as becoming a manner as possible? This remark is only to intimidate. It is an out-cropping of the fierce opposition of my friend to immersion *on that ground*. So I interpret and understand it.

You recollect on yesterday, Mr. D. promised us some *fun*. He brings it up this morning. He says a man, somewhere, was drowned in trying to be baptized. He read it in the morning papers; and the man who gives us the account adds his initials. Initials are not reliable evidence. How does he know whose initials they are? How does he know they are the initials of the man who wrote it? They may be those of some one else. It is in the morning papers, and that must be regarded as conclusive that sprinkling is baptism, I suppose. He promised to prove that sprinkling or pouring is Christian baptism, and this is his mode of doing it. I suppose, after so much talk for the past four days, you have in your minds clearly just the passage where sprinkling or pouring is mentioned in the Bible. What passage would you now read? Having listened so patiently and respectfully for so many days, what passage would you read from the Bible—not from some authority outside, not from some Talmud, but from the *Bible*, as authority for sprinkling or pouring? If there had been any such passage, of course my friend would have furnished it long ago. Had there been such a passage, he would have had you so familiar with the chapter and verse that you could never have forgotten it. He ought to say frankly, *Here is the chapter and verse where I find authority for sprinkling*. If my friend has such a chapter and verse, why *not* show them to you? The reason he does not, is because he can not. He is not to be blamed

very much for it, because he can not do it. I rather admire the bravery of that drowned man, if the story is true at all, who, rather than shrink from doing what God commanded him to do, lest it might appear to be a little indecent or be a little cold, bravely attempted to do what God ordered him to do, at the risk and loss of his life.

My friend said "they came out of the Jordan," but that they were not *in it*. He says they were not *immersed* in it. Whether they were immersed in it or not, is not the question now. If they had not been in the Jordan, how could they have come out of it? I did not say that since Philip and the eunuch went into the water there was, necessarily, an immersion. I tried to show that going into the water meant *going into the water*, that is all. The question, or the argument, was this: *Why* did they go into the water? If they intended to sprinkle, why did they not sprinkle somewhere else, where it could have been more conveniently done? Why did they go *into the water* to sprinkle? They did not intend to sprinkle or to pour, but they were about to do something which would *require* them to be in the water, which sprinkling or pouring does not. Therefore the practice was immersion. My friend thinks coming up out of the Jordan does not imply that they had been in it. Then he will never send a man to heaven or hell. He knows that *ek* means *out of*. Mr. Jelf says so. I read on page 288: "*ek*, preposition of motion. Primary meaning *out of*." So *eis* means *into*, primarily. That *every body knows*. The grammars are lying thick about my friend, and if he raises any controversy on this point we will examine it, otherwise it is not necessary. Accepting these facts, that *eis* means *into*, and *ek* *out of*, we read that the Savior was baptized, *eis, into*, the Jordan, and that he came up, *ek, out of*, the Jordan. These facts were demanded *in his baptism*. But they are neither *demande*d, nor could they be explained on the hypothesis of sprinkling. The same is true of Philip and the eunuch, of whom it is said: "They both went down *into* the water" and came up *out of* the water.

I wish to finish my reading of Conybeare: "It is needless to add that baptism was (unless in exceptional cases) administered by immersion, the convert being plunged beneath the surface of the water to represent his death to the life of sin, and then raised from this momentary burial to represent his resurrection to the life of righteousness. It must be a subject of regret that the general discontinuance of this original form of baptism (though perhaps necessary in our northern climates) has rendered obscure to popular apprehension some very

important passages of Scripture."—"Conybeare's Life and Epistles of St. Paul," vol. i, p. 439.

My friend can not see, when Paul says, "We are buried with Christ in baptism," that there is any *burial* in it. Conybeare says we can not understand that language of the Apostle Paul unless we understand that the ancient practice was immersion. But Mr. D. says he can not see it. He had better say that he *will not see it*. He can not see that there is a word of truth in the statement that in baptism there is a *burial*, though it is a *declaration in the Bible*. That is the high road to skepticism, to destroying faith in God, and leading men to wreck, ruin, and death.

I read in the next place an authority on the subject of *tense*. My friend says the baptized were left in the water, that is, if they were immersed, or that the *tense* used, *we are* buried, leaves them in the water. In the Greek it is, "*We were* buried;" and in Colossians it is, "*Were* raised up." As to the meaning of the past tense I read: "With regard to the TENSES of the verb, New Testament grammarians and expositors have been guilty of the greatest mistakes. In general, the tenses are employed in the New Testament exactly in the same manner as in Greek authors, namely: The aorist marks simply the past (merely occurrence at some former time, viewed, too, as momentary), and is the tense usually employed in narration."—(Winer, p. 264). On page 277 we have this language: "Nowhere in the New Testament does the aorist express what is *wont* to be done." At the top of the same page it is said: "It is only in appearance that the aorist is used for the future." I desire to quote Jelf, an authority second to none as a grammarian of the Greek language: "The aorist expresses an action as simply past, neither having, like the perfect, any connection with time present, nor, like the IMPERFECT, any reference to another past action, nor any notion of continuance. . . . Hence, further, the aorist is used when any action is to be represented as single or momentary, *i. e.*, as not lasting beyond the time necessary for the occurrence of the single act; and thus is opposed to the imperfect (continuance)."—Jelf, vol. ii, p. 67. It expresses no idea of continuance. The aorist is employed here. It expresses a momentary, instantaneous, past action. Now, says Paul, "*We were* buried"—at a former time—"with him by baptism into death." "As Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, so we" are raised up "to walk a new life." In that baptism you see a burial, and in it you see a resurrection. You certify by your faith seen in

that act, that Christ was buried and was raised up again. When you were baptized you enacted that tragedy over again. So when baptism is administered as it ought to be, you have a constant witness on this earth that Christ was dead, was buried, and was raised up again. The sinner is buried, as he was buried, and is raised up as he was raised up. Thus these great cardinal and spiritual facts in our holy gospel are re-enacted continually in baptism, and are constant witnesses to the truth of our holy religion. This is what John meant when he said: "There are three that bare record on earth; the Spirit, and the water, and the blood." These three testify to the same great facts of the Savior's life, his death, burial, and re-urrection. We have to omit many things in this examination that are very important, as "Knapp's Theology," from which I would read if I had the time. On Colossians ii: 12, the argument is just the same, except that Paul here tells us not only that we were buried, but, says he, "*in which* we were raised up again." In what? "In which" (that is, in baptism) "we were raised up again." I put it to the intelligence of our hearers, When my friend sprinkles a man, is there any *burial*? Paul says we were buried in baptism. He and Paul seem to differ. When my friend sprinkles a man, is there any raising up? Paul continues: "In which we were raised up." Is there any burial or raising up in his baptism? Paul says there was a burying and a raising up in his baptism. If there is in my friend's baptism nothing to suggest, or to remind one of a burial or a resurrection—and there is nothing of the sort—then his and Paul's baptism are not the same. If not, his baptism is not Christian baptism. That is, "sprinkling or pouring is not Christian baptism," and my friend fails to sustain his proposition. On Colossians ii: 12, I have Dr. Clarke, stating expressly that it is immersion. Wesley and Macknight, great lights on my brother's own side, say the same thing.

I will state, in the next place, that Paul says "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." What was that? It was a baptism. Wherein did the baptism consist? In raining drops of water on them? No. They were under a cloud, but not a *rain* cloud. It was a cloud of smoke by day, and of fire by night; therefore, it was not a rain cloud. My friend says the cloud was *behind* them. Paul says they were *under* the cloud and *in* the sea. The cloud went behind them at night, to protect them from the Egyptians during the night; but afterward the cloud came over them.

But turn to the Psalmist David; he tells us, Mr. D. says, something about a storm of rain. Paul says they were under a *cloud* and in the sea. It was not a rain cloud. The fact that the Psalmist says something about the *clouds* pouring out water does not prove that the water was poured upon the Israelites at the Red Sea; but if it had been, that does not prove that the *pouring* was the *baptism*. He says, in passing through, they had sometimes the spray of the sea thrown upon them. That is not correct. It is said the sea was congealed, and that it stood in heaps on each side. It was, therefore, not throwing spray on them. But there is another objection to this. If it had not been so congealed, standing in heaps; and if the spray had been thrown upon them, my friend must remember that, according to all careful calculations, the sea must have been opened for a distance of four or five miles, to have allowed them to go through in the time in which they were engaged in passing through. It must have been opened *that wide*, at least. The wind certainly did not blow both ways at the same time. If it blew at all (and there is no evidence that it did), it could have blown only one way. Suppose it did blow, and that it blew favorably for throwing spray from the sea on that people; suppose it blew so hard that the water was carried five miles, in order that they might *all be baptized*; the persons who were on the side *whence the wind came* would have been *overwhelmed* and destroyed by the force of the wind and water upon them: for, otherwise, the water would not have reached to the other side. But the water was on both sides *congealed*. It will not do, then, to suppose that they were baptized from the spray. If they had been, it would, as we said, have drowned the persons on the side whence the wind came. Any thing on this earth is seized hold of, if it promise any help, to avoid immersion. That is the point.

My friend has said almost nothing, absolutely nothing, in favor of sprinkling or pouring, and actually *nothing from the Bible*; but has gone in search of evidence nearly every-where else. There is a rule of law that, when a man has a case in litigation, he must bring the *best* evidence of which that case is susceptible. And if he attempts to bring any other evidence than that, it is a suspicious circumstance. For example: when a man has a written document obligating certain parties to certain things, if the matter comes into controversy, that original document is demanded by the law. Even a copy, except in certain extremities, will not be allowed as evidence. For a similar reason, far-fetched, hear-say testimony is not received in court. The

law presumes that if a man have good evidence in his case he will produce it; that he will bring the very best evidence that he has at command. Therefore, the fact that a man indulges in far-fetched conclusions, drawn from gloomy and doubtful premises; or that he seeks every other source and kind of evidence, except that which he ought and would be expected to produce, are proofs conclusive that he has no case.

So my friend reads the Talmud, comprising the Mishna and Gemara—those dreamy things—and thinks he has clear proof for sprinkling! I was musing to myself while he was talking. I said to myself, here is a man of distinction, whom his brethren place forward as their champion and oracle. Is it possible that they can believe in their hearts that sprinkling is baptism, after what and from what has been said? Then, where is Sir William Hamilton? Where is Whately? Where are the logicians? They surely never knew any thing of this sort.

The Israelites were *under* the cloud and *in* the sea; they were, then, immersed. Bengel says, “The cloud and the sea took the fathers out of sight, and restored them again to view, much as water does those who are baptized.”

We are told, in Hebrews vi: 2, something about the doctrine of baptisms. There never was a sprinkling or pouring of pure water practiced in any dispensation as a religious rite. There are only two classes of cases recorded of sprinkling, for purifying, in the whole of the Old Testament; and there are about eighteen other classes of cases where there was no sprinkling at all. Even in the cases of cleansing, where there were sprinklings, there were immersions also. So it comes to this: there never was any case of cleansing any body, no matter what the cause of the uncleanness was, where the body was not washed, or bathed, in water.

I call your particular attention to this. In Hebrews x: 22 we have this language: “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.” There is no controversy but that the “bodies washed in pure water” here, has reference to baptism, and also has an allusion to the Jewish ablutions. Now mark: when it is said our hearts are sprinkled, the sprinkling of water is not alluded to; for it is the blood of Christ that is sprinkled—a thing distinct from the water. It is a separate thing. The sprinkling here can not allude to the sprinkling of water in baptism, for it is a thing

distinct from it. That which is sprinkled is the heart. That is distinct from the body. The heart is held up in conception as a thing distinct from the body; as the part of the person, however, that is sprinkled. The Jews sprinkled blood, blood and water mixed, and water and the ashes of a *red* heifer mixed. These, all, they *sprinkled*, but never simply water. The blood was the significant thing in all these sprinklings. Those ancient sprinklings typified the sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ. The blood of Jesus Christ is now, as it were, sprinkled upon the hearts of men. And now, as under Judaism, after the blood is sprinkled, the body is bathed in water. Under the Jewish economy, after the blood, or ashes representing blood, mixed with water to multiply or greatly extend its diffusive quality, had been *sprinkled*, the unclean person was required to bathe the *whole flesh*, or body, in water. So now our *bodies* are to be bathed in water. This is the apostle's line of reasoning. His language is in allusion to the fact that our Christian ceremonies correspond to the Jewish ceremonies; that the Jewish were types, and ours their antitypes. We have the fulfillment in the antitype, when we have our hearts sprinkled, and our bodies washed in pure water. So says Stuart; and Macknight, Alford, and Clarke say the same thing.

I have one other remark to make, and this is in regard to the Savior's baptism in suffering. I will present a general view of it. The passages will be found in Luke xii: 50, and in Mark x: 38, 39. The sufferings of Christ are called a baptism. The Savior says, "Can you drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with? And they said unto him, We can. And Jesus said unto them, Ye shall indeed drink of the cup that I drink of; and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized: but to sit on my right hand and on my left hand is not mine to give." The Savior was to be baptized. That is universally regarded to have been complemented in the sufferings of Jesus Christ. The sufferings of Christ were his baptism. This is admitted. Baptism means something. It is claimed to mean sprinkling, or pouring, or immerison. According to my friend's view, it must have meant one of these three things. Which could it have meant? The Savior goes to the garden of Gethsemane. There, in anticipation of that cup of suffering, that baptism, he suffers so that he sweat, as it were, great drops of blood. He cries in the agony and anguish of his soul—for he was man as well as God—he cries, "My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me." The weight of the accumulated sins

of the then past, present, and to come was resting on his soul. By his stripes we are healed, and the chastisement of our peace was laid upon him. He was bruised for our offenses. Look at that Holy One there, crying in agony on that *night* in Gethsemane's garden, with the crushing weight of the sins of the world upon his soul. Then follow him to the cross. Behold the crown of thorns put upon his head, and blood oozing from his temples. The spear enters his side, and the nails his hands and feet. See that wonderful suffering, and then tell me, my friend, in the honesty of your soul, remembering that you will have to stand at the judgment and give an account of the way you deal with these holy things, will *touching* your finger to a little water⁴ in a small *cup*, and then placing it to the forehead, represent that suffering? Do you believe it? Who believes it? There is not a man who has ever written upon this subject who so interprets it. Mr. Robinson, in his "Greek Lexicon," under the head of baptism, refers to this case, and says it is an allusion to the *overwhelming sufferings* of Jesus Christ. It is, then, an allusion to immersion. It does not allude to sprinkling or pouring. Therefore, baptism is not sprinkling or pouring.

I have a remark to make with regard to spiritual baptism. My friend says the Spirit was *poured* out, and people were baptized *with* the Holy Spirit. I ask him, was the *pouring* the *baptism*, or was the *effect* of pouring the baptism? The Spirit overwhelmed, took entire possession of the apostles' intellects; or they were just as effectually under the control and influence of the Spirit of God, as a man's body is entirely in subjection to, and under, the water, when he is immersed in water.

MR. DITZLER'S FOURTEENTH ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Let me ask you in all seriousness: What has my brother done in the way of answering *any* thing I have said? Nothing at all—nothing whatever. He is terribly excited, and flies about first on *eis*, then on *ek*, then he runs from Ænon to Jordan, and from Jordan to Gaza, but all to no purpose. He brings up the pliable young Dr. Kleeburg. What desperation! Who is he? What his reputation? Why, Lightfoot would weigh down forty thousand such men. Fürst, the learned Jewish Rahbi, who says its radical signification is to sprinkle, "*perfundere*," would be "Hyperion to a Satyr." Yet *this* is the help he now seeks. I have quoted Gesenius, whose law of interpreting Hebrew all scholars now repudiate, who gives *tingo*, moisten, stain, sprinkle, as its first definition, in his great "Thesaurus." I have shown that Buxtorf, the prince of all the Hebrew scholars the world ever produced, till Fürst came in, though he lived long before the great principles of learning the true root of Semitic words, sustains my cause; so of all the rest. But, beyond all, I showed that *tabhal*, as used in the Bible, applied to affusions, as in the case of sprinkling Joseph's garment with blood—*tabhal*, and where, in Rabbinic Hebrew, a man baptized (*tabhal*) himself, with as much hail melted as he could hold in the hollow of his hand. Where is the immerse? Many more cases are given here in the Talmudists before me, but this settles the whole question. I leave the brother with his brother Kleeburg, while I seek better company.

His interpretation of Clemens Alexandrius is contrary to all the laws ever known in grammar, contrary to all the parallel passages where the same form occurs—"Baptized on a bed," as Novatian, Theodosius, etc.—contrary to the illustrations given in the same passage, in none of which is there *any* allusion to what he refers it to. We have in Clemens such an allusion, and *another* form, another case,

and another preposition are used—all different, and just such as all the laws of language require in such a case. There, the Greek is, ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ σύζυγιαν κούτης . . . βαπτίζεσθαι, “To baptize *from* the couch,” and the *kata sudzugian*, express what he refers to in Leviticus. But there is nothing of the kind here.

I now take up the strongest hold of immersionists, the text out of which they have made more capital than out of all others. Romans vi: 3, 4: 3. ἢ ἀγνοεῖτε ὅτι ὅσοι ἐβαπτίσθημεν εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν, εἰς τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ ἐβαπτίσθημεν; 4. συνε-άφημεν αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ βαπτισματος εἰς τὸν θάνατον. Know you not that as many of us as have been baptized unto Jesus Christ, were baptized unto (into) a participation of his death? We are therefore buried with him through the baptism into his death.

To understand this much abused passage, we must inquire closely into, WHAT IS THE SUBJECT MATTER OF THE DISCOURSE? It is not baptism in any of its bearings. It is this:

1. “SHALL WE CONTINUE IN SIN?” This is *the* issue—*continuance* in sin, or in *spiritual life*. He says, *No*. What is the *remedy*? *Death to sin*. But *that* settled, *how* is the *death* effected—accomplished? He answers, v. 6, συνεσταυρώθη, ἵνα κ. τ. λ. “We are *crucified* in order that the body of *sin* might be destroyed, that *henceforth* (notice, the whole life is contemplated—it is a *continuance*—habit, which the aorist tense will come to aid directly) we should not serve sin.” “For he that is dead (notice the tense—he *continues* dead—crucified) *is* freed from sin.”—v. 7. Read the whole chapter, and Col. ii, to iii: 1.

2. Now, *water baptism* is no proof that we are pardoned, or dead to sin, and freed from it; Mr. W. and all his people admit *immersion* is no such proof, for the vilest hypocrite on earth can undergo the act of the so-called burial in water, as well as the truest believer. Hence, it *can not be* a proof or test.

3. If it *were* a proof, no one claims that it is or *can* be a test or proof of *continuance* in a *death to sin*, etc. But *this* burial into death *continues*—this death is “*always*.”—2 Cor. iv: 10.

4. It is a fact that our baptism by water is *never* made the basis of an argument by the apostles in religion or duty. This is a remarkable fact, and *VERY significant*. Yet this burial into *death* is made the basis of Paul’s argument against *continuance* in sin.

5. It is a fact important here also, that *water* never symbolizes or represents suffering, death, burial, crucifixion, but it does represent the very reverse, viz., life, vivacity, joy, happiness, bliss, heaven.

Death and the grave imply corruption, loathsomeness, dust—water the reverse. See Rev. xxii: 17; vii; Is. lv: 1; John vi, etc.

6. If it means *immersion*, it is absurd, since it further reverses the whole order of nature by having us to be *buried before we die*—we are *buried INTO death*; and if the baptism is a burial, grave, etc., we are buried by a burial into death.

7. A quick, partial, or sudden dip for a moment into water, can not represent three days' burial.

8. When referring to his burial, which Christ often did, he never names, or alludes to, baptism. He refers to Jonah once, never to baptism.

9. Baptism never having had such an import in the history of the world, it is impossible that Paul should have so used it with such a far-fetched meaning, which no one claims was ever meant before that by it. Baptism had been in existence for at least fourteen hundred years, in daily practice. If such a *new* and unheard-of use and meaning were to be taken on, it was their duty to carefully elaborate it, and not drop it in incidentally in such a highly figurative relation. For all the language here is figurative, all admit—death, resurrection, crucifixion, rising. Why should not the *burial* be so too, as it is simply the *confirmation* of death?

10. If burial literal be meant, the Jews always anoint people in respect to their burial by *pouring* the oil on them. Matt. xxvi: 7, 12—the woman with the oil—κατέχευεν τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ—*poured* it on his head. Of that act Christ said, v. 12, “In that she hath poured this ointment (ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος μου, πρὸς τὸ ἐνταφιασαί με) upon my body, she did it in respect to my being buried.” On πρὸς see Gr. Grammar of Kühner, § 288, p. 443. “Robinson’s Gr. Lex.,” *sub voce*, “In reference to, in respect to, implying the direction or remote object of an action.”

11. The whole immersion theory turns on σιναπτω, “bury,” which is not literal, but wholly spiritual—the confirmation—completeness of death.

12. If Christ’s baptism meant to represent death and burial, is it not strange that at his baptism he never thought to give it such an explanation, nor did a single one of all the evangelists ever dream that such was its meaning? Nay, Luke xviii: 33, 34, expressly tells us, long after that event, when Christ did tell of his death, burial, etc., “They understood none of these things.” They knew not “what the rising from the dead should mean.” Now; as the apostles were used

to seeing people baptize constantly, if it imported death and resurrection, surely they ought to have known it, especially in respect to Christ's baptism.

13. As to *θάπτω* (*thapto*), the word rendered bury, it applies to *any kind* of disposal of the dead without respect to mode, manner, or result. It applies to the disposal of the dead by burning on funeral piles, on altars, suspended in a tree, laid on a scaffold, put away in a rock, embalming, etc., etc. *MODE is never conceived of in the Greek word.* Genesis 1: 26, *καὶ ἐθαψεν.* "And they embalmed (*θάπτω*) him and placed him in a coffin in Egypt." (xlix: 30, 31.) Ch. 1: 2, 7: "And Joseph commanded his servants, *the physicians* (*ἐνταφιάσταις ἐνταφιάσαι*—the embalmers), to *embalm* his father." Here is the same word as a noun applied to the embalmers, and the verb embalm is the same. Verse five shows he was not buried for forty days. Yet *θάπτω* is applied to the embalming of him, though not interred.

14. The whole lesson and the aorist tense here forbids the idea of immersion being meant. The aorist applied to a *mere momentary action*, especially a physical action, such as baptism, is past and over, "were," "have been baptized." It is a *completed* action. As a momentary act it is all over when the ceremony is finished. The aorist is applied generally to such acts. But to principles, experiences, or such facts as *continue*, it is rendered by the *present* tense. Hence, here bury—*sunetaphaemen*—is in the aorist tense, expressing "*continuance*"—"shall we *continue* in sin?" We *are* dead—*continue* dead to sin. We *are* crucified—were so and *continue* so—aorist tense. We are not to "*remain* in sin," but *remain* in death to sin. Hence "we **ARE** buried." But were they still immersed—sunk under the water? To evade this they try to evade the tense by misquoting and garbling grammars. As my brother parades Jelf so loudly I will quote him in full. Jelf's Greek Grammar, vol. ii: 3d ed., Oxford: "The primary sense of the aorist seems to have been the occurrence of the verbal notion expressed by the root, *without any more reference to time than is necessary to the conception of a verb*, and thus it is properly NEITHER PAST, PRESENT, NOR FUTURE; but as such an indefinite notion of mere existence is by the mind necessarily thrown into some time past, the aorist becomes the proper expression for past actions, without expressing any exact moment in past time. The action implies the notion of some moment of time for it to take place in, without giving any more exact notion of time; hence the aorist is *momentary . . . indefinite*. Hence . . . twofold: *a. Of the simple verbal notion as actually IN OPERA-*

TION. *b.* Of the verbal notion in past time, but not any definite time."—P. 66, 67. "*a.* The use of the aorist, merely to express *the actual* existence of the verbal notion, is more clearly seen in the infinitive, see § 405, but we find it also in its other forms; thus the aorist is used almost as a *present*; the *context* placing the action in time *present*, etc. *b.* and 2 *a.* Aorist expresses simply past actions not connected with the present nor with other past actions, *single* or *momentary*."—P. 67. Rom. vi: 3, 4, is not a momentary act, as we have seen. The *burial* is announced as a *general*, nay, *universal* truth of religion. § 401, 6, the aorist and historic *present* interchange.—P. 68. § 402, i, p. 69: "It (the aorist) is used to express an action which took place repeatedly, etc., or *in the statement of some GENERAL FACT* or *habitual practice* which operated at different indefinite moments of past time. [Such is the case with our text—"buried."] The *verbal notion* . . . is viewed as *general* and of *universal application*." Such is the case here exactly. It is a general, or rather universal, fact—all Christians are to die unto sin and *remain* dead—buried. Jelf then shows that the difference in such cases between the *present* tense and the *aorist*, in Greek, is, the *Greek present* indicates it "*as particularly true at the present time*."—P. 69. But the truth of Rom. vi: 3, 4, etc., is true for *all time*—*universally* true. § 404, it has the force of the *perfect*, and § 806, which corresponds to our *present*, "are buried." Hence, says Jelf, p. 516: "When the aorist has the force of the perfect the past action is considered as *continuing* and *extending into present time*." P. 517: It is used also "to mark the *present continuance* of a *past act*." This also exactly corresponds to the passage under consideration. Thus am I sustained throughout, and Mr. W. overthrown completely by his own authority.

Kühner has no superior as a Greek grammarian and critic on the Greek. In his large grammar, § 256, p. 346-7, he says: "The aorist is often used in *general* propositions which express a fact borrowed from *experience*, and hence *what is* CUSTOMARY; here a single fact which has been observed to be true in many instances, but not established as universal, is stated to be *generally* true; the truth frequently observed in regard to a single event, is considered as holding in other similar events. In such cases the aorist is *usually translated into English* by THE PRESENT, or by the verb, *is wont, is accustomed*." That completely destroys the gentleman's assumption. Winer does not support him, and he has suppressed his statements in every debate we have held, to avoid their force. § 41, p. 217: Winer states, as Kühner

and Jelf do, that where "*only one point of the past*" is looked at, the aorist is rendered as the imperfect tense, and he is guarding against the *abuse* of the aorist as he does the abuse of all grammatical rules, and trying to direct to a correct view. Winer gives Rom. vi: 4, the very text under controversy, as a case where the aorist is used for the perfect in Greek—*present* in English. The passage quoted by Mr. W. is garbled and left unfinished. Winer only tells us there that the aorist is not used "to express *customary action*" in *two texts*, Matt. xxiii: 2; xi: 19, where many supposed it was. Yet he reads that in a way to make believe it is a *universal* declaration, though expressly limited to *two* verses of the Testament. Such is his way of using authorities. Winer fully admits and states that it *is used for the present* under the rule given by Jelf and Kühner, for no one ever questioned it on earth. He says again: "The aorist in John xv: 8, is not to be taken *merely* for the present with Tholuck." Ho then gives a number of instances, and translates the aorist *by the present*, and says: "Other passages where modern translators render the aorist *by the present* (e. g., Rom. x: 3; xi: 31; 1 Cor. vii: 28, see Schott) *are sufficiently plain*." He then gives a number more where the aorist is used for the present, and adds: "The Greek writers do not observe carefully that use of the aorist for the present."—P. 218, 219. But does he not know Rom. vi: 1, 2, settles this whole matter? The question is put: Shall we *continue* in sin—*habitually* sin—that grace may abound? Far be it. God forbid, μή γένοιτο. How shall we *that are dead* to sin? etc. There, "*are dead*" is in the *aorist* tense also. What will he do with it? Not to render it by the *present* would destroy the whole sense, and makes nonsense, as all can see. But it can not be rendered by the present consistently unless buried be so also, since it demands it *more* rigidly indeed than "*are dead*" in verse second. Alas, to what will a man rush to rescue a helpless, defenseless cause!

This is in perfect accord with the whole theme. The theme continues with Rom. viii: 17, 18, including conformity to Christ's suffering—"suffering with him," v. 29.

We repeat, *it is a general truth*, such as the aorist most fittingly expresses. "I am crucified with him." "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh." "The world is crucified to me and I to the world." "I die *daily*." Gal. ii: 19, 20; v: 24; vi: 14; 1 Cor. xv: 31; Rom. viii: 9, 11; 2 Cor. iv: 8, 9: "πάντοτε—*always bearing about in the body the dying of the Lord Jesus Christ*; that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our body. For we who *live are*

ALWAY (*ἀεί*) delivered into death through Jesus"—*ἀεί γὰρ ἡμεῖς διὰ ζωντες, εἰς θάνατον παραδίδμεθα διὰ Ἰησοῦν*; Rom. vi, it is buried into death; here, delivered, given up into death; there, it is through the baptism; here, through Jesus—both refer to the same fact and means. But it continues "always." The spirituality of the baptism is further illustrated, if it needed more light, by Col. ii: 11, 12, 20, and iii: 1-3. The baptism is the same there as Christian circumcision, which is putting away the body of sins. It is called "blotting out" of sins in the same verses. We are "buried (*ἐν τῷ βαπτισματι*) in the baptism (*ἐν ᾧ*), in which also we are risen through the faith of the operation of God." This is called "circumcision without hands," while v. 20 contrasts all this with ordinances, showing by the most absolute facts that water baptism is not thought of in the whole matter. Then ch. iii: 1-3 continues it, "For ye are dead," etc. So Phil. iii: 10, we are conformed to Christ's sufferings and resurrection in our daily lives. Hence all the translations of the world that I have ever examined render Rom. vi: 4, buried by the English present, "we are buried." It is sheer folly, the merest desperation, to oppose such facts.

Does it say we are buried in water? Is water named? Was ever such an act as immersion in water representative of death and burial in any language on earth? Never, NEVER! Is there any thing of solemnity and awful impressiveness in a plunge in water to remind people of death? Is it not just the reverse? Ten thousand great names can not make such ridiculous incongruities sensible.

Finally, they abuse the word "wherein we are risen," as if it implied emergence—coming up out from under the water. "As Christ was raised—*ἠγέρθη*." Col. ii: 12, "Wherein ye are risen (*συνῆέρθητε δια*) through the faith of the operation of God." Now, this is aorist also, from *ἐγείρω*—"to awake, wake up, rouse up, to arise." It never implies emergence—NEVER. It further means "to cause to rise up, set up, set upright," etc. It applies to rousing from sleep, from dead, from lethargy, inactivity generally, and so occurs constantly.

It is not necessary to review in detail the facts I named on the baptism of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit fell on them, as the oil in anointing fell on the believers and apostles. It is called baptism.

But he urges that they were baptized in the Jordan, in the water of the Jordan—immersed into the water of the Jordan. But the Bible does not read that way. I showed that they were baptized in Jordan as the Israelites cut wood, encamped, dwelt, persons were found in Jordan, in fountains, in rivers—that the *en* only indicated the place

in which *as a locality* they were baptized. Men "stood still in Jordan," were "on dry land in the midst of the Jordan," "came up out of the Jordan," yet never were immersed.

He often wants to know if a little water sprinkled on a person's face represents the sufferings of Christ, while he goes off, as they all do in debates, in a detailed account of the sufferings of Christ. We showed that *water* never was meant to represent such sufferings at all; that baptism had been in use since the days of Moses, and yet never had such a meaning.

But pictures disgust the gentleman. There are those records. They stand cold, but changeless, eloquent monuments of proof in favor of sprinkling as the ancient mode. Sneers can not destroy them. Clamor can not hush them. They utter a voice deep and unanswerable against the position my opponent assumes. Mr. Campbell's evasion shows how utterly incapable they are of meeting the facts they reveal.

Against his assertion as to Jordan, I refer the audience to my last speech. He may evade; he may

"turn, and turning still,
Cry, I at last will have my will;"

but there are the facts. But he says my Savior so and so; my Bible tells me so and so. So he says. But it is not so. His Bible knows no such facts. He may quote his immersionist Barclay, who tells of waters, pools, and ponds all around Jerusalem, deep, yea somewhere between twenty and one hundred feet deep. But there stands the fact that, 1. The Bible knows no such facts. 2. No historian ever found them there in *ancient* times. 3. We all know that these pools he writes about were made *centuries* after apostolic times. He does not tell us that. 4. He does not tell us they *all* go dry, and are dry half the year. *These* are important facts. The records I quote no man dare question.

But oh, how fond Bro. Wilkes now is of various readings! Why, it was horrible for me to question the canonicity of Mark xvi: 15. But here the very authorities that he flies to now, and regards as the only lights worth notice, repudiate *in a body* Mark xvi: 15. I showed (see p. 625) that five-sixths of all authorities have *and* in Mark i: 10, "*from the water,*" implying he never had been *in* the water at all as a *literal* fact, but only in Jordan, as were the Israelites, etc., when they stood in the midst of Jordan "*on dry land.*"

As to his authorities, why, there is no consistency among them.

Maldonatus, the greatest Catholic commentator known that favors immersion, argues thus foolishly, that "martyrdom is called a baptism, a metaphor, as I think, taken from those who are *submerged in the sea to be put to death.*" (See Conant's "Baptizein," 151.) Just think of it! I never read of a martyr drowned that way for the first six hundred or a thousand years of the church. The rack, the scaffold, the cross, were the means of death to them. *The shedding of their blood—*baptism with their *blood* and *tears* constantly is named, as we read abundantly, but *never* is submergence alluded to. In my next speech I will give authorities of a general character. Lexicographers, critics, etc., I have given in superabundance. But I have a list of the most distinguished commentators in the world that I will read, to show you how utterly the facts have been perverted.

MR. WILKES' FOURTEENTH REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I have a few matters which I wish to notice, not in a very connected way. First, my friend notified me twice, that he had some little doubt about the report I made of a conversation held with Dr. Kleeburg. In the second place, he said he would like to have it in writing. I have with me, now, the writing, which I will read:

1. What does *tával* 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 Hebrews 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."

LOUISVILLE, KY., Dec. 23, 1870.

DR. L. KLEEBURG.

Mr. Ditzler has postponed, till his last speech, the discussion of the question before us from a Bible stand-point, and especially from a New Testament point of view, where we have Christian baptism instituted, taught, and variously exemplified and illustrated. Now, as I can not introduce any new matter into my last speech, if I do not follow him closely in his last speech, it will not be my fault.

I have some new matters which I wish to present in this reply.

It has been intimated that water was scarce about Jerusalem. There were several pools in and about Jerusalem, all but one or two being outside the walls. I will speak of them and their size.

There was the upper pool of Gihon, which was 315 feet long, 208 feet in width, and 42 feet deep, in the deepest part. Also the lower Gihon, which was 592 feet long, 275 feet wide, and in depth 42 feet, containing about 4 acres of water. The pool of Siloam was in length 50 feet, in width 18 feet, and in depth, 19 feet. The pool of Beth-

esda was 360 feet long, 130 feet wide, and 75 feet deep, with a long neck, 142 by 45 feet. Then, the pool of Hezekiah was 252 feet long, 126 feet wide. They were all public pools, entered by steps, and of varying depth, and contained in the aggregate about 15 acres of water.

This morning and yesterday, my friend said something about Sozomen's history, and about Eunomius introducing "the heresy of immersion." I had not at that time laid my eyes on the true solution of that case. I now have it in the "Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology," by J. H. Blunt, editor, and a very distinguished theologian. I read from pages 42 and 43: "Eunomius, afterward made Bishop of Cyzicus, was deposed for his gross heresy. He was often banished, and is said, on their joining his sect, to have rebaptized Catholics and Samaritans; altering the form of baptism, and baptizing with one immersion only; thus," says Sozomen, "corrupting the apostolical tradition handed down to that day." The heresy of Eunomius consisted in baptizing with *one immersion* instead of with three immersions, as I told you they all did at that time. But it was not the heresy of changing sprinkling into immersion, as my friend would have you believe; and he can not truthfully cite Sozomen's history in support of his statement.

I desire to call your attention to the fact that my friend intimated that water must have been scarce between Jerusalem and Gaza; and, in support of that position, he stated that the country was *desert*. It is said that Philip met the eunuch on the "way from Jerusalem to Gaza, which is desert." The question is, What was desert? Was the *way* desert, or was it Gaza that was desert? At present, I simply cite Hug's "Annotations on the New Testament," p 21, in which he says: "In Acts viii: 26, the city of Gaza is mentioned, with the remark that it is desert. It is true, this was often laid waste; but it was invariably rebuilt, and was so in the days of Herod the Great, not long before the event here related. Uncommon erudition has been employed to solve this difficulty. But there are two words in Josephus, which have escaped the learned, from which we learn how well Luke was acquainted with the event concerning which all history else is silent. A short time before the siege of Jerusalem, the Jewish revolution, on account of the slaughter of the Jews in Cæsarea, had assumed a decisive character; and, in revenge, the Jews burned or otherwise laid waste a multitude of villages and cities in Syria and the vicinity. Among these was Gaza, which they destroyed. Thus

it was really in this condition when Luke wrote." He says the words *autē estin erēmos*, "which is desert," do not refer to the *country* between, but to Gaza itself, which at that time had been demolished by the Jews, and was "desert." So my friend does not profit much by that passage, as Hug understands it. Some commentators differ, I know, on the subject, but Luke is right; the city of Gaza was desert. "Which is *desert*," does not mean barren, a *waste*, in the sense in which we use the word desert, even if it refers, as Mr. D. supposes, to the "way;" but it means simply *uninhabited*.

There is another matter that I desire to introduce. It is conceded by a great many of the most distinguished writers on my brother's side of this controversy, that, though they sprinkle and pour, the practice is an "*innovation*;" that it is a "*deflection*;" it is an "*abridgment*." It is an "*abridgment*" of the "*divine thing*," as CYPRIAN says.

I will again read from Mr. Blunt: "That immersion was the ordinary mode of baptizing in the primitive church is unquestionable. Tertullian says, '*ter mergitatur*'—*we are thrice immersed*; and St. Ambrose speaks of immersion in the name of each divine person. St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, and St. Basil also mention the same usage. Immersion in the name of each divine person was, indeed, the ordinary mode of baptizing [trine baptism] during as long as twelve centuries. The innovation of affusion, or pouring water on the baptized, afterward began in the Latin Church, and has become the general western usage. In the Eastern Church, baptism has always been by immersion, and, as a modern, well-informed writer says, the Eastern Church has never ceased to protest against the innovation of the mode of baptizing of the Latin Church."—Blunt's "Dictionary of Doctrinal and Historical Theology," p. 75.

Again, on the same page of the work, he says: "Admitting this, a practical theologian must protest against the usage of baptizing by aspersion, or sprinkling a few drops of water; a usage which, in cases of haste or carelessness, has often caused great doubt respecting the validity of administration." Hear this distinguished author, one that could not be prejudiced on my side of the question, but on the other side, if possible. He acknowledges that the practice was immersion anciently, and that it is an "*innovation*" to sprinkle or to pour. This is strictly true. I will prove the same thing by other authorities.

I now call your attention to a statement made by Neander. Quoting Cyprian, he says: "In the sacraments of salvation, where neces-

sity compels and God gives permission, the divine thing, though outwardly abridged, bestows all that it implies on the faithful."—Neander's "History of the Christian Religion and Church," vol. i, p. 310.

My friend thinks much of Moses Stuart; especially when it suits him. I will, however, first read from Dr. Kendrick, of Baltimore, archbishop of the Catholic Church:

"When religion had consummated her triumphs over paganism in the various countries of Europe, the custom of Christians baptizing children being universal, ages passed away almost without an instance of the baptism of adults. Hence, the necessity of receding from the mode of immersion became still more frequent, since the tender infant oftentimes could not be immersed without peril to its life. The cases thus multiplying, the more solemn method fell gradually into disuse, until it was, in most places, entirely superseded.

"Another cause contributed to favor affusion. A class of females formerly existed in the church, under the name of deaconesses, who, among other exercises of piety, instructed and prepared for baptism the catechumens of their sex, and performed some of the ceremonies preparatory to its administration. . . . This class of females having ceased, from a variety of causes, it became expedient to abstain from the immersion of females."—"Kendrick on Baptism," pp. 172, 173.

And on page 174 of the same work:

"The change of discipline which has taken place in regard to baptism, should not surprise us; for, although the church is but the dispenser of the sacraments which her divine spouse instituted, she rightfully exercises a discretionary power as to the manner of their administration. She can not change their substance."

On the same page he says:

"The church wisely sanctioned that which, although less solemn, is equally effectual. The power of binding and loosing, which she received from Christ, warrants this exercise of governing wisdom; that, the difference of times and places being considered, condensation may be used with regard to the mode of administering the sacraments without danger to their integrity."

Now I read from Moses Stuart. He says: "It will be seen from all this, that Christians began somewhat early to deflect from the ancient practice of immersing."—Stuart on "Christian Baptism," p. 175. Moses Stuart never wrote any thing truer than that. There is nothing truer in the Holy Bible, or under the whole circle of the heavens, than that Christians began, perhaps as early as 252, to *deflect* from the ancient practice of baptizing by immersion.

I now read from the distinguished Dr. Johnson, who was, I believe, an Episcopalian, and an earnest contender for the faith of his church. I read from the debate of C. and R.:

“Dr. Johnson, in his Dictionary, says, ‘To baptize, is to sprinkle; to administer the sacrament of baptism to one. Baptism, an external ablution of the body, with a certain form of words.’ He speaks this as a member of the Church of England; and where he speaks *ex cathedra*, he is thus quoted by Boswell, as follows:

“‘Dr. Johnson argued in defense of some of the peculiar tenets of the Church of Rome. As to giving the bread only to the laity, he said, they may think that, in what is merely ritual, deviations from the primitive mode may be admitted on the ground of convenience; and I think they are as well warranted to make this alteration, as we are to substitute SPRINKLING in the room of the ANCIENT BAPTISM.’”—Campbell, Debate with Rice, p. 173.

Neander says it is an “abridgment of the divine thing.” Archbishop Kendrick says it is an alteration; that the church made it, and he feels that the church had a right to make the alteration.

I now read from page 176 of Booth. He quotes Mr. Bonner, as follows:

“Baptism by immersion was undoubtedly the apostolic practice, and was never dispensed with by the church, except in cases of sickness, or when a sufficient quantity of water could not be had. In both these cases, baptism by aspersion or sprinkling was allowed, but in no other.”—“Hist. of the Popes,” vol. ii, page 110.

Again, on page 192:

“Chamierus: ‘Immersion of the whole body was used from the beginning, which expresses the force of the word BAPTIZO: whence John baptized in the river. It was afterward changed into sprinkling, though it is uncertain when, or by whom it commenced.’”—Pastral Cathol: t. IV. l: v: c: ii. 6 §.”

On the same page, I read from Bishop Stillingfleet’s “Rites and Customs of the English Church:”

“Rites and customs apostolical are altered; therefore, men do not think that apostolical practice doth bind; for if it did, there could be no alteration of things agreeable thereunto. Now, let any one consider but these few particulars, and judge how far the pleaders for a divine right of apostolical practice do look upon themselves as bound now to observe them.”

I read also, from page 194 of the same work:

“Deylingius: ‘It is manifest, that while the apostles lived, the ordinance of

baptism was administered, not out of a vessel, or a baptistery, which are the marks of later times, but out of rivers and pools; and that, not by sprinkling, but by immersion.' . . . So long as the apostles lived, as many believe, immersion only was used; to which afterward, perhaps, they added a kind of pouring, such as the Greeks practice at this day, having performed the true immersion."

On the same page, I read :

"Heideggerus: 'Plunging, or immersion, was most commonly used by John the Baptist, and by the apostles . . . It is of no importance whether baptism be performed by immersion into water, as of old, in the warm Eastern countries, and even at this day; or by sprinkling, which was afterward introduced in colder climates.'"

Again, same page, I read from Edward Leigh :

"Edward Leigh: 'The ceremony used in baptism is either dipping or sprinkling; dipping is the more ancient. At first, they went down into the rivers; afterward, they were dipped in the fonts. . . . Zauchius and Mr. Perkins prefer (in persons of age, and hot countries, where it may be safe) the ceremony of immersion under the water, before that of sprinkling or laying on the water, as holding more analogy to that of Paul (Romans vi: 4).'

Again, page 196 :

"Dr. Whitby: 'It being so expressly declared here [Romans vi: 4] and Colossians ii: 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, by dying to sin, 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 urgeth, 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 case of the clinici, or in present danger of death.'"—Booth, p. 196.

This distinguished author, on the side of my friend, expresses the wish that the old custom should have remained; that no departure should have been allowed from that custom established by the Savior, except in cases of old age, or sick persons, or where necessity seemed to demand it. Then he thought sprinkling should be allowed *on the ground of age or inability to be immersed*; or, on account of *sickness*.

Once more, I read from Booth, pp. 197, 198 :

"Dr. Wall: 'Their [the primitive Christians] general and ordinary way was to baptize by immersion, or dipping the person, whether it were an infant or a grown man or woman, into the water. This is so plain and clear by an infinite

number of passages, that, as one can not but pity the weak endeavors of such Pedobaptists 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-Pedobaptists, 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, to go about to represent it as ridiculous and foolish, or as sinful and indecent; when it was, in all probability, the way by which our blessed Savior, and for certain was the most usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism. . . . 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.' "

My friend can not find immersion anywhere, either in the histories, or in the accounts given in the Bible! I pause here to examine what that was which induced Moses Stuart to say that "sprinkling is a deflection." What was it that caused Bishop Kendrick, with all his learning and his reputation at stake, to say sprinkling is a "change?" What caused Mr. Blunt, writing in this present century, and one of the most distinguished writers in Europe, and one of the prominent representatives of his church, to say that it is an "innovation?" and to proceed to say that immersion was not only the thing authorized, but practiced for centuries? What, I ask, caused these men to so depose? Nothing could have caused them so to write, except the facts staring them in the face, that the word means immersion, as they all knew; and that the practice of the church was immersion for from eleven to thirteen centuries after the Christian era!

I desire, now, to present some few remarks in answer to my friend's last speech. With regard to *ek*, in Mark i: 10, instead of *apo*, which would give us *out of the water*, instead of *from the water*, I insist that question is settled. I do not allow that there is any controversy about it. The law has gone forth. The question is settled, and it is final. It reads, "*ek tou hudatos.*" Alford puts it in his text; Tischendorf puts it into his text; Greene puts it into his text; Lange favors it; Griesbach is known to have been in favor of *ek* as far back as 1674. It is a settled question; and I now state that there is not a scholar of respectability, as far as I know, within the last fifty years, who denies it. During the last fifty years there has been more learned on the subject of collating Greek manuscripts and Greek criticism, than in all the centuries before that time. There is not one scholar, that stands as a light in the world, or that has had any practice in collating Greek manuscripts, and has made for himself any reputation whatever, but says that *ek* is the true reading. The earnestness with

which Mr. Ditzler denies that *ek* belongs to the text, in this verse, shows that he feels that if it does, then the argument is decidedly, if not fatally, against him. This compels him to insist that it does not. If *ek* belongs to the text, and signifies *out of*, as he confesses, then, of course, the Savior was in the water when he was baptized, and, after baptism, came up *out of* the water. My friend would, in that case, be confronted by the question, WHY was he in the water? He knows that he does not take persons *into* and *out of* the water when he *sprinkles* them. Hence his efforts to prove that *ek* does not belong to the true text. We may learn the meaning of the word baptism by understanding the circumstances attending the recorded cases of it.

In a court the lawyers, the jury, and the judge, are wont to determine the proper conclusion in a case by the circumstances that harmonize with a given hypothesis. When all the circumstances, remote and immediate, harmonize with a given hypothesis, they assume that hypothesis to be true. They often hang a man on such evidence. When the circumstances, if important, do not harmonize with that hypothesis, or, when they contradict it, they assume the hypothesis to be false, and the accused man is acquitted. Now the hypothesis of my friend is that sprinkling took place when the Savior was baptized. All of his friends who are distinguished, acknowledge it was immersion. The facts are all *contrary* to my friend's hypothesis. None of them *demand* sprinkling, and none of them *harmonize* with sprinkling. But they are all demanded by immersion, or, rather, immersion demands their presence. In other words, immersion demands that they should "go down into the water." Immersion demands that they should "come up out of the water." Immersion demands the presence of the subject. Immersion demands the presence of the operator. All these are present in the baptism of the Savior. They are not all demanded by sprinkling. They are contrary to the hypothesis that sprinkling was done. My friend says that Dr. Conant retains *apo* in Mark i: 10. But I will venture to assert that he does not. If he does, let my friend lay the proof of it on the table before us. But he can not do it because he has it not, and never saw it in his life. About that he is simply mistaken. Dr. Conant never put out a Greek text, and, therefore, he could not have retained or rejected it. But if he referred to Conant's English translation, let me tell my friend that his English translation is "*out of*," precisely as it is in our common English version.

My friend thinks the current of the Jordan is so swift that nobody

could baptize by immersion in it. I must be permitted to believe my Bible when it says that John baptized "*into the Jordan,*" not that he *went* into the river to baptize, but that he BAPTIZED *into the river*. The VERY ACT of baptism, whatever that act was, was the act which put the baptized party *into* the river.

My friend says the current of the Jordan is *very swift*, and he intimates that immersion in it would be nearly impossible. I refer him to Lyman Coleman, the author of "Ancient Christianity Exemplified," than whom few more distinguished men live in America, and a Presbyterian. He says, in substance, quoting Lieut. Lynch, that the waters of the Jordan, at the lower part, where the Savior was probably baptized, and opposite Jericho, where Israel crossed the Jordan, murmur and wind, and move *slowly*, as though reluctant to disembogue their "sweet and sacred waters" into the fatal Dead Sea, maintaining all their sinuosity or tortuous courses. He says, the fall in the whole length is very great, but from the Lake of Galilee to the Dead Sea—sixty miles in a direct line, or, by the course of the river, two hundred miles—the fall is only three and a half feet to the mile. It is a very *crooked* stream, more crooked than the Mississippi River, as my friend has very good reason to know, since he made a very fatal mistake in regard to that matter once.

Mr. D. says: "Immersion can not be the Bible idea, because in Colossians ii: 12, it is said: The baptized are 'raised up by *faith*.'" The fore part of that same verse says: "Buried with him in baptism." Does Mr. Ditzler believe that part of the verse? Has he any faith in *that* statement? When he comes to believe that part of the verse he will be prepared to learn and to understand how the baptized are "raised up by faith." The Bible says they "were raised up." Every religious act done by a Christian man is done by faith, and this is true as well of the burial as of the resurrection in baptism. "Without faith it is impossible to please God," says the Apostle Paul.

MR. DITZLER'S CLOSING ARGUMENT.

Gentlemen Moderators, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I now close my argument on this important proposition. Many things said I can not notice. To the observing this is wholly unnecessary. As to that little primer he quotes for a *Syriac* lexicon, it is simply ridiculous. Does he seek to pass that for a lexicon? And what is it? I have had Uhlemann's "*Syriac Grammar*" since 1855—sixteen years. He quotes that language *as if from* this author! Is it not astounding that he will so presume upon the people? Uhlemann never wrote one word of that appendix. It is put in by the American translator, consisting of just *thirteen leaves*, without any tracing of meanings, any adaption to scholars, designed for beginners to learn to read simple commencement exercises. It was by an immersionist, who *took out* the lexicon and definitions put there by Uhlemann, and put in that little, far, far inferior thing in its place. And yet *this* thing that Uhlemann never saw, he parades as U.'s lexicon! What will he not do?

And now I turn to the *authors* of whom they have said so much. Mr. W. began with them in his *first* speech, and has harped on them all the way through. Now, I have those great authorities here before me, and I will show how they have used Stuart, Wesley, Witsius, Lightfoot, and other great names. I do not quote Barnes, and all the more simple and uncritical commentators, because all know they wholly garble and misrepresent him; and he is not held as a critical and very learned authority. So of many others I could name. He has paraded several that are too ridiculous to notice, considering the character he gives them.

I will begin with *Moses Stuart*, whom he has misquoted terribly, as he did Jelf, Winer, Stokius, and all others. I read from Stuart's work, as he published it in the "*Biblical Repository*" of 1833. Notice the all important parts Mr. W. *left out*. I am going to quote such commentators as all parties recognize as the most learned in the world—Alford, Baumgarten, Olshausen, Stier, Ebrard, Havernick, Fairbairn,

Tholuck, etc., of the present age, Koenael, Witsius, Lightfoot, etc., of former ages. I could indefinitely extend the list. Mr. Wilkes carefully suppressed all the words of Moses Stuart where he carefully states just the opposite of what Mr. Wilkes makes him state by their favorite way of quoting all authors. You remember his citations. [See pp. 422, 423.]

MOSES STUART: "Let us come now. . . to the more important part of our inquiry under the first head, viz., *What are the classical meanings of βάπτω and βαπτίζω?*" He then adds—

"Βάπτω and βαπτίζω mean to dip, plunge, or immerge, into any liquid thing. All lexicographers and critics of any note, are agreed in this." --"Bib. Repos.," 1833.

"It is impossible to doubt that the words βάπτω and βαπτίζω have, in the Greek classical writers, the sense of dip, plunge, immerge, sink, etc. But there are variations from this usual and prevailing signification," though he acknowledges they are kindred.

Βαπτίζω—"to wash, cleanse by water."

Βάπτω—"to moisten, wet, bedew." The cases in Daniel "make it plain that the word βάπτω was occasionally used to designate the application of liquid or moisture to the surface of any thing, in any way whatever; whether of washing, or by gentle affusion of the dew. The example of Judith shows very clearly that *washing* of the person may be designated by βαπτίζω; for into the fountain in the midst of the camp, it is not probable that she plunged."

Βαπτίζω—*literally not applied to the rite*—"to wash in the literal sense." Mark vii: 3, 4; Luke xi: 38, etc. "There is, then, no absolute certainty from usage, that the word βαπτίζω, when applied to designate the *rite of baptism*, means of course to immerge or plunge. It may mean washing.

"We have also seen, in Nos. 2, 5, 6, of examples from the Septuagint and Apocrypha, that the word βαπτίζω sometimes means to wash; and βάπτω to moisten, to wet, or bedew. *There is, then, no absolute certainty* from usage, that the word βαπτίζω, when applied to designate the *rite of baptism*, means of course to immerge or plunge. It may mean washing."—"Bib. Repos.," 313.

"Both the classic use and that of the Septuagint show, that *washing* and *copious affusion* are sometimes signified by the word."—"Bib. Repos.," vol: i, 318. He then urges that it must then be determined "from *other evidence* than that which *the word itself* necessarily affords."

Yet he has been quoted from Dan to Beersheba as favoring the im-

mersionists exclusively. Such is their way of using, or rather abusing, authors.

ED. ROBINSON: "βαπτίζω . . . In Hellenistic Greek, and in reference to the rite of baptism . . . expressed not always immersion, but the more general idea of *ablution* or *affusion*."—Gr. Lex., *sub voce*. He then shows that all the facts and ancient excavated baptisteries, etc., prove that it was by affusion.

BAUMGARTEN, one among the ablest commentators of Europe, says: "The baptism of Saul followed *immediately* the receiving of his sight. . . Upon calling upon that holy name, his body . . . is baptized . . . by means of the water *poured upon* him."—Acts ix: 1-36. Vol. i, 238, 239.

"He orders all those who had received the Holy Spirit, to be baptized *with water*."—Acts x: 47.

"With a part of the same water" used in washing the apostles, "the keeper of the prison and all his were baptized . . . without the dipping of the whole body, in the open, running water."—Acts xvi: 11-40. Vol. ii, 134.

OLSHAUSEN, one of the greatest and best commentators of any age, and the most impartial and profound, says on John iii: 25-27: "The dispute related to baptism—καθαρισμος, equivalent to βάπτισμα (*baptism*)." Mark vii: 4: "Ablutions of all sorts, among the rest those applicable to the priest (Ex. xxix: 4; xxx: 18, sq. with Heb. ix: 10), were common among the Jews. Βάπτισμος is here, as in Heb. ix: 10, *ablution*, *washing* generally; κλιναί here, couches on which the ancients were wont to recline at meals." Here he held that the legal sprinklings of John iii: 25-27; of the priests; Exodus xxix: 4, etc., were the "diverse baptisms" of Paul, Heb. ix: 10. That the couches of dining were baptized as the Jews did—by affusion. Again:

On Acts ii, he considers the three thousand were baptized by sprinkling. Vol. iv, 383: "The difficulty can only be removed by supposing that they already employed mere *sprinkling*," etc.

BENGEL'S "Gnomon," a commentary only for the learned, says: "Immersion in baptism, or at least the *sprinkling of water* upon the person, represented burial; burial is a *confirmation* of death—*facit ratam*."—Rom. vi: 4. Vol. iii.

On Heb. ix: 10, βαπτισμοῖς: "In different washings." On John iii: 25, καθαρισμῶν, *purifying*: "John did baptize . . . John nowhere uses the terms, a baptism, a baptizing . . . nay, even to express Levitical *baptism*, he uses the word *purifying*."—Ch. ii: 6." Here Bengel

considered those washings, had out of the six gallon jars, of John ii: 6, Jewish baptisms, all by sprinkling and pouring. On John ii: 6, Bengel again: "Jews . . who used to have frequent washings." On Mark vii: 4, 8: "The washings (*baptismous*) of pitchers," etc.

LIGHTFOOT'S Commentary is only for the learned, like the above, written in Latin. That he holds the highest rank of scholarship, is admitted by all: "The word, therefore, *βαπτισμοῖς* (washings), applied to all these (brazen vessels, beds, etc.—Mark vii: 4), properly, and strictly is not to be taken of *dipping* or *plunging* (italics his), but, in respect of some things, of washing only, and, in respect of others, of SPRINKLING only."—Horæ Heb. et Tal., tom. ii, 419.

STIER: "*Βαπτίζω* occurs frequently in the sense of mere washing." He supposes, at times, they may have been "dipped," where, otherwise, baptism would be administered by sprinkling, as probably with the thousands on the day of Pentecost.

He is inferior to no commentator—one of the greatest and most voluminous.—"Reden Jesu," vol. viii, 303, note.

WESLEY: The immersionists have been misquoting Wesley, Adam Clarke, and Watson, for years, especially the two former, just as they do Witsius, Beza, and the rest. Here is A. Campbell's quotation of Wesley, just as Bro. Wilkes has quoted it—"Ch. Baptism," p. 143. Here is the quotation he gives as Wesley's: "Rom. vi: 4. 'We are buried with him,' etc. Alluding here to the ancient manner of baptizing by *immersion*." Now the two last words do not occur in Wesley at all. Wesley's language is, "Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing." That is all. But Wesley is quoted as favoring *their* idea *as against ours*, else why quote him. Here is Wesley's note on Mark vii: 4. "*Washing of cups and pots and brazen vessels and couches*—the Greek word (baptisms) (i. e. *βαπτισμοῖς*—*βαπτίζω*) means indifferently either washing or sprinkling."

On Matt. iii: 6, Wesley says, in his notes: "Such prodigious numbers could hardly be baptized by immersing their whole bodies under water; nor can we think they were provided with change of raiment for it, which was scarce practicable for such vast multitudes." He then urges that they must have been baptized by affusion.

GEO HILL: "Both sprinkling and immersion are implied in the word *βαπτίζω*, both are used in the religious ceremonies of the Jews."—"Lectures on Divinity," 659.

A. CLARKE: "In what form baptism was originally administered, has been deemed a subject worthy of serious dispute. Were the peo-

ple *dipped* or sprinkled? for it is certain βαπτω and βαπτίζω mean both.”
—On Matt. iii: 6.

HERMANN WITSIUS has been paraded by the immersionists as a special favorite. They often begin their list with his great name. Campbell quotes him as sustaining their views. I hold his work in my hands, the “De Œconomia Fœderum Dei,” etc., Hermanni Witsi, MDCLXXXV. It is quite venerable—nearly two hundred years old. In book iv, lib. 4, ch. 16, § 13, 14, he discusses this question: “Whether only by immersion, or also by pouring of water out of a vase, or sprinkling, the rite of baptism was administered?” He then admits immersion was practiced ordinarily—*ordinarie mersisse*. He admits that “it can not be denied but that *bapto* and *baptidzo* may mean to sink (*mergere*), and to moisten or dip.” But he says, § 14, p. 672 (de Baptismo), “Yet it is not to be supposed that immersion is thus necessary to baptism, since it may be accomplished by pouring or sprinkling—*ut perfusione vel aspersione rite pergi non possit*.” After explaining further, he says—and I will render it literally, as I only have the Latin copy: “It is more probable that the three thousand who were baptized in one day, Acts ii: 41, were *perfused* (poured on) or sprinkled with water than that they were immersed. Probabilius est, eos ter mille, qui unâ die baptizabantur Acts ii: 41, aqua perfusos vel adpersos, quam mersos esse. Etenim verisimile non est, homines in verbi præconio occupatissimos, quales apostolli erant, tam operosæ tot millium immersioni suppeditare potuisse. Neque credibile est, Cornelium, et Lydium, et commentariensem, in privatis ædibus, unâ cum suis, baptizatos, baptisteria mamon habuisse, quibus toti immergi potuerint. Perfusionis exempla ex antiquitate attulit Vossius Disput. 1. De Baptis. Th. 9, etc. 2. Licet βαπτίζειν, propriè significet mergere, tamen etiam generalius usurpatur de qualicunque ablutione; ut Luc. xi: 38, etc. 3. Res significata baptismi perfusionis et adspersionis vocabulis tam in Vet, quam in Novo Testamento exponitur. De Superfusione vide Isa xliv: 3, De Adspersione Isa. lii: 15; Ezek. xxxvi: 25; Heb. xii: 24; 1 Pet. i: 2—For it is not likely that the men engaged in the preaching of the word as the apostles were, with ever so much pains, could immerse so many thousands. Neither is it credible that Cornelius, and Lydia, and those who were baptized in their own private houses, had baptisteries at hand, in which they could be totally immersed. Vossius adduces examples of pouring from antiquity, Disput. 1, in his Treatise on Baptism, etc. 2. It is admitted that *baptidzein* may properly signify to sink, yet also it takes

the more general signification of washing in any way whatsoever, as for example Luke xi: 38, etc. 3. The thing signified by baptism is set forth both in the Old and New Testament by the words *pour* and *sprinkle*. See Isa. xlv: 3, concerning pouring; Isa. lii: 15; Ezek. xxxvi: 25; Heb. xii: 24; 1 Pet. i: 2, on sprinkling." Now, this is one of the great standards they have for fifty years paraded as sustaining their dogma of immersion to the exclusion of sprinkling. Vossius they have held up as a bright light to the same effect, yet he is here followed by Witsius, who gets his arguments from Vossius.

KUINCEL is claimed by Conant as *par excellence* one of the great immersion authorities that wrote for the *learned*, 149. Of the four commentators out of scores, this is one of the favored ones. We have his Greek text and Latin Commentary before us, as well as the others quoted. 1. He translates βαπτίζω by *tingo*, moisten, stain, sprinkle. 2. By *lavo*, wash, cleanse, sprinkle. 3. By *purge*, purify, cleanse; *i. e.*, "*baptismois*, Mark vii: 4, *purgationes*, purifications; Luke xi: 38, non . . lotum esse."

On Matt. iii: 6, 11, "John baptized," etc., he says, "Lustrationes ante sacrificia, preces solennes, etc., apud Græcos et Romanos in usu erant; etiam qui scelera commiserant, ad expiationem peccati corpus aut manus abluere solebant.—Lustrations [or purifications] before sacrifice, stated prayers, etc., were in common use among Grecians and Romans. And those who committed crime were accustomed to wash the body or the hands for the expiation of sin." He then gives a great array of quotations and facts, in which three-fourths were by sprinkling only. He says, "Fieri solebant lustrationes aqua fluviali vel etiam marina—They were accustomed to perform their lustrations with running water or also with sea-water." Defining the word, he says, "Notat: imbueri aliquem re aliqua, cumulatim tribuere, largiter suppeditare, copiose dare," etc. It means, to imbue any one with any thing, to administer plentifully, *to supply largely, give copiously*," etc. Is supplying any one, administering to one, giving to one copiously, immersion? On v. 11, he says: "En ἰδατε pro simpl. ἰδατε v. Luc. iii: 16, sed βαπτίζειν ἐν ἰδατε εἰς μετάνοιαν est baptizare aliquem, etc. *En hudati*, is simply for *hudati*, with water, Luke iii: 16; but to baptize with water (*eis*) unto repentance, is to baptize any one (*ut*) that he may engage to amend his life, etc.; unde Marc. i: 4, Johannis baptismus dicitur βαπτισμα μετάνοιας, Marc. i: 4, *eis* enim hac in formula *finem*, *consilium* indicat—Whence, Mark i: 4, the baptism of

John is called 'baptism of repentance,' Mark i: 4, for *eis* in this formula indicates the *end*, the *design*."

BLOOMFIELD, Gr. Test., Mark vii: 4. "This is best explained, 'unless they wash their bodies,' in opposition to the washing of the *hands* before mentioned, in which, however, is not implied immersion." Heb. vi: 2, "Always in the sense of washing," here "as a general term referring both to the Jewish and Christian baptisms." Heb. ix: 10, "*βαπ* denotes those ceremonial ablutions of various sorts, some respecting the *priests*, others the *people at large*, detailed in Leviticus and Numbers."

Acts viii: 38. . . "Philip seems to have taken up water with his hands and poured it copiously on the eunuch's head."

ALFORD, Gr. Test., Mark vii: 4, "*βάπτισονται* (*baptize*) themselves; but probably not the washing of their whole bodies;" v. 8, "The *βαπτισμοί*, as applied to *λιθῶν* (couches at meals) were certainly *not immersions*, but *sprinklings* or *affusions* of water."

Luke xi: 38, "Did not imply necessarily immersion of the whole body, for it was only the hands which the Pharisees washed before meat."

FAIRBAIRN: "The diverse evidently points to the several uses of water, such as we know to have actually existed under the law, *sprinklings*, *washings*, *bathings*."

EBRARD: Heb. ix: 10: "*Washings*," *Tholuck*, "The *βαπτισμοί* themselves belonged rather to the *means* of expiation and purification [sprinkling, blood, etc.], meats and drinks, and washings, along with the institutes of the sacrifices, the remaining parts of the ritual worship."—*Tholuck* in loc. See also vol. ii, 24, where *λούω* is put as *βαπτίζω*, wash, baptize.

HENGSTENBERG calls it a "double washing"—baptism of water and spirit.—*Christol.*, ii, 23. So I could quote Weisinger, Matthies, Locke (John), and scores of others.

ROSENMULLER, claimed by A. C. and the immersionists, says, in John iii: 25, vol. ii, p. 379: "There arose, etc., concerning *purification*:"

"*Ἐγγενο—καθαρίσμων.—Arta est igitur disputatio a discipulis Joannis cum Judæis* (‡. *Judæo quodam de baptisate*. . . .

Περὶ καθαρῶσμων de baptisate, sacra ablotione, sc, Joannis et Jesu (nam sequitur v. 26. *οὗτος βαπτίζει coll. 2 Peter i: 9.), sicut et Josephus verbo.*

Καθαίρειν utitur, in narrando baptisate Joannis."

"It arose, etc., concerning *baptism*," *peri katharismori*, concerning purification, concerning baptism, the sacred ablution supply of John and Jesus (for it follows, v. 26; compare 2 Peter i: 9), as Josephus also uses the word purify in narrating John's baptism." On Heb. ix: 10, vol. v: 261, he says: "Varios lotiones nominat, quia lotio alia erat Sacerdotum, alia Levitarum, alia Israelitarum post impuritatem aliquam contractam. He calls them (*lotiones*, the washings—*vari generis*, of various kinds) various washings (baptisms), because there was one kind of washing for the priests, another for the Levites, another for (of) the Israelites, after any impurity was contracted." Mark vii: 4, and Luke xi: 38, he renders by *lavo*, wash, *lavat*.

BEZA, always quoted as out and out immersionist, not only translates *bapto*, stained, as opposed to dipped, but *baptidzo* by wash, purify, and quotes Augustine's view approvingly. He states in substance that it came to mean wash by *consequence*, but *then* it may mean wash in *any way whatever*. It is by an abuse of the laws of all languages that he is misrepresented.

HÄVERNICK, than whom lives no abler critic and commentator, whose "*Commentar über den Propheten Ezechiel*," 1843, is acknowledged to be the ablest ever written on Ezekiel, commenting on Ezek. xxxvi: 25, agrees with Rosenmüller, Jarchi, and Hengstenberg that it refers to die lustrations—ceremonie Numbr. 19, das mit der Ashe rothen Kuh vermischte Wasser der Unreinigkeit, etc., "the ceremonial cleansings, Num. xix, where the water was mixed with the ashes of a red heifer for purifying." This purifying water (die wasserreinigung) was symbolic. He then shows that from this the rabbis and people believed Messiah would *baptize*, and refers to *Lustrations-Ritus*, rite of purifying of "*der Teufer Johannes*," John the Baptizer, and "*das βαπτισμα*, etc., the baptism of repentance." Thus Hävernick believed the words, "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," was the prophesy of baptism, as well as the sprinklings of Num. xix.

DR. FRIEDRICH BLEEK, Berlin, 1840, in his "Einleitung . . . und fortlaufenden Commentar" on Hebrews, "Der Brief an die Hebräer," is acknowledged to have given us the ablest and most learned as well as copious commentary ever written on that epistle. I regret Hävernick and Bleek's commentaries are not in English. I have to read you from the German, as I did from the others in Latin. I have only time to give you the facts. John's baptism he calls a Jewish lustration, Judischen Lustrationen, while Heb. ix: 10, in commenting on vi: 2, he says were "the ablutions and purifications" referred to,

Mark vii, while on ix: 10, he refers them to the washings "with water" and "sprinkling of water." Ex. xxix: 4; Lev. xi: 25, 28; xiv: 6-9; xv: 5, etc., Num. xix: 17. On Heb. x: 22, sprinkled, and *λοῦω*, wash, he says it is spoken of the washing *with water*—*mit wasser*—administered by Moses to Aaron and his sons, and quotes them as baptisms. In a word, the sprinkling of the purifying water made up the most important part of Jewish baptisms. So held Bleek.

1. And now what is the grand summary on this question? I showed you in detail that the first great and favorite canon law of the immersionists is totally untrue, viz: that a word can not mean both to sprinkle and immerse. I gave a great number which meant pour water on the head and immerse, sprinkle and immerse, dip and sprinkle, in Hebrew, Syriac, Arabic, Greek, and Latin. What did he say or offer in reply. Absolutely nothing. He made no pretense of reply. This was in my first speech on this proposition.

2. I showed that *βαπτίζω* was never used in the Bible as in heathen Greek—never in heathen Greek as in the Bible. That in classic Greek it meant "to sink," "to drown," to "intoxicate," "make drunk," "stab," "drench," "overwhelm." It never has such meanings in the Bible. On the contrary, in classic Greek it *never* has a *religious* import. That *whenever*—in *all cases*—it put any object under an element in classic Greek it always left it there UNDER the element. No emergence is implied. To all this NOT ONE WORD of reply was made. He simply called on me over and again to *prove that βαπτίζω* was used in a different sense in the Bible to what it was in classic Greek! And that after the array of facts I adduced, and when in Proposition II he distinctly stated that there was an almost infinite difference.

3. I then showed that every lexicon in use sustained our practice, but more especially (1.) all the *native* Greek lexicographers in all ages defined *βάπτω*, the root of baptize, of same *action* and meaning all admit, as *βαπτίζω*, by to wash, to pour, and to stain or moisten. (2.) All the best modern lexicographers define it in the same way. (3.) All the fathers of the first four hundred years of the "Christian Church" that defined the word, rendered it *sprinkle*, of whom Tertullian, Julianus, and Augustine were representatives. (4.) All native Greek lexicographers of modern times, of whom Kouma and Gazes are most eminent, rendered *βαπτίζω* by to sprinkle, to pour, shed forth, pour upon. (5.) The greatest lights in modern lexicography, not native Greeks, who wrote lexicons on the New Testament, Schaetgen, Wahl,

Robinson, Stokius, and Schleusner, define it by *lavo, abluo profundo*, to wash, to cleanse, to pour forth, and tell us, *e. g.*, Stokius, that this washing was done *by SPRINKLING the water* on them; that the water also was *POURED* on them in baptism, hence the baptism of the Spirit is called *affusion*, pouring out of the Spirit, or, as Schleusner, that in the New Testament it *never* means *immerse*, while wash, where the best and most ancient Greek Testaments read *sprinkle* for *baptidzo*, pour, etc., were its New Testament meanings. Hence ALL THE LEXICONS ARE WITH US. (4.) I then showed that the Hebrew *tabhal* was translated by βάπτω, and βαπτίζω (baptize), was one of the Hebrew words for baptize. That its root meant to sprinkle, to moisten. That it was defined by sprinkle by the highest lexicography in the world, and that such a meaning was sustained (1.) by every word in which the root occurred. (2.) By the ancient translations, especially the venerable and renowned Peshito-Syriac, which rendered it *sprinkle*. (3.) By the fact that the first place of its occurrence, Gen. xxxvii: 31, Joseph's coat was baptized (*tabhal*) with blood. We showed that immersion was out of the question. (4.) We quoted where a man baptized himself (*tabhal*) with the water melted from one handful of little particles of *hail*. Surely immersion is out of the question there. Yet how has he met these crushing facts? He has never alluded to most of them at all, and carefully slipped over the others with bold talk about coming up to the question, sneers at Hebrew, Arabic, Syriac, etc. He *knows* these facts CAN NOT BE MET.

5. I showed there was another Hebrew word (*rachatz*—רָחַץ) rendered *nipto, lavo, and cheo*, in the Greek Septuagint—wash (as of the hands), wash (as of persons), pour, which Campbell and all immersionists tell us was *always* done by immersing the person completely in water. It, all agree, is termed baptism by Luke, Mark, and Paul (Heb. ix: 10). I showed this word meant, radically, to pour, drop, flow, and translated χέω, *pour*, in the Greek Bible used by the apostles. Yet, what was the response? *Nothing at all.*

6. I showed that the *Arabic* versions had three words for translating βαπτίζω. (1.) *Gasala*, always simply to wash; (2.) *Amada*, to wet or moisten, as with rain; to shed down water as rain, etc.; (3.) *Savagha* (same as Syriac and Chaldee *tzeva*, ALL agree), which means to sprinkle, drop juice, moisture, to pour, to pour out; and then, like Latin *tingo*, to stain, as the result of dropping juice, grape juice, etc., on any thing. Of four words meaning only to immerse, not one is rendered from βαπτίζω—*baptidzo*.

7. I showed that the old Itala, made in or within the closest time to the apostolic age, rendered, (1.) *Tabhal* by *tingo* as opposed to *intingo*, and that, by *tingo*, it meant stain by affusion. (2.) That it never rendered it by immerse. (3.) It habitually transferred the word *baptidzo* untranslated, as James' version did. (4.) That it translated *bapto* by *aspergo*—sprinkle. (5.) That it translated the Chaldee (same exactly as Syriac) *tzeva*, the word immersionists have claimed, above all other words, as settled in favor of immersion, and which M. Stuart, Rice, and our writers gave up always—that this ancient version renders *tzeva* by *conspergatur*—sprinkled, and by *infunderis*—sprinkled. If he prefers to say *infundo* is not sprinkle, then it is *pour*—in, *intensive*, and *fundo*, to *pour*. He will not deny THAT. I showed it applied to other cases where pour and sprinkle occurred—never immerse. He paid no attention to this at all, though it was as the breath of a tempest of fire to the cob-web logic he boasts of.

8. The same facts apply to the noble translation by the learned and modest Jerome, the noblest of all Latin fathers. I need not repeat them now.

9. I showed that five of the most ancient, and two of the best modern, versions render *bapto* by to sprinkle. That Irenæus, Origen, and Hippolytus, the most ancient and learned Greek fathers of the second and third centuries, translated *bapto* sprinkle. That one of the oldest manuscripts, dating about A. D. 325, rendered it sprinkle.

10. I showed that the Peshito-Syriac (1.) translated *tabhal* (*baptize*) by sprinkle. (2.) It renders *bapto* sprinkle. (3.) It renders *baptidzo* by *tamash*, to moisten, stain. (4.) It renders it by *secho*, to wash, as opposed to immerse. (5.) It renders pool of Siloam several times by baptistery, *i. e.*, place of baptizing; where people simply washed at it. (6.) It renders *baptidzo* by *amad*, which means to wash, and is of the root with the Arabic, to moisten, let rain fall, emit or shed down water. I showed that, in a Syriac council, they included sprinkling and washing, as opposed to *immersion*, in it, which settled it also. (7.) I showed that the old Syriac word for baptize was *tzeva*. Immersionists all agree to this, and press it. I showed it was used after Christ as the general word for baptize by the *Tsabians*, a Syrian Christian sect. I showed that (1.) the root of *tzeva* was to sprinkle, to moisten, to drop, shed forth, *pour, pour out*. (2.) That a man who hung on a cross was crucified, was (*tzeva*) baptized with his own blood, thence called *the Baptist*. (3.) I showed, from Luke vii: 38, 44, that it was there applied to a case of affusion, where dip, plunge, immerse

were out of the question, as he knows too well. "My feet hath she baptized with her tears." It so occurs twice. He tells us *βοτρω* is the Greek. Of course it is. It means to shed either *tears* or *rain*, *sprinkle*. It never means *immerse*. But pour, shed, *sprinkle*, in *Greek*, is translated *baptize* in this oldest, purest, most literal and best translation the world ever knew. It is in the tongue of Christ, also, and likely of *apostolic* origin.

11. I showed that Euthymius, of the fourth century, and the two most valuable copies of the New Testament on earth—the oldest known—both of which I held up before you, made about A. D. 325, had translated *βαπτισονται* (Mark vii: 4) by *ραντισονται* (*baptisontai* by *rantisontai*), the word of all immersionists hate worst—their hated *rantizo*—*sprinkle*, *i. e.*, the baptism of the Jews, these learned men knew, as always in such cases, by *sprinkling*, and they so rendered it. Seven other ancient copies (manuscripts) so render it. The reason they all thus rendered this case was, it was not Christian baptism there as they held, but the daily Jewish baptism; and while they held the one as a sacred Christian term, not expressible by *sprinkle*, *pour*, or *immerse*, though *sprinkle*, *etc.*, was *the action* by which *baptism* was accomplished, they had no such idea of the sacred character of the Jewish baptism, and, therefore, tell us just what it *was*—a sprinkling of the person with water.

And now, gentlemen and ladies, my argument is closed. The gentleman began this proposition by securing his strategic point in the renowned plains of old and classic Greece—the land of the oaten pipe and classic muse. He stood in armor clad, and in imagined security. But it was not the soul-inspiring plain of Plataeæ, nor the renowned pass of Ota, where a Leonidas fell and the Spartan bled. Wrapped in the flattering vision of imagined security, he boldly blew the horn of litigious war on hills and dales, and sounded the stern notes of unrelenting war. He saw in his dream hosts of the Spartan band gathering from Thermopylæ, and numberless spirits swarming from the banks of the tuneful Ilyssus or descending from the plains of Delphi! A shout is raised—the Greeks! the Greeks! the Sea! the Sea! I readily saw the character of his defenses, the armor, and *the intended line of retreat*. I remembered that *Michael* had his sword from the *armory of God*. I summoned to my side the Hebrew host and the Gideon band, well backed up with an apostolic army that were well posted as to the field on which such deeds of daring were to be executed, and the armor to be borne. We assailed them in center, flank, and

rear. But ere the battle became even interesting, I saw they were fearful the fords of the Jordan would be secured, and, instantly, his whole army were on a Bull Run stampede for Jordan. Alas! what intimacy had Thessaly or Locris with Judea? But I saw his *objective* point. Securing more prisoners than I knew what to do with, and leaving the debris of his scattered and dismayed Greeks, all staggering and *drunk* with draughts of *baptidzo*, slipping and falling on (*eis*) ice, I considered them *ek* (out of) this fight now, and hurried on to the attack. But, instead of guarding well the Jordan at El Meshra, his army were scattered from Hisbaiya to the Dead Sea. They were *in* the Jordan, and they were *under* it. Desperate will be the fight now. But on came my Hebrew host, flushed with victory, and bore down on them with such force that instantly the whole Jordan was abandoned, and they fled into a region of rocks, hills, and most precipitous steeps. He found an encampment so secure that for eighteen hundred years no mortal knew of it till his Brother Barclay found it. Here he would fight, for there was "much water" there. But a single flank movement and a few bombs soon sent them flying along the road to Gaza, over hill and dale, plain and desert. A little seeping puddle was found, where Philip got water enough with which to baptize the eunuch; and here he planted his banner, with the dreadful motto, "Come one, come all!" On we came, our ensign full high advanced; on,

"Like to the Pontic Sea,
Whose icy current and compulsive force
Ne'er feels retiring ebb."

They wavered; their lines shook; their treacherous Greeks forsake them; they fly in wild dismay; and when I find my friend, the brave captain of Grecian hosts, he is "*buried* by baptism into death!"

"No more we'll seek his merits to disclose,
Nor drag his frailties from their dread *repose*."

Ah, "lowly dead, lie down. Uneasy lies the head that wears a crown." As "noble spirits war not with the dead." I will leave him there, with the Greek acorist holding him there, and o'er his grave *sprinkle* "flowers, sweet flowers."

Gentlemen Moderators, we thank you for your patient and impartial presiding. To you [Mr. Wilkes] I have no unkind feeling. We have both contended for what we sincerely believed to be the truth,

and our facts and arguments we leave with the people. As a man's heart and character, in many respects, may be better than his theory, and as God knows and reads all hearts, we believe that much allowance is to be made for what we believe to be great and dangerous errors in men's doctrines, leaving them to the mercy of that God on whose mercy all our hopes are suspended. To you, my kind auditors, I say, in a better, in a holier, in a sweeter clime, where no jars nor discords reign; where no contest divides our sentiments; where no cloud obscures our mental or moral vision; amid the assembling and choiring millions of the redeemed, I hope to meet you all amid the unfolding and ever-expanding glories of an eternal day.

MR. WILKES' CLOSING REPLY.

Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I wish no advantage in the report or before the audience, and, therefore, I will make a calm and deliberate address. Mr. Ditzler has delivered you a very fine exhortation. I notified the audience once or twice during this discussion, that he was a better exhorter than I. At one time I felt hard pressed on that point, and was almost disposed to *hire* an exhorter to assist me; but my friend subsided on the exhortation, and I have felt no necessity for one since, until now. Now, I admit that I have not an exhortation prepared to meet his. I must, therefore, let that part of his speech all go without an answer.

My friend presses this question of Fuerst's definition of *tával*. He thinks that Dr. Kleeburg, Gesenius, Mr. Davidson, Buxtorf, and all the great lights in the world, in Hebrew learning, know so very little that they must all be set aside, because Fuerst happened to say "sprinkle" once, *if, indeed, he really did*. Fuerst defines *tával* as follows:

"*Tával*, to moisten, to sprinkle, *rigare, tingere*; therefore, to dip, to immerse, in any thing fluid, with the accusative of the object (as *regel*, a foot, etc.) and *b'* (*in*) of the liquid (as *b' dâm*, in blood); to dip in *shachath* (a slimy pit) where one is dirtied, hence to defile generally (Syriac only in this sense); also to bathe. The fundamental signification of the stem is *to moisten, to besprinkle*."—Fuerst's "Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon."

Tával, he says, means "*to sprinkle*." He follows that by "*rigare, tingere*." He then says, "Therefore, *to dip, to immerse*." Is it not singular that he should say it means to "*moisten, to sprinkle, and, therefore, to dip, or immerse?*" But he still proceeds: "To dip, to immerse, in any thing fluid." We have *tával*, and then we have the object, or accusative of the thing, *távaled*, or *baptized*. Even according to Fuerst himself, where we have the object of *tával* in the accusative, and "*b'* (*in*) of the liquid," we should have it in the sense of

dip or *immerse*; and, hence, so far as baptism is concerned, even Fuerst is on our side, and Dr. Kleeburg is not mistaken. I have only to say this: I protest against my friend's putting Fuerst against every body. I admitted, at the beginning, that Fuerst says sprinkle; I deny, however, that we are to accept Fuerst as against all others; against lexicons made by great men both before and after his time; and then against the whole Jewish people every-where, who have certainly preserved the traditions concerning the practice of their own church, and the meaning of their words, as well as any other men. Dr. Kleeburg speaks the Hebrew language as well as we do English, and reads it as well as we read English. He reads *tâval* "to *dip*." That is sufficient on that point.

My friend says Dr. Conant preserves *apo* in Mark i: 10. Dr. Conant does not. I will read the passage from Dr. Conant which he read; p. 98:

"NOTE.—It has been erroneously supposed, that the same thing is stated in Matthew iii: 16, and Mark i: 10. But the preposition *from* (*ἀπὸ*) is there used; and the proper rendering is 'up from the water.' But here (in Acts) the preposition is *ek*, *out from*, *out of*; and the only possible rendering is, 'came up out of the water;' into which (as just before said) they had gone down."

I apprehend that Dr. Conant is talking, particularly, about Acts viii: 26; about Philip and the eunuch's coming up out of the water; where *ek* is certainly used. Nobody denies it. Dr. Conant is not here *making* a text; he is not *criticising* the common Greek text. He is *quoting* from the Elzevir "Textus Receptus," made centuries ago, and made when there were no Greek manuscripts known, of great weight on a question like this. There was no manuscript known—when that text was made—more ancient than the tenth century; and the text, at that time, was not made critically accurate. It does not stand before us now as of *critical* authority; not at all, as my friend knows, and as all scholars know. Dr. Conant does not pretend to *criticise* that text at all, in this note.

Again: I remark that, in Romans vi: 1-4, the Apostle Paul raises the question, "Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound?" No; by no means. "How shall we, that are dead to sin, live any longer therein?" That is, as sin killed us, how can we expect to live by sin? Said he, "Do you not know that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death? Therefore, we were buried with him by baptism into death;" showing that they ought not to

expect to sin that they might live. The apostle is not discussing baptism; he is only alluding to the fact that they were baptized or were buried; and that, in being baptized, or buried, they had confessed themselves to be dead. For we do not bury live people. They confessed themselves to have died. Died to what? To sin. Having no desire to sin; having as little inclination to sin as a dead man, then they were buried. Paul alludes to that fact, and says: "Therefore we were buried with him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead, so we should walk in newness of life." It makes no difference what other things may be meant. Several questions might be raised, I know. But there are some things that are *certainly* true. Their baptism was a burial. It was like the Savior's death and burial; and their resurrection from their baptism was "like unto his resurrection." We know the Savior died, was buried, and was raised up again. Paul's view here is, that his baptism had in it that which *corresponded* to these great elements of the gospel; that the baptized man had died to sin, been buried, and raised up again. Except Prof. Stuart, all the commentators, nearly, take the same view. Hence, their baptism meant or signified that they should not think to "live in sin that grace may abound." The same lesson is taught by the use of another figure. Paul says, "Knowing this, that our old man is (was) crucified with him, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin." Mr. Ditzler supposes that the *baptism* symbolized the *crucifixion*: that this is Paul's meaning here. But he is mistaken. The crucifixion, death, burial, and resurrection to a new life, are all referred to as reasons why the Romans should not "continue in sin that grace might abound."

The same lesson is taught in the figure of planting. The apostle says: "For if we have been planted together in the likeness of his death, we shall be also *in the likeness* of his resurrection: knowing this, that our old man is crucified with *him*, that the body of sin might be destroyed, that henceforth we should not serve sin."

Mr. D. says the burial, here alluded to, was not, necessarily, a putting into the ground, as we now bury. It might, he thinks, have been a laying away on shelves, or a burning, as sometimes was done in ancient times. I answer, the Romans did not *burn* their dead, except, sometimes, their distinguished dead. And when they did burn them, their ashes were put into urns and buried. Persons not distinguished, even among the Romans, were *buried* without burning their bodies.

Among the Jews there was no burning of the bodies of their dead, except in the case of Saul and his sons, and they were burned to keep them from falling into the hands of their enemies. They then buried their bones. Whether baptism in this chapter is a *burning* or not, or whether it is a mere *laying away*, seems to be decided by the fact that they are baptized *IN WATER*. It would be a singular mode of burning a man's body to baptize him *in water*. I see no connection, nor any thing striking in the way of an analogy, between laying a dead body away or putting it in a tree, as Indians do, or laying it on a shelf, as is sometimes done, and baptism. If there is not a connection between burying and baptism, the two things are not here so related as that the one should illustrate the other. Indeed, the burial here specifically alluded to was that of the Savior, and we know from history that he was buried in the ground, in a rock, and that on the third day he was raised up. The burial and resurrection in the baptism of the Roman disciples set forth their faith in the fact that the Savior was buried, and that he was raised up again by the glory of God; so they, having been raised up to walk in newness of life, ought not to sin that grace might abound.

My brother says that the *pouring* of oil on the Savior's head represented his burial. No, there is not a word to that effect in the Bible. It is stated in the Bible, and that by the Savior himself, that this pouring of oil on his head was *against*, or with reference to, his burial. There is not one word said of its *representing* his burial, and it did not represent it. The idea of the pouring of oil representing the burial of Jesus Christ, is as foreign to any statement made in the Bible, or that ought to be made in the Bible, or by any man even, as any thing my friend could well think of. He is mistaken about that. It never represented the Savior's burial. There is no analogy between the things. There is no point of comparison; there is no point of likeness, to justify the use of such a comparison.

Again: My friend says that the aorist tense is used here in the sense of the *present*. I remark that if that be true the apostles' argument is without point. The apostle, when he says you were "buried" into the death of Christ—and that was the text my friend commented on—is referring them *back* to something that had actually taken place in their own history. The apostle says, You ought not to think that you may sin that grace may abound, because, said he, you *died* and you were *buried* with Christ, and were *raised up* again. Mr. D. says the presence of the aorist tense here makes it a sort of "*continuing* in the

thing." The Bible says they did not continue in their baptism, but were *raised up* again, that, like as Christ was *raised up*, by the glory of the Father, they should walk in newness of life. It refers to the transactions in their past history which would show that they ought not to assume they might continue in sin that grace might abound. The aorist tense, as I read from Jelf and Winer, marks an event in the past that took place instantaneously, and has no reference at all to the idea of continuance. For instance, "James died," would be expressed by that tense. "James has died," would be expressed by the perfect tense. "James will die," would be expressed by the future tense, and "James is dying," by the present tense. These tenses are well marked, Winer says, in their forms and meanings in the Greek New Testament.

My friend says Moses Stuart shows that the jailer, the Pentecostians, Lydia, etc., were, severally, *sprinkled*. Moses Stuart does not even *profess* to show that in his book; and my friend slightly, accidentally, misrepresents Moses Stuart. Stuart tries to show that *possibly* they were not immersed—just what my brother has been trying to do all this time. You will remember that he has not quoted any one text, saying, Here in the Bible is my authority for sprinkling, and the record will show that he has not even *pretended* to do it; and yet he stands here, the acknowledged and accredited champion of his church in this State, to demonstrate that "the sprinkling or pouring of water upon a proper subject, by a proper administrator, is Christian baptism." Not one single text does he quote to prove it, not one. But he says, "I do not see that any of them teach immersion." In the first place, I am not required to show that they do. In the next place, I claim that every text in the Bible, which speaks of baptism, from the first, demonstrates immersion, and I am willing to take any one of them and say *this* means immersion. "Go, teach all nations, immersing them," Matthew xxviii: 19, is one of them. "Go, preach the gospel to every creature. He that believes and is immersed shall be saved," is another. In Romans, "We were buried with him by immersion into death," is another. In Colossians, "Buried with him in the immersion, in which (immersion) also you were raised up with him," just as we bury people when we immerse them and then raise them up again, is another. I take them all, and believe them all to mean immersion. Will my friend say that these passages mean sprinkling? No, he will not.

A few other matters, and I will then present you a general review.

I wish to remark, with regard to Fuerst, that his work is a translation, and I do not know how it came to be as it is. I know it does not make any sense to say that the word *taval* means "to sprinkle or pour," and, therefore, "to immerse," "to dip." That is not good sense. "To sprinkle or pour, and, therefore, to dip, to immerse in any thing fluid," makes no sense. I conclude that there must have been a mistake made in the translation of Fuerst.

I wish now to spend a few moments in simply summing up, and presenting in substance what my positions have been, and my reasons for them. In the first place I stated that all the Jews' purifications, which were doubtless typical of our baptism, were bathings of the whole body in water. I supported that view by the express language of the Bible; and of the great Maimonides, who lived in the twelfth century; of Buxtorf, and others; the former stating that if even so much as the end of the little finger was left out of the water, the party was not considered as washed or bathed, in their sense of the word, and was not clean.

I mentioned that *taval* means *to dip*. It is the usual word for baptism in the Hebrew language, and it is the word which is used to translate the word *baptizo* in three or four of the translations that have been made. I proposed, when we first raised this question, as the word *taval* occurs sixteen times in the Bible, that we should look at all the passages. I offered to affirm that *taval* means *to dip* in every place where it occurs. I proposed, if we were doubtful about the meaning of the word, that we should survey the very ground where the lexicographer went in order to *make* his lexicon, and there gather its meaning for ourselves. But my friend *prudently* and *cautiously* refused to say a word on the subject. Here, from the entire sixteen occurrences of the word in the Bible, we could have gathered from circumstances, whether it is probable that *taval* is used in the sense of *to sprinkle*. We should have thus demonstrated that it is not so used. I brought it up in connection both with sprinkle and pour in two consecutive verses. It is stated that the priest should *pour* oil into the palm of his left hand; and that he should then *taval* his right finger in the oil, and *sprinkle* of the oil with his finger seven times before the Lord.—Lev. xiv: 15, 16. Where it is *taval* in the Hebrew it is *dip* in our English version. The oil was *poured*, the finger was then dipped (*tavaled*), and then the oil, adhering to the finger that was dipped, was *sprinkled*. What does the word mean? The circumstances standing around it here leave us in no doubt as

to its meaning. It does not mean to sprinkle or to pour here. Thus we have *tával* used under circumstances which show that it does not mean to sprinkle or to pour, for it is used in contradistinction from these two words. My friend knows this is true. Then why adhere to this definition, which he must be aware is as defenseless as any thing can be?

Again, we have considered the word *amad*. I trust it will be borne in mind, that my friend is not here to show—which he has been trying to do—that I can not prove that immersion was *always* practiced. That is not his position here. Nevertheless, he has spent his time and his strength, his patience and his energy, to show, or attempt to show—which I think he has not done—that *immersion* was not invariably the practice; why not show that *sprinkling* was sometimes practiced, or that it is somewhere authorized? He comes to *amad*! He is every-where, almost, where he should not be. In law, as I stated, a man is expected to bring the best evidence that his case can afford, else he is turned out of court. If a man comes into court, the judge tells him, "We want the testimony that bears on the case, either direct or circumstantial." But my friend, instead of that, goes to the Hebrew, and then to the Syriac. There he finds *amad*, and he "beats around" and through Syriac literature, and through all the lexicons; and then, after learnedly lumbering through it all, did he find that the meaning of the word *amad* is to *sprinkle*? Did he find in *any* lexicon, a single authority—Buxterf, or Schaaf, or any other—saying that *amad* means "to *sprinkle or pour*?" No, he did not; because the word never had any such meaning. His mode of referring to classical usage is worthy of all non-imitation. He refers to a passage where *bapto* occurs, a word which the Holy Spirit excludes from this question. This he translates into Latin by the word *tingo*. He then translates *tingo* into English, *to moisten, to sprinkle*, which is not correct. Then he takes *tingo* into the Hebrew, representing it by *tával*. He then passes into Syriac, Arabic, etc., careering through all the languages of the earth which he would like the people to think he understands, or which he thinks they do not understand, and then, lifting up his hands in perfect tragedian style, he says: "Thus you see that *bapto* means *to sprinkle or to pour*!" That is not right.

But, I ask, what did the Savior and his apostles do? Did the Savior authorize *rantism*? He said to his disciples, "Go, and baptize the people." I watch them to see what they do, noting all the circumstances. I inquire whether the hypothesis that they sprinkled

harmonizes with the known facts. I watch the Savior and his apostles. I see what they do; and I see that the hypothesis that they immersed harmonizes with all the circumstances of their practice, and that all the circumstances are against *sprinkling* or *pouring*.

I look into the Greek classics, and I find that the word, in the Greek, is used two hundred and fifty or three hundred times, and in not one single case, for nearly two thousand years, can my friend find, or does he pretend to find, where the word, under any circumstances, means to sprinkle or pour; and yet, in the name of his God, he is willing to hold up his hands and sprinkle a man for baptism!

We would expect that the Savior used the word in its current or ordinary meaning, when he gave the command to his apostles to baptize. What is the current meaning of that word? We have shown you that it means immersion, and not sprinkling, or pouring.

Then we have Josephus, who was born thirty-seven years after Christ, and who wrote when the apostles lived. He was educated at Jerusalem. He was educated in the Greek language, as Mr. Chambers says, and in the Hebrew language and literature. Josephus uses the word in the language of that day, from thirteen to seventeen times. He never uses it except in the sense, *to immerse*. Even my friend, with all his wide range of learning and research, does not pretend that Josephus ever used it in any other sense than that of immersion.

What, then, *must* the Savior have meant, when he said, Go teach and baptize the nations?

Then Philo, in the second century, used the word in the sense of *immersion*, and in no other. We have also the fathers. How did they understand the word? We have shown, from Dr. Blunt and other authorities, that the Latin fathers and the Greek fathers both used the word *baptizo* in the sense of immersion, and never as meaning to *sprinkle* or to *pour*.

My friend brings a testimony from Sozomon, which I have *demonstrated* to be a mistake. He also reads from Tertullian, where it is said that, after *dipping* a man, he is also *sprinkled*; but does Tertullian say that the sprinkling was the baptism? No, he does not. Even his own translation of Tertullian does not show that the sprinkling was the baptism. Moreover, Tertullian says expressly, "We are three times immersed." The fathers, then, teach immersion. He made an argument on the translations, which I will notice. There are about thirty, I believe, and of all the translations made, there is not one, ancient or modern, that has, as a definition of *baptizo* or *bap-*

tisma, "to sprinkle," or "to pour." That is strange, is it not, if sprinkling be baptism? No man has ever been willing to risk his soul in the next world, or his reputation in this, by translating one single passage in the Bible, where the word occurs, by "to sprinkle or pour." *Not one!* I state here deliberately—not one. Will my friend ask me whether any body translates the word *baptizo*, in the New Testament, by *immerse*? I answer, their name is legion, and the greatest men in America and Europe at that. Then, as to the lexicons, not one, even of Mr. D.'s own, gives to *baptizo*, as a regular definition, sprinkling or pouring, as far as I have caught his report.

The modern translations give immerse, never sprinkle or pour. John's baptism was immersion, says Mr. Coleman.

We also looked at the circumstances of the baptisms of the Bible. Jesus came (*epi*) to the Jordan (*pros*), to John, who was baptizing (*eis*) into the Jordan. HE came (*ek*) out of the water. Now, these circumstances harmonize with the hypothesis that the Savior was immersed, but they are wholly incompatible with the hypothesis that his baptism was *sprinkling* or *pouring*.

Time having expired, Mr. Wilkes announced that Mr. Ditzler and himself had mutually agreed to give, at the conclusion of the report of the debate, a table of versions, so arranged that the first column should give the name of the version, the second the date, the third to contain the word employed in the particular version for baptism, while the fourth should give the English meaning of the word.

An expression of thanks to the Moderators for their uniform urbanity and impartiality, and to the auditors for the patience and interest they had manifested, closed the discussion.

A final benediction terminated the proceedings.

APPENDIX B.

MR. DITZLER'S TABLE OF VERSIONS.

As we agree not to give all the words that bear on this subject in the subjoined "TABLE," such as βαπτω, *tabhal*, etc., but restrict ourselves to βαπτίζω (*baptidzo*), as used in the translations given by Gotch, copied by A. Campbell, we refer our readers to the former arguments for details and facts, while it is desirable to give more light on these versions which we failed to get time to introduce, systematically, in the discussion.

We begin with the venerable PESHITO-SYRIAC. The importance of the versions may be judged of from Mr. A. Campbell's devoting ten pages of his "Christian Baptism" to "ancient versions" and "English translators" (134-144), to ten and a half *lines* on the *Bible*; while Conant, the most learned Baptist in America, devotes eight pages -142 to close of 149--to "Usage of the Versions," four pages, full, to "Usage of the Greek Versions of the Old Testament" --83 to close of 86--making twelve *pages*, to sixteen and one-half *lines* from the *Bible*, as a *Bible* argument, in the whole book-- "Baptizein." Such is the value the greatest of immersionists in America attach to this source of information; while Gotch, Lindsay, Carsou, Gale, the greatest European lights, seem to devote even more pains to the versions.

Of all versions, those of the first four centuries, all agree, must be by far the most valuable. The versions of the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries were made almost entirely from the Latin by men whose knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew were sadly defective. Indeed, in the fifteenth century, the Greek was unknown in western Europe, if we except the last fifteen years of that century. As late as 1470 it was unknown altogether, save to a very few persons, who came from the East. The Hebrew, Syriac, etc., were unknown, critically, until the seventeenth century, and even to within the last forty

years was but very imperfectly known, as we showed in several speeches. We owe the excellency of our translations, not to the knowledge of the translators of the Greek and Hebrew, but to their so closely following the ancient Vulgate and Itala versions, made when the Greek and Hebrew were understood.

As the Syriac is by far the most important version, by common consent, I will devote most time to it. If it was not made in the apostolic age, as all the Syrians contend the New Testament was, it was made very near to it—early in the second century. The Syriac was the native language of Christ and the apostles. Hence, A. Campbell, in his "Debate," and in his "Christian Baptism," p. 135, speaks of "the original word used by the Savior in his *native* Syro-Chaldaic language."

W. K. PLINDLETON, President of Bethany (Mr. A. Campbell's) College, "Mil. Har.," Nov., 1867, pp. 582, 583: "Let it be conceded at once, then, that the adverb does mean *sometimes from above*; but that it also means *again*. The question arises, Which is its meaning here? To cite *passages* in which *another* means from above, is idle; because *there can be a similar citation of passages in which it means AGAIN*. So with the lexicons. . . . Be it remembered, our Savior, in speaking to 'a ruler of the Jews,' did not use the Greek language. He spoke in Hebrew or Aramaic, and in neither of these tongues is there any such *ambiguity*. The Savior did not use this *ambiguous* word at all, *but one clear and definite*, and SINGLE IN ITS MEANING; and Nicodemus could not have misunderstood him." We know that even if there were some variations between the Syriac proper and the vernacular of Christ, the word for *baptism* is the same in *all* the dialects.

The Hebrew ceased to be a living language after the Babylonish captivity, and there was "substituted in its stead the Hebræo-Aramæan, as it was spoken in the time of our Savior."—Horne's Intro., i. 190. Before the Syriac was studied much, in former days, a later date was given to the Peshito-Syriac. As it was studied more since 1750, Michaelis, Storr, Adler, Hug, Eichorn, and others, put it late in the *second* century. But, as it has been more thoroughly investigated, a much earlier date is given. It is now placed by most of more recent scholars, *very* close to the apostolic day—*early* in the second century. But the investigation gives more light, and the most eminent critics now put it in the apostolic day. Says Horne, vol. i, p. 270, N. T., 1844, Intro.: "Bishop Walton, Carpzov, Leusden,

Bishop Lowth, and Dr. Kennicott, fix its date in the first century." Michælis puts it in "the close of the *first*, or to the earlier part of the *second* century." John is the same.

The following facts confirm its early existence :

1. No record is given of it being made, which would have been the case had it been after the apostolic age.

2. All admit the Itala was made in the second century, or in the apostolic age, while both have no date or author given.

3. The Aramean or Syriac being the vernacular of all Palestine, Syria, etc., it is absurd to suppose they were without a version.

4. As Michælis states, we know that even the kings of Syria, in Edessa, were converted to Christianity in the middle of the apostolic age. Would their Christian subjects be without Bibles?

5. All ancient traditions of all Syrian churches, "Nestorian, Monophysite, Melchite, and Maronite, in all of which this version has been in public use, time out of mind, and has ever been revered as co-eval with the origin of those churches," hold it, and ever held it, as apostolic in its date and origin.

SAMUEL DAVIDSON, who has no superior as a critic, says: "The Peshito in the Old and New Testaments is one and the same version, having been made *in the first century of the Christian era.*"—Art. in "Kitto's Cyclo.," p. 809. See also p. 826.

PALFREY says the Peshito "has the peculiar interest of presenting the discourses of our Savior essentially in the language in which they were originally pronounced."—I. G. Palfrey, D. D., of Harvard University. T. J. Conant, Baptist, says the Peshito gives us "the privilege of reading *the oldest version* of the New Testament."

MARTINI, in his elaborate preface to his Syriac New Testament: "If not the very language in which CHRIST himself conversed with his apostles, approaches very nearly to the vernacular tongue of our Savior and his companions, etc. The *first and most ancient* of all versions." W. Fraucius: "This version all the learned pronounce and declare to be the *purest* of all versions, and, doubtless, it was so exactly transferred by the holy men, because *Christ* spoke and discoursed in the Syriac language." He was a colleague of Martini. He urges that the apostolic writers remembered Christ's very "words recently uttered," "and understood their meaning. For CHRIST himself used this language." Emmanuel Tremelius, in his "Preface to his Syriac New Testament," says: "It is entirely consonant with truth that this version was formed at the very commencement of the Chris-

tian Church, either by the *apostles* themselves or by their disciples." The great Walton, in his prolegomena to his polyglot of Syriac, Arabic, etc., etc., says: "For the New Testament being written in Greek, whose *vernacular language* was Syriac, every-where savors of *Syriasims*. Hence Ludovicus (author of a Syriac lexicon, etc.) affirms that the true import of the phraseology of the New Testament *can scarcely be learned except from the Syriac*." "They conceived in Syriac that which they wrote in Greek."—Appendix to J. Murdock's Translation Peshito, 498, 499.

E. STILES, D. D., President Yale College, says: "The greater part of the New Testament was originally written 'in Syriac,' and not merely translated in the apostolic age." He says with him the Syriac-Peshito is "of the same authority as the Greek." All early fathers held that the gospel of Matthew, if not Mark, and Hebrews, was written in Syriac. The proofs are all in its favor. Bolton held "nearly all the epistles must have been first composed by the apostles *in Aramean* (Syriac), their *native tongue*." The learned Bertholdt defends this view. "The Syriac translator has recorded the actions and speeches of Christ in the very language in which he spoke."—J. D. Michaelis.

The Arabic is of great value, because (1.) a kindred dialect with the Hebrew, Syriac, and Chaldee, all of one stock. Hence, being a living language yet, and having a rich literature, it is of infinite value in tracing the meaning and roots of Syriac and Hebrew words. (2.) It was made when Arabic learning was in its *golden age*, and when they studied and read Greek with the greatest admiration. In these respects its value can not be over-estimated. It has three words for baptize—*tsavaga* (or *zava*), and *amada*, often *interchanging* with each other. The Itala is, next to the Peshito, of highest value and of greatest purity. It was most certainly made in the apostolic age. The Vulgate of Jerome, A. D. 382-3, is next in value and purity. On words meaning penance, and bearing on the Virgin Mary, the Catholics have introduced some false readings to favor their views, all of which are easily pointed out.

In the Arabic, *gasala* occurs of the Jewish baptisms. *Amada* and *tsavagha*, or *sabhagha*, *savha*, variously pronounced, are the two words in constant use for baptism, and freely interchange with each other. Their meanings are examined in the fourth and fifth of my speeches on Proposition III, and, subsequently, pp. 489, 503-508, 548, 671, etc.

A TABLE OF VERSIONS, with the most perfectly settled dates as to the time when made, giving the translations of βαπτίζω, to baptize, and the most literal meanings of those words as developed in the preceding Debate:

VERSIONS.	DATE.	WORDS EMPLOYED.	MEANING.
I. SYRIAC OR ARAMEAN.			
1. Peshito.....	1st Century....	1. כחא (<i>secho</i>)..... 2. עמר (<i>amad</i> or <i>amad</i>)	<i>lavit</i> , wash. <i>ablus, emitto, effudo pluviam</i> —to wash, to pour out, shed forth water.
2. Philozenian ..	6th Century	3. צבע (<i>tzeva</i> or <i>sabha</i>)	sprinkle, moisten
II. ARABIC.		(Same as above.)	
1. Polyglot	7th Century....	1. <i>amada</i>	to pour out, shed forth water; wet with rain.
		2. <i>gasala</i>	<i>lavit se, lavit</i> , wash, wash one's self.
		3. <i>tsavagha</i> (<i>tzeva</i>)...	sprinkle, moisten, shed forth, drop as rain.
2. Propaganda...	1671.....	(Same as polyglot.)	
3. Sabat.....	1816.....	(Same as polyglot.)	
same in substance.			
III. PERSIC.....	8th Century....	<i>shustan</i> and <i>shuzidan</i>	wash, baptize.
IV. ETHIOPIIC.....	4th Century....	<i>tamaka</i>	<i>tinzit</i> , moisten, wet, stain, sprinkle, dip.
V. AMHARIC.....	1822.....	<i>shustan</i>	wash, baptize.
VI. EGYPTIAN....	3d Century....	<i>oms</i> (<i>amd</i>).....	moisten, wet rain.
1. Coptic.....	3d Century....	<i>tamaka</i>	<i>tinzit</i> , moisten, wet, stain, sprinkle dip.
2. Sahidic.....	2d Century....	βαπτίζω	sprinkle, wash, baptize.
3. Basmariic.....	3d Century....	βαπτίζω.....	sprinkle, wash, baptize.
VII. ARMENIAN.	5th Century....	<i>mogridil</i>	to baptize.
VIII. SCLAVONIC	9th Century....	<i>krestiti</i>	cross.
IX. GOTHIC.....	4th Century....	<i>dauppan</i>	baptize.
1. German.....	1522.....	1. <i>taufen</i>	baptize (<i>by affusion</i>).
		2. <i>waschen</i>	to wash (<i>by sprinkling, pouring, etc</i>).
2. Danish	1524.....	1. <i>dobe</i>	baptize (<i>by affusion, always</i>).
3. Dutch.....	1460 to 1480...	1. <i>taufen</i>	baptize (<i>both by affusion and dipping</i>).
		2. <i>doopen</i>	baptize (<i>both by affusion and dipping</i>).
		3. <i>waschen</i>	wash (<i>ceremoniously done by sprinkling</i>).
4. Icelandic.....	1584.....	<i>skira</i>	cleans (by affusion).
X. ANGLO-SAXON	8th Century....	1. <i>dyppan</i>	baptize (<i>by dipping and sprinkling, etc</i>).
		2. <i>fullian</i>	cleans, baptize (<i>by sprinkling</i>).

VERSIONS.	DATE.	WORDS EMPLOYED.	MEANING.
LATIN.....	1st to 4th Century.....	1. <i>baptizo</i>	baptize (by sprinkling, pouring, and immersing).
Of the early fathers.....	1st to 4th Cent.	2. <i>tingo</i>	moisten, sprinkle, dip, stain.
		3. <i>perfundo</i>	sprinkle, pour.
		4. <i>adspergo, conspergo</i>	sprinkle.
		5. <i>effundo</i>	pour, pour forth.
		6. <i>immergo (rarely)</i> ...	sink, sink in.
		7. <i>lavo, abluo</i>	wash, cleanse, sprinkle
ANTE-HIERONYMIAN.	3d Century....	Same as last, <i>tingo, perfundo, adspergo, conspergo, effundo</i> ...	Same as last—moisten, sprinkle, etc., pour.
Vulgate.....	4th Century...	1. <i>baptizo</i>	baptize (any mode as above).
Itala.....	1st Century....	2. <i>lavo</i>	wash, ceremonially, by sprinkling.
French.....	1535.....	1. <i>baptizer</i>	baptize (as above).
		2. <i>laver, lave</i>	wash (as above).
Spanish.....	1556.....	1. <i>baptizer</i>	baptize (as above).
		2. <i>laver</i>	wash (as above).
Italian.....	1562.....	1. <i>baptezzare</i>	baptize.
		2. <i>lavar</i>	wash.
English:			
Wickliffe.....	1380.....	<i>baptize, christen, wash</i>	christen, baptize.
Tindal.....	1596.....	<i>baptize, wash</i>	baptize, wash.
Welsh.....	1567.....	<i>bedyddis</i>	wash, baptize.
Irish.....	1602.....	<i>baisdin</i>	wash, baptize.
Gaelic.....	1650.....	<i>baisdean</i>	wash, baptize.

MR. WILKES' TABLE OF VERSIONS.

The preceding, partial, investigations of ancient and modern versions, and other prior and subsequent examinations, have confirmed me in the conclusion reached by the learned and distinguished Dr. Gotch, of Trinity College, Dublin: *No version of the Holy Scriptures, made from the original Greek into any language, in either ancient or modern times, by either Baptist or Pedobaptist, affords reasonable grounds for the conclusion that the word BAPTIZO, or any of its cognates, signifies, in current New Testament Greek, either to sprinkle or to pour.* This con-

clusion I express in the language of Mr. Gotch, quoted by Mr. Campbell, as follows :

"1. With regard to the ancient versions, in all of them, with three exceptions, (viz., the Latin, from the third century, and the Sahidic and Basmuric), the word *baptizo* is translated by words purely native; and the three excepted versions adopted the Greek word, not by way of transference, but in consequence of the term having become current language.

"Of native words employed, the Syriac, Arabic, Ethiopic, Coptic, Armenian, Gothic, and earliest Latin, all signify to *immerse*; the Anglo-Saxon, both to *immerse* and to *cleanse*; the Persic, to *wash*; and the Slavonic, to *cross*. The meaning of the word adopted from the Greek, in Sahidic, Basmuric, and Latin, being also to *immerse*.

"2. With regard to the modern versions examined, the eastern generally adhere to the ancient eastern versions, and translate by words signifying to *immerse*. Most of the Gothic dialects, viz., the German, Swedish, Dutch, Danish, etc., employ altered forms of the Gothic word signifying to *dip*. The Icelandic uses a word meaning *cleanse*. The Slavic dialects follow the ancient Slavonic; and the languages formed from the Latin, including the English, adopt the word *baptizo*; though, with respect to the English, the words *wash* and *christen* were formerly used, as well as *baptize*.

"It may, perhaps, be acceptable to place these results together in a tabular form, as follows :

VERSION.	DATE.	WORD EMPLOYED.	MEANING.
SYRIAC:			
Peshito.....	2d Century...	<i>Amad</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
Philoxenian	6th Century...	<i>Amad</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
ARABIC:			
Polyglot.....	7th Century....	<i>Amada</i> , 47 times.....	<i>Immerse.</i>
Propaganda.....	1671.....	<i>Amada</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
Sabat.....	1816.....	<i>Amada</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
PERSIC	8th Century....	<i>Shustan and Shuyidan</i> ..	<i>Wash.</i>
ETHIOPIC:	4th Century....	<i>Shustan</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
Amharic.....	1822	<i>Shustan</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
EGYPTIAN:			
Coptic.....	3d Century....	<i>Tanaka</i>	{ <i>Immerse.</i>
Sahidic.....	2d Century }	<i>Baptizo</i>	{ <i>Ptunge.</i>
Basmuric	3d Century }		<i>Immerse.</i>
ARMENIAN	5th Century....	<i>Mogridil</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
SLAVONIC:	9th Century....	<i>Krestiti</i>	<i>Cross.</i>
Russian	1519 }	<i>Same root</i>	<i>Cross.</i>
Polish.....	1585 }		
Bohemian	1593 }		
Lithuanian	1660 }		
Livonian, or Lettish.	1685 }		
Dorpat Esthonian, etc	1727 }		
GOOTHIC:	4th Century....	<i>Daupjan</i>	<i>Dip.</i>
German	1522.....	<i>Taufen</i>	<i>Dip.</i>

* Probably later.—[W.]

VERSION.	DATE.	WORD EMPLOYED.	MEANING.
GOTHIC :			
Danish	1524.....	<i>Dobe</i>	<i>Dip.</i>
Swedish	1534.....	<i>Dopa</i>	<i>Dip.</i>
Dutch, etc.	1460.....	<i>Doopen</i>	<i>Dip.</i>
Icelandic	1584.....	<i>Skira</i>	<i>Cleanse.</i>
ANGLO-SAXON :			
“ “	8th Century....	<i>Dyppan</i>	<i>Dip.</i>
“ “	8th Century....	<i>Fulhan</i>	<i>Cleanse.</i>
LATIN :			
Of the early fathers.	8th Century....	<i>Tingo</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
Ante-Hieronymian... ..	3d Century....	<i>Baptizo</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
Vulgate.....	4th Century....	<i>Baptizo</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
French	1535.....	<i>Baptiser</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
Spanish	1556.....	<i>Baptizar</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
Italian, etc.....	1562.....	<i>Baptizzare</i>	<i>Immerse.</i>
ENGLISH: (Wicklif)...			
Tindal	1380.....	<i>Wash, christen, baptize</i> ...	<i>Immerse.</i>
Welsh.....	1526.....	<i>Baptize</i>	
Welsh.....	1567.....	<i>Bedyddio</i>	<i>Bathe.</i>
Irish.....	1602.....	<i>Baisdim</i>	<i>Bathe.</i>
Gaelic	1650.....	<i>Baisdeam</i>	<i>Bathe.</i>

On this showing of Mr. Gotch, Mr. Campbell remarks :

“Here, then, we have sixteen ancient versions, six of them in the second and third centuries, and ten of them completed before the close of the ninth, indicative of immersion ; one, from the sign made in baptism by the Romanists, is rendered *cross*. From the ninth century we have twenty more, all indicative of the same fact. In all these we have thirty-six foreign, and many of them ancient versions, in proof of our first proposition. In all these it is not once rendered by the word *sprinkle* or *pour*. The investigation of Mr. Gotch goes to show, moreover, that the notion of either transferring the original word into translations, or of manufacturing new words, has no countenance from these thirty-six ancient and modern versions.”

He then proceeds to quote Mr. Gotch as follows :

“Our investigation, then, shows that it has not been the practice of translators, until quite recent times, to adopt the plan of ‘transference’ in respect to the word *baptizo*. The word has been translated, in most instances, by a term strictly native ; or, where the term has been derived from the Greek, it appears to have become naturalized in the respective languages before the translation was made. There is no instance, until of late years, in which it can be shown that the translators *made* the word ; and it well deserves the consideration of all who are engaged in translating, or disseminating translations of the word of God, how far such a plan is justifiable. It may, indeed, be said that though the word *baptizo* has not been thus transferred, other words have ; and that thereby the *principle* of transference is countenanced by former translators. It is certain that such words as proper names, and designations of things which are not known, and, therefore, have no word by which they can be expressed, must be so rendered ; but what proof is there of translators, in general, carrying transference farther

than this? Let it be remembered that the Greek language was closely united to the Latin, to which the appeal has been frequently made, and that on this account Greek words were continually naturalized in it. Such words we may expect to meet with, but to prove that translators *transferred* words, in the modern sense of the term, it must be shown that words, the meaning of which might have been expressed in the language, were given, not only by terms derived from the Greek, but without meaning, being made for the occasion, and purposely left without definition. It will not surely be said that the word *baptizo* has no meaning; that a command, involving, as most Christians believe, a thing to be done by or for every disciple, yet conveys no definite idea of what is to be done. We are not now inquiring what that meaning is; every one who attempts to translate the word of God is bound to judge for himself on that point. Let him so judge and give the result of his judgment."

The value of a version depends upon the honesty and qualifications of the translators or revisers. It is evident that those who lived near to the apostolic age, and who understood well the language in which the apostles wrote and spoke, and whose works were completed before any discussions arose, the spirit of which is so well calculated to blind and mislead, would be more likely to understand the sense in which the Lord employed the word *baptizo* than would others; that is, the very ancient versions possess, for our present purpose, peculiar interest. Among these the PESHITO-SYRIAC, the ITALIC, and the VULGATE, are prominent. These all translate the word *baptizo* by words which signified, at that time, to immerse. The first translated by the word *amad*, which, whatever it meant at the time, *did not mean to sprinkle or to pour*. The other two employed the word *baptizo* itself, but, from current history, we *know* they used it in the sense of immersion. Thus we have, in these versions, the history of *baptizo* for nearly four hundred years immediately succeeding the Christian era, with the conclusion, as certain as facts can make it, that the words in controversy were employed by the translators in the sense of immersion.

The COPTIC is a "dialect of lower Egypt." A version of the New Testament was made in this dialect in the third century. The word for *baptizo* in this version is *tanaka*. Of it Doctor Gotch says: "Yet it is difficult to conceive what use of the word could suffice to prove this if its use as the translation of the Greek words, βαπτο (*bapto*), καταδυνο (*kataduno*), καταποντιζω (*katapontizo*), καταπινω (*katapino*), will not. What can it mean but *dip, sink, overwhelm, swallow up?*"

The SAHIDIC version was made, probably, in the second century, and the BASMURIC, in the third century. These are dialects of Egypt, and very nearly related to the Coptic. The word *baptizo* is itself used in

these versions. From and before the time of the Ptolemies—three hundred years before Christ—to the time when these versions were made, the Greek language, learning, and literature had been mingling with the Egyptian. It was, probably, under Ptolemy Philadelphus, in Egypt, that the Septuagint, our Greek version of the Old Testament, was made. Greek words gradually became current in the Egyptian dialects, bearing their meanings with them. The meaning of the word *baptizo*, at the time of its migration into Egypt, is not doubtful. It carried, and had, during its entire former history, the idea of *submergence* with it.

The word employed to translate *baptizo*, in the ARMENIAN version, made in the fifth century, is *mogridil*, which “is thus given in the ARMENIAN lexicon of Brand and Aucher, the most recent lexicon that has been published: ‘(*mogridil*); *v. a.* to baptize, to wash by plunging into water.’”—Bible Question, p. 147. The word employed to translate *baptizo*, in the GOTHIC version, is *daupjan*, “which, it is on all hands agreed, signifies *immerse*.” This version was made in the fourth century by Ulphilas, bishop of the Moesians.

The ARABIC Polyglot, dates probably about the seventh century. The words used to translate *baptizo*, in this version, are *amada* and *tsabagha*. “The former of these verbs occurs, as the translation of *baptizo*, forty-seven times; the latter, thirty-one.” The latter of these words (*tsabagha*) means to immerse. This is generally admitted. Golius defines it: “1. Tinxit pannum. Inbuit. Immersit *manum in aqua*. Baptizavit,” etc. “*To dye or dip clothes. To imbue. To immerse the hand in water. To baptize.*” Freytag defines the word thus: “Tinxit *pannum*; immersit *manum in aquâ*.” *To dye or dip clothes, to immerse the hand in water, etc.* “There seems, therefore,” says Dr. Gotch, “to be no room for controversy as to its signification. But not only do we thus find a word, the acknowledged meaning of which is ‘*immerse*,’ used frequently in the Arabic to designate the ordinance of baptism, but it is so used as to show in what sense the other word employed (*amada*) was understood by the translator.” That is, it is used interchangeably with *amada*. For example: In Acts viii: 12 and 13, it is said: “When they believed Philip preaching the things concerning the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ; they were *immersed* (*tsabagha*) both men and women. Then Simon himself believed also, and when he was *baptized* (*amada*), etc.” Acts viii: 36–38, “The eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be *immersed* (*tsabagha*)? And they went down both into the water, both Philip and

the eunuch; and he *baptized* (*amada*) him." Again, Acts xix: 3-5: "He said, With what *baptism* (*amada*) were ye *immersed* (*tsabagha*)? and they said, With John's *baptism* (*amada*). Then said Paul, John verily *baptized* (*amada*) the people with the *baptism* (*amada*) of repentance, saying unto them that they should believe on HIM who should come after HIM, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this they were *immersed* (*tsabagha*) in the name of the Lord Jesus." Now, look at these two words carefully; and the meaning of *baptizo*, as they develop it, is certainly to *immerse*.

In several of the versions, as the Persic, Icelandic, and some others, the word used to translate *baptizo* seems to signify, primarily, to *wash* or *cleanse*. The venerable Scapula and many other lexicographers of the greatest distinction, have said, in substance, that things are accustomed to be *dipped* or *immersed* into water that they may be washed or cleasured. It was this fact, I suppose, which caused the translators of these versions to select words, as names for the ordinance of baptism, signifying to wash or cleanse, and not that they supposed the original word signified to sprinkle or to pour.

According to our agreement, I have placed, in the preceding table of versions, those only which are found in the table of A. Campbell, on "Baptism." We were to give the names of the versions in one column, just as found in the work mentioned above. In a second column we were to give our date for each version. Several of these dates are a little uncertain. It is even probable that the Peshito-Syriac version was made later than the second century. There was, it is true, a Syriac version made in the second century; perhaps in the early part of it. But this is not the *Peshito*. I have not thought proper, as I have seen no sufficient reason, to change the dates, but prefer to leave them as Mr. Gotch and other learned men have given them to us. I have, however, suggested a change of the date of the *Peshito*. This I do on the following evidence. Dr. W. Smith, in his unrivaled work, "Dictionary of the Bible," vol. iii, p. 163?, says: "There is neither evidence nor internal probability against the supposition that the old Syriac version was revised into its present form . . . in the fourth or even third century, to make it accord with Greek manuscripts then current at Antioch, Edessa, or Nisibis; and without some such supposition the Syriac text must remain an inexplicable phenomenon, unless we bring the Greek and Latin texts into conformity with it by contradicting the full and clear evidence which we do possess respecting them."

Again, next page, the Doctor says: "Among the manuscripts brought from the Nitrian monasteries in 1842, Dr. Cureton noticed a copy of the Gospels, differing greatly from the common text; and this is the form of the text to which the name of Curetonian-Syriac has been rightly applied. Every criterion which proves the common Peshito not to exhibit a text of extreme antiquity, equally proves the early origin of this." And a few lines below he says: "The judgment that the Curetonian-Syriac is older than the Peshito is not the peculiar opinion of Cureton, Alford, Tregelles, or biblical scholars of the school of ancient evidence in this country, but it is also that of continental scholars, such as Ewald, and, apparently, of the late Prof. Bleek." In a note below, on the same page, we have the following: "It is very certain that many who profess a peculiar admiration for the Peshito do this rather from some traditional notion than from minute personal acquaintance. They suppose that it has some prescriptive right to the first rank among versions; they praise its excellencies, which they have not personally investigated; and they do not care to know wherein it is defective."

On page 1635, Dr. Smith further says: "Every successive investigation, on the part of competent scholars, aids in the proof that the Curetonian Gospels are an older form than those in the Peshito; that the Peshito is a revision replete with readings unknown in the second century (and often long after); and that the Curetonian text possesses the highest critical as well as historical value."

Of the Curetonian-Syriac, Kitto, "Biblical Cyclopædia," edited by W. L. Alexander, vol. iii, p. 919, says: "It is an older version than the Peshito; which the author or authors of the latter consulted throughout." On same page, he says: "And there are marks of antiquity about it which show an age prior to the Peshito."

In regard to the word used and its meaning, in each of the versions, I know no reason for making any change.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX BY MR. DITZLER.

I had no idea that we had the right to introduce any argument on baptism in the Appendix. Hence I confined myself to facts equally important to Mr. Wilkes' side, if the versions were with him. As he argues it, and quotes lexicons, I will simply add a few facts. In my third, fourth, and fifth arguments, all the assumptions of Gotch are overthrown. I refer the reader thither. Against Gotch I showed that, 1. All those words radically mean sprinkle and pour. 2. I gave *numerous examples* in Arabic, Syriac, Chaldee, etc., where they are used where no other mode was possible, where immerse was totally out of question. 3. Mr. W. and we all, add even lexicons; all are dependent on *examples* for their definitions. 4. All the lexicons defined *sabha* to pour, pour out, drip as juice, etc. 5. The ancient Itala and Vulgate rendered *tzeva* (*sabha*) *sprinkle*, never immerse. The unreliability of Gotch is patent, and in accordance with immersionist writers, such as Conant, the evidence of whose guilt is before me. Turn to pages 478 and 479 of this debate and read Conant's definitions of *baptidzo*, as professedly given by *Kouma* and *Gazes*. I had quoted them on *bapto*, p. 444; of *baptidzo*, p. 447. Read C.'s letter and Mr. W.'s comments, 478-9. Now, I have written to *Astor Library* and *Cambridge*, and have letters from Bishop Williams, of the Episcopal Church, Conn., and Prof. Wm. E. Eizenbrodt, N. Y., and others. Each sends the entire definitions of both words (*bapto* and *baptidzo*) as given by *Kouma* and *Gazes*. They are all *verbatim*, as quoted by me on pages 444, 447, of this debate. A typographical error of one particle I now correct in G.'s definition of *baptidzo*—*ανα του* (*ana tou*,) should be *απι του* (*anti tou*), i. e., to place before, over against, instead of upon; then it is, *brecho ti*, to shed forth any thing; *epichuno*, pour upon,

etc. I leave Dr. Conant, the most learned immersionist in the world, to the just indignation of all truthful and honest men. He was asked for "*the definition*" of a word—he *suppressed* it and utterly falsified the record. I have taken much pains to ferret out facts, and feel nobly compensated.

As to the Nitrian or Curetonian text, found by Dr. Cureton, I believe it to be the oldest, the *original* of the Peshito, myself. I am thoroughly satisfied that the Peshito text has received some changes. It is perfectly evident. But that only aids my cause. *These words* for *baptism* are *the same* in *all* of them, and so it affects not our question, only in this: the Curetonian text proves the early date of the SYRIAC, and the Peshito bears the relation to it that the Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts do to the earlier Greek texts. Gotch perverts the facts on *tamaka*. See my fourth and fifth arguments on Prop. III. It exactly corresponds to *tingo*, which is from the Greek τεγγω (*teggō*), "to moisten, wet, tinge, sprinkle, dip." THE VERSIONS OVERWHELMINGLY SUSTAIN OUR PROPOSITION.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX BY MR. WILKES.

1. My understanding was that the desire to make an Appendix grew out of the fact that we were not able to get all our arguments on baptism from versions into the body of the discussion. Hence I added, in my Appendix, any reflections that occurred to me.

2. Mr. Ditzler claims that, in his third, fourth, and fifth arguments, he "overturned all the assumptions of Gotch," that "all those words radically mean sprinkle and pour." Under these statements, *here unnaturally urged*, I feel quiet as May, and leave the reader to "what is written."

3. Mr. D. says. "Mr. W. and all, add even lexicons; all are dependent on *examples* for their definitions." This intelligence Mr. D. doubtless gets from Syria. It may sometimes be true. It is often not true. It is, as a rule, absurd.

4. The statements, in this fourth division of his supplement, that "the ancient Itala and Vulgate rendered *tzeva* (sabha) *sprinkle*, never immerse," is probably not true, and certainly has no bearing on the definition of *baptizo*.

His great rage against Dr. Gotch, and his statement that "the evidence of whose—Dr. Conant's—guilt is before me," can excite in the minds of sensible men, who know all the parties, no feeling short of contempt. But the *real point in this supplement* by Mr. D. is that he thinks he *now* has some information against the statements made by Dr. Conant in his letter, which we read at the debate in Louisville, in December, 1870, which at the time he did not have, and which he wishes to get in. A little more than half of his whole supplement is in reply to nothing that I said in my Appendix; but he makes my Appendix, which was made in *strict accordance with our agreement*. the occasion

of going back and rearguing the correctness of Kouma and Gaze's definitions of *baptidzo*, as given and recorded in the debate itself eight months ago. For the honor of doing this he may contend. There is no space nor time to argue these matters here.

As to the Curetonian text, the Peshito, and the word *tanaka*, nothing more is demanded.

INDEX TO MR. DITZLER'S ARGUMENTS.

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom or church, 70; justified by faith, in sense of pardon, when seventy-five years old, and by works in the sense of commendation, approval forty-five years after justified by faith in sense of pardon, 221, 222.

Acts ii: 38, 293-296, 308, 309, 340, 341, 356, 392.

Acts xvi: 33, 180.

"viii: 12, 13, 222.

"viii: 38, baptism of eunuch.

"x: 47.

"xvi: 15, 16, 85; v. 33-35.

"xxii: 16, 343, 345.

"of Apostles analyzed, on baptism for remission, 310-313, 360-364.

Adhah, Heb., church, 21.

Amad-*amada*, Syr., Arabic, for baptize, 464, 465; lexicons on, 464, 465; includes sprinkling, 466, 538, 549, 550, 671; does not mean to stand, 538, 539, 549, 550, 554, 555; means to wash; example of, 539; root of, 550; in Ephraim Cyrus, 586, 587.

Altar of Elijah, baptism of, 571-573; W. on, 576; D. on, 586.

Apostles never were baptized, as far as is known, 570, 571; were charter members (W.), 165.

'*Apò* (*apo*), 277, 624, 625.

Arabic words for baptize, 470-472, and see '*gasala*, '*seva*, and '*amad*; importance of, 687.

Augustine on *baptidzo*, 445, 446.

Authorities on Mark xvi: 15, 278; on Mark i: 4, 247-249, 260, 261. On proselyte baptism, 110, 111; on baptism by affusion, 661-668.

Backsliders lost by W.'s system, 324, 325.

Bal, root of Hebrew baptize, 449, 462.

Báπτω, root of *βαπτίζω*, 431-433; rendered sprinkle by Origen, Irenæus, and Hippolytus, 303, 304, 532, 533; by versions, 537-539, 555, 556; original meaning, 604, 605.

Βαπτίζω-*baptidzo* (I baptize), in classic Greek, 405; in Bible, 405, 584, 669; make drunk, in classic Greek, 400; 'sink, 406, 426, 567, 669. "If once immerse, always so."—A. C., 408; its Hebrew equivalent, 462, 463; in Syriac, 464-468, 670; in Arabic, 468-472; with lexicons, 670; translated sprinkle by oldest Greek Testament MSS., 522, 523, 536, 584, 672; Greek lexicons on, 445-447, 521, 483-488, 498, 499; translation of, 584; *ἐπι κοίτη*, in Clemens Alex., 592, 593, 643, 644. Commentators, etc., on, 661-668.

Baptism, of repentance, for remission of sins (Mark i: 4), which obligates to repentance, 248, 260, 261, 311-313; test of loyalty to Christ examined, 232, 233; said not to have been appointed under old dispensation, 208, 209; but was, 221, 243, 244; before days of Christ, 208, 209, 235, 236; central idea of W.'s system, 248; Jewish does not put us into Christ, according to W.'s system, 323, 324; and its consequences, 324; never for remission, 297, 312, 366; no evidence of pardon, 246, 247; doctrine of W. gives man the power of remitting sins, 377; case of sick and dying, 377, 378; originated among the heathens, 380, 381; of Elijah's altar, 571-573; of blood, tears, 553, 554; statutory representing, 584-586; of Christ at the river in Ephraim Cyrus' hymn, 586, 587; of Novatian by sprinkling, 590, 591; of the eunuch, 625-627; Fathers on, 612, 613, 571, 572, 590, 591; prophecy on, 613, 614. "Ecclesiastical" baptism, 603, 604; with water and the Spirit, 614, 615; arguments of immersion on, 401, 402; leading sources of argument on, 404.

Baptized, because "born from above."—A. C., 228.

- "Baptizein," Conant's, his order, 401, 402.
Barclay on water at Jerusalem, 584.
Barrel, unknown in Elijah's day, 572.
Bengel on Mark i: 4, 261; on mode, *last speech*.
Bible, how to be interpreted, 404, 405.
Blackstone, 404, 405.
Blood of Christ only found in water, 221-229, 264, 275. Can we be saved without it? 379, 380.
Born of God not connected with baptism, 359, 360.
Braden (Pres.) on law of pardon, 262; reach blood only in water, 264; God has changed law of pardon, 275, 276.
Brazen laver and baptism, 605-608.
Brooks & Fitch Debate—only reach the blood of Christ in water, 265.
Βρέχω (*brecho*), 555.
Buried in baptism, 644-649.
Buxtorf on proselyte baptism, 97, 110; *Beza*, etc., on, 93, 110.
Campbell, Thos., father of Alexander, conversion of, 325.
Campbell, Alexander, of Bethany, Va., on church of O. T., 19; not spiritual, 19; *no faith, etc., in*, 19, 42; admits a Jewish Church, 52; had infants in it as members, 52; on Heb. viii: 8, *συντελέσας* "complete," 69; on circumcision of infants, till A. D. 100, by the apostles, 83; admits Tertullian refers to infant baptism, 147, 148; admits regeneration, in the Fathers till A. D. 400, meant baptism, 148, 149, 161, 162, 179; quoted on baptism for remission, 224-226; makes immersion absolutely necessary to salvation, 224-226; whatever necessary in any case necessary in all, 227; Holy Spirit not received till after immersion, 226; blood of Christ only reached in water, 224, 229; on faith—only consent to truth of New Testament, 279, 280; his own conversion, 325; on mode of baptism, order of argument, 402; has only ten and one-half lines as *Bible* argument, 403; on *bapto*, 431, 432; relies on "most ancient lexicons," yet does not, 443; on *Stokius*, 484-487; on *Schleusner's Greek Lexicon*, 487-489; his first precept in decalogue of philology tested, 419, 521, 532; renders *baptizo* by thirteen words, 520, 521; borrowed his idea of Rev. xix: 13, from *Gale*, 533; on translations, *Ditzler's Fourth Argument*.
Canon of immersion, 406; examined, 407-410.
Carthage, council of, 131; seat of learning, etc., and not *negroes*, 162, 163.
Chadash, renew; W. on, 79; authorities on, 81, 82, 85, 86.
Charter members, 165.
Christ never baptized any one, yet pardoned sinners, 223, 276; only found in water, 224-227, 327; native language of, 5.
Christian Baptism, 227, A. C. on.
Christian Baptist quoted, 224.
Church, two words for in Hebrew and Greek, 20, 21; defined, 20, 21, 39. (See *ἐκκλησία*.) Design of, 16, 180; originates in religion, 16, 180, 181; secondary in time and design, 16; visible and invisible, 16, 17; same always, 17, 40, 180-183; unchangeable, not depending on rites and ordinances, 18; its principles unchangeable—always the same, 41, 42, 55, 56, 180-183; not identical with State among the Jews, 22, 23; excommunication from church, not from State, 23; same in Old and New Testaments, 16, 23, 24, 54; spirituality of, 53, 183; not established on Pentecost, 82, 83, 99; absurdity of such view, 83, 99; composed only of immersed persons—absurd, 98; infants born members of, 52; church members chartered (W.), 165; co-extensive with all the saved, 166; is not baptized with water, 394.
Circumcision, details of, not expressed by the Hebrew or Greek words in full, 407, 427; of infants by apostles till A. D. 100, 164; it was a recognition of membership, 164; more intimately connected with pardon than baptism, and far oftener, 345-337, 495.
Classic Greek, New Testament not written in it, 404, 405, 426, 427, 460, 584.
Clemens Alexander, 592, 593, 643, 644, 610, 611.
Colossians ii: 11-14, 385.
Commission to the apostles, Matt. xxviii: 19, how to be interpreted, 15, 85, 86, 98, 99, 143; scholars on, etc., 144, 158.
Conant, Dr. T. J. (Baptist), plan of argument, 401, 402; renders *baptizo* by ten words, 520, 568; inconsistency of, 568, 569; letter of, 478.
Confessional, instituted, 144, 145.
1 Corinthians i: 14-17, 362.
 " vii: 14, 129.

- 1 *Corinthians* x: 2, 624.
Cornelius' conversion analyzed, 310, 311, 322.
Couch, baptism on, 592, 563, 610, 611.
Damm, W.'s system does, the pure, 395-397;
Davidson, B., Hebrew lexicon quoted, 82; on *tzava*, third argument, proposition III; also 510, 517, requoted in full, as first, 548; quoted G. W., 453, 507.
Davidson, Samuel, LL.D., on Mark i: 4, 260; on Mark xvi: 15, 142, 143, 277, 278, 292.
Discipline, Methodist, 16, 110.
Disobedience is not to believe, 280, 281.
Drunk, meaning of classic *baptidzo*, 406, 520, 521.
Drown, meaning of classic *baptidzo*, 520.
Δω, *sink*, *mergo*, in Latin, 517, 520.
Εγγίζω (*enggidzo*), 82, 83.
Εἶδω (*eido*), participate in, 261, 262.
Εἰς (*eis*) into Christ, with *pisteuo*, 223, 245; not retrospective, 307; Philip and eunuch, 626, 627.
Εν, 626-628.
Εκ, 625, 626.
Ecclesiastical baptism, 603, 604.
Εκκλησία—*ekklesia* (church), defined, 20, 21; does not exclude infants, 39; same as Hebrew *kahal*, 20; applied to Jewish Church, 72.
Ephraim Cyrus on *amad*, 586, 587.
Επεροημα (*eperoema*), 1 Pet. iii: 21, 145, 296, 297, 357, 358, 365, 394.
Ephesians ii: 11-21 explained, 184, 175; v: 26, 27 explained, 366, 394.
Epi *cheo*, pour upon, 540.
Ἐπι (*epi*) τῷ ὄνοματι imply reliance upon, 294, 295, 392.
Esther, baptism of, 482, 483. Carson and A. C. on, 483, 484.
Euthymius, a Greek father, translates *baptidzo* sprinkle, 522.
Exceptions of Mr. W. destroy his system, 223, 224.
Faith defined, 307, 308; "soul-renewing principle of religion" (A. C.), 228, 278; only a conviction of the truth of a proposition (A. C.), 279, 280; that view tested, 308, 309; connection with pardon, 360-364.
Fathers on infant baptism, 129-132; on sprinkling, etc., 570-574, 587-590.
Figurative use of words, 406, 426, 427.
Fürst's Hebrew Lexicon quoted, 20, 82; only perfect Hebrew lexicon made, 501, 502.
Galatians iii: 27, 264.
Gasola, Arabic, for *baptize*, 470-472, 521.
Gazes, a native Greek lexicographer, on *baptidzo*, 447; on *bapto*, 444; Co-nant's letter on, 478, 479, 483-485, 671.
Γενεσθαι (*genesthai*) explained, 116, 359.
Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon very deficient, 501, 502.
Greek language of N. T., 404, 442, 443.
Greek lexicons on *bapto*, 444.
 " " on *baptidzo*, 445-448, 487, 483-485, 488, 498, 499, 671.
Hayden on remission, etc., 227, 228.
Hebrews viii: 8-12, 63, 69, 186, 187.
 " ix: 10, 221.
History of infant baptism, 129.
Hopson (Dr. W. H.) on baptism for remission, 230-232, 358.
Household baptism, 85.
Immersion in water to the waist to be baptized by *affusion*, 400; often in Bible, but never expressed by *baptidzo*, 406; words of, 408, 409, 431; real idea and meaning of in Latin, Greek, etc., 517-519, 566, 557; in English, to *sink*—its literal meaning, 567; not in the Bible, 632, 633.
Infant depravity, fathers taught, 130, 131, 165.
Infant baptism involved in infant membership, 16, 19.
Infants formally recognized as members, 71, 72, 185, 186; saved unconditionally on *their* part, 128.
Infans, meaning of, 176, 177.
Infunderis, sprinkle, 469.
Intingo, dip, 428-430, 481, 589.
Irenæus on infant baptism, 147, 148, 163, 177-179.
Isaiah xlix: 6-21, 112, 113.
 " lii: 15, sprinkle many nations—*not astonish*, 413, 414.
Jamer' version, made by immersionists, 439, 524-526.
James ii: 22, 24, explained, 221, 222.
Jelý's Greek Gram. on genitive, Mark i: 4, 248; on *eis* (*eis*), 248, 627; on aorist.
Jerome, 202-204, 481.
Job xiv, 14; lxx on *pi-ous*, 285, 297.
John iii: 5 does not oppose infant baptism, iii, 223, 224; does not teach baptism for remission of sins, 348, 393; i: 10-12, 115, 222; W. on, 236, 237; D.'s reply, 244; i: 1-18, explained, 115, 116; xii: 42, 223.

- John the Baptist**, disciples of not Christ's, 293; not pardoned, 262, 263, 393; did not immerse the people, 628-631; why he baptized at Jordan, etc., 583, 584, 627-631.
- Jordan**, baptizing at, not to get water enough to immerse, 583, 584, 626-628; in Jordan, 627, 628; swiftness of, 628-631; impossible for John to have immersed the multitudes in, 628-631.
- Josephus** on pros. bap., 111; on classic Greek and N. T. Greek, 442, 443, 481.
- Julianus**, fourth century, defines *baptidzo*, 445.
- Justin Martyr** on regeneration for baptism, 148, 168.
- Καθαρίζω**, not to sprinkle, yet done by it, 408.
- Kingdom of heaven** not established on pentecost, 70, 71; A. C. on, 71, 114, 115.
- Kouma**, native Greek lexicographer, on *baptidzo*, 446; Conant's letter on, 478, 479, 483-485.
- Laver** stands between sinners and Christ; A. C., etc., on, 224, 225, 231; its philosophy, A. C., 245, 246; baptism at, 605, 612.
- Lavo**, sprinkle, etc., 428.
- Lexington** law of pardon, 262, 263.
- Living Pulpit** quoted, 227, 228, 230-232, etc.
- Λουτρον**, A. C. on, 224, 225.
- Λούω** (*lavo*) defined, 428, 429; with their own blood (*αιματι*), 554.
- Longan**, 232.
- Luke** iii: 7-21, 262, 263.
" vii: 38, 44; *teva*, 505, 521.
- Lydia** and her children, 85.
- Madefacio**, 428.
- Μαθητευο** (*disciple*), 144, 158.
- Μαθητης**, 159.
- Mark** i: 4, authors on, 248, 249, 260, 261, 391, 392.
- Mark** i: 10, *ἀπό* (*apo*); W. on, 560, 561, 624, 625.
" xvi: 15 not authentic, 142, 143, 277, 278, 292, 625.
" meaning of, 244, 245, if inspired.
- Matt.** xvi: 18, 127.
" xxviii: 19, 144, 158.
- Mergo** and *immergo*, 483, 484, 517-520.
- Milligan**, Pres., on new covenant, 142.
- Mil. Harbinger** of A. C., 228, 230.
- Mishna** on infant baptism, 97, 110, 111.
- Moisten** is the radical idea of *sprinkle*, 548; and third and fourth arguments on Prop. III.
- Μολύνω** (*moluno*), sprinkle, 489.
- Native Greek** lexicographers, 444-447.
- Neander**, inconsistency of, 177, 178.
- Neocæsarean Council** on baptism of the sick, 591, 592.
- New creature**, 365.
- New Testament**, language of, 403; not classic Greek, 404, 441, 442; W. on, 456.
- Novatian** baptized by sprinkling; A. C. on, 590-592.
- Obedience** for baptism not true, 280, 396.
- Οικοδομήσω**, 127.
- Olive-tree**, the church, 55, 56, 184, 185.
- Old Testament** language, 403.
- Opposition**, first, to infant baptism, 129.
- Ordinances of flesh**, design of, 21, 22; did not change religion, 21, 22; words of, do not express *action* of, 406, 408, 427.
- Origen** on infant baptism, 140, 150, 176, 178, 202-204; on *bapto*, 533; on baptism of wood on the altar, 571-573.
- Parnubus**, infant, etc., 149, 161, 165, 176.
- Pardon** constantly occurs, not connected with baptism, 276, 360-365.
- Pelagius** on infant baptism, 147.
- Pendleton**, Pres. Bethany College, etc., on Stokius, 376, 448.
- Pentecost**, church not founded on, 82, 83, 99, 127, 128, 185; persons on that day (Acts ii) not believers till instructed, 296, 342.
- Perfundo**, 428, 455.
- 1 Peter** iii: 21, 145, 296, 297, 357, 358, 365, 394.
- Philosophy of faith**, 231, 232; of baptism for remission, W., 240, 241; D. on, 245-247; the relation of faith to repentance, 286, 328, 329.
- Pictures of baptism** by affusion, and A. C. on, 584-586.
- Pictures of baptism**, 571, 572.
- Πιερσίω**, 223; *εις* with, 223.
- Plunge**, not dip, 567, 568.
- Πλύω** (*pluno*), wash, 416, 445.
- Profundo**, 499.
- Prophecies** on Jewish Church, 112.
- Proselyte** baptism, 96, 97, 110, 111; not borrowed from John the Baptist, 110.
- Rachatz**, wash, pour, 449-451, and third and fourth speeches on Prop. III.
- Παυρίζω**, for *baptidzo*, 522, 523.
- Regeneration** for baptism, 148, 149, 161, 162, 179; in O. T., 16, 182.

- Repentance and faith, order of*, 279, 280, 328, 329.
- Religion, origin of*, 16, 180-183. See *church*. Always the same, 16, 41, 42, 180-184.
- Revelation xix*: 13, 504, 533-536.
- Robinson, Baptist historian, utterly untrustworthy*, 162, 591.
- "*Rotten*," not used by "Mr. D.," 291.
- Romans vi*: 3, 4 assumed by immersionists as deciding *baptidzo*, 401; true meaning of, 644-649.
- Ρυπος (rupos)*, pollution, sin (1 Pet. iii: 21), 296, 297, 358, 588.
- Sava, sabha, sabhagha* (see *tzeva*, same), Arabic for *baptidzo*, 466-469; Jerome's translation of, 469, 522, 548, 549.
- Salvation not dependent on other parties*, 232, 233, 358, 359, 396.
- Σαρξ (sarr)* sin, 358.
- Sallust on decet and accus.*, 338, 356, 376.
- Scott, W.*, on *bap.* for remission, 227.
- Schleusner's Gr. Lex.*, N. T., 487; A. C. on, and misquotes, 487, 488.
- Simon Magus did not trust in Christ*, 222.
- Sin, pardoned in*, "O. T. days," 42, 67, 81.
- Sink*, English of *immerse*, 567.
- Sophocles' Greek Lexicon*, 521.
- Sozomen on baptism*, 593, 594.
- Spirit, contradictory views on by W.'s church*, 378, 379.
- Spirit in O. T.*, 41, 182; implies pardon, 310.
- Sprinkling usual mode of all ceremonies*, 632, 633.
- Stokius' Gr. Clavis N. T.*, on Mark i: 4, 260, 291, 306, 307, 338; settled, 376; D. willing to refer the issue to scholars, 377; on *baptidzo*, only in N. T., 448; quoted by Mr. W., 476, 477; by Mr. D., 483-485, 498, 499.
- Stourdza*, 554.
- Stuart, Moses*, on Mishna, 189; on *tzeva*, third and fourth speeches, prop. III, and 548-550; on *baptidzo*, 661, 662.
- Συντελεσσω (sunteleso)*, complete, perfect, 69, 95, 183, 188.
- Syrian Church's mode of baptism*, 552.
- Syriac words for baptize*, 466-470, 503-505, 522, 523, 533, 534, 670, 671; of Rev. xix: 13, 533-536, 551; versions, 685-687.
- Tabba*, immerse, press, 408, 431, 461, 462, 566, 624.
- Tabhal (tabal-taval)*, 448; lexicons on, 448, 461-463, 489, 500, 503, 505, 670.
- Tingo (baptize)* defined, 428-430, meaning of in lexicons, 429, 431; W. on, 473; D. on, 481, 482, 603; different from *intingo*, 481, 482.
- Titus iii*: 5, 343-345, 394.
- Tertullian on infant baptism*, 146, 147; first to oppose it, 129; A. C. on, 147, 148, 162; unreliability and sophistry of, 177, 178; on baptism for remission of sins, 341; on efficacy of water, etc., 380, 570, 571; on *baptidzo*, 446.
- Tzeva (sabha)*, Syriac and Arabic for baptize, 466-472; root of it is to sprinkle, pour, etc., 466-472; lexicons on, 489, 503, 505, 517, 523, 548, 549, 551; W. on, 453, 507.
- Tzeva (Chaldee)*, for baptize, 449, 504, 670-672. See above.
- Uhlenmann's Syriac Grammar*, 661.
- Vatican MSS. on Mark xvi*: 15, 142; on Mark vii: 4, 522, 532.
- Vattel on law of nations*, 19, 20.
- Versions*, 466-470, 503-505, 533-536, 551, 685-689.
- Vineyard*, for church, 69, 70.
- Vulgata* as correct as Greek text, 481.
- Wahl's Gr. Clavis N. T.*, on Mark i: 4, 248, 247; quoted by Mr. W., 476; by Mr. D., 483, 498; by W., 511.
- Wall's Hist. Inf. Bap.*, 110; misquoted and misrepresented, 160.
- Wash* for inward cleansing; stronger term, and oftener applied to pardon than baptism, yet not for remission, 342-344, 366, 395; W. on wash, 464; D. on, 460; with blood, 553.
- Wesley's tract*, so-called, not written by him, 339, 340, 356, 357; published by agent in ignorance of the facts, 357; the question again, more fully, 374, 375; on βαπτίζω, W. quotes on Rom. vi, 623; D. quotes.
- Winer's idioms*, N. T., on Mark i: 4, 248; on *sig*, unto repentance, 260, 277, 292; fully and finally quoted, 375, 376; Mr. W. used spurious edition of, 376.

INDEX OF MR. WILKES' PART OF DISCUSSION.

- Ablutions, certain ones not *strictly* religious ordinances, 414
 Acts II 38, 197, 198, 286 289 301
 ' III 25, 139
 VIII, 138, 581, 582
 VIII 8, 139
 XXII 16, 319 320, 335, 336
 Ænon, 580 581
 Affirm, immersion alone, 411
 Alcum, 459
 Alford on Mark XVI 16, 335
 ' on John III 5, 578
 Allusions to a law, to be explained by the law, 284
 Ambrose, 459, 597
Amad, 452, 531, 544, 545, 577 598, 599
Amada, 475
 Anoint the head for the whole body, 617, 678
 Anthon C, on *baptizo*, 422
 Aorist tense, 637
Apo and *ek*, 561, 676
 Appendix (A), Mr Ditzler's, 202
 " (A), Mr Wilkes', 201
 " (B), Mr Ditzler's, 684
 " (B) Mr Wilkes', 689
 Assent or consent, faith, 299, 300
 At hand, not *in* hand, 92-94
 Augustine, 155
 Authority for immersion, 577, 578, 679
 Authority for infant baptism demanded, 26, 36-38

 Backslider, 333
 Bagster's Analyt Greek Lexicon, 541
 Baptism, Christian, when 235
 " alone, 271
 " not named, 317, 318
 " cases of, 314
 " faith and repentance necessary to, 252
 " of the Spirit, 642
 " of suffering, 641
 Baptize, not sent to, 371, 372
Bapto and *baptizo*, 416, 436, 453, 454, 479 617
Baptizo, its classical sense, 418 420, 422, 423, 437, 473
Baptizo, in Septuagint, 559, 579
 Barclay, Dr, and Dr Coleman on Ænon, 580, 581
 Barnabas, 437
 Barnes, Dr, on *eis*, 302
 " " on Isaiah lii, 616
 Battle-held argument, the, 335
 Basil the Great, 458
 Beza on *baptizo*, 512
 Blood of Christ, 59, 60.
 Blunt Dr, on proselyte baptism, 105
 " " on change of mode, 654
 Born of water, 108, 109, 218, 219, 257 259, 579
Brecho and *cheo*, or *keo*, 417
 Buxton, Hebrew Lexicon, 453
 Buxton 564

 Calling, or calling upon, the name of the Lord, 298, 299
 Calvin on *baptizo*, 512
 Campbell, Alexander, 333, 334.
 Canons, Apostolic, 459
 Certainly, why not? 269, 270
 Charter members, 101, 102
 Chrysostom, 457, 458
 Circumstances attending baptisms, 659, 681
 Clement, of Rome, 438
 Church, meaning of the word, 29, 30
 " different meanings of, 29, 45
 " visible and invisible, 28
 " in the wilderness, 30
 " without ordinances, 30, 31
 " spirituality of, 31, 44
 " identity of names, 32
 " not before Christ, 64, 65
 " conditions of membership in the Jewish, 73, 74

- Commission, authority for baptizing, 27, 87, 88
 Commission, the, 136, 197, 272, 547
 Conybeare, 636.
 Conant, Dr., on lexicons, 478
 Correspondence, 5-10.
 Cornelius, etc., 315, 316, 332, 333.
 Corruptions, 136.
 Covenants, general view of, 33-36
 Covenant, Abrahamic, in what sense infants were in it, 47, 48
 Covenant, infants in, 73, 74.
 " new, 48-51, 60, 78-80.
 " renewed, 92
 Cough, baptisms on the, 597
 Cyril, 458

 Damned if not baptized, 299.
 Davidson's Hebrew Lexicon, 453, 474, 507, 541.
 Deliver, from Egyptian bondage, 273
 Desert, 653.
 Dion Cassius, 456
 Disciple, 135, 137, 154, 155, 167, 197.
 Discipline of the M. E. C. S., 46, 47, 58.

Eng., connects what? 270, 301-305, 319, 331, 332, 353, 636
Ek., nine authorities for in Mark i: 10, 561, 636
Ek., 658
 English versions, 635.
 Ephesians i 7 and v 26, 321, 336, 337.
 Ephraim Cyrus, 577.
Epi to onomati (upon the name), 304.
Epi route, 619
 Epictetus, 456.
 Eunomius, 620, 653.
 Ewing's Greek Lexicon, 511
 Examples of every thing but infant baptism, 48.
 Exceptions to baptism for remission, 237, 238
 Exhortation, 385, 675.
 Eye, slip of the, 192

 Faith, *the*, 62-64.
 Faith defined, 318, 319
 Fathers, Barnabas, 437
 Forgiveness, actual or not, 283, 284
 Fuerst's Hebrew Lexicon, 91, 453, 507, 675, 680
 Fun, 635

 Galatians iii 27 and iv: 21, 140, 141, 320, 321.
 Gale, Dr., on *mathetes*, 137
 Gaza, 653.

 Gaze's Lexicon, 455.
 Genitive, *metanoeas*, 241, 242, 253-257, 267, 268.
 Gesenius' Hebrew Lexicon, 91, 453, 541
 Gift of Holy Spirit received, 315
 Gotch, Dr., on *amad*, 530, 545, 598
 Green, T. S., on Mark vii 4 and Luke xi: 38, 559.
 Gregory, of Nazianzus, 458.
 Gregory, of Neocæsarea, 457
 Grove's Greek Lexicon, 541

 Hackett, Dr., on *eis*, 302.
 Hand, *at*, not *in*, 92-94.
 Head for body, 617
 Heb vi 2 and x: 22, 640.
 Hedericus, 510.
 Heliodorus, 457.
 Hesychnus, 455
 Heirus, shepherd of, 438
 Horne, T. H., 543.
 Households, baptisms of, 87, 151-153.
 Hug's Intro., 542.

 Identity of covenant, 77, 193
 Identity of kingdom, 80
 IMMERSION, alone affirmed, 411
 " changed form, 424.
 " Neander, 423, 424
 " first century, 439
 " second " 439.
 " third " 439, 440.
 " fourth " 441
 " nude, 596
 Infant membership, carnality of, 45, 46
 Infants can not be baptized, 28.—
 " are they in or out of the church? 102
 Inferences, 36, 38, 48
 Irenæus on infant baptism, 170, 171, 190
 Italic version, 506

 Jelf, Gram, on *eis*, 303.
 Jerome, 459, 497, 619.
 John baptized *in*, 560.
 " in 5, 106, 578
 " of Damascus, 458.
 Johnson, Dr., 656.
 Jordan, swift current, 659, 660
 Josephus, 454-456, 475, 476, 490.
 Judith, 617, 618.
 Julianus, 455.
 Justification, 236
 Justin Martyr, 438.

Kadush, 102.

- Kainos*, new, renew, perfecting, etc., 60, 61.
 Kendrick, Archbishop, on disciple, 155.
 Kendrick on change of mode, 655.
 Kingdom, in the, 106, 107.
 " in hand or at hand, 133.
 Kitto on *baptizo*, 495, 543.
 Kleeburg, Dr., 618.
 Knapp, Dr., infant baptism, 174.
 Kouma, 455.
Krestiti, 531.

 Lange on Mark xvi: 9-20, 285.
 " on baptism for remission, 290.
 " on *eis*, 303.
 Law of evidence, 639.
 Leigh, Edward, 657.
 Letter, Dr. Kleeburg's, 652.
 Lexington law of pardon, 268.
 Lexicons, reliance on, 412.
 " on *baptizo*, 490, 509-513.
 Liddell & Scott's Greek and Eng. Lex., 542.
 Lost, a penitent believer! 370.
 Lucian, 457.
 Luther on *baptizo*, 513.

Maimonides on purifications, 563.
 Manuscript, the vatican a translation! 527, 545.
 Mark i: 4, 267, 304, 314.
 " i: 4 (*eis* connects), 270.
 " vii: 4 and Luke xi: 38, 562.
 " xvi: 9-20, 134, 153, 285, 286.
 " i: 4, 214-216, 258, 282.
 " i: 9-10, 559, 658, 676.
 Matt. iii: 3-8, 107, 108.
 Membership, 108, 194.
Mergo, 619.
Michaelis on *amad*, 545.
 Milligan, Pres., 153.
 Millions, etc., 370, 371.
 Mode, change of, 596, 654-658.
 Murdock, 543.

 Naaman, 506, 507.
 Name of Christ for remission, 301.
 " through the, 369.
 Neander, "Plant. and Tran.," infant baptism, 173, 174.
 Neander, immersion, 423, 424.
 Nebuchadnezzar wet with dew, 506.
Nipto, rantizo, etc., 416.
 No text for, 679.
 Novatian, 439-440, 595.

 Objections to baptism for remission answered, 210-214.
 Oil on the head, 678.
 Olive-tree, 61, 76, 195.
 Order of graces, 283.
 Ordinances, 59, 415, 435.
 Origen on infant baptism, 156, 157, 169, 191.
 Origen on pour, etc., 575, 576, 621.
 Out of, not in *baptizo*, 575.

 Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon, 510, 511.
 1 Peter iii: 21, 139, 354, 355, 368, 385.
 Philosophy of faith, 240, 241.
 Pickering's Greek Lexicon, 513.
 Pictures, 622.
 Plutarch, 456.
 Pools at Jerusalem, 652.
 Pope, Irenæus wrote to, 190.
 Porphyry, 457.
 Pour, 476.
 Preliminaries, 14.
 Propositions, 13.
 Proposition, meaning of, 206-209.
 " statement of, 411, 412, 434.
 Proof, rule of, 195, 196, 209, 210.
 Proselyte baptism, 88, 103-105.
 Pure heart without baptism, 315.
 Purgation, 353.

Rachatz, 452.
 Recapitulation on second prop., 386-390.
 " " third " 682.
 Red Sea, 88, 89, 273, 638, 640.
 Refutation and disproof, 26.
 Religion, patriarchal, 76, 77.
 Remission of sins, 59, 60, 74, 75.
 " actual or not, 270, 283, 284.
 " baptism for, 289, 290, 300.
 Renew, *kadash*, 90.
 Renewed, 92.
 Report, the, 558
 Rev. xix: 13, 546, 617.
 Ridicule, rotten, 269.
 Robertson's Greek Thesaurus, 512.
 Robinson's Hist. pros. bap., 104.
 Robinson's Greek and Eng. Lex., 541.
 Rom. vi: 3-4, 320, 602, 622, 623, 638, 676.
 Rom. ii: 28, 139.
 Rotten system, 283, 289, 331.
 Rufinus, 168, 169, 191.
 Rule of the Latin infinitive, 367.
 Rules and stipulations of the discussion, 11, 12.

 Salvation never depends on second and third parties, 334, 384.
 Saved by, 363.
 Scapula, Gr. Lex., on *baptizo*, 509, 510.

- schaft on baptism for remission, 303
 " on *amad* 545
 Schlessner Gr Lex, on *lavai*, 479
 " " " on *baptizo* 493,
 494, 512
 Schrevelius' Greek Lexicon, 512, 541
 Sick the how saved, 333, 384
 Smith's Bible Dictionary, 543
 Sophocles' Greek Lex, 513, 525, 526
 Sozomen's Eccl Hist, 620, 653
 Sprinkle, 476, 508, 558, 616
 Sprinkling, origin of, 424, 453
 Spurious passage from Origen, 168
 " " " Irenaeus, 171
 Stockius, 455, 476, 477, 494
 " on *metanoidas*, 216
 " on Mark 1 4, 282 298 30,
 352, 367
 Stuart, M., on *amad*, 544
 " " on proselyte baptism 10
 " " on infant " 173
 " " on change of mode, 655
 " " on *bapto* and *baptizo*, 422,
 425
 Substitution, 526, 557
 Suffering, baptism of 641
 Sudas, 455, 458
 Syllogism on 1 Peter iii 21, 140
 Syriac, the Peshito, Rev XIX 13 528-
 530, 542
 System in disorder, 283, 287

 Tabernacle 61 78, 194
 Tatus, 457
Taval 415, 453 454 540, 675 680
 Tense 637, 678
 Terms, meaning of 205, 206
 Tertullian, 459
 " on infant baptism, 169, 170
 Testament, 75, 76
 Textus Receptus tenth century, 561
 Theophylact, 458
Tingo, 436, 457, 473, 474
 Tischendorf on Mark xvi 9-20, 285
 Tracts, Wesley's doctrinal, 331, 349-
 351
 Translations, 490 492, 546, 557, 558,
 574, 599, 600, 616
 Promianus' Gr Concor, 512
 True immersion, 596

 Tropical sense, 414
 Trough, in a, 369
Tsea, 452, 473, 474, 476, 479, 507, 541.
 Types and antitypes, 368

 Unclean, purifications of the, 562, 563,
 618

 Verbal notion, *eis* connects a, 303, 304
 Verse, the, 635
 Versions, rely on, 413
 Version of the LXX, 495
 " of Aquila, 495
 " Symmachus, 495
 " Hebrew, 496
 " the Syriac, 496
 " the Slavonic, 496
 " the Arabic, 496
 " the Italic, 496
 " the Vulgate, Latin, 496
 " the English, by immersionists,
 507 509, 635
 Visible and invisible church, 28, 46
 Vitringa on *baptizo*, 512
 Vossius, Gr I, 513

 Wash, 415, 476, 492, 493, 511, 512
 Wall on burn of water, 109
 " change of mode, 657
 " on English version, 508
 Wash 601
 Washing of regeneration, 352
 Washings, 373, 454, 601
 Water at Jerusalem, 652
 " where Philip baptized, 621
 Watson, baptism for remission, 303
 Whitby, 657
Winer on Mark 1 4, 282, 304, 314,
 332, 349
Winer on the tenses, 637
Wuk and *in* water, 634
 Words, meaning of, how learned, 453
 " current sense, 418, 424
 " primary and secondary meaning
 of, 436
 " classical and sacred sense of,
 413, 414, 454
 " tropical meaning, 414, 454

 Zonaras, 455