

DEBATE

ON

BAPTISM AND KINDRED SUBJECTS,

BETWEEN

ELDER JAMES M. MATHES,
OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST,

AND

REVEREND T. S. BROOKS,
OF THE M. E. CHURCH.

HELD IN THE TOWN-HALL IN BEDFORD, IND.; CONTINUING SIX DAYS, FROM

JANUARY 28, 1868, TO FEBRUARY 3, INCLUSIVE.

BY

Elder J. M. MATHES.

CINCINNATI:
H. S. BOSWORTH, PUBLISHER.
1868.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1868, by
JAMES M. MATHES,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the
Southern District of Ohio.

INTRODUCTION.

It may be asked, why publish another debate upon the great issues dividing the Church of Christ and the Methodist Episcopal Church? We answer, that, owing to the many misrepresentations that were put in circulation all over the country, immediately after the close of the debate, it seemed to us that the publication might do good in correcting public opinion. A great many brethren who heard the debate urged us to give it to the public, believing that it would do good. And as Mr. Brooks was a "chosen vessel" to conduct the discussion on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Bedford, an importance was given to his arguments, assertions and admissions, that otherwise they would not have possessed.

Our means of giving a correct report of the debate were good. It is true the debate was not reported by a regular stenographer, as we had no idea of publishing it until it commenced. But still our facilities were good:

1. We had our part of it well prepared in advance, and our speeches on our three affirmatives were mostly written out; so that we had no trouble in reproducing our own speeches from our own materials. And we took ample notes of Mr. Brooks' speeches for the purpose of replying.

2. Brother William B. Chrisler, of New Albany, who is a fine scholar and a ready writer, sat at a table in the hall and patiently went through the whole discussion, taking full and ample notes of all that was said on both sides after the first day. These notes were put into our hands, and Brother Chrisler himself aided me during the next three weeks in writing out the discussion.

3. In addition to these, another very competent gentleman, who is not a member of any church, took notes of the whole discussion for his own satisfaction. These, also, were placed at our disposal.

From all these futilities and means, we had no difficulty in reproducing Mr. Brooke's speeches substantially as he delivered them, so far as the positions, assumptions, arguments, and the Scriptures and other testimony relied on, were concerned. Of course, the *mannerism* could not be transmitted to paper. The voice, the peculiar gestures and the grimaces, could not be preserved in a report of the speeches. In this respect the reader can not be placed upon equal grounds with those who heard the debate.

Anxious to have the debate go forth with the hearty concurrence and indorsement of Mr. Brooks, we wrote him a letter, proposing to place his half of the debate in his hands for his revision and verification. But, as the reader will see by the correspondence, he refused to have anything to do with it. We are, therefore, compelled to give it to the public without his sanction and without his revision. But we feel confident that those who heard the debate will fully sustain the fidelity of our report. We know that we have done Mr. Brooks ample justice in reporting his speeches and replies and quite a number of persons who were present at the debate, have read our manuscript report, and pronounce it good. But, in order to set myself right before the people everywhere, in regard to this debate, I will publish the correspondence so far as it is necessary to give the people a full understanding of the case. we would publish the whole correspondence, were it not for its great length. But the correspondence being unnecessarily protracted, and the number of letters running up to some twenty-nine or thirty, and some of them lengthy, we can not afford to encumber the volume with the whole of it, but shall publish only as much as may be necessary to a full understanding of the case.

From the correspondence, it will be seen that Mr. Brooks was the challenging party, and that the first five propositions were framed by him, and submitted in his first letter containing his challenge. To these, one other proposition was added by agreement, making the sixth. We tried to *get* Mr. Bowers to affirm that the "Methodist Episcopal Church was a branch of the Church of Christ." while we proposed to affirm the all-sufficiency of the Bible as a rule of faith and peace. This, however, he declined. He would not consent that Mr. Brooks should affirm the one nor deny the other.

It will be seen that the correspondence on the Methodist side was conducted by Rev. S. Bowery pastor of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Bedford. The reason we refused to correspond with T. S. Brooks, or have anything to do with him on his own account, was, that he had treated us so badly in his July letter, which we published in an extra of the Christian Record in September, 1867; and we only accepted him as an opponent when he was made the "mouth-piece." and chosen organ of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Bedford.

If we had framed the propositions, we should have worded them differently—that is, we should have made them more definite; but, under the circumstances, we thought best to take them as they were offered us.

J. M. MATHES.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LETTER NO. 1.—T. S. BROOKS TO J. M. MATHES.

PROPOSITION I. The church of which I, J. M. Mathes, am a member, is the church founded by Christ and the Apostles.

Mathes affirms; Brooks denies.

PROP. II. Infants of believing parents are entitled to membership and baptism in the Church of Christ.

Brooks affirms; Mathes denies.

PROP. III. Immersion, to a penitent believer, is in order to the remission of past sins.

Mathes affirms; Brooks denies.

PROP. IV. The Holy Spirit does sometimes operate separate and apart from the written or revealed word of God.

Brooks affirms; Mathes denies.

PROP. V. Is immersion the Bible mode or action of baptism? Mathes affirms; Brooks denies.

HOUSTON, IND., October 10, 1867.

MR. J. M. MATHES—*Sir*: I challenge you to a friendly public discussion of the above propositions, at Bedford, at some time in the future, when we can be at leisure to attend to it.

T. S. BROOKS.

P. S.—This is my first challenge to any man to debate with him, and my conditions are these: That you will not gather

in all your ministers from the surrounding country, and hold a protracted meeting during the debate, to give it the appearance of success.

T. S. B.

The following note from Mr. Bowers covered the above letter from Mr. Brooks, fully indorsing the challenge. Mr. Brooks' letter of challenge was sent, not to us, but to Mr. Bowers, and by him handed over to us, through the Post-office, with this note:

LETTER NO. 2.—S. BOWERS TO J. M. MATHES.

BEDFORD, IND., October 15, 1867.

ELDER J. M. MATHES—*Sir*: The inclosed propositions, from Rev. T. S. Brooks, challenging you to a public discussion, came into my hands from the author, yesterday, accompanied with the request that I should convey them to you and receive your reply.

In this, Mr. Brooks has my indorsement, and I will guarantee that the discussion, on his part, shall be both manly and Christian.

It will be necessary for me to receive your reply by Thursday noon, in order to get it to Mr. Brooks this week.

Hoping that it will be "your pleasure to gratify Mr. Brooks," in coming up to a manly discussion of the subjects proposed, I remain,

Yours, truly,

S. BOWERS.

LETTER NO. 3.—MR. MATHES' REPLY.

BEDFORD, IND., October 16, 1867.

REV. S. BOWERS—*Dear Sir*: Your note of the 15th inst., inclosing live propositions for discussion, and a challenge from your friend Brooks, was duly received. Mr. Brooks knows that I will not debate anything with *him*. He attempted to get up a debate with me some years ago, and we told him then, that we would not take him as an opponent; and I am sure that you did not expect that I would *notice* his challenge. In view of Brooks' course toward me, I can have nothing to do with him.

But you tell me that "you now indorse Mr. Brooks, and will guarantee that the discussion, on his part, shall be both manly and Christian." But I happen to know that he is not capable of anything of the kind. But you shall be accommo-

dated with a discussion of the issues between us. I will take Rev. S. Bowers as an opponent, instead of T. S. Brooks. You can not object to this little change in the programme, as you indorse the challenge. What say you?

And, that there may be no *quibbling*, nor *backing out*, I will take the five propositions exactly as you have submitted them, substituting "S. Bowers" for "T. S. Brooks," wherever it occurs.

And I will ask you to allow the following to be added, viz:

PROP. VI. "Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." Bowers affirms; Mathes denies.

PROP. VII. The Bible alone, without any human Creed, Confession of Faith, or books of Discipline, is a sufficient rule of faith and practice, and bond of union, for all Christians. Mathes affirms; Bowers denies.

PROP. VIII. The Methodist Episcopal Church, of which the said Bowers is a member, is a *branch* of the Church of Jesus Christ, founded by Christ and his Apostles, and is of divine authority.

Bowers affirms; Mathes denies.

Please let me hear from you immediately, and say *when* and *where* we shall meet to settle the preliminaries.

With kindest regards, J. M. MATHES.

LETTER NO. 4.—S. BOWERS TO J. M. MATHES.

BEDFORD, IND., October 17, 1867.

ELDER J. M. MATHES—*Sir*: Your communication, in which you try to *back down* from a fair discussion with Rev. T. S. Brooks, and substitute me in his place, is received.

You say he tried to get up a discussion with you some years ago, "and we told him then that we would not take him as an opponent." *We; whom?* Do you mean that you and your ministers would not do it? It appears that several of your ministers have taken him as "an opponent," and that to their discomfiture. I know not what efforts he may have made to induce *you* to debate with him; but it is very clear that he failed to enlist you, and it is believed that the reason is one which you have not assigned.

You say he is not capable of discussing the subjects submitted, in a "manly and Christian manner." Is not this a mere

subterfuge to assist you out of a bad place? I will indorse him, and so will the Methodist Episcopal Church in Bedford. We will agree that his manner and language shall be as respectful as your own. And if Mr. Brooks fails to measure up to the standard of a gentleman and a Christian, it will be to your advantage; for he will be our representative in this discussion. We shall expect you to represent your church in Bedford, and for it to indorse you as such. Elders J. Wright and W. R. Pritchard, and other ministers whom you claim to be representative men, have debated with Mr. Brooks (if I am not misinformed, they challenged him). Are you better than they? Come; don't show the *white feather*, Brother Mathes.

You say, in view of Brooks' course toward you, you can have nothing to do with him. You made a bitter and uncalled-for attack on him in your RECORD, in which you called him a "religions demagogue," accused him of being "insane," and, he says, otherwise misrepresented him; and because Mr. Brooks paid you hack in severe language, you complain of his course. As I stated in my letter for your RECORD, I do not indorse the severe language either of you used. But do you propose making unprovoked personal attacks on the character of ministers in your RECORD, and expect them quietly to submit to these attacks? Now, if, by your uncalled-for attacks, you have aroused a lion, go out and meet him like a man, and don't try to skulk and hide from him in pretending he is not your equal.

In order to try to get released from Mr. Brooks, you propose to debate the subjects with me. The challenge is not from me; it is from Mr. Brooks. Your proposition to shift it from him to me, is a mere quibble. Meet him like a man, and then it will be time for you and me to talk of the matter.

Mr. Brooks sends you a fair challenge, and proposes entering into a friendly debate with you. In this we indorse him as our man; consequently, there is but one of two things left for you to do—*either accept the challenge, or back down*. Which will you do? Come—no quibbling; say *yes*, or say *no*. Yours, etc., S. BOWERS.

LETTER NO. 5.—J. M. MATHES TO S. BOWERS.

BEDFORD, IND., October 21, 1867.

REVEREND S. BOWERS—*2£y Dear Sir*: Yours of 17th inst. came duly to hand, and its contents have been well considered.

You refuse to meet me in the discussion of the issues between us, as I proposed in my last; and insist that I shall take Mr. Brooks. This I regard as rather unkind in you, and a confession of weakness on your part. But are you not trying to crowd this man Brooks upon me as an opponent, expecting me to refuse to meet him under any circumstances? And then my refusal will be claimed by you as "*a back down*" and thus you expect to "*make a little capital in a small way.*"

But you tell me that you and the Methodist Episcopal Church in Bedford will indorse him as your representative man. Very well; this will put a new face upon the matter. Let this be done to my satisfaction, and I will take him. The indorsement must be in writing, and signed by yourself, Dr. S. A. Rariden, and the men composing your official Board, and other prominent members. And, in this, I ask nothing but what I am willing to give in return. I send you a certificate of indorsement, which you will please to have signed up and return to me in your next. If the matter is put in this form, I will waive my personal objections to the man, and consider myself debating with you and the Methodist Episcopal Church, through your chosen organ.

I shall expect you to allow my three propositions to be added to the five you submitted.

I can enter into no agreement about who shall attend the debate, or whether we will have preaching of nights. This is a matter over which I have no control.

Very respectfully,

J. M. MATHES.

LETTER NO. 6.—S. BOWERS TO J. M. MATHES.

BEDFORD, IND., October 22, 1867.

ELDER JAMES M. MATHES—*Dear Sir*: Your letter, accepting Mr. Brooks' propositions, came to hand yesterday evening, and I reply at my earliest convenience.

You ask if I am not crowding Mr. Brooks on you, expecting you to refuse to meet him? *I am not*. Mr. Brooks made out his propositions and his challenge without the dictation of a syllable by me: consequently I do not consider it any "confession of weakness" on my part to refuse your proposition to shift on me what properly belongs to Mr. Brooks and yourself.

Permit me also to say, that, had you refused to debate with Mr. Brooks, I should not have taken it as an occasion to

"*make a little capital in a small way.*" I have never yet stooped to anything of the kind.

In reference to admitting your three propositions, I have nothing to do; Mr. Brooks and yourself must settle that. But, by your permission, I would suggest that no Methodist preacher could negative your *seventh*, because it is affirmed in our Discipline, which says, that the Bible is the; "only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice." You can not expect us to *negative* what we have always *affirmed*. Your *eighth* would make Mr. Brooks affirm what he does not believe, viz: That the church was founded in the Apostolic age. I will have your letters mailed to Mr. Brooks to-morrow, and will forward to yon a certificate of indorsement, signed by our official members, in due time.

I shall insist that there be no preaching on either side during the discussion, except it be on the Sabbath day. This will be as fair for you as for ourselves.

Be assured that our object in this discussion is not to gain a personal victory over any one, but that the truth may be vindicated. Respectfully, S. BOWERS.

We omit several letters here, which were rather lengthy, and presented nothing of general interest. They embrace an effort on our part to get in my three additional proposition?. The following letter of Mr. Bowers, to us, states his position in reference to these three propositions pretty fully, and so we insert it:

BEDFORD, IND., November 15, 1867.

ELDER J. M. MATHES—*Sir*: Your letter has just come to hand. Mr. Brooks authorized me to arrange preliminaries with you. In your letter of October 21, you say you will meet Mr. Brooks if we will indorse him. This we have done; and now you want to know if he is going to admit your three propositions. He said not one word about it in his letter to me. But I can say to you just what you knew when you wrote those propositions: that no Methodist preacher will affirm a thing he and his church have always negatived; nor will he negative what he and his church have always affirmed. I believed, when you submitted your propositions, that you did it to get out of a fair debate, and your last letter confirms me in that belief. Now, sir, I will agree that Mr. Brooks will

affirm our *Ninth Article of Religion*, which we will add to the five he submitted. Now, say whether or not you will meet him. If you will, pay so; if *not*, let me know at once.

I go away on Monday, to be absent several days. You will confer a favor on me by answering this letter to-day.

Yours, truly,

S. BOWERS.

LETTER No. 7.—S. BOWERS TO J. M. MATHES.

BEDFORD, IND., November 15, 1867.

ELDER J. M. MATHES—*Dear Sir*: Your reply came to hand this evening. I supposed Mr. Brooks would suggest preliminaries; but he did not. His letter was a private one, addressed to myself. In it he requested me to arrange preliminaries with you. Had his letter been written for you, I should have laid it before you at once.

I said nothing about believing or disbelieving the "Methodist Episcopal Church a '*branch*' of the Church of Christ." I said we did not believe the church was founded in the Apostolic age. You certainly know that our Discipline says the *Bible is the only rule, and the sufficient rule, both of our faith and practice*. It is possible that Mr. Brooks is personally objectionable to some Methodists; so I know you to be to some of your people. But this argues nothing against either of you. No man can please everybody.

I suggested to Mr. Brooks an earlier date for the discussion; but his engagements are such that he can not engage in the debate earlier than the middle of January, and would much prefer the last of the month, if it will suit you.

Would it not protract the debate unnecessarily to have it of nights? It appears to me that one night to a proposition would not be sufficient. I would suggest Capt. E. E. Rose as one of the moderators.

Yours truly,

S. BOWERS.

P. S.—I do not leave town until Monday noon. If you have anything to communicate I shall be glad to receive it.

S. B.

LETTER No. 8.—J. M. MATHES TO S. BOWERS.

BEDFORD, IND., November 18, 1867.

REV. S. BOWERS—*Dear Sir*; Yours of Saturday evening was received too late to be answered the same day, and I hand it to you at the earliest moment convenient.

You now inform me that the reason why you can not affirm that the Methodist Episcopal Church is a "branch," etc, is, because I had added, "founded by Christ and his Apostles." If I understand you, then, you do believe, and are willing to affirm that "the Methodist Episcopal Church is a 'branch' of the Church of Christ." Very well; I will discuss it in that form then, as it presents the real issue, which is all that I desire. If you will so affirm, it will stand Proposition VII.

I am aware that all human Creeds, Confessions of Faith, and books of Discipline, admit that "the word of God is the sufficient rule of faith and practice;" but, I am also aware, and I presume that you are too, that, notwithstanding this admission, the Methodist Episcopal Church has made a Discipline, which she has added to the word of God, as a rule of faith and practice. It was to reach this additional *human* rule, that I submitted my proposition upon that subject. But your refusal to negative the proposition, is an admission that your Discipline can not be defended. Very well; let it stand so. I will waive my preference for an earlier day, and accept your suggestion of January 28 as the time.

I have no preference for night sessions; but I know there is a very general desire on the part of our business men, that it should be so arranged. But we can determine this point hereafter. I am well pleased with Captain Rose as one of the moderators, and I will give you the name of my moderator in a few days, and the two can select a third, as President of the Board. Very truly, yours, J. M. MATTIES.

P. S.—Since writing the foregoing, I have selected Captain Samuel W. Short as my moderator, who, in concert with Captain Rose, will select the umpire.

I also hand you the propositions as they now stand, and hope you will be willing to add the seventh as proposed above.

Please let me know immediately if all is satisfactory.

J. M. M.

From the foregoing correspondence, the reader will be able to learn all that is necessary for him to know in regard to the causes that led to the debate. I could get but one of my three propositions in, as the reader will see. The Creed question was too strong for them. Mr. Bowers and his brethren can not take the negative of our position on that subject. And they would not affirm that the "Methodist

Episcopal Church is a 'branch' of the Church of Christ," though we suppose they believe it. We now introduce the indorsements.

INDORSEMENT OF T. S. BROOKS.

To Whom It may Concern:

We, the undersigned, members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Bedford, Ind, hereby indorse the Rev. T. S. Brooks as a gentleman and a Christian, and we accept him as our representative in the contemplated debate with Elder James M. Mathes; and we cheerfully and confidently intrust our cause in his hands in such a discussion.

S. BOWERS, P. C.	P. T. VESTAL,
J. GARDNER,	WM. P. HODGE,
M. N. MESSICK,	S. A. RARIDEN,
ROBERT H. CARLTON,	DEAN BARNES,
ENOS E. JOHNSON,	JOSEPH A. HENDRICKS.

BEDFORD, IND , November 1, 1867.

INDORSEMENT OF J. M. MATHES.

To Whom It may Concern:

We, the undersigned, members of the Church of Christ in Bedford, Ind, hereby indorse Elder James M. Mathes as a gentleman and a Christian, and accept him as our representative in the contemplated debate with Rev. T. S. Brooks; and we cheerfully and confidently intrust our cause in his hands in such a discussion.

JOHN W. NEWLAND, Elder.	W. DUNCAN,
SAMUEL W. SHORT, "	C. C. WILLIAMS,
STOVER YOUNGER, "	JAS. K. P. WILLIAMS,
JOHN C. WINTER, Pastor.	GEORGE W. ADAMS,
D. G. GRAY, Deacon.	WM. M. COLE,
J. L. MESSICK, "	T. H. MALOTT,
AND. GELWICK, "	DANIEL D. ELDRIGE,
D. F. TILFORD, "	WILLIAM RAGSDALE,
JOHN W. MITCHELL,	WILLIAM DAGGY,
D. R. BOWDEN,	H. W. MCDANIEL,
LEVI HOUSTON,	J. M. DAGGY,
CHARLES G. BERRY,	JACOB MILLER,
HENRY DAVIS,	C. R. ALLY,
WILL. P. MALOTT,	A. J. HOSTETLER.

BEDFORD, IND, November 1, 1867.

RULES OF DEBATE.

1. The discussion to commence on Tuesday, January 28, 1808, at 10 o'clock A. M., in the Town-Hall in Bedford, Ind.*
2. The affirmants may each occupy two days in the discussion of one proposition each, and one day each on all the other propositions.
3. In opening each proposition, the affirmant may occupy forty-five minutes, and the negative the same in replying; and after that, thirty minutes alternately until the proposition is closed.
4. On the final negative of each proposition, no new matter shall be introduced.
5. Each debatant shall choose one moderator, and the two thus chosen shall choose an "umpire," who shall not be a member of either of the two churches.
6. The debate shall be opened each morning by prayer, and closed each afternoon by the benediction.
7. The debatants agree to be governed, in the pending debate, by the rules of debate laid down in Hedges' Logic, pp. 159-162; edition of 1855.
8. All the books introduced by either shall be free for the inspection of the other during the hours of debate.

To the foregoing rules and regulations, we mutually agree, and hereunto subscribe our names, this 21st day of December, 1867.

J. M. MATHES,
S. BOWERS,
for T. S. BROOKS.

 PROPOSITION'S.

PROPOSITION I. The church of which I, J. M. Mathes, am a member, is the church founded by Christ and the Apostles.

J. M. Mathes, affirmative; T. S. Brooks, negative.

PROP. II. Infants of believing parents are entitled to membership and baptism in the Church of Christ.

T. S. Brooks, affirmative; J. M. Mathes, negative.

PROP. III. Immersion, to a penitent believer, is in order to the remission of past sins.

J. M. Mathes, affirmative; T. S. Brooks, negative.

"In the Town-Hall," or any other suitable room that may be secured in Bedford, provided the Town-Hall can not be had.

PROP. IV. The Holy Spirit does sometimes operate separate and apart from the written or revealed word of God.

T. S. Brooks, affirmative; J. M. Mathes negative.

PROP. V. Is immersion the Bible mode or action of baptism?

J. M. Mathes, affirmative; T. S. Brooks, negative.

PROP. VI. "Wherefore, that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort."

T. S. Brooks, affirmative; J. M. Mathes, negative

The following two letters will explain themselves:

BEDFORD, IND., March 6, 1868.

REVEREND T. S. BROOKS—*Dear Sir*; I drop you this line, to say that there is quite a demand to have our little debate published. I think this can be done very satisfactorily, if you think so. I have very full notes of the debate, taken by myself; and I have full notes of it, taken by Wm. B. Chrisler, of New Albany; and I have borrowed full notes taken by a very intelligent man, who is not a member of any church, and from these resources I have written it out by the aid of Mr. Wm. B. Chrisler, and feel satisfied that we have reproduced it in all its essential parts.

Now, if it strikes you favorably, I will send you a specimen of your speeches. Or, if you wish to read them all, and make such verbal alterations as you may desire, not changing the argument any, I might send you all your speeches, by express, to some point in your county, on the Ohio and Mississippi Road, and let you do that, with the distinct understanding that you will read and return them to me immediately, with your corrections. I will then publish it in book form, and send you a few copies for your trouble.

Or, if you prefer it, you can appoint Mr. Bowers, or Doctor Rariden, to examine the manuscript for you. This, I presume, would be just as well, and would save much time and trouble.

What say you? Please let me hear from you immediately on the subject.

Very respectfully,

J. M. MATHES.

HOUSTON, IND., March 19, 1868.

REV. J. M. MATHES—*My Dear Sir*; Yours of the 6th inst. has come to hand, and, without allowing unnecessary delay, I hereby respond.

You propose, under certain conditions, and with my consent, to publish, in a book, our late debate at Bedford; or rather, you propose to obtain my consent for you to publish, in that form, and place in market, what you and your friends may choose to prepare and present to the public as a *reproduction* of that debate. Now, to such a proposition I object, and must, therefore, withhold my consent. I object to any attempt, on the part of myself or my friends, to write out, from our notes, however extended they may be, our own version of your speeches and of mine, and present it to the public as a full, fair and life-like reproduction of the debate. This, as a Christian man, I could not conscientiously do; though I am quite ready to admit, that myself and friends usually cherish and appropriate a proportionate share of the integrity and capacity common to the better class of Christian men. I object to the publication of that debate, at this late period, by you and me jointly; for, though you and I were to be equally employed in reproducing, as best we could, by the use of all the resources now available, it could not fail to be, more or less, a misrepresentation of what it would purport to be I object, most of all, to the publication of a so-called copy of that debate, got up and prepared, by you and your friends, notwithstanding your gracious privilege, tendered to me, of making some verbal corrections of *your* manuscripts of *my* speeches, without the privilege, however, of correcting *your* manuscripts of *your own* speeches. Indeed, sir, it is a little amusing to see with what complacency you presume upon your own high claims, or upon my humble virtues. Although I had no itching ambition in that direction, I may here say, that, had you proposed, in due time and before the debate, to employ, jointly, a regular and competent reporter to take down the debate as it progressed, and write it out for publication, I would have cordially consented, and joined you in the enterprise, with this express and sole condition, to-wit: that all the profits of such publication should, in good faith, be appropriated to some public benevolent enterprise common to the churches. Excuse me, Mr. Mathes; I can not consent that you shall publish that debate. The stipulation, previously entered into between us, is binding upon us both; which is, that no publication of the debate should be made, unless by the mutual consent of both parties.

To this agreement I hold myself strictly bound to conform,
and I shall expect the same of you.

Yours, truly,

T. S. BROOKS

To the above letter I made no reply, and only wish to say now, that I am perfectly willing that the public may judge as to the fairness of my proposal to Mr. Brooks. He is, however, very much mistaken in saying that we are mutually bound in an agreement not to publish the debate without the mutual consent of both parties. We never heard of such an agreement. We never made any such agreement, nor did any one ever ask us to enter into such an agreement. Indeed, the question of publishing the debate was never agitated, so far as we know. We did not entertain a thought of it until after the close of the discussion, when we found that we had such ample material for the work.

It then occurred to us that Mr. Brooks could have no reasonable objection to the publication, after he had corrected his speeches, if he found that they needed correction. But the foregoing letter shows that we were mistaken. He did not intend to have it published, if he could prevent it. And we leave the reader to guess why? And without further comment, we submit the following report of the debate, and our prayer is, that good may result from its publication.

J. M. MATHES, *Publisher.*

DEBATE .

TOWN-HALL, BEDFORD, IND., }
January 28, 1868—10 o'clock A. M. }

Met according to agreement. A large concourse of people were in attendance, with some forty ministers. The moderators—Samuel W. Short, Esq., on the part of J. M. Mathes; and E. E. Rose, Esq., on the part of T. S. Brooks; and Hon. Moses F. Dunn, umpire—took their seats, and called the house to order. Prayer by Elder Wm. M'Nutt, a Baptist minister. The President then read the first proposition for discussion—viz:

"PROP. I. The church of which I, J. M. Mathes, am a member, is the church founded by Christ and the Apostles." Affirmative, J. M. Mathes; Negative, T. S. Brooks.

First Day.—First Proposition.—January 28, 1868.

MR. MATHES' FIRST SPEECH—(45 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I count myself happy this morning that I am permitted to appear before this large assembly, on this interesting occasion, to answer, for myself and my Christian brethren, touching all those important matters embraced in the six Propositions to be discussed upon this important occasion. And you will permit me to assure you that I regard these matters of the very highest importance to every one of us. In them is involved the destiny of our race for all time and eternity.

Some may be inclined to doubt the importance of the first proposition, now immediately to be discussed, and

which has just been read in your hearing. They have been taught to look upon the various divisions of Protestant Christendom as so many *branches* of something which they call the church. They therefore regard all sects and parties as about equal. They suppose that, if a man is only honest in his heart, it matters not to which of these branches, or sects, he may connect himself. And many go even further than this: they teach that if a man is honest in his religious belief, and conforms his life to it, he will be saved, just as well out of the church as in it.

Now, to all such, my proposition will appear quite frivolous and unimportant. But to all who believe that the Church of Christ is a divine organism, having no branches except its individual members, the great value of this proposition will be apparent. All must admit that our Lord Jesus Christ has established a church on earth which he calls "My Church." It is also called "his body, the church," his "Kingdom," his "Vineyard," his "Temple," his "Tabernacle," his "House," his "Husbandry." And this church is always spoken of, in the New Testament, in the *singular number*. "Church," and not "churches."

Christ says, "On this rock I will build my church." And Paul says, "Unto him be glory in the church, by Christ Jesus, throughout all ages, world without end. Amen." Eph. iii: 24. Thus we are taught that the Church of Christ is a divine organism, and that God is only glorified in "the church." All those, therefore, who are constitutionally members of the Church of Christ, are in a saved state, and can glorify God in their bodies and spirits, which are the Lord's. While those who are not in this divine organism, are out of Christ, and in a state of condemnation and death.

This being admitted, as I know it must be by all, then the importance of identifying the Church of Christ, must be seen and felt by every one. And, without condemning others, I am here to prove that the church to which I be-

long is the Church of Christ; and, therefore, that I and my brethren are right. The importance of this proposition rises entirely above all mere personal or party considerations. May God enable us all to forget *self and party*, and investigate the subject with candor, in the light of God's holy word, and with a solemn reference to that day when we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ. May we all be enabled to learn the truth, do the truth, and be made free by it.

Before entering more fully into the discussion, permit me to say to all my Methodist, Presbyterian and Baptist friends, that I am not here to make war upon you. I am happy to say that I recognize among you all, many pious and worthy men and women, who, we doubt not, are honest in their religious views, and for whose convictions and feelings I have the highest respect. I claim to have as much charity as any one in this hall, for those who honestly differ from me. But neither your charity nor mine has anything to do with the great questions involved in this discussion. They must be decided in a higher court. Our appeal must be made "to the law and the testimony."

But, in view of the unhappy divisions that now distract the Christian world, I can adopt the language of the good Mr. John Wesley, who says: "Would to God that all the party names and unscriptural phrases and forms which divide the Christian world, were forgot; and that we might all agree to sit down together, as humble, loving disciples, at the feet of our common Master, to hear his words, to imbibe his spirit, and to transcribe his life in our own."

The proposition now under discussion is very definite and simple, and, therefore, needs but little explanation. I use the term "Church" in its most common scriptural acceptation. Lord King defines the term thus: "But the usual and common acceptation of the word, and of which we must chiefly treat, is that of a particular church—that

is, a society of Christians meeting together in one place, under their proper pastor, for the performance of religious worship, and the exercising of Christian discipline."

In this sense I shall use the term. The church is the visible body of Christ, composed of men and women who have been called out from the world by the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, and separated from the world by the ordinances of the Gospel.

And by the term "*founded*" I mean just what the language imports—that Christ was the *founder* of the church, and is its glorious Head. And that the inspired apostles were his ambassadors to all mankind, under the great commission; and guided by the Holy Spirit into all truth, they organized the Church of Christ in the City of Jerusalem, on the ever-memorable day of Pentecost.

I do not claim for the church of which I am a member, that we have & *personal* succession from the church founded at Jerusalem, through an unbroken chain from the apostles to the present time. We do not regard such succession necessary to sustain our proposition. We attach no importance whatever to the boasted apostolic succession of bishops and popes through a pretended uninterrupted chain from the apostles. It is a beggarly assumption, without the least foundation in fact on which to rest. Even if it could be proved that such succession existed, still it would amount to nothing. Mr. Wesley says: "The figment of the uninterrupted succession, I know to be a fable."—*Watson's Life of Wesley*, p. 298.

Again, arguing the succession question with High Church men, he says: "I deny that the Romish bishops came down by uninterrupted succession from the apostles. I never could see it proved, and I am persuaded I never shall."—*Wesley's Works*, V. III, p. 44.

But the succession which I contend for, is the succession of TRUTH, in theory and in practice, in organism and

in name. This is the only true succession, and the testimony of all the great Reformers sustains me in this position.

John Calvin says: "Now, this question of being the successors of the apostles, must be decided by an examination of the doctrine maintained." And further on, he says: "For, suppose that such an *unbroken line* as they pretend really existed, yet, if their apostleship had perished (and it necessarily did, by their corruption of God's worship, by their destruction of the offices of Christ, and pollution of the sacraments), what then becomes of their succession? Except, indeed, as an heir succeeds to the dead, so they, true piety being extinct among them, succeed to domination. But, seeing they have changed entirely the government of the church, the chasm between them and the apostles is so vast as to exclude any communication of right from the one to the other. And, to conclude the point in one word, *I deny the succession scheme as a thing utterly without foundation.*"

Philip Melancthon says: "The church is not bound to an *ordinary succession*, as they call it, of bishops, but to the Gospel."

We might quote much more to the same effect, from the early Reformers and the Christian Fathers; but let this suffice till I see what course my opponent will take in the premises. Now, if I prove this true succession of the Gospel in favor of the church of which I am a member, I shall have proved my proposition. And this I expect to do, to the satisfaction of all unprejudiced minds in this intelligent audience. I do not admit that the Church of Christ ceased to exist at any time since its first organization at Jerusalem. Mr. Jones, in his History of the Church, has proved that during the darkest days of the apostacy the church continued to exist in the Valleys of Piedmont, holding fast the primitive Gospel and divine order of things, more or less pure, even down to the Ref-

ormation. But I do not rest the case upon such grounds as this—believing, as I do, that such a succession, if it could be demonstrated, is only *incidental*, and not essential to my proposition.

I. My first argument is, *That the church of which I am a member is built upon the same foundation with the apostolic church.*

Let us inquire, then, upon what foundation the apostolic church was built. The answer to this is easy. But, before answering *directly*, I wish to say *negatively*, that the model church at Jerusalem was not built upon Judaism. They did not put "new cloth to old garments." It was not built upon the law of circumcision. Paul declares that "the law had become dead by the body of Christ." (Romans vii: 6.)

But, to answer *directly*: The church was built upon Christ. "The foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself, being the chief corner-stone." The prophet says: "Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone, a tried stone, a precious corner-stone, a sure foundation: he that believeth shall not make haste." (Isaiah xxviii: 16.)

This foundation which God promised to lay in Zion, was JESUS THE CHRIST. That I am correct in this interpretation of the promise, I prove by the use Peter makes of it. He says: "To whom coming, as unto a living stone, disallowed indeed of men, but chosen of God, and precious, Ye, also, as lively stones, are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ. Wherefore it is contained in the Scripture, Behold, I lay in Zion a chief corner-stone, elect, precious: and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded." (I Peter ii: 4-6.)

In perfect harmony with this, we have the following teaching of our Lord himself upon this point. Peter had just confessed, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the

living God." And the Lord blessed him, saying, "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." (Matthew xvi: 16, 18.)

How, this is a very important passage of Scripture, and should be carefully examined. The Saviour says, "Upon this rock I *will* build my church." This proves that his church was not yet built when he made the statement. It is also proved that "Jesus the Christ," as confessed by Peter, was to be the foundation of this church when it should be built. And this is sustained by Paul, who says: "For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." (I Corinthians iii: 11.) The foundation had been laid in the days of Paul's writing, as is proved by the above declaration; therefore, it had been laid, and the Church of Christ had been built upon it, after the conversation of Christ with the disciples (Matthew xvi), and before Paul wrote his Epistle to the Corinthians.

This fact, together with the preaching of the apostles on the day of Pentecost, and after, clearly establishes the fact that the primitive or apostolic church was built upon JESUS THE CHRIST, as the sure foundation, and that it was founded on the day of Pentecost.

Very well; the church of which I am a member, is built upon the same foundation, which is JESUS THE CHRIST. We receive Christ as our Prophet, Priest, and King, and build upon him: not as a mere man, or an angel, or a created being; but as he is set forth in the Scriptures—the Divine Saviour, the Son of the Living God. His divinity is clearly established in the following Scriptures, and many others:

The prophet says: "For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Coun-

sellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." (Isaiah ix: 6.)

Again: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." (John i: 1.) And Paul says: "For in him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, who is the head of all principality and power." (Colossians ii: 9, 10.) And Paul applies the following declaration, from the Psalms, to Christ: "But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. And Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thy hands." (Hebrews i: 8-10.) Once more: "And, without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit," etc. (I Timothy iii: 16.)

As an organization, the church of which I am a member is built, together with the apostolic church at Jerusalem, upon Jesus the Christ, as "the sure foundation stone." We, therefore, stand identified with it, and are, in fact, the same divine organism. But I will more fully develop and establish this during the day, when I hear the objections of my opponent, if he has any to urge.

II. My second argument is drawn from the fact that we, as a religious organism, have the same faith—"the faith once delivered to the saints." If I prove this, I establish the proposition, and prove that we have the only true and legitimate apostolic succession. The faith of the church founded by Christ and his apostles may be learned from the preaching of the apostles and evangelists, as recorded in the New Testament, and particularly in the Acts. The book of Acts is a faithful and inspired history

of the "planting and training" of the Church of Christ. Let us, then, turn to this inspired record, and learn what their faith was.

1. It was not the "Arian Creed," nor the creed of "St. Athanasius." It was not the "Nicene Creed," nor was it the creed commonly called the "Apostles' Creed;" as no apostle ever saw or heard of it. It is now admitted by all well-informed men that the "Apostles' Creed," so called, was manufactured by uninspired men, long since the death of the last apostle, and, therefore, has no authority. The faith of the primitive church was not the decrees and canons of the "Holy Council of Trent," or of any other council of uninspired men. It was not the "Confession of Augsburg," nor of the "Westminster Assembly of Divines;" it was not the "Thirty-nine Articles" of the Church of England; nor was it the "Twenty-five Articles" of her daughter, the Methodist Episcopal Church, as found in her Discipline!

No; it was none of these. No doubt all of these documents contain much that is true, borrowed from the ancient faith of the church. But there is, in all of them, a mixture of error that renders the truth which they contain, inoperative, and of non-effect. But the errors found in any one, or all of them, may be accounted for, not by supposing that those who manufactured them were dishonest and bad men, or that those who embrace and maintain them have done so with bad motives; but from the fact that all men are *fallible*. And, as these documents were made by uninspired men, they are necessarily fallible, like their authors. And hence the great Protestant principle so universally adopted by all parties:

"The scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the word of God, and are the only infallible rule of faith and practice."

In the Acts of the Apostles (chapter ii), we have the

history of the organization of the Church of Christ—the model church. Here we learn what the apostles preached to the people who had come together on the day of Pentecost, which was the "*beginning*" day; and what that multitude believed, and upon what conditions they were admitted to baptism and membership in the Church of Christ. This will settle the question as to the faith of the apostolic church.

When the day of Pentecost had fully come, some eight or ten days after the ascension of Christ to heaven, his disciples, to the number of one hundred and twenty, were together at one place in Jerusalem, praying, and waiting for the promise of the Holy Spirit. And suddenly the "power from on high" came down upon them. Luke says: "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them. And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance."

Being thus baptized in the Holy Spirit, the apostles, who had received the great commission, commenced preaching the Gospel to the people, in the various languages. This strange occurrence was soon reported throughout the city, and a great multitude ran together, greatly astonished at what they saw and heard. But Peter, standing up with the eleven, all guided by the Holy Spirit, preached unto them Jesus the Christ. He said: "Him being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands have crucified and slain: whom God hath raised up, having loosed the pains of death, because it was not possible that he should be holden of it," etc. "Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." And he assured them

that the same Jesus whom they had crucified, had been constituted both Lord and Christ.

"And when they heard this, they were pierced in their heart, and said unto Peter and 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 the Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. 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."

They already had faith, as they had believed the preaching; and they now "gladly received the word," and were baptized, "and the same day were added to them about three thousand souls." And Luke informs us "that they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." (Verse 42.)

In all their subsequent preaching they always delivered the same faith to the people, and required the same things to be done in order to admission into the church, as we can demonstrate at any time, and will, if it becomes necessary.

Now, the church of which I am a member, holds precisely the same faith. We preach precisely what the apostles preached, and *as* they preached it; and we require the same conditions to be complied with, in order to admission into the fellowship of the church; and I defy Mr. Brooks, or any other man, to point out a discrepancy in these particulars. Therefore, so far as these two points of identity are concerned, I have proved my proposition. We have the true apostolic succession of the faith and practice; and as an organism, we are the same.

Now, I ask my friend Mr. Brooks to come square up to the issue, and examine all my arguments fairly; and if he thinks that I and my brethren are wrong, let him show it if he can. We have no interest in being wrong; and if

he can show us that we are in error, we will most cordially thank him for it. The truth only can make us free. Truth is with me the pearl of great price. For it I have been and now am willing to make every needful sacrifice. But if, in my anxiety to possess the truth, I have grasped a gilded counterfeit, and am therefore deceived, the sooner I am undeceived, the better for me. "I would rather be *right* than be President."

Let us, then, my friends, lay aside all prejudice and party feelings, and examine all these great issues in the light of the divine word, and let us willingly receive the truth into good and honest hearts. This may be hard for some to do; but no matter: we owe it to ourselves, to the community, and to God, who will hold us all accountable for what we believe, say and do, to be honest and candid in our investigations into religious truth. The Lord help us to be candid and honest with ourselves. [Time expired.]

First Day.—First Proposition.—January 28, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' FIRST REPLY—(45 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: I am very happy to meet a man of Mr. Mathes' acknowledged ability and learning. He stands at the head of his church in Indiana, and I know that he possesses the entire confidence of his brethren, not only in this State, but everywhere. If Mr. Mathes can not sustain the doctrine of his church, no other man can do it. He is the oracle of his party, and if I defeat him, I defeat them all. And I am glad to find him such a mild and pleasant gentleman; and, I have no doubt, we shall get along without any difficulty. In some respects he and I differ in our temperaments. I am rather excitable and enthusiastic, and persons not acquainted with me might suppose that I was in a bad humor; but this is a great mis-

take. I am only greatly in earnest: while Mr. Mathes is mild, pleasant, calm and cool in his manner of speaking. But, I hope he will be jovial and good-humored, that we may occasionally have a little pleasantry as the debate progresses.

You have heard the proposition read, and have listened to the reading of a very nice speech by Mr. Mathes. But I will read the proposition again. "The church of which I, J. M. Mathes, am a member, is the church founded by Christ and the Apostles."

Now, you see from the reading of his proposition that he claims for himself and his brethren that they are *the church*. Now, mind you, by taking this ground, he unchurches all other denominations. He assumes that his church is the *only* Church of Christ. If he is right in this awful assumption, then we are all wrong, and on the road to hell! The Presbyterians and Baptists who attend this debate can have no sympathy with Mr. Mathes. He stands against them all. It is true that the Baptists immerse, but they do not immerse "for the remission of sins," but *because of* remission of sins; and, according to Mr. M. and his brethren, such immersions amount to nothing—it is no baptism at all. Then you see that Baptists can not sympathize with him in this debate. All denominations must stand with me, and against him.

But I affirm that Mr. Mathes' church is no church at all!—that it is no part of the Church of Christ. It had its origin in unbaptized men, and, therefore, they have no right to preach the Gospel or to baptize. They have no legal ordination. This proposition is a direct *insult* to all other denominations. His church came into existence in 1827, as I can prove. How, then, can it be the Church of Christ?

But where do they get their authority to preach and baptize? Nowhere. They have no legal authority; their

claim is all *bogus*! Christ ordained the apostles, and gave them authority to administer the ordinances, and they conferred the same authority upon others, and thus the "official grace," or the Apostolical authority, has come down to us through an uninterrupted chain of ordination from the apostles. Therefore, we have this divine right to preach the Gospel and administer the ordinances.

But Mr. Mathes and his church have no such "official grace," and, of course, have no such right. I charge that they have come from unbaptized and unordained men, and so you see that their claim is *bogus*.

But I will now prove that Mr. Mathes' church is not the Church of Christ, or any part of it. Infants were members of the church in the days of Abraham; but there are no infants in Mr. Mathes' church, and, of course, it can not be the Church of Christ, or any part of it. I would like to know if an unbaptized man has a right to baptize others? I deny it;—as well might an alien to our government attempt to naturalize other aliens! And you all know that he could not do it. Yet those who started this church of Mr. Mathes were unbaptized aliens, and, of course, had no proper authority to do it.

I now affirm that the Church of Christ was organized in the lifetime of the patriarch Abraham, and in his family, and has existed ever since. But, according to Mr. Mathes, God killed the church, or, it died a natural death; and then he made another church, different from it! I am surprised that a man of Mr. Mathes' talent should be so inconsistent!

But I deny that any church was organized on the day of Pentecost, and Mr. Mathes can not prove it. But let him try it, if he chooses, and then I will attend to him. This affair on the day of Pentecost was not the organization of a new church, as Mr. Mathes teaches, but simply a great revival of religion; and three thousand souls were con-

verted on that day, and added to the old Abrahamic church, then in existence.

Yet Mr. Mathes and his brethren are always harping upon Pentecost, as though the Church of Christ began on that day. But I tell you, my friends, that there is not one word of truth in it; and I will prove it in this discussion. But I will wait till Mr. Mathes delivers himself more fully on the subject of the founding of the Church of Christ, But Mr. Mather and his brethren are always lampooning the sects, and abusing all other denominations, all over the country, and especially is this done by Mr. Mathes in his Christian Record, which I read. They style us "*the sects.*"

But I will read you the definition of the word "*sect*" I have taken it from Webster's Pictorial Dictionary, which is the best authority in the world. He says: "Sect—A denomination which dissents from an established church."

So, you see that they are themselves a *sect*, according to Webster. Now, mind you then, when they abuse the *sects*, they abuse themselves as much as anybody else! They are a *sect*, although they deny it, and maintain that they are no sect. God organized the Church of Christ himself, in the immediate family of Abraham. But Mr. Mathes says that the church, under the old dispensation, was a *political institution!* Now, you see where he stands! According to this, then, Christ was a political preacher; for he was a "Minister of the circumcision." But let Mr. Mathes take his ground, and develop his teaching upon this point, and then I will attend to him.

But Mr. Mathes denies the apostolic succession of bishops; but mind you, now, whenever he destroys the regular, unbroken chain of bishops from the apostles to the present time, he destroys the church itself; for it depends for its very existence upon this succession in the ministry! The succession must, therefore, be maintained, or we must give up the church. But the church can never

be destroyed; for Christ said that "the gates of hell" should never prevail against it. Therefore, the doctrine of the succession from the apostles is true. But Mr. Mathes seems to think that the gates of hell have prevailed against the church, and that it became extinct, and that he and his brethren restored it in 1827!

I will now show that Mr. Mathes is wrong in the assumption that the Church of Christ began on the day of Pentecost. The prophet says: "Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice, from henceforth even forever." (Isaiah ix: 7.)

Now, from this you see that the kingdom and throne of David, and the kingdom or Church of Christ, are identically the same institution. The kingdom and government of David was to be *increased* under the reign of Christ, not destroyed, and a new kingdom established, as Mr. Mathes teaches. The church can not commit suicide. And, therefore, Mr. Mathes is mistaken in his proposition.

But, mind you, now, Mr. Mathes says, in the face of all this testimony against him, that the Jewish Church died, and a new church was organized on the day of Pentecost! But I will now set all this aside. Christ said to Peter: "Moreover, I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." But, according to my friend Mr. Mathes, Peter had the keys; but there was no kingdom of heaven, or church, then in existence for him to open. Now, can't you all see the absurdity of his position? Yes; and twelve apostles chosen, too, and no church yet in existence, in which to officiate! The church is a *visible* body, and, of course, must have a *visible* head. But, according to Mr. Mathes, the church was organized on the day of Pentecost, and was a visible body, but had an *invisible* head, and has remained in that condition ever since.

I will now read Mark xi: 9, 10; "And they that went before, and they that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna; Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord: Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord." Also, Luke i: 32, 33: "He shall be great, and shall be called the Son of the Highest: and the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David; and he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever." These scriptures prove that the kingdom of Christ was simply to be a continuation of the kingdom of David; and Mr. Mathes is wrong as to the commencement of the church, or kingdom, of Christ. I charge that the organization, or church, to which Mr. Mathes belongs, is no part of the Church of Christ,—but a *faction*.

I will now read Luke xiii: 28: "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth, when ye shall see Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the prophets, in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out." Now, you see what a fix he has placed himself in by denying that the Church of Christ was not founded till Pentecost! I have now proved by the passage just quoted, that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets, were actually in the kingdom. This could not be true if the kingdom of heaven, or Church of Christ, had not been in existence in the days of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and all the prophets. You see, now, how my friend's cause labors. Indeed, his position is false; and I am sure that you can all see it.

The Church of Christ was organized in the days of Abraham, and has existed ever since. All the righteous persons who lived before that time, were saved by faith, though they were not members of the church. But I will now cut the throat of his whole system, by reading what the prophet Daniel says about the church, or kingdom, of Christ:

"And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven

set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed; and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand forever." (Daniel ii: 44.)

The kingdom here spoken of was the kingdom, or church, of Christ. This will not be disputed by Mr. Mathes, and if he admits that, he is gone up! For the four kingdoms seen in the vision, were all to be destroyed by it; and three of these great kingdoms were destroyed by the Church of Christ before Christ was born! Therefore, the Church of Christ must have been in existence, as a power to destroy kingdoms, before the days of Daniel. Now, you all see the fix Mr. Mathes has got himself into; and I shall hold him to it. I will not allow him to dodge the real issue. No doubt he will squirm and twist, and try to crawfish out of it; but he shall face the music. You are not editing the Record now, brother Mathes; you have a very different job on hand now, and I am here to help you, and see that no violence is done to the truth. When Mr. Mathes is sitting quietly in his office, editing the Record, he has a very nice time of it. He says what he pleases, and there is no one present to correct him when he goes wrong. But there are two of us here now, and I am going to hold him to the work. I will show that his proposition is false, and his whole system *bogus*; and I have proved, and I will still further prove, that his church is no church, nor any part of the Church of Christ. I am really astonished that a man of his ability and information should attempt to maintain such a system in debate before an intelligent community! But you will all see how he will come out. I feel sorry for him! [Time expired.]

First Day.—First Proposition.—January 28, 1868.

MR. MATHES' SECOND SPEECH—(30 MINUTES)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am happy to meet you all here again. We have had our dinners, and, I presume, we all feel good-humored and cheerful. We are now prepared to go on with this important investigation. But, before resuming my regular line of argument, I will briefly notice such statements and arguments in Mr. Brooks' speech as I deem worthy of notice.

The first part of his speech was taken up in trying to create a little prejudice against me, and call out a little sympathy, for his cause, from Baptists and Presbyterians, by representing me as unchurching everybody. The *Odium Theologicum* is never resorted to in a debate, except where a man is conscious of the weakness of his cause, and feels that his only hope of success is in placing his opponent in a false position.

I unchurch nobody. I am not here to prove that everybody is wrong; but to prove that the church of which "I am a member is the church founded by Christ and the apostles." But what if it should turn out, in this investigation, that all the sects and parties are wrong I This has nothing to do with the question in debate. My motto is,

Let God be true, and every man a liar." Whether few or many will be saved, is not the question; but, what is truth?

But Mr. Brooks says that I and the church of which I am a member, had our origin in unbaptized men and unordained men! This I deny; and his assertion is entirely worthless without the proof. But, I presume he will give no proof but his unsupported assertion. I have already said that we attach no importance to the succession doctrine, as taught in the Romish church, and contended for by Mr. Brooks. We base all our claims on the true apostolic succession of the Gospel. But he says that the church of

which I am a member came into existence, as an organism, in 1827 He is entirely mistaken in this, as I shall more fully establish before I am through. But he says that I and my brethren have no authority to preach and baptize—that our claim to be the Church of Christ is *bogus!* But has he proved it? Not; unless his mere gassy assertions may be regarded as proof! Such assertions are very cheap, and amount to nothing, as every intelligent person knows.

But he asserts that the Church of Christ was organized in the days of Abraham, and in his family. And that there were infant members in it then, and all along through the Jewish age; and, of course, that infants ought to be admitted to membership in the church now. Now, this is all *assumption*. The Bible says nothing about a church in the days of Abraham. No mention is made of any church till the law was given at Sinai. Then we have the "Church in the wilderness." But this was the Jewish Church, and not the Church of Christ. It is nowhere called the Church of Christ.

It is true that the church in the wilderness, or Jewish Church, had infant members in it; but they became members, not by faith, not by circumcision, but by a natural birth. Flesh and blood were the conditions of membership in that church; and such infants were circumcised, not to bring them into the church, but because they were already in it. There was no church in the world, up to the giving of the law at Sinai. The religion that God had established in the world was family religion. The patriarchs worshiped in families, from the creation to that time. Abraham and his family worshiped God, not as a church, but as *& family*.

But, why does my friend bring this matter of infant church-membership into this debate now? It will be time enough when he comes to affirm his proposition on that subject.

But he represents me as teaching that God actually killed the Jewish Church; and seems to be horror-stricken at the idea! I wonder if Mr. Brooks has ever read what the prophet says upon this very subject? Listen: "' Behold, my servants shall sing for joy of heart, but ye shall cry for sorrow of heart, and shall howl for vexation of spirit. And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen: for the Lord God shall SLAY thee, and call his servants by another name." (Isaiah lxxv: 14, 15.) Here God declares that he will SLAY the Jewish Church, and "call his servants by another name;" which was, no doubt, the name, "Christian." I hope this will satisfy Mr. Brooks.

But he denies that any church was organized on the day of Pentecost, and challenges me to the proof. I am really surprised that a man of Mr. Brooks' sharpness should make such a denial! But, let us see: One hundred and twenty members of the Jewish Church had become disciples of Christ, and were waiting for the promised Spirit, when the day of Pentecost had fully come. They were ready for the change. The Church of Christ is a kingdom, and Christ is the king. In the very nature of things, a kingdom can not exist until the king is crowned. Jesus was not crowned king until he ascended up to the right hand of God. When the Holy Spirit came down, on the day of Pentecost, he advocated the claims of Jesus to the kingdom, and testified that he was crowned king in Zion.

And his reign as king began that very day; composed, at first, of the hundred and twenty as his subjects, to whom were added on the same day, "three thousand" more—by faith and obedience to Christ as the reigning Prince. Here, then, we find the church fully organized, as a kingdom, for the first time. God recognized it as his church, by sending down the Holy Spirit to fill it with life and power. Up to that day the disciples were not "the church," as they were still members of the Jewish Church;

but after the day of Pentecost, they are always referred to as "the church"—"church of God." I regard this argument as unanswerable, and I call the special attention of Mr. Brooks to it. He must answer it, or his cause is lost. But, I presume, he will not attempt it.

But I am charged with lampooning the "sects." I plead, not guilty. I oppose *sectarianism*, and kindly point out the errors of the *sects*; but I lampoon no one. But Mr. Brooks denies that *sect* implies *heresy*, and reads us a part of the definition given by Webster as the third meaning of the word. Why did he not read Webster's first and second meaning, also? This would have been fair. But I presume he was afraid to do so fair a thing, as this would have ruined his argument.

Webster's first and second meanings of the word *sect*, are: "1. A part cut off, a cutting, a scion. 2. Hence, a body of persons who have separated from others." etc. But Mr. Webster is not aiming to give the Scripture use of the word *sect*, but only the *usus loquendi*, its common meaning among those who speak the English language. Paul is a better lexicographer on the Scriptural use of words than Webster, or even my friend Mr. Brooks, and he uses it as equivalent to *heresy*.

When Tertullus accused Paul, before the governor, of being "The ringleader of the sect of the Nazarenes," Paul understood that this was a charge of *heresy*, and answered him accordingly: "But this I confess unto thee, after the way which they call *heresy*, so worship I the God of my fathers."

Dr. A. Wyley, President of the State University, and a Presbyterian Doctor of Divinity, wrote a book entitled "SECTARIANISM IS HERESY," thus showing that he understood the matter just as Paul understood it, and as I teach. I am, therefore, in good company.

But Mr. Brooks told us in his speech, that the Church

of Christ depends for its very existence upon the miserable *assumption* of the unbroken chain of ordination and succession from the apostles, through the popes and bishops of Rome, to the present time. And upon this ground he charges that I and my brethren have no authority to preach the Gospel and baptize. But I tell him that, in saying this, he destroys his own church. He and his brethren have no "official grace."

I hold in my hand a volume of sermons, "By G. T. Chapman, D.D., of the Protestant Episcopal Church," the church from which my friend's church came. Of the ordination of Thomas Coke, he says: "But if, by this imposition of hands, anything more was intended than the blessing of a good old man upon his fellow-laborer in the ministry, or, if the word superintendent was designed to be used as synonymous with bishop, then we are called upon to believe the strange anomaly that one presbyter, as Mr. Wesley styles himself in the instrument, can advance another to a higher order in the priesthood than he himself possessed." (Page 113.) And Dr. Coke came over to the United States and claimed to be a bishop, by virtue of the private laying on of Mr. Wesley's hands in his bed-chamber, and ordained Francis Asbury to be a bishop also. But Dr. Coke, the father of the American Episcopal Methodist Church, had no confidence in his ordination; for, six years after, he applied to Bishop White, of Philadelphia, an Episcopalian Bishop, to be ordained again, but for some cause was refused.

So, according to my friend's argument, he and his church have no authority to preach or baptize, and their claim to apostolic succession is simply ridiculous.

As to what Mr. Brooks says about the kingdom of Christ being the same as the literal kingdom of David, I can only say now that the position is preposterous. No commentator or Bible critic of any denomination agrees

with him. The learned world and the common sense of mankind are against him, and with me, upon this subject. But, as the Scripture he has quoted upon this subject will all come up again, I will attend to them then.

Now, you will bear in mind that he has not attempted to answer one of my arguments. He has quoted a great many texts of Scripture at random, most of which has no more reference to the question in debate than a wagon to a State-house. I will only notice one more text quoted by Mr. Brooks, and then resume my affirmative argument.

He quoted Daniel ii: 44, and said, with an air of peculiar triumph: "By this I will cut the throat of his whole system!" This threat was rather alarming! He then went on to interpret the prophecy thus: The kingdom that the God of heaven set up was the kingdom or Church of Christ, and was in existence in the days of Daniel. He asserted that it destroyed three of the universal monarchies seen in the vision, before Christ was born.

Now, I affirm that such an interpretation of this prophecy is unheard of. No interpreter of prophecy, or theologian of any denomination, agrees with him. Every man of them are with me, and against Mr. Brooks. But, then, it is a contradiction of facts. "Days of these kings." What kings? Mr. Brooks would make you believe that Babylon, the Medo-Persian and Macedonian kingdoms, are referred to; and that these three universal monarchies were all destroyed by the kingdom of Christ, before he was born!

But, I tell you, my friends, that such is not and can not be the meaning of the prophet. Daniel lived in the days of the Babylonian captivity, and while that kingdom was at the zenith of its power and glory. This was the first of the four, and perished by the hands of Cyrus, the great captain of the Medes and Persians, and not, as Mr. Brooks tells us, by the Church of Christ. And the Persian em-

pire was destroyed by Philip and Alexander, and the Grecian monarchy established in its place—which was the third kingdom of the vision. And this third kingdom was destroyed by the Romans, as all know; and the great Roman empire, or fourth and iron kingdom of the vision, was established upon its ruins.

And the prophet is speaking of the fourth kingdom, and its series of sovereigns, the Caesars, when he says: "And in the days of these kings, the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom," etc. It was an event yet future when Daniel lived and spoke—"shall set up." This kingdom of Christ was not and could not be set up till three of the kingdoms of the vision had perished, and the fourth inaugurated. The first three were destroyed by pagan governments, and before Christ was born. And the fourth kingdom was to be broken in pieces and destroyed by the kingdom of Christ.

And we know that Christ was born in the days of the Roman empire, and his kingdom was set up on the day of Pentecost, when the Roman empire was at the zenith of its glory; and it made the conquest of pagan Rome when Constantine the Great was converted, and the Christian religion protected and established by the empire. In view of all authentic history, such a statement as that just made by Mr. Brooks is perfectly reckless, and in defiance of the well-established rules of interpretation. And, instead of "cutting the throat" of my proposition, as he said it would, it only proves that he is unworthy of confidence as an expounder of the Bible! This prophecy fully establishes my proposition.

III. My third argument is based upon the fact that the church of which I am a member has the same government as that established in the primitive church by the inspired apostles. This fact is so well known that my opponent will not venture to call it in question. The divine gov-

ernment established in the apostolic church, was very simple. The apostles themselves administered the government for a time; but, when the number of the disciples was greatly multiplied, it became necessary that they should be relieved, in part, of the labor imposed upon them. And, at their suggestion, seven deacons were chosen, and set apart to "serve tables"—to see that the widows were not neglected in the daily distribution of food, etc.

After this the apostles gave themselves more fully to preaching the Gospel. But, when persecution had scattered all the disciples abroad, except the apostles, they, the disciples, went everywhere, preaching the word. These disciples were not ordained preachers, but simply disciples of Christ—male and female. They preached the Gospel, and constituted churches, wherever they went. If Mr. Brooks had been there, he would have said to those disciples: "Cease your labors! *You* have no authority to preach the word and baptize, as you are not in orders! Your work is *all bogus!*"

But the apostles approved the work of these zealous disciples; and elders were chosen in every church, to administer the laws of the Lord; not to make laws. "Not to lord it over God's heritage," but to be examples to the flocks. In every church, there were a plurality of elders, or overseers, or bishops. (All these names being used by the apostles to designate the same officer.) Paul addresses the church at Philippi thus: "To all the saints in Christ Jesus who are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." So, the apostle directed Timothy and Titus to ordain overseers and deacons in every church where they labored as evangelists. And the same fact is seen in the case of the elders of Ephesus, who, at Paul's request, visited him at Miletus.

Now, the church of which I am a member has precisely

the same government as may be seen in all the organized congregations of the Christian brotherhood:—overseers, or elders, to feed the flocks and take the oversight of the spiritual interests of the congregation; and deacons to serve the church by taking charge of her temporal interests. We have no lordly bishops by divine right, "lording it over God's heritage, and claiming to be the successors of the apostles, and vicars of Christ." But I shall have something more to say upon the "succession question" in my next. But, in the mean time, I want my friend Mr. Brooks to respond to my arguments. Never mind Abraham and the babies now; they will come in tomorrow, and I will be with him then. [Time expired.]

First Day.—First Proposition.—January 28, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' SECOND REPLY—(30 MINUTES)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I think you all see how Mr. Mathes has failed to make out his case. He says that he does not unchurch anybody—that he acknowledges that there are pious and good people in all the denominations. Then, why does he oppose, abuse and lampoon, the sects? He is inconsistent with himself!

But he still argues that the Church of Christ was "founded by Christ and the apostles;" though, mind you now, in taking such a position he contradicts the Bible! Christ says, "On this rock I will *build* my church"—not make a new church, as Mr. Mathes contends, but *increase, enlarge, and strengthen* his church which had been in existence ever since the days of Abraham, as I have fully proved already.

But I will further prove it by reading Webster's definition of the word "BUILD." He says: "*Build—to increase, to strengthen, to extend.*" But Mr. Mathes tries to make you believe that *to build* means to *erect a new church*, of

new materials—to bring materials together for the first time, upon a new foundation! But you see, now, Mr. Mathes not only contradicts the Bible, but also Noah Webster! I am, indeed, astonished to hear him do so, as he is a smart man, and a great man, and ought to know better. But he does not like my definition of the church. Well, I can't help that. Neither do I like his definition of it; so, then, you see we are even! I have as good a right to define words as he has. He does unchurch everybody who does not belong to his own sect, and he can not avoid the conclusion. I maintain that the Methodist Episcopal Church, of which I am a member, and whom I have the honor of representing in this debate, is a *part* of the Church of Christ, and that the Presbyterian and Episcopal churches are also parts of the Church of Christ, and just as good as Methodists. All denominations who have a regular succession in the ministry from the apostles, are equal to each other, and parts of the Church of Christ. No one of them is *the church*; but, taken altogether, they constitute the church, or kingdom, of Christ, which was organized in the family of Abraham.

I do not claim for the Methodist Episcopal Church the *succession* through bishops, as it is claimed by the Episcopal and Romish churches. It is true, however, that they are in the regular line of the succession, and are, therefore, parts of the church universal. But we do claim that the Methodist Church is also in the line of the regular apostolic succession, though we claim only through "PRESBYTERS," the second order in the ministry. But my friend Mr. Mathes, and his church, have no valid claim to the *succession*, nor any legal ordinations. They sprung from the Baptists, and the Baptists in this country had their origin in old Zeke Holliman, an unbaptized layman.

Zeke Holliman baptized Roger Williams, and then Williams turned round and baptized Zeke! And they then

started the Baptist Church in the United States! Now, will any one pretend to say that such baptism is valid? I once debated with a very tall, rough man, who said: "If a man, in good faith, and in case of necessity, where he could get no one to baptize him, should do as John Smith did—that is, go down into the water, and pronouncing the formula of baptism, should immerse himself—his baptism would be valid!" Now, mind you, this tall man was one of the prominent preachers of my friend's church, and, of course, it is the doctrine of his sect!

Mr. Mathes declares, that the doctrine of the regular apostolic succession in the ministry is a *delusion*. And he says: "Even if it could be proved, it would amount to nothing,"—that the whole thing is a fable! But I charge that when he destroys the apostolic succession in the ministry, he will destroy the Church of Christ, and make Christ a liar; for he says, the "gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

But Mr. Mathes charges, that the bishops and clergy of the Methodist Church have no legal ordination, and, consequently, they have no authority to preach and baptize, according to my doctrine on the succession. And, to prove that we have no ordination, he has read from a book published by one of our enemies.

Now, this is not fair. But, the truth is, and Mr. Mathes ought to know it, that Mr. Wesley was a presbyter of the Church of England, and, of course, had a right to ordain others to the same office. Doctor Coke and Francis Asbury were ordained to be presbyters. It is true, that they were styled "bishops," but then, bishops, elders and presbyters, were terms used in the Scriptures to indicate the same offices in the church. And, the fact that they were presbyters, proves that they were entitled to be called bishops, and that they had a right to ordain others to the same office, which they did, and the regular succes-

sion has come down to us. We have, then, a right to preach and administer the ordinances.

I deny that *sect* means *heresy*; and I will now prove that it means no such thing. "But we desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest; for, as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against." (Act xxviii: 22.) Now, the *sect* here referred to, was the Church of Christ, and St. Paul defended it. Now, you can all see that Mr. Mathes is wrong in his position, and that I am right in my position. Sectarianism is *not heresy*, as Mr. Mathes affirms.

In speaking of Daniel ii: 44, Mr. Mathes has ruined his cause! He has contradicted the Bible. He has now set his foot in it, and I will hold him to it? Daniel the prophet lived in the days of the Babylonian kingdom, and he declares that the *stone church* will "break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms."- Three of them were destroyed before Christ was born. This proves that the Church of Christ, as an organism, existed in the days of the kingdom of Babylon. Yet, Mr. Mathes has tried to make you believe that the three kingdoms which fell before the birth of Christ, were destroyed by other pagan nations, and that the Church of Christ had nothing to do with their destruction! In so saying, he flatly contradicts the Bible! You see, now, how my friend's cause labors!

But Mr. Mathes charges that the chain of apostolic succession is a *broken* chain, links of which are entirely lost! And that, even if it were sound, still it would be worthless, as many of the popes and bishops who constitute links in the chain, were desperately wicked men. But, I answer, the apostolic succession in the ministry is essential to the very existence of the church. Christ promised that the "gates of hell shall not prevail against the church;" which would be *false*, and Christ a liar, if the regular chain of apostolic succession in the ministry is broken! It is fair, therefore, to *presume* that the chain

of ordination has been preserved '*perfect* from the apostles down to the present time; as no one can perform valid baptism unless he has been regularly ordained to the work of the ministry by those who are in the regular line of the succession from the apostles. Now, you see where my friend Mr. Mathes and his church stand. They have no foundation, and their organization is *bogus!*

As to the bad character of many of the succession popes and bishops of Rome, and the charge made by Mr. Mathes, that even a wicked woman ruled the church for some two years as pope, and must, therefore, be counted as a link in the chain of succession, I need say but little. Now, what if that is all true; it amounts to nothing. I am, indeed, surprised that Mr. Mathes should be guilty of such quibbling upon such small matters! Why, I might admit all that he has charged upon these popes and bishops, and the woman too, and still it would not weigh a feather against my position. The validity of an official act does not depend upon the virtue or moral goodness of the man who performs it. It depends *alone* upon his being in "orders." If he belongs to the regular succession in the ministry, his acts are valid and right—no matter how black may be his character, morally and religiously.

But, to save his cause, if possible, Mr. Mathes would deny the validity of all ordinations performed by wicked men, though their regular succession in the ministry could be proved. Who ever heard the like! Why, such doctrine would lead us to repudiate all the baptisms performed by bad and wicked men! Then, if a preacher proves himself to have been a bad man, all those who have been baptized by him would have to be *re-baptized!* We could find an example of a minister in this town who proved to be a bad man; and, of course, all baptized by him should be baptized again, if Mr. Mathes is correct.

But the Methodists attach no importance to the moral

character of the administrator, in determining the validity of his acts. The great and *only* question in the premises is, "Is he in ORDERS?" He must be "called of God, as was Aaron," and then all his acts are valid; and no amount of subsequent wicked conduct can make his calling void, or render his official acts invalid.

I now proceed to prove that the Jewish and Christian churches are one and the same church. For this purpose I will read the following Scripture: "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." (Isaiah xlix: 15.) But Mr. Mathes contends that God did forget his church, and that he actually killed his wife, or, that he suffered her to die a natural death! What a horrid doctrine! It is most astonishing that a man so thoroughly posted as Mr. Mathes is, should proclaim such a monstrous doctrine. [Time expired.]

First Day.—First Proposition.—January 28, 1868.

MR. MATHES' THIRD SPEECH—(30 MINUTES)

MR. PRESIDENT, MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: As this is my last speech on this proposition. I will notice, very briefly, a few things said by Mr. Brooks in his last speech, before resuming my regular argument; and I must be permitted to say that he has utterly failed to meet a single argument that I have offered, unless his bold assertions and frothy declamations may be considered a reply. But, has he not evaded the real issue? I take it as presumptive evidence of the strength of my cause, and the weakness of the negative, as advocated by Mr. Brooks.

He charges me with contradicting the Bible, because I

affirm that the Church of Christ was "founded by Christ and his apostles." But how can this be a contradiction of the Bible? It is precisely in accordance with the teaching of the Bible. Who so likely to *found* the church as Christ himself, who is its Head. But he says he thinks, according to my position, "the gates of hell have prevailed against it." Now, so far from this passage contradicting my position, it fully sustains it, and proves that I am right. The church was not yet *founded* when Christ made this promise, or he would not have said, "I *will* build my church." According to Mr. Brooks' theory, Jesus would have said, "Upon this rock my church was *founded* in the days of Abraham." It is Mr. Brooks who contradicts the Bible, and not I. Jesus says, "I will build my church." My friend seems to say, "Lord, thou art mistaken; the church was built or founded in the days of Abraham, nearly two thousand years before thy advent into the world!"

Jesus Christ was the foundation. But as a "foundation stone" he had to be *tried* before the church was built upon him. He must die upon the cross, be buried, and his spirit go into hades, or the unseen world. "The gates of hades" are not the powers of evil, as my friend, with some others, seem to understand it; but simply *death* and the *grave*. And the resurrection of Christ, on the third day, was the fulfillment of the promise. "The gates of hell (*hades*) shall not prevail against it;" that is, against the foundation—the confession made by Peter. "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." And by this great trial he became a "*tried* stone," a sure foundation for the church, upon which it was built on the day of the Pentecost. And as the greater always includes the lesser, so the promise concerning the foundation includes also the church built upon it; and a resurrection from the dead, is secured to every Christian.

Mr. Brooks seems not satisfied with what he had advanced on the word "*build*;" and comes forward now with what he calls Webster's definition of the word, which is, to "*extend, increase*" But why did he not tell us that this was Webster's third meaning? The first meaning of "*build*" as given by Webster, is, "*To frame, construct, to raise, as an edifice; to form by uniting materials into a regular structure.*" Now, this first meaning is the one we attach to it in this passage, and the whole context shows that this is the true meaning of the passage. And, as Jesus said, "Upon this rock I *will build* my church," it is clear that the organization of the Church of Christ was an event then future, and my position on the subject right.

Now, what confidence can this audience have in the religious honesty of a man who will attempt to palm off upon them a far-off figurative *third* meaning" of a word, as Webster's definition of the word? and that, too, without any intimation that Webster had given any other meaning? It is monstrous!

But Mr. Brooks affirms again, for the twentieth time, that the Church of Christ was founded in the days of Abraham. I have again and again called for the proof, and none has been given. He has given us any amount of assertion; but this is no proof.

Mr. Brooks says that he does not claim for the Methodist Episcopal Church the regular apostolic succession of bishops. That is well; for they have no such succession. But he seems to think that they have some show for a succession through presbyters. But this dodge will not save his cause; for I have already proved that Mr. Brooks, and the Methodist Episcopal Church, whose mouth-piece he is, have no valid claim even to that. Dr. Coke and F. Asbury claimed to be BISHOPS, not presbyters; and they pretended 'to make others bishops. And all this was done by virtue of an assumed authority, and official grace, not rec-

ognized by any one. It was fraud upon the world! And, according to Mr. Brooks' admission, and this history of the rise of Methodism in this country, Methodist preachers to-day have no valid ordination; and, consequently, no proper authority to preach or baptize, as ministers of the Gospel.

But Mr. Brooks charges that I and my brethren get all our authority from the Baptists; and the Baptists, he says, spring from old Zeke Holliman, an unbaptized and unordained layman; and, of course, the Baptists have neither authority nor official grace. This is a great mistake, so far as we are concerned. Some of our brethren came from the Baptists, some from the Presbyterians, and a great many from the Methodists and other sects. And, in coming, we brought away with us all the authority and official grace that any of the sects could bestow by their ordination and baptism.

But we attach no importance to such authority and official grace. We claim no authority from the Baptists, nor any other sect, to preach or baptize, or to do anything else. We get all our authority from the Lord himself, through his word and his church. But Mr. Brooks reasserts that *sect* does not mean *heresy*, and quotes the language of the Jews of Rome to Paul. (Acts xxviii: 22): "For as concerning this SECT, we know that everywhere it is spoken against." But this proves nothing against my position. The Jews hated the church, and called it a *sect*, using the term in the sense of "*heresy*" But Paul does not admit that the church was a sect. It was simply a malicious charge, made by the enemies of the Church of Christ. And, strange to say, Mr. Brooks quotes it as good authority against the Church of Christ now!

Not satisfied with his arguments based upon Daniel ii: 44, my friend Mr. Brooks has tried his hand on it again, with, however, no better success than before. He

reaffirms the monstrous absurdity that "three of the universal kingdoms of the vision were actually destroyed by the Church of Christ, before Christ was born!"

Now, let us look at this again for a moment. Four universal kingdoms were seen in the vision. These were—1, Babylon; 2, Medo-Persian; 3, Macedonian; 4, Roman, or iron kingdom. The first three were destroyed before Christ was born, but not by the Church of Christ. The Babylonian kingdom was destroyed by Cyrus, who was a pagan idolator. The Medo-Persian kingdom was overrun and destroyed by Philip and Alexander, both pagans. And the Macedonian was destroyed by the Romans, who were pagan idolators too. Every one who has read history knows that the above statement of the case is true. With what face, then, does Mr. Brooks stand up before this intelligent audience and *assert* what all authentic history contradicts?

But the Roman empire, after it had subdued the Macedonian kingdom, was established, and became the iron kingdom of the vision. This kingdom was afterward divided into ten divisions, corresponding with the ten toes of the image seen in the vision.

It was in the days of these kings—that is, in the days of the Caesars—that the kingdom of Christ was set up. And we know that the Roman empire was at the zenith of its power and glory when Christ was born. It is, therefore, absurd to talk of the Church of Christ destroying Babylon, Persia, and Macedon. It is not only a contradiction of all history, but it contradicts the Bible. The Church of Christ destroyed pagan Rome, according to the prophecy, by converting it to Christianity. This forever sets aside all Mr. Brooks' quibbling upon the subject.

But Mr. Brooks says that he might admit all that I have said about the wickedness and profanity of the popes and bishops of Rome, and of England, male and female, and

still maintain his position on the uninterrupted succession in the ministry from the apostles down to the ministers of the Methodist Church of the present day! Now, I regard this as admitting all the wickedness that I have charged upon them. He does not dare to deny it. Let it be understood, then, by all, that Mr. Brooks, the chosen organ of Methodism in this discussion, admits that many of the popes, bishops and priests, who constitute links in this wonderful unbroken chain of succession from the apostles, were corrupt and wicked men, and that a corrupt and licentious woman (Joan) ruled the church for some two years, from 853 to 855, forming a link in the chain of ordination.

Now, what do you think of this chain? And what do you think of the ordination that comes down through such a corrupt channel? Mr. Wesley calls these succession-bishops, "HEATHEN PRIESTS, AND MITERED INFIDELS." What a lovely source from which to receive "official grace!" Yet Mr. Brooks claims nothing better. But I will not dwell upon this. I have proved that this pretended apostolic succession is a *delusion*. But the Church of Christ rests not upon "heathen priests, and mitered infidels" for authority to disciple the nations: we get our authority from the word of God.

But Mr. Brooks says that, according to my teaching, "God killed his wife," or suffered her to die a natural death; and he challenges me to the proof. I accept the challenge. "And ye shall leave your name for a curse unto my chosen; for the Lord God shall slay thee, and call his servants by another name." The thing to be slain was the church under the old covenant; and the "chosen," who are to be called by *another name*, were the disciples of Christ, "called Christians first in Antioch." Thus I have fully sustained my position.

I will now resume my argument:

IV. My fourth argument is: THAT WE WALK BY THE SAME

RULE. The word of God *alone*, as delivered to the church in the beginning by the inspired apostles, was the only rule of faith and practice of the primitive church; and after the death of the apostles, no human creed or confession of faith for the government of the church was made or adopted till the fourth century. Peter says: "According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness." (II Peter i: 3.) And the Church of Christ, of which I am a member, does precisely the same thing. We have made no human Creed, Confession of Faith, or book of Discipline; being fully satisfied with the divine rule—the word of God *alone*. In everything concerning the religion of Christ, and the government of the church, we make our appeal to the "Law of the Lord, which is perfect," and all willingly submit to the divine behest. And we pledge ourselves, before heaven and earth, most cheerfully to give up any and every item of our faith and practice for which we can not produce authority from the word of God.

V. My fifth argument is: THAT WE HAVE THE SAME ORDER OF WORSHIP. The proper day for the observance of the social worship is, "the first day of the week," as Christ rose from the dead on this day. On this blessed day we assemble to worship God, according to apostolic example and the fitness of things; and when thus assembled, we attend—

1. To the apostles' teaching, by reading the word of God, with or without remarks at the time;
2. To prayer; in which the congregation most heartily joins;
3. The overseers of the congregation then feed the flock with such instruction drawn from the word of God as they may judge suitable to the occasion and the audience; or, if an evangelist be present, a discourse, founded upon some portion of Scripture, is delivered;

4. The breaking of the loaf. We also attend regularly to the "breaking of the loaf," in memory of the broken body of the Lord, and taking the cup in memory of his "shed blood." This we do upon the first day of every week;

5. The fellowship. We also attend regularly to "the fellowship," or contribution. In this way we keep something in the Lord's treasury, for the relief of the poor, and the contingent expenses of the church;

6. We then sing a hymn, and go out.

Now let us inquire if this was the order of worship established in the Jerusalem Church. All will answer in the affirmative. Luke says (Acts ii: 42): "And they continued steadfastly in the apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers." Here we find our order exactly. Any one who will attend any of our "*first-day meetings*" in Bedford, can see this divine order carried out exactly. Therefore we are the same organism.

VI. My sixth argument is: THAT WE HAVE THE SAME SUPREME HEAD. We acknowledge no head but Christ, the risen and glorified Saviour, who now sits at the right hand of God. Paul says that Christ is "made Head over all things to the church, that in all things he might be pre-eminent." Therefore, our position is right. We have the true succession of the Gospel.

VII. My seventh argument is: THAT WE WEAR THE SAME DIVINE NAME—CHRISTIAN. Luke says: "And the disciples were called CHRISTIANS first in Antioch." (Acts xi: 26.)

This NAME was given to the disciples by divine authority, and was worn by the disciples during the first ages of the church, until human creeds came in, and division was inaugurated among them. Peter says: "If any man suffer as a CHRISTIAN, let him not be ashamed." And Agrippa said to Paul: "Almost thou persuadest me to be a CHRISTIAN;—not a Methodist, a Baptist, or a Presbyterian,

but a "CHRISTIAN." And the Church of Christ is called, "The Bride, the Lamb's wife." And, as a dutiful bride, she wears the name of her heavenly husband, and refuses to answer to any other name.

Now, from these seven arguments, none of which have been answered—and I presume will not be, because they are unanswerable—it must be apparent to every candid lady and gentleman in this large and attentive audience, that I have most fully and triumphantly sustained my proposition—That *"the church of which I, J. M. 3fathes, am a member, is the church founded by Christ and the apostles"*

In conclusion, I will call up the points that I have made in sustaining the proposition. I have shown that the "unbroken apostolic succession," as held by Mr. Brooks and others, is a *fable*; and that the true succession we have—which is the succession of the Gospel. I have proved that the church of which I am a member, is the church, by seven *unanswered* and *unanswerable* arguments, as follows:

- I. We are built upon the same foundation.
- II. We have the same faith.
- III. We have the same divine government.
- IV. We walk by the same rule.
- V. We have the same order of worship.
- VI. We have the same glorified HEAD.
- VII. We wear the same divine NAME.

With these seven arguments, and my review of Mr. Brooks' objections, I will now submit my first proposition to your enlightened judgments. I ask every one to lay aside his prejudice, if he has any, and judge us fairly and candidly, by the law and the testimony. "If they speak not according to this, it is because there is no light in them."

Mr. Brooks will follow me in his closing reply; but, ac-

according to the rules which we have adopted for the government of this discussion, he can introduce no new matter. We shall, no doubt, have a good deal of boasting of what he has done, and what he is going to do. But you all know that *noise* and *assumption* are not argument, and, therefore, prove nothing. [Time expired.]

First Day.—First Proposition.—January 28, 1868. '

MR. BROOKS' THIRD REPLY—(30 MINUTES)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am very much pleased to find that we are getting along so well. My friend Mr. Mathes has now fully committed himself, and can not take it back, as he has made his last speech on this first proposition. So, you see now, he has exhausted his ammunition. You have heard the? very best and strongest thing that can be said in favor of his proposition. And, mind you now, he has failed to sustain it—not for the want of learning or talent; for Mr. Mathes is a man of talent. He is a representative man. He has done all that any man of his church could have done to sustain the cause he advocates. But he has entirely failed, because the cause he advocates can not be maintained.

I am glad that Mr. Mathes admits my ability to do justice to my side of this debate. He admits that I am a sharp man, and an able debater—a "*perfect walking library*" And I am happy to know, and publish to this large audience, that my Methodist brethren recognize me as their representative. I am their "mouth-piece," and they are "PROUD OF ME!" And I take pleasure in thus publicly saying that I regard Mr. Mathes, not only as an able debater, but as an honorable man, and the most perfect gen-

tleman that I ever met in debate; and I have held a number of debates.

But, I must now attend to the arguments of my friend, and then sum up my own argument, and close the discussion upon this first proposition, as this is my last reply.

Notwithstanding all that Mr. Mathes has said about the succession in the ministry, and the validity of baptism and ordination in his own church, I charge again, that Mr. Mathes and his church have no lawful ordination, and can perform no valid baptism. They are not the church of Christ, or any part of it, and are, therefore, "off the track." They have no authority to preach, or administer the ordinances. Their claim is *bogus!* They came from the Baptists, as already stated, and the Baptists are without any properly ordained ministry, and can not impart to others what they have not themselves. The stream can never rise higher than its fountain, and, therefore, Mr. Mathes and his brethren have no valid ordination; for the Baptists, who are the fountain from whence they draw all the official grace that they have, had none themselves, and could impart none.

I have proved that the church has been the same under all dispensations, and was founded in the days of Abraham, And I am very happy to be able still further to establish this by a witness of very high authority. I hold in my hand a number of the "Christian Record," of which Mr. Mathes was then, and is now, the editor and proprietor. I suppose it will be received as good authority in this discussion. Mr. Mathes is often addressed by persons who ask him questions upon various subjects; and he seems to be always ready to answer. He is a sort of oracle, at which they inquire, and he is always ready to give them needful light.

In this case, one John King asked him the meaning of Romans xi: 16-20. In this passage Paul speaks of the

tame and wild olive-trees. [Here Mr. Mathes asked Mr. Brooks what number of the Record he was about to read from; and was informed by one of Mr. Brooks' friends that it was the June number of 1859.] Mr. Brooks, resuming—Here Mr. Mathes, in his answer, sustains my position. He answers, that "Abraham was the trunk of the tame olive-tree, and his fleshly descendants were the 'natural branches.'" Some of these natural branches were broken off because of their unbelief in Christ; that the Gentiles who believed and obeyed the Gospel were the "branches of the wild olive-trees, and who, contrary to nature, were grafted into Abraham, among the good olive branches, by faith." So, you see now, that he has set his foot in it.

But I differ with Mr. Mathes about this tame olive-tree. He takes the position, as you will see by reading his answer to Mr. King's query, that Christ is the root, Abraham the trunk, and the Jewish people, or Jewish Church, were the natural branches; and when the Jewish Church were broken off from being the children of Abraham, by their unbelief in Jesus Christ, they were not separated from the Jewish Church as such, but from Abraham as the father of the faithful, both Jews and Gentiles; and that the grafting in of the Gentiles, or wild olive, did not make them members of the Jewish Church, but simply "children of Abraham," and heirs according to the promise. Now, mind you, I don't believe this. Mr. Mathes is wrong about the "olive-tree," and the "grafting in." I believe that the Jewish Church, constituted in the days of Abraham, was the trunk, and that when the Gentiles were "grafted in" by faith, they became members of the Jewish or Abrahamic Church.

But Mr. Mathes has again tried to make you believe that I did not give the correct meaning of the word "build," from Webster, and has read the first and second

meanings from Webster, which sustain him in his position upon Matthew xvi: 18. But what of that? I was not aiming to give the common meaning of the word, but the theological meaning, which I affirm is, "to extend, increase, strengthen." It is true, the meaning I read was Webster's *third meaning*; but I *assert* that this is the theological meaning of the word "*build*" as this is just what was done on the day of Pentecost. No new church or kingdom was built; but the old Jewish or Abrahamic Church was only "extended, strengthened and increased."

But Mr. Mathes says that the expression, "Kingdom of David," is a figurative expression, and is applied to the kingdom of Christ, simply because Christ was "of the seed of David according to the flesh." But if that be so, then we have a figurative church, a figurative king, and a figurative membership composing the kingdom. You see now what a fix he has got himself into. But Mr. Mathes wishes me to tell how the three thousand Jews could be "added" on the day of Pentecost, if they were always in the church? I answer: God had turned all the Jews out of the church, except the "hundred and twenty," before the day of Pentecost; and, of course, when they were converted, they simply joined back again, and were added to the old Abrahamic Church. This is just as plain as the nose on a man's face, and you see that my nose is very plain on my face. Christ came to reform his church, not to organize a new one.

But Mr. Mathes still contends that the word *sect* means "*heresy*." I will read you a passage from his sermon on "Union," from the Western Preacher. Now, mind you, this is Mr. Mathes' own language. He says:

"But, some one is ready to ask, which one of all the evangelical sects is right? We answer, none of them. We know of no evangelical sects. You might as well talk to us of 'evangelical heresy,' evangelical witchcraft, evan-

gical idolatry, evangelical strife, or even evangelical drunkenness. Sectarianism is *heresy*, and Paul classes heresy with the works of the flesh." Gal. v: 19-21.

Now, you see that Mr. Mathes says that you are all wrong, and to be classed with drunkards, witches and idolators; yet he claims to have charity for us all. But you see now what difficulties he has got himself into. But I do not blame him: he has done the very best that can be done for his cause; and he is an able man, and the leader of his church in Indiana.

But he says that the church under the old dispensation was slain, and a new one organized under another name and upon a new foundation, and quotes Isaiah lxx: 15, to prove it. But this can not be so; as I have abundantly proved that the church under the old covenant will continue as long as time shall endure. Jesus says: "I am the vine; ye are the branches." Therefore, the church was in existence in the days of Christ's sojourn on earth; and the "tame olive-tree" fully sustains this position. The olive-tree was not Abraham, as Mr. Mathes teaches; but it represents the Jewish Church under the old covenant, and the Gentiles were grafted into it by faith.

Who called the disciples "Christians?" I say, it was not God, but their enemies. I will now read from Dr. Clark's Commentary, and we shall see that I am sustained in my position on Daniel ii: 44. [Reads from A. Clark.] Dr. Clark says that the three kingdoms were destroyed before Christ was born, and *I* affirm that they were destroyed by the Church of Christ. To what were the three thousand added, if the church was not in existence before that day? I know Mr. Mathes contends that the Church of Christ was organized on the morning of Pentecost, composed of the one hundred and twenty disciples who were ready, and the three thousand who were baptized on that day were added to them; but he did not prove it, and I deny it.

But if Mr. Mathes is correct in his teaching, then the damnation of all infants who die in infancy is certain. I do not say that Mr. Mathes believes this; but such is the inevitable consequence of his doctrine. But Mr. Mathes contends that his church is the Church of Christ, because they have the same faith and practice with the primitive church, and wear the same name, and are built upon the same foundation. Well, I might admit all this—that, as an organism, they are built upon the same foundation, have the same faith, order of worship, government, Gospel, and name; and still I maintain that they are not the church of Christ, or any part of it: because they have no "official grace"—no apostolical succession, and do not claim it. And I have proved that no church can be the Church of Christ who can not show an uninterrupted line of ministerial succession from the apostles.

I have also proved that no church was organized on the day of Pentecost; but that the old church, constituted in the family of Abraham, still existed, and was "extended and enlarged" on the day of Pentecost. I have also proved that infants were members of the church from the days of Abraham; and there being no law to put them out, they are still members of the church. But there are no infants in my friend's church, and, therefore, it can not be the Church of Christ.

Thus, you see that Mr. Mathes, with all his talents as a debater, has entirely failed to make out his case. I am but a small Methodist preacher, and if I can handle with so much ease a man of Mr. Mathes' ability—for I acknowledge that he is a man of fine ability and learning—what would he do if one of our great men were to debate with him? Why, he would be nowhere; not for the want of talents in him, but because his cause is bad, and can not be maintained. [Time expired.]

Second Day.—Second Proposition.—January 29, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' FIRST SPEECH—(45 MINUTES.)

PROP. II "Infants of believing parents are entitled to membership and baptism in the Church of Christ." Affirmative, Mr. Brooks; Negative, Mr. Mathes.

MR. PRESIDENT: I will in the first place define the difference between Pedobaptist and Baptist churches. I will read the Scriptural definition of the word church. "It is a legally organized body of people under the law of God, including both adults and infants as members." The Baptist idea of a church excludes infants from the church. But I affirm that the church, under both dispensations, is one and the same identical church. This is a great point, and I expect to fully prove it to-day; and if I succeed in this, then my proposition is established.

There was a church in the days of Moses, as is shown in Acts vii: 38: "This is he that was in the church in the wilderness, with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sinai, and with our fathers; who received the lively oracles to give unto us." Moses was in that church, and, mark you, it was *the* church, not *a* church. In Psalms xxii: 25: "My praise shall be of thee in the great congregation." In Heb. ii: 12, this passage in Psalms is referred to by the apostle when he says: "In the midst of the church will I sing praises unto thee." These passages prove the identity of the church; that is, that the church has been the same in all ages, and under all dispensations.

This issue is not now on the *mode* or design of baptism; these will come up in their proper order. What we now have on hand, is the right of infants of believing parents to membership and baptism in the Church of Christ. Jesus regarded infants as members, for he says: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of

such is the kingdom of heaven." I affirm that the kingdom of heaven here means the church, for the Saviour so uses the phrase in Matthew xvi: 18,19, where he speaks of "building his church," and of giving to Peter the "keys of the kingdom of heaven." Here the terms *church* and *kingdom of heaven* are convertible terms.

In Matthew viii: 11, 12, we are taught that the kingdom of heaven existed in the days of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; or, in other words, the church existed then. In Matthew xviii: 1, Jesus answers the question, "who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" He "called a little child unto him, and set him in the midst of them, and said, Verily I say unto you, except ye be converted, and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." By this passage we see that the Saviour regarded little children as *then in* the kingdom of heaven; or, in other words, in the church. The same idea is expressed in Matthew xix: 13, when the Saviour put his hands on little children and prayed. They were in the church, or kingdom of heaven. The same is referred to in Luke xviii: 15, where they are called infants by the Saviour.

The children under the new dispensation are exactly in the same condition as they were under the old covenant, as shown by Jeremiah xxx: 20: "Their children also shall be as aforetime, and their congregation shall be established before me, and I will punish all that oppress them." Here it is shown by the prophet that their children, under the new covenant, *shall be as aforetime*; that is, as they were under the old dispensation. This proves that, as they were *in* the church under the old covenant, so they should be in the church now. And I call upon Mr. Mathes to show us a law turning infants out of the church. But, mind you now, he can not do it.

In John x: 16, we are told there is "One fold, and one

shepherd." Does the shepherd put the old sheep into the fold, and leave the lambs out in the cold, exposed to the danger of being devoured by wolves? If I command a man to put my sheep into the fold, would he obey my command if he were to separate the lambs from the flock, and put the old sheep in the sheepfold, and leave the lambs out? Certainly not. I would discharge a man from my service at once who would so disregard my authority.

The term *sheep* embraces the lambs as well as the big sheep. But, according to my friend Mr. Mathes, the lambs must be left out in the cold, because it does not say in so many words, "the lambs must be put up with the old sheep." Yet everybody knows that the lambs are included in the term *sheep*: and where one is to go, the other is to go also. So we see that infants and parents are to be in the church together; no separation—where the believing parents are, their infant children are to be with them. Children are commanded to "obey their parents in the Lord;" that is, in the church. And so the wise man expressed it in Proverbs xxii: 6: "Train up a child in the way he should go; and when he is old, he will not depart from it." By this expression, the wise man certainly means, "train up your children *in the church*."

I observe again about the sheepfold, that lambs have a MARK. But Mr. Mathes and his party will not allow them to be *marked*! He will permit the old sheep to be marked, but the lambs he will keep out of the fold, among the wolves, *unmarked*, until they become old sheep! But we mark them all, lambs as well as the old sheep. Now, you see the difference between us.

Again, there is no express command from the Lord *forbidding* infants to be baptized; but I admit there is no express command from the Lord to baptize infants; and I affirm that there is no express command to baptize adults! The great commission does not command the baptizing of

adults; but Peter says, on the day of Pentecost (Act ii: 39): "The promise is unto you, and to your children." Then, according to Peter, whatever is promised to parents, is promised also to their children—that is, infants.

But, in order to show you that there was a church in existence in the days of the prophet Isaiah, I will read Isaiah xxviii: 16: "Therefore thus saith the Lord God, Behold, I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone," etc. Here was a "ZION" *then* in existence—a church then in operation when the prophet wrote, as he uses the present tense. Not *to be* founded several hundred years after, on the day of Pentecost, but *then*, in the present tense. But Mr. Mathes will say it was to be established away off in the future. But this contradicts the Scriptures; for the prophet says: "I lay in Zion," *now*, in the present tense.

It is also said, that "Jesus came to his own and they received him not." That is, he came to his own church, and they received him not. And, of course, the church existed before he came, or he could not have come to it. It is impossible to come to a thing that has no existence at the time. Again, Psalms ii: 6: "Yet have I set my king upon my holy hill of Zion." Here a "holy hill of Zion" is spoken of, which proves that the church was in existence in the time of David; and hence I have proved the identity of the church in both dispensations. And as the one had infants in it, so must the other also.

The church is called the "Commonwealth of Israel," in Eph. iii: 11, 12; showing that it extended back to Israel, and then had infants in it, as when the apostle wrote. The prophets were in the foundation, as expressed in the twentieth verse: "Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets." This proves that the church under the Gospel is identically the same church that existed under the Old Testament, in which the prophets were members.

The same idea is expressed in Mark xi: 12, when the multitude cried, as the Saviour was riding into Jerusalem in triumph, "Blessed be the kingdom of our father David, that cometh in the name of the Lord." It is called "The kingdom of our father David." In John i: 49, Christ is called the "King of Israel." He was not a literal king, but a spiritual king. The wise men said, "Where is he that is born king of the Jews?" And, again, the prophet Micah says: "Out of thee shall he come forth unto me, that is to be ruler in Israel." (Chap, iv: 2.) He was to be a governor; he was to rule under both dispensations.

In I Cor. x: i, Paul says: "All our fathers were baptized unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea." Here was a church, and a pure church, too; for all were baptized, the children as well as the old ones, or adults. They were then pure, though they backslid afterward.

The first society that opposed infant baptism, was formed no further back than 1522, as shown by Dr. Wall, in his History of Infant Baptism. The opposition to infant baptism was made by the Anabaptists of Germany. It is true that Tertullian advised the delay of infant baptism. He said, if the infant was about to die, it ought to be baptized.

I admit that a sect of the Albigenses also opposed infant baptism about the year 1320; but this does not prove that infant church-membership, and infant baptism, are not of divine authority. It only proves that those who opposed it were not orthodox.

Infant baptism, then, is the doctrine of the Bible, or there is no church. With infant baptism and membership, the Church of Christ stands or falls. No one has a right to baptize another, who has not been baptized himself. The opposition to infant baptism has grown up outside of the church, not inside of it. It comes from those who have no authority to baptize anybody, and who never received

baptism in the regular way, at the hands of a regularly ordained minister who can trace his succession back to the apostles.

I agree with the Catholics, one of whose authors I read, who says: "If there is no infant baptism, then there is no church—the gates of hell have prevailed against it, and the Saviour's promise has failed." This, however, is impossible, and the church still continues to exist; and, therefore, infants of believing parents have a right to membership and baptism in it.

Now, can't you see it? I affirm that infants have been in the church from the days of Abraham, and, the church being identically the same now that it was then, infants have the divine right to come into the church now with their believing parents. [Time expired.]

Second Day.—Second Proposition.—January 29, 1868.

MR. MATHES' FIRST REPLY—(45 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT, MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I think you must all have noticed one very important feature in Mr. Brooks' speech on this proposition; and that is, he has missed the real issue entirely, and has spent most of his forty-five minutes in quoting a multitude of Scriptures. But he has quoted them loosely. Not one in ten of the Scriptures he has quoted have any reference to the subject in debate. To quote Scripture in abundance, is any easy matter; but to apply it correctly and candidly, is a very different thing. But to show you that Mr. Brooks has entirely missed the issue on the proposition, I observe that he labored mainly to prove that God had a church under the old covenant, and most of his quotations of Scripture were made to prove that. This, however, is

a proposition that nobody disputes. It is not involved in his proposition at all. I suppose he thought it would be easier to prove that God had a church under the old covenant, because it is Scriptural, than to do what he had agreed to do, as his proposition is *unscriptural*.

But Mr. Brooks confounds the covenants made with Abraham. I will state the case plainly. God made two covenants with Abraham,—one in respect to the land of Canaan, and the other in reference to Christ and the Gospel. The Gospel covenant is recorded in Genesis xii: 3. The covenant in respect to the land of Canaan is found in Genesis xiii: 14-18, and parallel passages. The Gospel covenant, though made first with Abraham, is called the "New Covenant," because it was consummated last, at the coming of the Messiah. The land covenant, though made with Abraham last, is called the "Old Covenant," because it was consummated *first*. It was consummated at Sinai. The conditions of the land, or old covenant, were flesh and blood and money. The conditions of the new, or Gospel covenant, are faith and the obedience of faith.

Mr. Brooks is mistaken as to the church being constituted in the immediate family of Abraham. There was no church organized until the covenant made with Abraham was consummated at Sinai. Then, and not till then, was the church constituted. It was done at Sinai, when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, and sprinkled the blood of the covenant upon the book and all the people. All the infants of Jewish parents were in the church by virtue of a flesh and blood relation, and were circumcised the eighth day, not to bring them into the church, but because they were already in it.

But faith is the great condition of the new covenant. And all who come by faith and obedience to the Gospel, enter into the Church of Christ, and become "children of Abraham and heirs according to the promise." Such are

Abraham's spiritual children. The basis of the two covenants are entirely different. Moses was the mediator of the old covenant concerning the land of Canaan; but Christ is the mediator of the new covenant. "A better covenant established on better promises."

Mr. Brooks must prove that these two covenants are one and the same covenant, before he can advance a single step in proving the identity of the Church of Christ with the Jewish Church. His bare assertions will not do; we want Scripture proof. It will be impossible for me to notice, in detail, the multitude of Scripture that he has quoted. I can only notice a few of the most relevant.

I will now notice his definition of the word "build"¹ again, as he enlarged upon it in his closing speech, yesterday. He read again Webster's third meaning of the word, and calls that "the *theological meaning*;" and he argued that when Jesus said, "On this rock I will build my church," he meant "to enlarge and extend" the Jewish Church; and, therefore, he argues, the Jewish and Christian churches are precisely the same. But, by what rule he decides that Webster's third meaning is the *theological meaning*, I know not. He guesses at it, I suppose, because he thinks he can make it suit his purpose best.

Webster's definition is—first, "To frame, construct, and raise, as an edifice of any kind; to form by uniting materials into a regular structure, to fabricate. Second—To raise on a support or foundation; to form, establish or produce by using appropriate means—as to build a reputation. Third—To increase and strengthen; to settle, or establish and preserve."

Now, why does he attempt to impose the third meaning upon you for the *theological meaning*. Does he not know that we are always bound to take the first meaning of a word, unless there is something in the context forbidding it? But the context actually requires the first meaning

of the word " build" in this text; and, therefore, it is the meaning to be taken as the true meaning. His position in regard to the identity of the Jewish and Christian churches, with infants in it, could not be sustained by taking the passage in its obvious and true meaning, and hence this quibbling; but it will avail him nothing. All see its weakness.

" On this rock I will build my church," taken in its obvious and true meaning, forever explodes his speculation about *church identity*. Christ, as a foundation, is called by the prophets "a stone, a tried stone, a sure foundation." This foundation was *tried* when Jesus died upon the cross, and was laid in Joseph's tomb. How could the church be built upon this foundation before it was laid? Men never build a house till the foundation is laid. Evidently, Mr. Brooks is wrong in this whole matter. The great Matthew Henry, a Presbyterian commentator, says, upon this text: "Reference is here made to the truth enunciated by Peter, as the foundation upon which the church was to be built." My friend's position is, therefore, *absurd*.

The Saviour did not *then* give the "keys" to Peter, but promised to do so afterward, when the kingdom was established, on the day of Pentecost. He said to Peter: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven." Again, the kingdom could not exist as an organism till the king was crowned. His coronation was essential to the organization of his kingdom. But he was not coronated king until he ascended up to the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens; and, therefore, his church was not built till the day of Pentecost.

Again, Christ is the Head of the church, and became Head when he ascended to heaven. But Mr. Brooks has the church existing without a Head. But he finds the name "Zion" applied to the Church of Christ, and he

hence argues that it is the same old "Zion" of the former dispensation. But this proves nothing of the kind. Christians are called "The true circumcision," "Israel of God," "Jews inwardly," "Zion," etc.; but this does not prove that Christians and Jews are *identical*, or that "The Israel of God" now, is the same old kingdom of Israel under the law. God the Father presided in the Jewish Church, or kingdom; but "Christ as a Son over his own house," presides in the Church of Christ, or spiritual Israel.

The Jews remain until this day a separate and peculiar people, retaining the distinctive features of their old church organism, with their three orders in the ministry. They do not now, nor did they ever at any time, recognize Christ as the foundation of their Zion; but, according to Mr. Brooks' idea of *identity*, they would be compelled to do so. Yet, he knows that "The God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob," *was*, and *is*, the acknowledged Head and foundation of the Jewish Church; while they *denounce* the Christ of the New Testament as an impostor. Yet, Mr. Brooks would make you believe—if he could, in order to get babies into the church—that this old Jewish Church, with all its opposition to Christ, is *now*, and always was, the Church of Christ. How absurd!

But, admitting that infant baptism was practiced in every age of the church to the time of Tertullian—an admission which I by no means make—yet, that would not prove that it is of divine authority, as the "mystery of iniquity had begun to work" even in the days of the apostles. Infant baptism is not once alluded to in the New Testament, either in the way of precept or example; yet the Methodist Discipline claims it as an ordinance of the New Testament. How can it be an ordinance of the New Testament, when it is not once named, or alluded to, in that sacred volume? And you remember that Mr. Brooks, with all his zeal for the tradition of his fathers, frankly ad-

mitted that there is no command for infant baptism in the Bible. This is an honest admission of the truth; but it is giving up the question. But my friend argues for the practice, because there were infants in the Jewish Church. But this argument, if it is worth anything, would make it an ordinance of Judaism, and not Christianity. But, when any reference is made to infant baptism by the fathers, it always means "infant immersion." They had no idea of sprinkling, or pouring, as modes of baptism in the early ages. And as for proselyte baptism among the Jews before Christ came, there is no good authority for it. It is a mere figment of the brain, invented to try to bolster up Paedobaptism.

Infant baptism originated at Carthage, in Africa, not at Jerusalem. Its origin was, therefore, in the wrong place, and at the wrong time. It started under Cyprian, and not Christ. Did it never occur to my friend that infant baptism originated among the darkies in Africa? I do not say this to reproach the darkies. It is theirs by the right of *discovery*; and, if there is any honor in it, they are entitled to it. "Honor to whom honor is due."

But those who practiced infant baptism at first, and for centuries after, also practiced "infant communion;" and my friend Brooks, to be consistent, must hold to infant communion also. There is the same authority for the one as the other, and not a particle for either.

But I will now examine Mr. Brooks' position on the "sheepfold." He thinks the sheepfold is the Church of Christ; and that, as lambs are always put into the fold with the old sheep, so infants must be put into the church with the parents. Now, if the lambs must go into the sheepfold with old sheep, I insist upon it, that they shall be fed when they are in. Infant communion necessarily follows infant baptism and membership in the church. It is the inalienable right of all the members of Christ's church to

come to the Lord's Table, and show their faith in the sufferings and death of Christ.

What would you think of a shepherd who, after putting the lambs into the fold with the sheep, would drive them all off into one corner of the fold and refuse to allow them to eat a mouthful of food, and thus literally starve them? Why, you would discharge him and employ a shepherd who would care for the lambs of the flock, and feed them well.

Now, Mr. Brooks is that hard-hearted and cruel shepherd, who will take all the lambs he can get hold of into the fold, and *mark* them too, "in the right hand, or in their foreheads," so as to make sure of the ownership of them, and then, with the brush of discipline, at feeding-time, he drives back all the lambs while the sheep are fed. They stand off, bleating piteously, but without making any impression upon his heart. Not a morsel of food will he give them. He says, if without eating, they can work through, and get to be old sheep, and yield him good fleeces of wool, he will *then*, and not till then, permit them to feed with the grown sheep. Now, what do you think of him? Is he fit to be a shepherd?

Mr. Brooks told us, yesterday, that all the Jews were excluded from the Church of Christ before the day of Pentecost, except the "hundred and twenty." These hundred and twenty disciples constituted all that was left of the church of Abraham on the morning of Pentecost; and that the three thousand converted on that day, were the excluded members of the church, who simply joined back again. Now, this is simply ridiculous. But we notice that the hundred and twenty are called "disciples;" consequently, there were no infants among them, for disciples are learners, and infants are not learners. Then, according to Mr. Brooks, we have the church, identically the same in all ages, reduced down to one hundred and twenty disciples, and not an infant among them. This is rather a

bad showing for the church, and worse for infant baptism and church-membership.

But three thousand were converted and added on the day of Pentecost; may-be the babies came in then. Let us see. Mr. Brooks has himself decided this case. He told us, yesterday, that the three thousand who were converted on the day of Pentecost had all been members of the church before, but that "God had turned them all out of the church for bad conduct; and that, when they were converted, they only joined back again." According to Mr. Brooks, then, there was not an infant among them. But let us hear what Luke says about it. Luke says: "And when they heard this, they were pierced in their hearts; and said, men and brethren, what shall we do?" Infants are never pierced to the heart when the Gospel is preached; nor are they capable of saying, "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" Peter told them to "repent and be baptized every one of them." Infants are not capable of obeying these commands. But Luke further says of them: "And as many as gladly received the word were baptized." None were baptized but those who "gladly received the word." Infants are not capable of doing this. From all these considerations, we know there was not an infant among the one hundred and twenty disciples on the morning of Pentecost; and not a single infant among the three thousand who were baptized and added to them on that day. And, therefore, on the evening of Pentecost the church numbered thirty-one hundred and twenty, and there was not an infant in it! Rather a slender beginning for infant church-membership and baptism, I call Mr. Brooks' special attention to this.

The church had no infant members in it the first day of its existence: and if any were brought in afterward, it devolves upon Mr. Brooks to show *when*, *where*, and by what authority?

But Mr. Brooks says that the three thousand who were baptized and added on Pentecost were simply backsliders from the church, who had been excluded for bad conduct. I ask, then, why were they baptized? Does Mr. Brooks and his brethren baptize those who backslide before receiving them back into the church again? How inconsistent!

The passage quoted by Mr. Brooks, concerning Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, in the kingdom, has no reference to the Church of Christ on earth. Every Methodist preacher on this platform knows that it refers to the last judgment, and so apply it in their preaching. Of the passages quoted, which speak of the kingdom and throne of David, I have only to say, that David ruled over a kingdom of this world; but Christ's kingdom is not of this world. And as David's Son, according to the flesh, was to be the Messiah who would set up a kingdom, these expressions are used by the prophets, not to convey the idea that Christ would literally sit on the old wooden throne of David, ruling the same kingdom that he did, but simply, speaking after the manner of men, to describe the spiritual kingdom and reign of the Son of David. These Scriptures do not look in the direction of church identity, and prove nothing for Mr. Brooks' proposition.

The prophet says: "The law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." This was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. This was the beginning point. Here the Church of Christ was founded. Let Mr. Brooks go to work to prove his proposition. We want some Scripture authority. The Scriptures he has quoted do not partake of the nature of his proposition, and, therefore, prove nothing in his favor. Let him prove that the old covenant is the *new* covenant, and that the new covenant is the old one, and that they are both one and the same, if he can. But this he can not do.

Paul contradicts Mr. Brooks, in Heb. viii: 2. Speaking

of Christ, he says: "A minister of the sanctuary, and of the true tabernacle which the Lord pitched, and not man." Moses made the first tabernacle, which was a type of the true tabernacle—the Church of Christ. But the true tabernacle was made under the authority of Christ on the day of Pentecost. One was worldly and typical; the other spiritual—true, and the anti-type, and, therefore, could not be the same.

Mr. Brooks says that there was but one covenant, and has been but one church in all ages, beginning with Abraham. But Jeremiah contradicts this. Speaking of the times of the Messiah, he says: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah." (Jer. xxxi: 31.) Paul quotes this in Heb. viii: 8. This new covenant is not according to the flesh, nor founded on flesh, as the old was; but it is "a new covenant"—a "better covenant, established on better promises." Moses was the Mediator of the old; Christ is the Mediator of the *new* and *better* covenant. The new covenant was not in force until Jesus died upon the cross and rose again. Yet Mr. Brooks will have it in force from the days of Abraham.

The Jews had a high priest, who officiated on earth. But the Christian's high priest could not be a priest on earth—he was not a priest after the order of Aaron, as he was of the tribe of Judah, and could not be a priest according to the law. But he is a "Priest forever, after the order of Melchizedek." All this is fatal to Mr. Brooks' theory of the identity of the church and the covenant. In the new covenant, Jeremiah says: "They shall not teach every one his neighbor, nor every one his brother, saying, know the Lord. For they shall all know me from the least of them, to the greatest of them." This is not the case in the Methodist Church. A large element in it do not know the Lord, and have to be taught as they grow

up, "saying, know the Lord." Therefore, the Methodist Church is not like the Church of Christ, who "all know the Lord, from the least to the greatest;" not an infant among them.

The Gospel is very simple in its elements, and children, at a very early age, may understand and obey it. Whenever any one is old enough to know the Lord, they may then come into the new covenant and Church of Christ. We say, whenever they are old enough to believe the Gospel, let them come.

I ask Mr. Brooks, not for a *command* for infant baptism and church-membership—for this he admits he can not give—but I insist upon it, he must give us at least one example of it. It will not do to say that infant baptism is not forbidden, and, therefore, of divine authority. We are not, in so many words, forbidden to baptize our horses; yet, who would pretend to have divine authority for the practice, simply because it is not forbidden? We are not forbidden to baptize our church bells; but does it follow from this that the practice is Scriptural? Certainly not. And yet there is just as much Scriptural authority for the baptism of horses and bells as there is for the baptism of infants.

I have passed over much that Mr. Brooks said in his last speech, because it was irrelevant, and not within the range of the proposition. I want Mr. Brooks to discuss the real issue, and not go off on these side issues. They have nothing to do with the issues made up for this discussion.

I certainly am not asking too much when I insist that he must produce one clear example of infant baptism from the New Testament. Let Abraham and the church in the wilderness rest for the present, and look into the New Testament for authority. The Discipline says, that "baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament." Then, let us

go to Christ and the apostles for authority, and not to Abraham or Moses.

In conclusion, I ask you, my Pedobaptist friends, to lay aside all your prejudice and prepossession, and hear us candidly through, and then decide according to the law and the testimony. [Time expired.]

Second Day.—Second Proposition.—January 2D, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' 'SECOND SPEECH—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: I am surprised at Mr. Mathes' explanation of the passage in Matthew (chap, viii: 12,) concerning Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven. Suppose it does refer to the last judgment; — does he not know that the church on earth and in heaven are one and the same. It is one all the way through, from the beginning to the end.

He calls on me for a positive command, or a plain example, of infant baptism in the New Testament—a "thus saith the Lord." I will answer this demand by asking him for a plain "thus saith the Lord" for "state meetings." I ask him to give us a command for female communion, or a plain example of it in the New Testament. Now, mind you, I am not denying it; but I want him to prove it from the Scriptures. Let him give the Scripture authority for the change of the Sabbath day from the seventh day to the first day of the week. There is no *thus saith the Lord* for any of these.

I do not object to the gentleman's state-meetings, female communion, the change of the Sabbath, etc.; but neither he nor I can point to a positive "thus saith the Lord" for any of these, and many other things we hold to and practice. Then Mr. Mathes is unreasonable in asking me for a positive command, or a plain example, for our practice of in-

fant baptism. We can often prove a thing by circumstantial evidence *alone*, or by analogy, as well as in any other way. I knew a man once who was convicted and hung, at Hawesville, Ky., on circumstantial evidence alone. Indeed, this kind of evidence is the strongest kind of evidence: for circumstances can not conspire to deceive; but persons may, and often do.

It is true that I read Webster's third meaning of the word "build," and omitted his first and second meanings. I did this because the third meaning, in my *opinion*, is the Scriptural meaning, and the one to be adopted in the text. (Matthew xvi: 18.) We are debating a Scriptural subject, and, therefore, the third meaning is the right one. Let us see if it is not the right meaning. I ask Mr. Mathes if the church was commenced and completed on the day of Pentecost? If it was, then neither he nor I, nor anybody else, is in the church, or can ever get into it. If it was completed on the day of Pentecost, then no one has joined it since that day. This proves too much, and, therefore, proves nothing.

But, Mr. Mathes charges, that infant baptism came from Africa; that it was actually discovered and practiced first by the darkies, and that we have received it from them. Now, is not this too bad? Did anybody ever hear the like before? I think it is getting down pretty low. The council he refers to, was composed of sixty-six bishops, all of whom might have been white men, for anything that I know. If they were niggers, then they were smarter than white folks, for they discovered infant baptism and imposed it on the white people, according to Mr. Mathes.

We now come to the covenants again. Mr. Mathes says that God made two covenants with Abraham. I deny it. He made only one. He made the other covenant with Moses at mount Sinai, and it had no salvation in it. It

was all about the land of Canaan. The covenant recorded in Genesis xii: 3, proves infant baptism. It says: "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." Families include the infants as well as adults; hence, infants are to be baptized. This covenant is repeated in Genesis xvii and xxii. It was for the whole house of Israel, not a *part* of it. Hence, infants are included, and ought to be baptized, as they constitute a part of the "house of Israel," and of "all the families of the earth."

The Gospel was preached to Jacob. (Genesis xxviii: 14.) Here we have the Gospel. It says: "And thy seed shall be as the dust of the earth; and thou shalt spread abroad to the west, and to the east, and to the north, and to the south; and in thee, and in thy seed, shall all the families of the earth be blessed." This covenant was never destroyed, but the covenant at Sinai went out—was abrogated. According to Hebrews ix: 1, the first covenant was not made with Abraham at all, but at Sinai. When God said, "I will make a new covenant," he meant the covenant with Abraham, and not the Sinaitic covenant, which was the first covenant. Then, you see we are under the new covenant made with Abraham, the Gospel covenant, which is four hundred and thirty years older than the old covenant which was made at Sinai.

But Mr. Mathes spoke of the writing of the law upon the heart under the new covenant, as described by the prophet Jeremiah. Well, that proves nothing against my proposition. Can not God write his law on the heart of the baby? He certainly can. And I have no doubt he does often write his law upon the heart of infants, by the direct operation of the Holy Spirit. God made a covenant with the animals, as well as with Noah, when he promised that he would not destroy the world with water any more; and if animals were capable of entering into covenant with God, why are not infants capable of doing

the same thing, and of having the law of God written upon their hearts? I am really astonished that Mr. Mathes should deny this; but he is compelled to deny it to maintain his position. Now, you see the fix he is in.

If all are to know the Lord in the new covenant, as Mr. Mathes affirms, why preach the Gospel at all? Why does he spend so much of his time preaching the Gospel, to get people to know the Lord? All the people know the Lord already, according to his theory. He is certainly wasting his time and labor in preaching, and editing the "Christian Record," if his position be correct.

But Mr. Mathes says that the laboring oar is in my hands to-day, and intimates that he has very little to do on this proposition; but I will tell my friend Mr. Mathes that the negative has something to do, and something to prove. He has his negative to prove, as well as I have my affirmative to prove. Let him go to work, then, and prove his negative, if he can. But this he can not do.

I affirm that there is no positive command to make a hymn-book; yet we all make hymn-books, and consider it right to do so. I challenge Mr. Mathes to show us a divine command for making hymn-books. Let him produce it, before he calls on me to produce a divine command for infant baptism; and whenever he gives us a divine command for making a hymn-book, I will also produce the authority for infant baptism.

The covenant of the law is given in Deuteronomy (chap. v). It was not made with Abraham, but with Moses. I now affirm that God never made a covenant in the Bible that did not include the infant. Paul says, in Hebrews xii: 22: "But ye are come unto the mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels," etc. This includes infants, for my friend himself admits that all infants will be saved in heaven.

In Luke xviii: 15, 16, Luke says: "And they brought unto him also infants, that he would touch them: but when his disciples saw it, they rebuked them. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God."

Now, my friend Mr. Mathes is just like the disciples were on this occasion. He forbids that infants shall be brought to the Saviour to be baptized. But Jesus said, *suffer* them to *come*, and forbid them not. See, also, Romans xi: 26, 27: "And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Zion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob: For this is my covenant unto them, when I shall take away their sins." This is properly the new covenant, and is to be made with Israel, and fully includes all the infants; for it says: "All Israel shall be saved." The infants are a part of "all Israel."

I declare to you, my friends, that I never would join a church that would not receive infants into it. If they would not take me in when I was a baby, I would never join them when I grew up to be a man. That church that excludes infants from membership and baptism, is not a true church of Christ, and is unworthy the name of a church, and I never would join it.

But I affirm that the true Church of Christ receives the infants of believers into it. It is the same identical church under all dispensations, and under all covenants, from Abraham down to the present time, and has always received into its fellowship the infants of believers. But my friend's church rejects the infants; therefore, it is not the true church, nor any part of it. They are entirely off the track. [Time expired.]

Second Day.—Second Proposition,—January 29, 1808.

MR. MATHES' SECOND REPLY—(30 MINUTE)

MR. PRESIDENT: I wish to look at the rise of Methodism for a moment, to see what sort of authority Mr. Brooks and his brethren have, by virtue of apostolic succession in the ministry, to baptize any one, adult or infant, according to his own *assumption*.

Mr. Wesley informs us that the first rise of Methodism was by four *unconverted* young men, at Oxford, England, A. D. 1729. Here we have Methodism taking its first rise in four young men, all *unconverted*, a little over one hundred years ago. By what authority, then, can Mr. Brooks claim to have any authority for baptizing anybody, from such a source as this? Let Mr. Brooks and his friends cease talking about Zeke Holliman and Roger Williams having no authority to baptize, until they can show a better origin. It comes with a very ill grace from such men. Let it be remembered, my friends, that Mr. Wesley himself was one of the four young men who originated the Methodist Church, and he preached Methodism for some ten years before he was converted! Yet Mr. Brooks boasts of apostolic succession.

But Mr. Brooks has fully admitted that he had no Scriptural command for infant membership and baptism. Very well; this is giving up his proposition. For, if he has no Scriptural authority for the practice, it is a mere human institution—"not from heaven, but of men,"—and of no value.

I knew he had no command for it, and I therefore called upon him for only one plain example of it in the New Testament. Has he produced it? You know he has not. Indeed, he has virtually admitted that he can find no such example of the practice. But he is not in the least dis-

couraged, because he can find neither a command nor a single example of infant baptism in the New Testament; but thinks he can prove it by analogy and circumstantial evidence! And he tells us that he once knew a man who was convicted and hung upon mere circumstantial evidence; and he would try to persuade you that that is even stronger evidence than a command or an example would be.

Now, does any sane man believe this? I presume not. It is a beggarly off-come, and proves that the thing has no foundation in the word of God. But he places infant baptism upon the same ground with several other things, for which he says there is no command or example in the New Testament—such as making a hymn-book, holding a state-meeting, female communion, etc. Now, this is a clear back-down from his proposition. He says there is no Scriptural authority for either of these, and infant baptism is resting upon the same sort of foundation—a *mere inference*.

But, I tell Mr. Brooks that he is simply mistaken. We have better authority for our state-meetings than he can show for infant baptism. Paul says: "Forsake not the assembling of yourselves together as the manner of some is." Here is a positive command for us to meet together; and we obey this command when we meet on the first day of the week to worship God, in our several congregations, and, also, when we all meet at a given place and worship together as a state-meeting.

As to the authority for making a hymn-book, the case is not in point. But still we are commanded to sing "Psalms, hymns and spiritual songs;" and the binding of these together in a convenient form, is a mere matter of convenience, and is incidental to the command to sing. But Mr. Brooks challenges me to produce some Scripture authority for "female communion." I presume the sisters will feel somewhat astonished to learn that Mr. Brooks, and the Methodist Church in Bedford, deny that there is any divine

authority for permitting them to come to the Lord's table, to show their faith in the sufferings and death of the blessed Saviour! But you have heard him say it, and challenge me to prove it.

I accept the challenge, and will proceed to prove that the sisters have the same rights at the Lord's table that we have. My first proof is, that females are called "disciples" in the New Testament. And all the disciples were commanded to "do this in memory of Christ;" therefore, females are commanded to come to the table of the Lord. Turn to Acts i: 12-15. Here we have the hundred and twenty disciples mentioned, and, it is said, at the fourteenth verse, "These all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication, with the women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren."

These hundred and twenty disciples were partly made up of the female disciples, with Mary the mother of Jesus, and were all together on the day of Pentecost; and after the baptism of the three thousand, they "continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." (Acts ii: 42.) "The breaking of bread" was the communion, as all admit. Therefore, these females communed with the brethren.

In Acts viii: 12, we have an account of Philip's success in the city of Samaria; and Luke says, "they were baptized, both men and women." And if the writer had said, "men, women and *children*" then infant baptism would have been established; but he says not a word about infants. But he does say *women*. They were made disciples by baptism, and as disciples they are commanded to "show the Lord's death till he comes." The command to "commune" is given to the church, as such, composed of women as well as men; and, therefore, female communion is commanded in the New Testament, as much as male communion. So my friend is entirely mistaken when he

says there is no command for it, or a plain example of it.

Now let Mr. Brooks try his hand again. The *inference* he draws from his analogies and circumstances, is not sufficient. Baptism and membership in the Church of Christ must rest on positive law, and not uncertain inference! And the "circumstances" which Mr. Brooks brings to justify his practice of infant baptism, without precept or example from the New Testament, have no relevancy to the case, and we need not now spend our time in noticing them. In reference to the change of the Jewish Sabbath to the Christian "first day of the week," it is only necessary to say, that the example of the apostles justifies this change. An apostolic example is equivalent to a law. Let Mr. Brooks give the plain example of the apostles for infant baptism. I do not ask him now to produce a positive law, in so many words, commanding it, but I require him to produce one, and just *one*, example of the practice from the New Testament. I know he can not do it. Will he venture to try it? No.

That the Sabbath was changed to the "first day of the week," is plain from apostolic example. Paul met with the disciples at Troas, on the "first day of the week," and preached for them. Christ arose from the dead on the first day of the week. The descent of the Holy Spirit was on the first day of the week. The disciples, in the first age, met together for worship on every first day of the week, while under apostolic teaching; and they have done so in all ages down to the present time. So it will not do to put the authority for the observance of the first day of the week on a- par with infant baptism, which has not the shadow of a shade of authority to sustain it. The Jewish Sabbath was abrogated when the law became dead by the death of Christ. I have now fully answered Mr. Brooks upon these points.

Mr. Brooks is again harping upon the word "build." On this, I need only repeat, that the first meaning of a word must always be taken as the true meaning, in any given case, unless there is something in the context which forbids it. In Matthew xvi: 18, Webster's first meaning is in perfect harmony with the context, and all the known facts of the case, and is, therefore, the true meaning of the passage. This forever explodes Mr. Brooks' whole theory of "*identity*" and infant baptism.

Mr. Brooks says if the Church of Christ was commenced and completed on the day of Pentecost, then no one has ever become a member of it since. What a strange conclusion. But suppose it was begun and completed in the days of Abraham, as he contends—how then has anybody got into it since? If his position and conclusion are both correct, then the apostles themselves were not members of the church, nor any person since the death of the patriarch Abraham. But I am happy to know that my friend is mistaken, both in his position and his conclusion.

The church of Christ was organized on the day of Pentecost, and was a complete organism at the beginning. It had a perfect Head and King, the glorified Redeemer. It was governed by the "perfect law of Liberty," and was in every respect complete as a church—"the body of Christ"—"the fullness of him who fills all things." But, in the organization of the church on that day, provision was made for the addition of members to it, in all time coming. The Gospel was to be preached to every creature, and all who "believed and were baptized" were to be added to the membership, as subjects of Christ's kingdom and members of his complete body, or church. It was complete and perfect in its organism on the first day of its establishment; and still, by this constitutional provision, "the Lord added to them daily the saved." I hope the gentleman is satisfied.

I asked my friend Mr. Brooks to tell us when the "precious corner stone" was "*tried*" if it was not at the death and burial of Christ, as I had affirmed. But, as I expected, he has not even attempted to answer me. I repeat, then, that the church was not built upon this foundation stone till it was *tried*, and, by the trial, proved to be a *sure foundation*. And this *trial* was the crucifixion, death and burial of Christ. And his resurrection from the dead, on the third day, was the conclusion of the trial; it was the decision of God in favor of the truth confessed by Peter, and that Christ, as the foundation stone, was a *sure foundation*; and on it the church was built on the day of Pentecost, only fifty days after the "stone was tried." Does Mr. Brooks admit that I am correct as to this trial of the stone? If so, he gives up his position, and his cause is lost. And if he does not admit it, why does he not tell us *when* and *where* this stone was tried before the crucifixion of Christ? Again, I ask him to try it; but I presume he will not, because he can not show it.

I have already answered his quibble about Isaiah's use of the present tense—"Behold I lay," etc. (Isaiah xxviii: 1G.) The prophets frequently use this form of expression when they evidently refer to events thousands of years in the future, and that is the case in this passage, as I have amply shown.

In Jeremiah xxxi: 31, we have a prophecy concerning the *new* covenant, which the prophet compares with the former covenant made with Abraham concerning the land of Canaan, and of which circumcision was the seal. This old covenant was reiterated and consummated with Moses at mount Sinai, circumcision being still continued as the seal. It is not true that the covenant consummated at Sinai was an original institution, made then for the first time; but it is true that it had been made with Abraham four hundred and thirty years before, but was not consummated and put

in force until the descendants of Abraham came to mount Sinai, fifty days after their baptism at the Red Sea.

As we have before stated, God made two covenants with Abraham; one concerning the Messiah, and the other securing to Abraham's posterity the land of Canaan. The covenant concerning Christ, or Gospel covenant, was the first made with Abraham, and is recorded in Genesis xii: 3, and quoted by Paul (Gal. iii: 8). This covenant was not consummated and put in force "until the seed came, which was Christ." Though made first, it was consummated last; and, on this account, it is called the *new covenant*.

The other covenant, concerning the land, was made with Abraham afterward, and is recorded in Genesis, chap. xv. Though made last, it was consummated first, at mount Sinai, and is, therefore, called "the first covenant," "the old covenant," and the "covenant made with our fathers," etc. Mr. Brooks and his brethren confound these two covenants, and, on this account, make many serious blunders and mistakes about the identity of the Jewish and Christian churches.

But, to go back to the prophecy of Jeremiah xxxi: 3 L—34. The prophet says: "Behold the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt; (which my covenant they brake, although I was an husband unto them, saith the Lord); But this shall be the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel: After those days, saith the Lord, I will put my law in their inward parts, and write it in their hearts; and will be their God, and they shall be my people. And they shall teach no more every man his neighbor, and every man his brother, saying, Know the Lord: for they shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord."

Thus, you see the new covenant, which is the Gospel covenant, consummated at the death of Christ, was to be unlike the old covenant in several important particulars—

1. In the old, it was written on stones; the new is written upon the heart.
2. Under the old, sins were remembered every year; but under the new, they are "remembered no more."
3. Under the old, there were a great many infant members, who had to be taught to "know the Lord" as they grew up in the Jewish Church and became teachable; just as it is now in the Methodist Church, and all other Pedobaptist churches, for they are all modeled after Judaism; but under the new covenant, "All shall know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them, saith the Lord." If the prophet is right, then the very *least* member in the Church of Christ "knows the Lord" for himself, and does not need to be taught to "know the Lord." Then, infant membership in the Church of Christ is impossible. This prophecy, therefore, destroys Mr. Brooks' proposition, and there is no escape.

But Mr. Brooks attempted a little quibble on this in his last speech. He said, if my position was true, then we need not spend our time and money in preaching the Gospel, as all the people already know the Lord, from the least to the greatest of them. Now, there is not in this large assembly a child ten years old, if it can read and understand plain English, but who knows that this is a miserable quibble to evade an argument, which he can not answer. Mr. Brooks, and every other person, knows that all the people of the world are not in the new covenant. None but the members of the Church of Christ are in the covenant; and to these only the prophet refers when he says: "They shall all know me, from the least of them unto the greatest of them." There is, therefore, ample room for us to preach the Gospel to the people outside of the church, and to teach them to "know the Lord."

As to the salvation of infants, I remark that ample provision is made in the Gospel for infants. "Where there is no law, there is no transgression." Infants are not subjects of law, or moral obligations. They are saved without faith, or repentance, or baptism, or any other condition whatever. They are saved by virtue of the death of Christ. The conditions of the Gospel apply only to those who are capable of understanding them, and of obeying them from the heart. But every one dying in infancy will be saved in heaven without these conditions, though they can not be members of the Church of Christ on earth till they are old enough to obey the Gospel.

But Mr. Brooks seems to think that infant baptism is proved by the "circumstance" that Jesus "took up little children in his arms and blessed them," and said to those who objected, "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." But, unfortunately, these Scriptures do not sustain him. 1. Jesus "touched them," "blessed them," "took them in his arms," etc.; but they say not one word about baptizing them, or a single word about taking them into the Church of Christ. These Scriptures, I think, clearly sustain my position—that infants, dying in infancy, will be saved in the kingdom above—nothing more. They are, decidedly, against Mr. Brooks.

I will again pay my respects to Mr. Brooks' remarks on the parable of the sheepfold and the lambs. He still insists upon infant membership and baptism, but opposes infant communion. You all saw how terribly he was embarrassed with this matter, and he labored to get out of an awkward situation; but, like a man in a morass, every struggle he made to extricate himself, only sunk him deeper' and deeper in the terrible bog. He will take the poor little lambs into the fold; but not a morsel of food will he permit them to take. At feeding-time he stands with a

huge cudgel in hand, and woe to the luckless lamb that will attempt to reach the table where the old ones are feeding. He will keep them on their own side of the pen at feeding-time, no matter how hungry they may be; and if they can survive ten or twelve years of starvation, and the wool begins to grow upon their backs, so that they give promise of a good "fleece," he will then let them eat. What a man!

But he says that he would never join a church when he was grown, that would not take him into it when he was a baby. Well, suppose he would not. What does that prove? Not much, I think. It may be stated in the form of a syllogism, thus: "I would never join a church when I became a man, that would not take me into it when I was a baby;" therefore, "infant membership and baptism" are of divine authority. Well, I am not sure but this is the strongest argument he has yet offered us.

He seems to think that the term "family" necessarily implies infants. This, however, is not true. I know of many families in which there are no infants. There is not an infant in my family. Men and women are mentioned in connection with family baptism—but infants, never.

[Time expired.]

Second Day.—Second Proposition.—January 29, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' THIRD SPEECH— (30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Mathes has not given us any positive law for the change of the Sabbath from the seventh to the first day of the week. He produces the example of the apostles and first Christians, and claims this as authority for the change; and he still insists that I ought either to furnish a positive law, or a plain example of infant baptism in the New Testament, or give it up. This

will not do, brother Mathes. You must find better authority for the change of the Sabbath than mere apostolic example. Example is not law. The apostle says that "sin is a transgression of law." But, according to Mr. Mathes, it ought to read: "Sin is a transgression of *example*" But that will never do—example will not do for law. He must do better than this, or cease calling on me for New Testament authority for infant baptism.

Female communion stands upon the same sort of authority. Females are not commanded to come to the Lord's table. Mr. Mathes has brought forward apostolic example, proving that they did commune in the days of the apostles, and he infers from such examples that there is divine authority for female communion. But this is an inference of his own. We don't want Mr. Mathes' *inferences*. We want a "Thus saith the Lord." Let him produce it, or cease asking me to produce a plain "thus saith the Lord," for our practice of infant baptism.

Mr. Mathes says, if the lambs are put into the fold with the big sheep, he wants them fed with them also. And I suppose he would like to shear the lambs, too. Do we shear the little lambs as soon as we put them into the fold? He knows we do not. But we wait until the wool is grown, say six months, before we shear them. And, then, the little, tender lambs do not eat the food of the old sheep. We put them all in the fold together, and feed the ewes, and the lambs draw their nourishment from them, and thus get their portion of the food. So in the church. We do not permit the little infants to commune, but their mothers commune, and the infants draw their portion of it from them by nursing. I hope Mr. Mathes is satisfied now.

Again: Mr. Mathes knows that every man, woman and child, in the State of Indiana, is a citizen of the State; yet they do not all enjoy all the rights of citizenship. So

children of believing parents are members of the church and citizens of Christ's kingdom; but they do not enjoy all the privileges of the church—they are not permitted to come to the Lord's table until they get older. Females, under the old dispensation, were regarded as circumcised by virtue of the circumcision of their brothers and other male relatives. Peter is said to have "preached to the circumcision." Did he only preach to the males? Or did he not preach to all the people—men, women and children? Certainly, he preached to females also.

If Mr. Mathes should ask me what good it does the infant to baptize it, I would answer him by asking him to tell us what good it did to circumcise a Jew? Let him answer that, if he can; and I will then answer his question as to the value of baptism to the infant.

I again *assert* that Webster's *third* meaning of *build*, is the Bible meaning of that word; and as we are debating a Bible question, the *third* meaning is the true one. This, I trust, will satisfy Mr. Mathes, though he appears to be very hard to please upon this point. I am surprised at him.

Infants were members of the Jewish Church by positive law; hence they must be put out by positive law. I claim, then, that there is positive law for taking an infant into the Church of Christ by virtue of the positive law of circumcision. Now, let Mr. Mathes answer this if he can. He is bound to admit that we have now produced *positive divine law* for infant membership and baptism in the Church of Christ, unless he can produce positive law to put infants out of the church, and keep them out, which I challenge him to do.

I contend that infants are included in the passage found in Acts viii: 12: "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." Mr. Mathes seems to think that there were no

infants baptized on this occasion by Philip, as they are not mentioned. Now, this is a great mistake. It is true that infants are not mentioned on the occasion, but I *assert* that infants are implied; and I am surprised that I can not get Mr. Mathes to see it.

But let us go to Judges ix: 51, to prove that I am correct in saying that infants were included in the statement "men and women," in the above passage: "But there was a strong tower within the city, and thither fled all the men and women, and all they of the city, and shut it to them, and gat them up to the top of the tower."

Now, will Mr. Mathes dare to say that all the men and women of the city fled to this tower, and left the infants behind them? Or will he take the absurd position, that there were no infants in the city at that time? He knows there were infants there, although no mention is made of them. Just so. I *assert* that infants are included in Acts viii: 12: "They were baptized, both men and women," though no mention is made of them. And since there is no command positively *forbidding* the baptism of our infants; and since infants were in the Abrahamic and Jewish churches, which are the same as the Church of Christ; and since there is no law putting them out of the church, therefore, we claim that infants ought to be baptized and received into the church, and that Philip did so at Samaria, when he "baptized both men and women."

I will now tell Mr. Mathes that there is no use in having a command to *baptize infants*, as there is no need of a command to feed lambs. The command to "feed the sheep," includes the lambs, as the command to "baptize believers," includes also the baptism of the infants of believers. God has never put infants out of the church, and we must not do it.

It is true that we do not feed the lambs *directly*; yet we put them in the pen; and we then feed the ewes, and

from them the lambs draw their nourishment. Just so we take our infants into the church with us, and baptize them; and while we do not permit them to come to the Lord's table, their mothers come to the communion, and the infants, therefore, receive the communion *indirectly* from their mothers. I wish I could get Mr. Mathes to see this; but I fear he never will.

The Saviour says: "Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of heaven." This proves my proposition, and shows that the Saviour was willing to receive infants, and, of course, to baptize them. But Mr. Mathes objects, and says: "No; they must not come to the Saviour while they are infants—they must be kept away till they are grown up." He will not allow them to come into the fold with the believers.

John the Baptist taught that God would "purge his floor," the church, then in existence. And, on the day of Pentecost, the church was purged, but not destroyed. It was only purified. But it was still the same old church afterward that it was before, from the time of Abraham. The apostle called Christ "The Minister of Circumcision," and you all know that circumcision belonged to the Abrahamic covenant and church. Then, Christ was a minister of the church founded in the days of Abraham, in which there were infants. God organized the church in the days of Abraham, as recorded in Genesis, chap. xvii. Circumcision was the seal of admission into it, as baptism is the seal of admission into the Church of Christ now: hence, baptism came in the room of circumcision. The church is under but one covenant, for God never made but one covenant with Abraham, and that is recorded in Genesis xv. The new covenant, of which Mr. Mathes speaks, is not yet made; but it will be made when the Jews are gathered in, and not till then.

In the mean time the church is under one and the same

covenant it always had. This second, or new covenant, spoken of by the prophet Jeremiah, is not yet made, and the Gentiles will have no interest in it when it is made. It will be made exclusively with "the whole house of Israel, and the house of Judah." It will not be made till the "fullness of the Gentiles be come in." I don't care if Mr. Mathes refers to a thousand covenants; yet I *assert* that there was but one covenant made with Abraham, and that is in existence yet, and infants are included in it, and also in every covenant that God ever made, or will make, with mankind.

In reference to Isaiah xxviii: 16, I say again, the *present tense* is used. Christ was with the church in the wilderness. He was the angel of the church then, and was always with it and in it. Therefore, he did not build a new church on Pentecost, as Mr. Mathes affirms; he only reformed the old church. Jesus was there in the church when Isaiah uttered the declaration: "Behold, I lay in Zion a stone," etc. Hence, he uses the *present tense* of the verb "*lay*" But Mr. Mathes says, that the prophets frequently use the present tense when uttering their predictions concerning events in the future. I deny it, and call upon him for an example of this style of speaking.

I am sorry to say that Mr. Mathes perverts the Scriptures. I do not say that he does so intentionally, but his system compels him to do it. He can not reply to my Scripture arguments, and he, therefore, perverts the Scriptures. The promise made to Abraham, was to his seed also. Children's names are registered in heaven; for the church on earth and in heaven are the same. I have eight children in heaven. Glory to God! [Time expired.]

Second Day.—Second Proposition.—January 29, 1868.

MR. MATHES' THIRD REPLY—(30 Minutes.)

MR. PRESIDENT: It is said, "the last shall be first, and the first shall be last." So I will reply to the last part of Mr. Brooks' speech first. He challenges me to produce examples where the prophets speak of future events, and use the present tense; and positively denies that such is the case. Turn, then, to the following prophecy (Isaiah ix: 6): "For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given." This prophecy refers to the birth of Christ. I ask Mr. Brooks—was Christ born when Isaiah delivered this prediction? He knows he was not born till more than seven hundred years afterward. And still the prophet uses the present tense—"For unto us a Child *is* born, unto us a Son *is* given." Mr. Brooks knows that future time is here referred to, while the present tense is used; and he will not deny that the prophet is speaking of the same event, as in Isaiah xxviii: 16: "Behold I lay in Zion for a foundation a stone." I might furnish many more examples of the same style of speaking; but this one is sufficient, as it settles the question.

But Mr. Brooks says that "apostolic example is not law." Now, I affirm that apostolic example has all the force of divine law. The apostles were the ambassadors of Christ, and were divinely inspired, and guided into all truth. They administered the affairs of the Church of Christ as the Holy Spirit directed them, and, of course, did not sanction any errors in doctrine or practice. Consequently, where we have a plain apostolic example, it has all the force of divine law. We know it is right, or they would not have practiced or sanctioned it. I produced both a command and apostolic example for "female communion." Yet Mr. Brooks says I did not prove it. He seems very hard to satisfy.

I asked Mr. Brooks to give us just one plain example from the New Testament of infant baptism; and I promised to be satisfied, if he would do so. But how has he met this? Why, he has virtually confessed that he can not find even one example of the practice in the times of the apostles, as he has not attempted to produce it. Now, what must be thought of a practice that is so important that the Methodist Episcopal Church, and all other Paedobaptist churches, could not exist for an hour without it; and yet Mr. Brooks, in all his fiery zeal for it, acknowledges that they have no divine command for it, nor a single example in the New Testament! I think you will all come to the conclusion that "infant baptism is not from heaven, but of men;" and that the church which depends upon this human tradition for its existence, is a mere human institution, and can lay no claim to being the Church of Christ.

But he *infers* that there were infants at Samaria, among those said to be baptized by Philip. (Acts viii: 12.) Let us look at it for a moment. The text reads: "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."

All the persons here referred to heard Philip preach the Gospel, and "they believed." Infants are never said to *hear* the Gospel, because they are not capable of understanding it. Infants can not "*believe* the things concerning the kingdom of God;" therefore, there were no infants among them. Again: "They were baptized." The same *they* that heard Philip preach, and who believed what he preached, were the "they" who were baptized; consequently, there was not a single infant baptized. But Luke settles the question forever, by saying: "They were baptized, both MEN and WOMEN." Now, every child of ten years old knows that "men and women" are not infants. If

infants had been baptized on the occasion, Luke would have said: "They were baptized, men, women and babies." But he excludes the infants entirely by saying "*both*"—that is, only the two classes, "men and women." If infants were among them, he would not have said *both*.

Hard pressed, indeed, must be the man and the system which is compelled to rely upon such *inferences* as these for support; and if Mr. Brooks can do no better—and, of course, he can not—I think he had better give it up. You see how his cause labors.

But he seems to give up the New Testament in despair, and turns back to the law of Moses. He claims that baptism came in the room of circumcision. But did he prove it? He did not even attempt to prove it. It is a mere *assumption*, which no man living can prove. It is false. But even if it were true, then it would prove too much for my friend. Circumcision was only for the male children, and if baptism came in the room of circumcision, then he would have no authority for female baptism. But he says the females under the old dispensation were considered circumcised "by virtue of the circumcision of their brothers and other male relatives." Very well! that still proves too much; for, if that be true, and baptism came in the room of circumcision, then there is no authority to baptize the females, as they would be recognized as baptized by virtue of the baptism of their brothers and other male relatives. How do you like the doctrine, my friends?—baptism by proxy!

But Mr. Brooks has brought forward the baptism of the Israelites, at the Red Sea, as an example of infant baptism. But this proves too much for him, and, therefore, proves nothing. The example is too old:—the baptism occurred, not under the Gospel, or even under the old covenant; it occurred before the law of circumcision was given at mount Sinai. And the subject under discussion,

if it be divine, is an ordinance of the New Testament, and, therefore, depends upon New Testament proof to sustain it. It can, therefore, draw no support from the Red Sea, near two thousand years before Christian baptism was instituted at all! But, in the second place, it proves too much: as all their cattle, beasts of burden, and cooking utensils, and all their property, were baptized, as well as their infants. But the truth is, the baptism of those who believed in God only is referred to. As Paul says of this baptism: "All our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." It is only claimed by the apostle that "all our fathers were baptized." The passage, therefore, even if it were in point, gives no sort of countenance to the baptism of cattle, beasts of burden, property, or even infants, although all these "passed through the sea."

Mr. Brooks' argument against "infant communion"⁷ is equally strong against "infant baptism." He argues that they ought not to be admitted to the Lord's table, because they are not capable of understanding its design—they can not "discern the Lord's body." But I would like to know if infants are capable of knowing anything more about baptism, or its design, than the communion? They are not; and if that is a good reason for not bringing them to the Lord's table—and I admit that it is—then, for the same reason, they ought not to be baptized. What will my friend say to this?

But Mr. Brooks has gone back to the sheep fold again, and he insists that the term "*sheep*" always implies the lambs—that sheep represent Christians, and lambs the infants. Now, let us try it. Jesus says: "My sheep (Christians) *hear* my voice and they follow me." Do babies *hear* the voice of Christ and follow him? They do not; as they are not capable of such actions. Sheep do

so; therefore, the term *sheep* does not necessarily imply lambs; and, of course, infants are not to be baptized.

But I was much surprised to hear Mr. Brooks, in his zeal to maintain his unscriptural dogma of infant baptism, affirm that God never made but one covenant with Abraham. I have, in a former speech, proved that God made two distinct covenants with Abraham. To further prove this, I now introduce Galatians iv: 22. The apostle here illustrates the two covenants under the allegory of the two women—the one "gendering to bondage, the other to freedom." He says, "Hagar represents the Jerusalem that now is, and is in bondage with her children." That is, the old covenant, consummated at Sinai, and the Jewish Church under it—born after the flesh, and holding membership by virtue of a flesh and blood relation. While Sarah represents "The Jerusalem which is above, and is free, the mother of us all." That is, the Church of Christ, which is free, and the mother of all Christians. The new covenant and Church of Christ under it, is represented by the free woman. The members of the Church of Christ hold their membership, not upon the condition of flesh and blood, as the Jews did, and as infants in Pedobaptist churches do now, but by faith. They are like Isaac, "born after the Spirit." Everything of a fleshy nature pertaining to the old covenant and the Jewish Church, as conditions of membership, have been done away in Christ. What, then, becomes of my friend's position, that the old covenant is still in force?

His position and arguments contradict the apostle most flatly. Now, if infants, on account of their connection with their believing parents, are entitled to baptism and membership in the church, as the Jewish infants were entitled to the bloody rite of circumcision, because born of Jewish parents; *then faith is* made void, and *flesh* is still the condition and ground of membership in the Church of

Christ. If the old covenant is still in force, as my friend Mr. Brooks contends, then we are not under grace, but under the law. But this is a contradiction of Paul, who says: "We are not under the law, but under grace." But such is the teaching of the Methodist Church, through their chosen mouth-piece, Mr. Brooks.

No Pedobaptist pretends to have a command for infant baptism in the New Testament; and I, therefore, called upon Mr. Brooks for one *example* of the practice in the New Testament, and he has entirely failed to produce even *one* example of it. He supplies the place of precept and example, by bold and reckless assertion. But will the people take that for proof? I think they will not. His position is, therefore, unsustained, and is, moreover, against the very nature and genius of the new institution, which is a system of faith and intelligent obedience to Christ.

But Mr. Brooks has called upon me to find a command in the New Testament forbidding infant baptism. Now, is not this a very singular demand? Does it not prove, conclusively, that Mr. Brooks is crowded to the wall, and feels that he is helpless? I think so, and I presume you will come to the same conclusion.

But I accept the challenge, and will furnish a command forbidding the practice of infant baptism. Infant baptism is forbidden by the terms of the great commission, given by the Lord to his apostles: "Go preach the Gospel to every creature; he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; and he that believeth not shall be damned." Men do not preach to babes; therefore, there were no infants contemplated in the commission. But who were to be baptized? Those only who believed. Infants can not believe, and are, therefore, not embraced. The very terms of the commission authorized only the baptism of *believers*, and, therefore, forbid the baptism of infants. A command to do anything, always forbids the doing of anything else,

and especially when that "something else" is the very opposite of the thing commanded to be done. If anything else is done, it is done without the authority of him who gave the command.

As, for example, suppose I commission Mr. Brooks to go to Kentucky and sell one hundred and sixty acres of land for me, and bring me the money. He goes on all right, sells the land for \$20,000, and invests the money in mules, and then makes his report to me. I complain of his action; and he undertakes to justify himself, by saying, "I hold your commission, and there is no command in it forbidding me to invest in the mules; and, therefore, I contend that I had authority to do it." Every sensible man knows that it would be a violation of my authority. He was forbidden to do anything not specifically authorized in the commission; and, therefore, his buying the mules was forbidden, and a violation of the commission under which he was acting.

The great commission given by Christ to the apostles utterly forbids the baptism of infants, as it only authorizes the baptism of believers. Yet it does not exclude them from salvation, as they are not mentioned in it, or referred to in any way. Infants are all saved by the rich provisions of the Gospel, without faith, repentance, or baptism, or anything else to be done by them as a condition, or anything done for them by others. They have no "original sin" to be washed away by baptism, as Mr. Brooks and the Methodist Episcopal Church teach.

But Mr. Brooks says "every creature," in the commission, does include infants, as they are *creatures*. But does not my friend see that such a position leads to the awful conclusion, that all infants dying in infancy will be damned. "He that believeth not, shall be damned." Infants can not believe; therefore, if they are embraced in the commission, and die in infancy, they must be damned, if Mr.

Brooks is correct, But, I thank God that this is not true. All the dear little ones are amply provided for in the Gospel of the blessed Saviour.

Mr. Brooks has presented a very singular objection to my definition of "*build*" He says, if the church was built on the day of Pentecost, in the sense of erecting a *new* house, by framing the materials together upon the foundation so as to make a complete building, then there has been no one added to it since—that he and I are both out. This, he thinks, would leave us all in a bad condition. But he does not seem to distinguish between the organization of the church and the increase of the body afterward. The church, as an organism, was complete and perfect the very first day of its existence; but, by a constitutional provision, believers were to be added as long as time shall continue.

The tabernacle was finished when Moses set it up, and the glory of God filled it, and it remained for some 1650 years, until it was taken down by divine authority, and was superseded by the true tabernacle—the Church of Christ. And during all these centuries, one generation after another of the priests came into it, and performed their ministrations. So the church in Jerusalem was organized on the day of Pentecost, and was a complete organism, and a pattern; and it remains a perfect model for the church in all coming ages, to which additions are continually being made. There is, therefore, nothing in Mr. Brooks' objection. [Time expired.]

Second Day.—Second Proposition.—January 29, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' FOURTH SPEECH—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Mathes has said much that I agree to—much that no man can object to, and, after all, he is entirely mistaken in denying that the Jewish and Christian

churches are the same. God has never had but one church in the world. Infants were members of the Jewish Church, and, therefore, infants are entitled to membership and baptism in the Christian Church—it being the same.

Mr. Mathes says that the great commission given by Christ to the apostles, forbids the baptism of infants. I will now attend to my friend upon this point. I have got him now just where I wanted him, and I will show the fallacy of his argument. His argument is, that, because none but believers are commanded to be baptized, therefore, infants are excluded. I ask him what he will do with that part which says, "And he that believeth not, shall be damned?" His argument will send all infants to hell, because they can not believe. Mr. Mathes and his party would, in this way, send all infants to hell who die in infancy. Now, mind you, I don't say that he intends it, as he is a man of fine feelings, and may not see where his argument leads him; but his doctrine leads to that conclusion.

Now, I will give a literal translation of the participle "*baptisthies*" which is rendered, "*is baptized*," in the common version. It should be rendered, literally, "*having been baptized*." The commission, then, as given by Mark, would read, properly, "He that believeth, having been baptized, shall be saved." The authority I give for this translation, is Professor Moore, the Principal of the Clear Spring High School, Jackson county, who is acknowledged to be one of the best scholars of the age. I read from a paper given me by Mr. Moore, in which he says, the "literal meaning of the participle *baptisthies*, in the commission, is, *having been baptized*." So, you see that baptism, in the commission, takes place before faith. This overthrows and entirely destroys Mr. Mathes' argument, drawn from the commission, forbidding the baptism of infants. The baptism comes first, and the faith at some

future time. So, you see that Mr. Mathes is mistaken, and, according to the commission, infants are to be baptized. Now, I want Mr. Mathes to get himself out of this difficulty, if he can. I shall hold him to the point. Now, you will see some crawfishing.

I deny that God made two covenants with Abraham. He only made one covenant with Abraham. Hagar represents the covenant made at mount Sinai; for the apostle says: "This Hagar is mount Sinai, in Arabia." It has no reference to a covenant made with Abraham, but to one made with Moses. Sarah, means the covenant made with Abraham, which remains in force to this day.

I again affirm that Isaiah xxviii: 16, refers to *present time*. Mr. Mathes must prove that it refers to future time. I will admit that the prophets sometimes spoke of future events in the *present tense*. But Mr. Mathes must prove that this passage refers to the times of Christ; and this he can not do.

Mr. Mathes refers to the "baptism of the fathers, in the cloud and in the sea." It does not say that the cattle, beasts of burden, and bread-troughs, were baptized; it was "the fathers" that were baptized. Mr. Mathes must be hard pressed when he resorts to such an argument as this. But his cause compels him to do so. I know he would not have condescended to use such an argument if his cause had not been weak, and stood in need of it. God never made any new covenant with the Jews, and children were in the covenant he made with them at Sinai; and, hence, infants are still in the covenant, and proper subjects of baptism. I affirm that the infants of believing parents are now in covenant relation with Christ; if they are not, then they will be lost. Will Mr. Mathes say whether he believes infants are embraced in the new covenant? If they are, they are proper subjects of baptism.

But Mr. Mathes introduces an argument from the lan-

guage of Jesus, "My sheep hear my voice," and wants to know how infants can *hear the* voice of the Saviour? I answer—the parents hear his voice, and the lambs follow them. So, you see it amounts to just the same thing as if the lambs heard his voice themselves. Mr. Mathes wants a positive command or example to baptize infants. But I tell him, there is no necessity for it. Infants were in the Abrahamic Church, and hence there is no need of a positive command to put them into the church, as the Christian Church and the Abrahamic Church is the same identical church. There is no positive command for female communion; yet Mr. Mathes will not say that women ought not to commune.

Circumcision is evidence of the right of infants to baptism, since the church is the same in all ages; and as infants were, by divine right, in the Abrahamic Church, and entitled to circumcision, and as circumcision was the initiatory rite into the Jewish Church, so baptism, coming in the room of circumcision, is the initiatory rite into the church now; and infants, as well as adults, are entitled to it.

In the conclusion, on this proposition I have a word to say to the outsiders, whom I expect, mainly, to influence in this debate. I don't expect to convert any of Mr. Mathes' party. Their minds are already made up, and they are wedded to their errors, and we shall have to let them alone. But I believe I have sustained my proposition—"That infants of believing parents are entitled to membership and baptism in the Church of Christ."

Look, my friends, at the facts in the case. I have proved the identity of the church in all ages. It has always been the same, with a few slight changes in its ordinances and ceremonies. It is one and the same in all ages, and in all dispensations, on earth, and will forever be the same in heaven.

Will we not look for infants in heaven? Yes! Glory to God! there will be infants in the church in heaven. Then, why will Mr. Mathes not admit them into the Church of Christ on earth? I ask you, my outside friends, to consider these things well, and not suffer yourselves to be carried away by the smooth words and false arguments of Mr. Mathes. I now submit the proposition, so far as I am concerned. [Time expired.]

Second Day.—Second Proposition.—January 29, 1868.

MR. MATHES' FOURTH REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Mr. Brooks is now through with this proposition, and you have heard the strongest and best things he can urge in its behalf. He has *asserted* and *reasserted* that his proposition is true, but he has utterly failed to bring one particle of proof to sustain it. He admits that there IS NO COMMAND for infant baptism; and he has failed to produce a single example of the baptism of a single infant. His cause is, therefore, virtually given up, and lost without remedy.

I will now attend to the criticism on the great commission, furnished him by Professor Moore, of the Clear Spring School. He introduces this with an air of peculiar triumph, and asks me what I will do with it? Why, I will have no trouble in disposing of this criticism. Why did not Professor Moore instruct Mr. Brooks more fully upon the subject? Why did not this Clear Spring critic inform Mr. Brooks that the *believing* and *baptizing* are both in the same tense, in the original Greek? This fact leaves Mr. Brooks exactly where he started, with faith before baptism. The text is, "*Pisteusas kai baptisthies*" which, literally rendered, would read, "*having believed and having been immersed*" shall be saved. Why was the

translation of this participle, *pisteusas*, suppressed by the Clear Spring critic? Did he fail to see it, or had he a party purpose to subserve by it? I leave you to decide. The criticism amounts to nothing.

Mr. Brooks misrepresents my position in reference to the baptism of the Israelites in the Red Sea. I did not contend that their animals and kneading-troughs were actually baptized; but I did contend that, if infant baptism was an inference fairly drawn from the case, simply because infants were carried through with the fathers, we might with the same propriety infer the baptism of their animals, etc., for the same reason. It is true, that nothing is said of the baptism of the animals, nor is there a word said of the baptism of infants—both rest on the same inference. It was the fathers, and not infants, who were "baptized in the cloud and in the sea."

But, if the infants were baptized, then, as a type of Christian baptism, why were they afterward circumcised? The fathers of the nation were "baptized unto Moses," which, according to Mr. Brooks, was putting them all into the church. Then, I ask, in reason's name, why initiate them into the church again by the rite of circumcision? *When* and *how* had they got out of the church?

I will now attend to Mr. Brooks' sophistry on the subject of infant damnation. He says, if infants are not to be baptized for the want of faith, they must be damned for the same reason, as, "he that believeth not, shall be damned." But this is all sophistry. Our position is, that infants are not embraced in the commission at all. The Gospel is not preached to infants, nor are they required to believe, repent, or to be baptized; therefore, "he that believeth not, shall be damned," does not refer to infants, as they are not subjects of Gospel address. The salvation of all infants who die in infancy, is made secure by the death, burial and resurrection of Christ. Infants

have no sins to be pardoned, and, therefore, have no guilt. They will all be saved in heaven, but not on the ground of their own faith, or the faith of their parents, or on account of anything done *by* them, or for them, by others, as conditions. Therefore, "he that believeth not, shall be damned," applies, not to infants, but to those whose duty it is to believe the Gospel, but who reject it.

I objected to Mr. Brooks' assumption that baptism came in the room of circumcision. My objection was, that none but the males were circumcised, and, therefore, none but males should be baptized, according to the position. But Mr. Brooks attempts to answer this objection by another *assumption*—that is, he says, "The boys were circumcised for the girls; and that the girls were considered circumcised in the person of their male relatives." But I ask, if that be so, and baptism came in the room of circumcision, why not baptize the boys only now, and consider the females all baptized by virtue of the baptism of their male relatives? If such a thing was valid in circumcision, the same would hold good in baptism, if it came in the room of circumcision. But this is too absurd to require further remarks, and my objection holds good against his position. He seems to think that because he has quoted a great many Scriptures, therefore he has proved his proposition. But the misfortune with him is, that his Scriptures have no relevancy to his proposition—it is not even alluded to in any one of the Scriptures he has quoted. They have no more reference to his proposition than a wagon has to a State-house. I keep to the main question. In this respect, Mr. Brooks and myself differ *in toto coelo*. It would be the best way for my friend to commence and read the Bible to the audience, and the more he would read, the more his proposition would be proved, if simply quoting Scripture would prove it, without any reference to its relevancy. Does he not know that the proof *must*

partake of the nature of the proposition, or it proves nothing?

But Mr. Brooks asks, where was the church during the dark ages, if we repudiate the regular apostolic succession through Rome? I answer—have we not Christ, the sure foundation? Have we not the pure word of God to direct us? Then we have all that is necessary to enable us to build up the house of God, without depending upon the corrupt hierarchy of apostate Rome. Mr. Brooks may go to Rome for his official grace, if he chooses; we repudiate the whole thing as a "cunningly-devised fable"—as "the mystery of iniquity."

Mr. Brooks has not attempted to answer my argument based upon Jeremiah xxxi: 31. The prophet here declares that under the new or Gospel covenant, "all should know the Lord, from the least of them to the greatest of them." That is, all the members of the Church of Christ are to "know the Lord." Infants are not capable of knowing the Lord; therefore, they can not be members of the Church of Christ. He has utterly failed to meet this, except upon the plan of the old sheep hearing for the lambs. Thus you see the weakness of his cause, and the utter "nakedness of the land."

He has been telling us about baptism bringing infants into the church, and of baptism coming in the room of circumcision. Now, the fact is, circumcision never brought a child into the Jewish Church. The male child was circumcised because he was a Jew, or in the Jewish Church not to make him a member. Then, according to this, the child must be baptized because he is already a member of the church. But Mr. Brooks says, that infants become members through baptism. How can this be reconciled, if baptism came in the room of circumcision?

But Mr. Brooks perverted my meaning of the passage from Jeremiah—"They shall all know me, from the least of

them to the greatest of them." He represents me as teaching that all mankind are to know the Lord since the founding of the church on the day of Pentecost; and he asks, what is the use of preaching to anybody, if all *know* the Lord. I answer, that the preaching of the Gospel is to convert the world, and bring them into the church, that they may *know* the Lord. But all *in the church* know the Lord for themselves.

Mr. Brooks charges, that the church to which I belong is a *bogus* concern. How modest! But I am not sure but some of the audience will come to the conclusion that Mr. Brooks is a member of a *bogus* church.

In the case of the two women, Sarah and Hagar, it is a gratuitous assumption that Hagar was cast out of the church. There is not a word in the Bible about turning Hagar out of the church. There was no church in existence when Hagar was sent away by Abraham, with Ishmael her son, with a bottle of water and a crust of bread: all has reference to the old covenant. Sarah represents the new covenant, which was consummated at the death of Christ. But, in the whole passage, there is not a word about *turning out* or *turning into* the church; because there was no church in the world in the days of Abraham, nor until the law was given at mount Sinai, more than four hundred years after Hagar and Ishmael were sent away from the house of Abraham. The worship of God was family worship, from the creation down to the giving of the law, more than two thousand years. Family religion was the oldest form of worship, and existed before and after the flood, until the descendants of Jacob were constituted a church in the wilderness, at the mount Sinai. This fact seems to have escaped Mr. Brooks' notice, and hence his blunder about a church in Abraham's family.

A covenant is a solemn agreement entered into between the contracting parties. Here it is shown by a sol-

an agreement between God and Abraham, that a Saviour would come into the world, of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh; and that, under his administration, *faith*, and *not flesh*, should be the basis of membership in his kingdom; that the rule of entrance into the Gospel covenant, or Church of Christ, is faith in Christ and personal obedience to him. Paul says: "You are all the children of God by faith; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. In Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, neither male nor female, for you are all one in Christ; and if ye be Christ's, then you are Abraham's children, and heirs according to the promise."

The history of religion shows that a flesh and blood relation in the church, always "gendereth to bondage." Such are all the national churches of the old world. The infants of the members of such establishments are taken into them, on the faith of their parents, or because their parents were members before them. The child, as it grows up, has no choice of its own, but is brought under bondage by the parents and rulers. Such, churches have always been persecuting and tyrannical in their spirit and government.

Now, my friends, in conclusion I wish to say, that it is the highest interest of every one to search the Scriptures, and learn what they teach. If you find an express command, or plain example, of infant baptism and church-membership, then believe it and adopt the practice. And I will be as ready as any one to aid in bringing them to the ordinance. But if you do not find a command for it—and Mr. Brooks admits there is none—or a plain example of the practice of infant baptism—and he has failed to produce it—then you will, of course, reject it, as not of heaven, but of men. Let us determine this, and all other religious questions, in the light of truth as revealed in the word of the Lord. [Time expired.]

Third Day,—Third Proposition.—January 30, 1868.

MR. MATHES' FIRST SPEECH—(45 MINUTES)

The following Proposition was read by the President:

"Immersion, to a penitent believer, is in order to the remission of past sins." Affirmative, Mr. Mathes; Negative, Mr. Brooks.

MR. PRESIDENT: In the discussion of this third proposition, which has just been read by the moderator, I shall use the term immersion, as synonymous with baptism. I make this statement now, that there may be no misunderstanding hereafter. I simply prefer to use an English term, rather than its Greek representative.

The question to be discussed to-day is a very important one, and one upon which we, as a people, have been more generally misunderstood than upon any other subject. But I am happy to appear before you under the present circumstances, to develop the subject, as far as it can be done in a single day, and, by a full and fair discussion of the real issue, test the correctness of our position. And I am happy to have so large an audience to hear and decide upon our arguments.

We do not affirm that immersion *alone* is for the remission of sins. We do not preach immersion *alone*, faith *alone*, repentance *alone*, or the Spirit alone; but the whole Gospel. A man must hear the Gospel, believe it, and repent of his sins:—this constitutes him a penitent believer. Then, upon a confession of his faith in Christ, he is immersed into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit, in order to the remission of his past sins. By the phrase "penitent believer," infants are excluded from immersion, as not proper subjects of the divine ordinance. They can not be penitent believers. A penitent believer is not necessarily a full-grown person; but any one, old

or young, who is capable of hearing, believing, and obeying the Gospel, may be a penitent believer. And, from the fact that the Gospel is very plain and simple, very young persons believe and obey it, and become Christians.

I desire a candid investigation of the proposition before us. Let us have no dodging nor quibbling, but a straightforward, candid and fair discussion, as we are all deeply interested in the truth. Nothing but the truth can make us free. I will read, as a starting point in my argument, the great commission, as recorded by the four evangelists: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (Matt, xxviii: 19, 20.) Here the command, "Teach all nations," means to make disciples in all nations, by teaching them—by preaching the Gospel. None but those who can believe the Gospel are embraced in it; and those who obeyed it, were recognized as disciples in the days of the apostles. Again:

"He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." (Mark xvi: 16.) Here salvation, or pardon of sins, is promised to none but believers who are baptized. Again;

"Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." (Luke xxiv: 46, 47.) Here we have the beginning-place clearly-stated. It was to "begin in Jerusalem." And the preaching in the name of Jesus did begin in Jerusalem, on the day of Pentecost. "Repentance and remission of sins" was never preached in the name of Jesus until the day of Pentecost; and as it began there, so it was to be preached in all the world. This is the reason why I and my brethren preach the Gospel to day just as it began in Jerusalem. Are we not right? Again:

"Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." (John xx: 23.) The power of declaring the law of pardon to sinners, is hereby delegated to the apostles, and they proclaimed it to the world on the day of Pentecost.

We have now heard the great commission, as recorded by the four evangelists, and which, taken together, is the commission in full. After giving this commission to his apostles, he told them to tarry in Jerusalem till they received the power from on high. He then ascended to heaven, and was crowned king, and sent down the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost. This was the promised "power from on high," and fully prepared them for the great work of preaching the Gospel in all the world, beginning at Jerusalem. In this commission we have the proof of my proposition.

The multitude heard Peter preach in the name of Jesus Christ, guided by the Holy Spirit. "Now when they heard this, they were pierced in their heart, and cried out, and said, 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 Spirit." (Acts ii: 37, 38.) These were penitent believers, and their baptism was for the remission of past sins. My proposition is already proved. For, "they that gladly received his word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them, about three thousand souls."

The commission authorized the apostles to do certain things, namely: to teach, and immerse the taught who became penitent believers. But it did not authorize them to do what it virtually forbid; that is, it gave them no authority to baptize infants, as they are incapable of being taught, or of believing the Gospel; and, consequently, the commission forbids their baptism. All the authority it

gives is found in the words of the commission itself, and not outside of it. All admit that baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ. Well, if Christ commanded it, it was for some purpose—it had a design.

If Mr. Brooks denies that remission of sins is its design, I hope he will try to show us what its design is. Has it any connection with the remission of sins? If so, what is it? In order to learn the full meaning of the commission, we must take all the record upon the subject by all the evangelists. Having learned the relation of baptism to remission of sins, we shall see that faith, repentance and baptism, all have their place in the Gospel plan of pardon, and one can not be substituted for another. It will not do to substitute baptism for faith, nor will faith, or anything else, do in the place of baptism. Each item in the divine arrangement must stand exactly where God has fixed it, and for the very purpose he commanded it. According to the commission, baptism was instituted for believers, and, of course, they are the subjects of it, and not unconscious babies. To apply it to any, therefore, but a penitent believer, is to pervert it from its original design.

Who, then, is a penitent believer? It may be any one, old or young, male or female, who is capable of understanding the Gospel. To be a penitent believer, it is not necessary that one should believe in the "five points of Calvinism," or the peculiar dogmas of any self-styled "orthodox creed;" but simply to believe the Gospel and repent of sins.

I quote the following Scriptures to show the design of baptism. "In whom also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him," etc. (Col. ii: 11, 12.) "Putting off the body of the

sins of the flesh," is *remission of sins*, and this is done through immersion, or a burial with Christ in baptism. Again: "But God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin; but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you. Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness." (Rom. vi: 17, 18.)

The form of doctrine, according to Mr. Wesley, Dr. McKnight, and others, is "Christian baptism." And Paul says: "Being *then* made free from sin." This fully sustains my proposition.

But I affirm that the concurrent testimony of all the Bible critics and scholars, and all the confessions of faith, sustain me in my position. I will read you an extract from Calvin's Institutes, Vol. III, p. 327: "The first is, that it (baptism) proposed to us by the Lord, as a symbol and token of our purification; or, to express my meaning more fully, it resembles a legal instrument, properly attested, by which he assures us that all our sins are canceled, effaced and obliterated, so that they will never appear in his sight, or come into his remembrance, or be imputed to us. For he commanded all who believe to be baptized for the remission of their sins. Therefore, those who have imagined that baptism is nothing more than a mark or sign by which we profess our obligation before men, as soldiers wear the insignia of their sovereign, as a mark of their profession, have not considered that which is the principal thing in baptism; which is, that we ought to receive it with this promise, 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.'" Again, he says (Vol. III, p. 328): "Nor must it be supposed that baptism is administered only for the time past; so that, for sins into which we may fall after baptism, it would be necessary to seek other new remedies of expiation in, I know not what other sacraments, as if the virtue of baptism had become obsolete.

* * * * But we ought to conclude that, at whatever time we are baptized, we are washed and purified for the whole of life. Whenever we have fallen, therefore, we must recur to the remembrance of baptism, and arm our minds with the consideration of it, that we may be always certified and assured of the remission of sins."

There are three things which John Calvin says, in the foregoing passage, baptism is for. 1. It is a legal instrument, or symbol, that assures us that our sins are canceled, effaced and obliterated, so that they will never appear against us. 2. Baptism is administered for the remission of *past* sins. 3. Baptism is also administered for the remission of all the sins of the whole of life—past, present, and future. So, that, if one falls into sin at any time after his baptism, he has only to remember his baptism to be assured that his sins are all pardoned. This is putting entirely too much stress upon baptism. Yet it shows the light in which the great Calvin, the Father of Presbyterianism, viewed the matter. According to him, baptism is for the remission of sins past, present and future.

Here, again, I will quote from John Wesley. (Doctrinal Tracts, p. 259, ¶ 10): "To sum up the evidence: if outward baptism be generally, in an ordinary way, *necessary to salvation*, and infants may be saved as well as adults, nor *ought we to neglect any means of saving them*" etc. Further along he says: "Lastly, if there are such inestimable benefits conferred in baptism—the washing away of the guilt of original sin, the engrafting us into Christ, by making us members of his church, and thereby giving us a right to all the blessings of the Gospel—it follows that infants may, yea, ought to be baptized, and that none ought to hinder them."

In this extract we find Mr. Wesley maintaining, not only that baptism is for the remission of *actual* sins, but that the guilt of "original sin" is also washed away in baptism,

and that it is necessary to the salvation of infants and adults. This is much further than we are willing to go; but it shows that Mr. Wesley, the Father of Methodism, taught the doctrine of baptism in order to the remission of sins. And I am astonished that Mr. Brooks, and the Methodist Episcopal Church in Bedford, should repudiate the teachings of Mr. Wesley, who says that he is "under God, the Father of the whole family." But so it is.

We now call your attention to the Great Reformer, Martin Luther, on the subject of the design of baptism. He says: "This is not done by the changing of a garment, or by any laws or work, but by a new birth, and by the renewing of the inward man, which is done in baptism, as Paul saith: 'All ye that are baptized have put on Christ.' Also: 'According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost.' For, besides that, they who are baptized are regenerated and renewed by the Holy Ghost to a heavenly righteousness, and to eternal life."—*Luther on Galatians*, p. 302; edition of 1801. Here it is distinctly stated by Luther, that the new birth, the renewing of the inward man, is consummated in baptism, and this brings the person baptized to a heavenly righteousness, and to eternal life. This language is stronger than any ever used by myself or my brethren, on the design of baptism.

I will now give you a quotation from the great Dr. Dwight, at one time President of Yale College, a distinguished Presbyterian Divine. He says: "To be born of water, here means baptism (John iii: 5), and, in my view of it, is as necessary to our admission into the visible church, as to be born of the Spirit is to our admission into the invisible kingdom. It is to be observed, that he who understands the authority of this institution, and refuses to obey it, will never enter into either the visible or the invisible kingdom."—*Dwight's Theology*.

Such is the strong language of one of the greatest men of the Presbyterian Church on the design of baptism.

I will now treat you to a quotation from the Westminster Confession of Faith, which is acknowledged by all good Presbyterians to be good authority, it being the Constitution of the Presbyterian Church. We read from chapter xxviii, on baptism:

"Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ, not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible church, but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace, of his ingrafting into Christ, of regeneration, of *remission of sins*, and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life," *etc.* I read also Question 165, with the answer, from the Larger Catechism. "Q. *What is baptism?* A. Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, wherein Christ hath ordained the washing with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, to be a sign and seal of ingrafting into himself, of remission of sins by his blood, and regeneration by his Spirit," *etc.*

In all these quotations from Paedobaptists themselves, the doctrine of baptism in order to the remission of sins is clearly taught, and my proposition fully sustained. But I wish now to read from the Methodist Discipline, on the design of baptism. This will be acknowledged to be good authority in this discussion. I read from the seventeenth Article of religion—"Of baptism:"

"Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also a sign of regeneration, or the new birth," *etc.* Again, in the ritual for baptism, we find the following in the first prayer in the ministrations of baptism to infants:

"Dearly Beloved: Forasmuch as all men are conceived

and born in sin. and that our Saviour Christ saith, 'None can enter into the kingdom of God except he be regenerated and born anew of water and of the Holy Ghost,' 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 thing which by nature he can not have, that he may be baptized with water and with the Holy Ghost, and received into Christ's holy Church, and made a lively member of the same."

Again we read:

"By the baptism of thy well-beloved Son Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, didst sanctify water for this holy sacrament; we beseech thee, for thine infinite mercies, that thou wilt look upon this child, *wash him*, and sanctify him "with the Holy Ghost; that he, being delivered from thy wrath, may be received into the ark of Christ's Church," etc.

By these passages from the Discipline, we find the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins clearly taught. And not only this, but they teach plainly, that baptism delivers the infant from God's wrath, and takes it into the ark of Christ's Church. And this is *water alone*, for infants can have neither faith nor repentance. But, worse still: these prayers teach that infants are under the wrath of God! Well, now, suppose, for a moment, that this position is true, and that they are delivered from God's wrath by baptism; then, what will become of the unbaptized infant, according to Methodism? Certainly, the unbaptized infants and adults will be lost, if this doctrine be true. I do not say that Mr. Brooks, or his brethren, believe in the awful doctrine of infant damnation; it is likely they do not hold it. But I do say, that such a conclusion can not be avoided, if the premises are correct.

All the Reformers held the doctrine of baptism for the remission of sins, and many of their utterances upon this subject are too strong for us, as I am free to confess. My

position is, that immersion to a penitent believer, and to no one else, is in order to the remission of past sins. The correctness of this position I have now fully established by the Scriptures I have quoted, and the passages I have read from the Discipline, from Wesley, Dwight, Calvin, the Confession of Faith, and from Martin Luther. These fully sustain my proposition. [Time expired.]

Third Day.—Third Proposition.—January 30, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' FIRST REPLY—(45 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: The proposition under discussion to-day is one of much importance, and I feel that we shall have a very pleasant time to-day. Mr. Mathes is a very pleasant debater. I know, and you all know, that he is able to defend his side of the question, if any man of his party can do it. Mr. Mathes is a man of superior ability, second to no man of his party in the State. The proposition is a fair one, expressing the real issue between us on this point. I accept the use of the term *immersion*, for baptism, and all will understand us. It will be time enough to look into immersion when we get on the *mode*. For the present, I shall not trouble myself with the question about the *mode*.

One of the best ways to show up the falsity of a proposition is to show the bad consequences it leads to, if admitted to be true. I will now apply this rule to Mr. Mathes' doctrine in order to test it. If his doctrine is true, then all who have died without immersion have gone to perdition; and, mind ye now, baptism with Mr. Mathes is always immersion, for he says so himself. You see, then, the awful consequences that will necessarily follow: all gone to hell except the few who have been immersed. Calvin has gone to perdition, for he never was immersed.

John Wesley is in hell, for he never was immersed. The great Martin Luther was not immersed, and is in hell, according to Mr. Mathes. Indeed, I may say that nearly all the great and good men of the past have gone to perdition, according to the doctrine of my friend Mr. Mathes and his party. General George Washington, the father of his country, has gone to the devil, if the doctrine of my friend be true, as he was never immersed. And the great Henry Clay—where is he? In hell! General Jackson, gone to perdition! Yes, all gone to hell, if Mr. Mathes is right; because none of them were immersed. I am astonished at such a man as Mr. Mathes holding such a monstrous doctrine as this, a doctrine that involves such consequences as these!

Why, my friends, if Mr. Mathes is right, nearly all the Presbyterians, Methodists, Catholics, Episcopalians, and all others, have gone to perdition. You see, now, the bad consequences of Mr. Mathes' doctrine. This is sufficient proof that it is false. Why, if his doctrine be true, then God has suspended the remission of sins on a third man, which can not be believed for a moment: because it is not reasonable that God has made the pardon of sins to depend on immersion; for, if it is so, then you and I will be lost unless we get some man to dip us. I can not believe such an unreasonable doctrine as this—a doctrine which involves such terrible consequences—the damnation of a large majority of the human family. I have a better opinion of the mercy of God than that. I believe that Calvin, Luther, Wesley, Henry Clay, General Washington, Jefferson, and a host of others who were never immersed, are now in heaven. So, you see now, that Mr. Mathes is wrong. A system that involves such bad consequences can not be true.

The witnesses introduced by Mr. Mathes prove too much for him—they prove more than he contends for, and

hence, they prove nothing. When I introduced the passage of the children of Israel through the Red Sea, and their baptism into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, to prove that infants of believing parents were the proper subjects of baptism, Mr. Mathes said the passage proved too much—as the cattle, knead-troughs, and all their property, were baptized at the same time, as well as their infants.

Upon the same principle I now object to his witnesses, since they prove too much for his purposes, and hence, prove nothing. The witnesses swear too much, and hence, they must stand aside. I shall not feel called upon to notice the testimony of Calvin, Luther, Wesley, Dwight, and others introduced by him, who, though they seem to favor his doctrine of baptismal regeneration, say, also, many things which Mr. Mathes admits that he does not believe; therefore, they prove nothing for him, and can not be heard at all, and need not be noticed in this reply.

But my friend Mr. Mathes would have everybody unbaptized except his own little party. But I say it is the gentleman and his party who are wrong and unbaptized. He can not trace his baptism further back than Zeke Holliman and Roger Williams. Zeke dipped Roger Williams, and then, upon the principle that one good turn deserves another, Roger turned round and dipped Zeke, and thus started immersion in this country. Mr. Mathes⁷ succession, therefore, is a very short line, running back only to Zeke Holliman. And, that being so, you see that he and his party have no baptism at all, and have no authority to preach or baptize anybody else. The whole thing is *bogus*.

I don't indorse Wesley's views of baptism. He said many good things on the subject, but he also said many things which I, and those I represent, do not indorse. He never was a member of the Methodist Episcopal Church, though he was a good Episcopalian, and died in that com-

munion. We do not agree with Mr. Wesley, that infants are forgiven and saved by baptism. These High Church doctrines were held by Mr. Wesley, in common with the Episcopal Church; but we Methodists of the present day do not indorse them.

But Mr. Mathes tells us that there are six hundred sects in the world, and, of course, his party makes another sect—thus making, in all, six hundred and one sects. He says they are all wrong except his party. That is, there are six hundred *naughts*; and I say that his church makes one more *naught*. I affirm, that Mr. Mathes' party is a sect, as much so as any other of the six hundred; and, if I am correct in this, it follows that Mr. Mathes and all his brethren are on the broad road to perdition. But, if I am wrong, and Mr. Mathes is right, then, mind ye, all the six hundred sects, with all the thousands comprising their membership, are on their way to hell. This alone is sufficient to prove his doctrine false. Mr. Mathes and his party deny that a man must be pardoned before baptism. But, if Mr. Mathes is right, then all denominations are in error, and on their way to hell; for they all deny that baptism is for the remission of sins. The Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, and all others, are a unit in denying that baptism is for the remission of sins, and, of course, are all on the broad road to the devil. The Baptists are no exception to this; for, though they do immerse, yet they don't do it for the remission of sins.

I will now quote a passage from Isaiah ix: 6: "For unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." Here is a prophecy which was to be fulfilled in the future, and had reference to the reign of Christ, which commenced on the day of Pentecost. God the Father had the government of

the church in his hands before that time. Before the day of Pentecost, John the Baptist had preached baptism for the remission of sins. But the disciples of Christ themselves had not been baptized by John; and hence their sins were not pardoned, and they were all lost, as well as Judas, if Mr. Mathes is right in his doctrine.

But we see that under the reign of the Father, men were saved without baptism; therefore, it is unreasonable to suppose that, when the Son took the government on the day of Pentecost, he so changed the order that men could not be saved without baptism. Some of the Scriptures quoted by Mr. Mathes have reference to the *mode* of baptism. But I will say to him that we are not now on the *mode*; but the issue to-day is, the *design* of baptism. When we come to the proposition on the *mode*, I will give him enough to do; but I shall not take up my time in debating the mode, till we come to it in the regular order of debate.

But Mr. Mathes' doctrine involves the absurdity that anybody may baptize, and it is all right; he would acknowledge it as valid baptism. Yet he will deny that the administrator is a Christian, if he has not been immersed; though he may immerse others, and it is valid. So, you see that Mr. Mathes gets himself into a *dilemma* here. But I deny his position; no man has any right to baptize another, who has not himself been baptized by a properly ordained minister of the Gospel—one who can trace his ordination and baptism back to the apostles.

Mr. Mathes admits the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the household of Cornelius. But, I ask, was it before or after their baptism with water? Is it reasonable to suppose that God would pour out the Spirit on those whose sins were not pardoned? They were baptized with the Spirit first, and with water afterward; therefore, baptism,

in the case of Cornelius and his house, was not for the remission of sins.

According to Mr. Mathes, whoever believes that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God, and is immersed, is saved—is a Christian. But we do not believe this. Why, according to this doctrine, king Agrippa would have been pardoned if he had permitted Paul to immerse him. He said to Paul, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." If Mr. Mathes had been there instead of Paul, he would have told him: "Just be immersed, and you will be a full-grown Christian." What a pity my friend Mathes was not there!

But Mr. Mathes says that the preposition "*for*" in Acts ii: 38, means "*in order to*." I deny it. John baptized for the remission of sins; then, I ask, what advantage was there in the change from John's to Christ's baptism? In the commission, as given by Mark xvi: 16, all agree that the translation, "*is baptized*" is right. It does not say, "he that believeth and will be baptized shall be saved;" but, "he that believeth and *is baptized* shall be saved." You see, my friends, that it is not in the future time, but the present. The person believeth *now*, and is already baptized when he believes. So, now, you see where my friend's theory has led him. This passage destroys his proposition entirely; as, according to this text, faith may come any time after baptism.

But I intend to give the gentleman some trouble with the preposition "*for*," which he says means *in order to*, in Acts ii: 38. If that is so, his proposition is already proved. But it is not true, as I will now prove. I will read you a parallel passage from I Corinthians xv: 29: "Else what shall they do who are baptized *for* the dead." If Mr. Mathes is right, then this should read: "Else what shall they do who are baptized *in order to the dead*." This makes nonsense, and is, therefore, false. Now, I want

Mr. Mathes to attend to this, and get out of the difficulty if he can.

I will now quote a passage from Mr. Campbell's Christian System, p. 209: "And here it is worthy of notice that the apostles, in all their speeches and replies to interrogatories, never commanded an inquirer to pray, read, or sing, as preliminary to his coming; but always commanded and proclaimed immersion as the first duty, or the first thing to be done, after a belief of the testimony. Hence, neither praying, singing, reading, repenting, sorrowing, resolving, nor waiting to be better, was the converting act. Immersion alone was the act of turning to God. Hence, in the commission to convert the nations, the only institution, after proclaiming the Gospel, was the immersion of the believers, as the divinely authorized way of carrying out and completing the work; and from the day of Pentecost to the final *amen* in the Revelation of Jesus Christ, no person was ever said to be converted, or to turn to God, until he was buried in and raised out of the water."

Now, you see what Mr. Campbell says upon this subject: "Immersion *alone* is the *act* of turning to God;" and he says nothing about faith or repentance, but it is immersion *alone*. Now, I do hope Mr. Mathes will attend to this in his next speech.

I now challenge Mr. Mathes to produce a single passage of Scripture which says that any one was ever baptized *in order to* the remission of sins. There is no such text in the Bible. I will now read Romans iv: 1-4: "What shall we say then, that Abraham, our father as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory: but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt."

Now you see where my friend stands: "Abraham be-

lieved God, and his faith was counted unto him for righteousness;" then, you see, it was by faith he was justified, and not by works. But Mr. Mathes would make you believe that justification is by works. Abraham was a model man, and if he was justified by faith, so the same faith will justify all who have it now. But Mr. Mathes is not satisfied with this, but must put in immersion. He says, without immersion there is no justification; thus he will have it by works, and thus contradict the apostle Paul. [Time expired.]

Third Day.—Third Proposition.—January 30, 1868.

MR. MATHES' SECOND SPEECH—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brooks seems to labor without system. He takes up a little *here* and a little *there*, but seems very shy. He does not come up to the work of answering my arguments. In fact, he has missed the question entirely, and debated a question not at issue between us. Most of his speech was made up of assertions and *ad captandum appeals* to the prejudices of Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists, without even an *attempt* to meet the issue with testimony and argument. I have a right, therefore, to assume that he can not meet me on the issue, and that he is conscious of it.

It was quite amusing to hear him, near the close of his speech, challenge me to produce a Scripture in the very words of my proposition. This is a most remarkable demand. A proposition in the very words of Scripture, would not be debatable at all: such a proposition could only be opposed by an infidel. It is, therefore, most unreasonable for my friend to demand a Scripture in the very terms of my proposition—that is, to find a passage of Scripture saying, that "baptism is *in order to* the remission of sins."

But I have already produced a passage which says: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for* the remission of sins;" and I have stated that "*for*" in this text (Acts ii: 38), is equivalent to "*in order to.*" If I prove this, the question is settled, and my proposition true. This is all that I have to show to gain the question, and this I shall do, if the Lord will.

I do not say that the Greek preposition *eis*, which is translated *for*, in Acts ii: 38, should always be rendered *in order to*; perhaps its more common meaning is *into*. Dr. Buck, of Louisville, at the time editor of the *Baptist Recorder*, took the position, a few years ago, that it should be so rendered in this very text, "Repent, and be baptized *into* the remission of sins," and I have very little objection to this rendering; it is equivalent to "*in order to.*" But I will introduce a few parallel passages to prove that I am correct in saying that "*eis*" in this passage, is equivalent to the English "*in order to*" or *into*.

We will first give the original phrase, "*eis aphasin amartion;*"—common version, "For the remission of sins," and, more properly, "*in order to the remission of sins.*" The very same form of expression occupies in Matt, xxvi: 28: "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many, *for the remission of sins*" Here it is exactly the same in the Greek, "*eis aphasin amartion.*" Now let Mr. Brooks tell this intelligent audience whether Jesus poured out his blood *in order to the remission of sins*, or because the sins of the people were already pardoned? Whatever the phrase means in this place, it means in Acts ii: 38, for they are precisely the same.

Take another example (Mark xiv: 8): "She hath done what she could. She is come beforehand to anoint my body to the burying." Here we have the same form of expression—"eis ton entaphiasmon;" which may be properly rendered, "*in order to the burial.*" Did this woman

pour the oil on the head of Jesus *because he was already buried*, or was it *in order to* his burial? Certainly the latter.

Another example we find in Luke ii: 32: "*Phos eis apokalupsin ethnon*"—"A light *to* enlighten the Gentiles." Here, *in order to* is evidently the meaning of the preposition *eis*. Was Christ a Light *because* the Gentiles were already enlightened? or was it *in order to* their enlightenment? This a child can understand. We might give a hundred other examples of the use of the preposition *eis*, where it necessarily means *in order to*, but these will be sufficient to sustain our position.

We now return to Acts ii: 38. Mr. Brooks has admitted what every intelligent man and woman in this assembly knows to be true—that, if *eis*, in this text, means "*in order to*" then my proposition is fully sustained. Very well; let us see. Peter said to the inquiring multitude who had heard his testimony concerning the Christ, and believed it: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *for* the remission of sins." "*Eis aphesin amartion*;"—which we render into English thus: "*In order to the remission of sins.*" In the common version it is translated, "*for the remission of sins.*"

But are we justified in rendering the preposition *eis*, by *in order to*, in this text? Mr. Brooks says we are not, and that it ought to be rendered "*because of*"—"because of remission of sins." That I am right, and Mr. Brooks wrong, will appear from the following facts: The copulative conjunction *and* joins on a member of a sentence, and shows that the connected words bear the same relation to some other word in the sentence. Here we have repentance and baptism joined together by the conjunction *and*. This shows that Peter commanded them to repent and be baptized for the same thing.

Now, if it means *because of* then it will make good sense

to read it so—thus: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, *because of* the remission of sins." That is, repent every one of you, because you have received the remission of sins. If baptism was because their sins were pardoned, then repentance was for the same reason. Now, what do you think of such theology as this, my friends? An inspired apostle commanding a believing multitude to *repent*, be *sorry*, because their sins were already pardoned. Yet this is the case if Mr. Brooks is correct. I am surprised that a man of Mr. Brooks' shrewdness should commit such a monstrous blunder.

But all is plain and consistent when we understand it to mean *in order to*. Their repentance and immersion were both for the same object—*remission of sins*.

But, while upon the preposition, I will notice the example which my friend Mr. Brooks brought forward as a parallel passage to prove that "for" means *because of*. It is I Cor. xv: 29: "Else what shall they do who are baptized for the dead." He quoted this with an air of triumph, as though he had overthrown my proposition by it. You will, no doubt, be surprised when I tell you that he is mistaken in the preposition. It is not *eis*, but "*huper*." The passage is "*huper ton nekron*"—literally, "*immersed over the dead*." Mr. Brooks either knew this, and tried to deceive you, or he did not know it. I will not accuse him of a bad design, but he ought to be better posted before he attempts another criticism. My proposition, then, is fully sustained; and here I might rest the matter. But I will add that the apostle is here speaking of the baptism of believers who had been immersed to set forth their faith in the resurrection of the dead. Some of them had denied the doctrine of the resurrection, and Paul answers them upon the hypothesis that there will be no resurrection of the dead—"Else what shall they do who have been immersed, to show their faith in the resurrection, if there

is none?" But *eis* generally means *into*, and I have no objection to using it in the passage in Acts ii: 38. "Repent, and be immersed into the remission of sins." This rendering fully sustains me, as we can not have remission of sins till we are baptized into it.

Hence, though I can not produce any Scripture that says baptism is *in order to* the remission of sins, in the common version, yet I have produced several passages which prove that *in order to* is most certainly the true meaning of the preposition *eis* in Acts ii: 38; and, therefore, I have done the very thing which he called for. I hope that this will satisfy Mr. Brooks upon this point.

Mr. Brooks charges that the church of which I am a member is *bogus*, and that we have no authority to preach and baptize; while he claims to be able to trace his own baptism and ordination back to the apostles. Well, this is quite refreshing. But I will show you what sort of succession Mr. Brooks and his brethren have. I read from a book of sermons by G. T. Chapman, D.D., an Episcopalian divine, who knew all about Methodistic succession. On page 113, as read on a former proposition, he speaks of Wesley's ordination of Dr. Coke, who was the first bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He says:

" But if by this imposition of hands anything more was intended than the blessing of a good old man upon his fellow laborer in the ministry, or if the word *superintendent* was designed to be used as synonymous with *bishop*, then we are called upon to believe the strange anomaly that one presbyter, as Mr. Wesley styles himself in the instrument, can advance another to a higher order in the priesthood than he himself possessed."

By this we show that the Methodist is not the *regular* church. They have no regular ordination or baptism. Their ordination is repudiated by the Episcopal Church, from which they sprung, and who understand its value;

and hence, according to Mr. Brooks' logic, Methodists are all unbaptized, and unordained, and have no right to preach or baptize. When John Wesley ordained Dr. Coke, he performed the ceremony *privately*, in his chamber, without the knowledge of his own brother, Charles Wesley, who was with him at the time.

But this ordination, such as it was, was not intended to make Dr. Coke a bishop, but only a "superintendent." But when Dr. Coke came over to Baltimore he *assumed* to be a "BISHOP," and immediately proceeded to make a bishop of Francis Asbury, by the laying on of his Episcopal hands! We affirm, that neither Mr. Brooks nor any other Methodist preacher can trace his ordination further back than to Mr. Wesley's bed-room, in England.

God never intended that an unbroken chain of ordination should be traced back to the apostles. It is a *delusion*, and a *humbug*. The true test of authority is fidelity to the word of God. This is the only test of the true church, and of the authority of its ministers to preach and baptize.

I was glad to hear Mr. Brooks admit that the reign of Christ commenced on the day of Pentecost. I think he is improving. But he charges me with sending Calvin, Luther, Wesley, Clay, Washington, and a host of other great and good men, to hell. Now, there is no argument in this; and no man ever descends to it unless he has a bad cause to manage. Such *ad captandum* appeals are an open confession of weakness and failure. I said nothing about sending anybody to hell; it is all in the gentleman's imagination. We are not debating the question, whether those great men have gone to heaven or to hell. What is God's plan of salvation?—this is the question. What does God say? If God's word sends men to perdition, neither Mr. Brooks nor myself can change it. My motto is: "Let God be true, and every man a liar."

But Mr. Brooks strangely confounds terms and ideas. My proposition is, that "Immersion, to a penitent believer, is in order to the remission of past sins." Now, I make a marked distinction between the remission of sins and the future salvation, or entrance into heaven. Mr. Brooks argues as though there was no difference. We have nothing to do with the future salvation to-day, as it is not in the proposition. The law of induction into the church on earth is the subject of our discussion to-day. No doubt many will be received into heaven who were not immersed, and not members of the church on earth—as all infants who die in infancy, and all idiots. So far as these men are concerned, we know nothing. If they lived and died in disobedience of the Gospel of Christ, we know that they were not members of the Church of Christ on earth. I think I am as charitable as any man in this assembly; and while I may have a favorable opinion of their reception into heaven, yet, in a question of this kind, we are not permitted to go beyond what God has revealed to us in his word. Therefore, what God will do, or will not do, outside of what he has revealed in his word, we know nothing, and, therefore, we neither affirm nor deny. It is our business to teach what he has revealed to us as his plan of pardon. I hope this will satisfy Mr. Brooks.

The salvation promised in the great commission simply means pardon of past sins. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved;" that is, shall be *pardoned*. This corresponds exactly with Acts ii: 38. In this passage, Peter is giving directions to penitent believers how they could be saved, and he says: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, in order to the remission of sins."

Here, then, I stand with eminent Baptists, and many of the most learned Paedobaptists, upon this subject. I ask, can a man enjoy the pardon of sins until he gets *into* it?

Were the three thousand converts on the day of Pentecost pardoned when Peter told them to be baptized? If they were, then they were pardoned before they repented; for they were instructed to repent and be immersed for the same object, namely: the remission of sins. If their sins were pardoned before they were baptized, it was done without repentance likewise.

If it is absurd to say that remission of sins was enjoyed without repentance, it is equally absurd and unscriptural to teach remission of sins before baptism. Yet, Mr. Brooks and his church teach the absurdity. According to their construction of Peter's language, he commanded them to "*repent, because* their sins were already pardoned."

But Mr. Brooks has quoted from Mr. Campbell to prove that he taught, "that immersion was the *only* thing required of any one in order to the remission of sins." Now, permit me to say, that I am not here to defend Mr. Campbell's views, but to disprove Mr. Brooks' position, and show that the New Testament teaches baptism in order to the remission of sins; yet I must say that Mr. Brooks has misrepresented Mr. Campbell. When Mr. Campbell said, that "immersion *alone* was the *act* of turning to God," the whole context shows that he only meant that immersion was the first and only *overt act* of the sinner in turning to God. He did not mean to exclude faith and repentance; for he had fully discussed these before, in the same connection, as conditions in turning the sinner to God. But he does not call faith and repentance *acts*—*overt* or outward *acts*. Immersion is the first and only *overt act* that God has commanded the sinner to do in turning to him. Faith leaves the sinner just where he was before he had faith, so far as any visible act is concerned, while immersion is a visible *act* in which the sinner puts on Christ, and is "translated from the kingdom of darkness into the kingdom of God's dear Son." And hence, Mr. Campbell's

statement is correct, when taken in its proper connection, as he intended it should be.

I will now proceed with my proof. I will next take the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, as recorded in Acts xxii. While journeying to Damascus, to persecute the disciples there, as he came nigh to the beautiful city, about noon-day, suddenly a great light from heaven shone round about him, exceeding the brightness of the sun, and he and his companions all fell to the ground in profound astonishment and wonder, no doubt expecting to see a vision; for you will bear in mind that Saul was an honest man, very religious, and thought, in persecuting Christians, he was doing right. The Lord spoke to him. And he answered and said: "'Who art thou, Lord?" The Lord said: "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom thou persecutest." Saul then said: "Lord, what wilt thou have me do?" The answer was; "Go into Damascus, and there it shall be told thee all things that are appointed for thee to do."

He went into the city, where he remained three days, without sight, fasting and praying. Then the disciple Ananias was sent to him to tell him what he *must* do. And after telling him why the Lord had appeared to him in the way, he said: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Here we have a penitent believer. He had believed that Jesus was the Christ, and repented of his sins, and then he was commanded to be baptized and wash away his sins. The washing away of sins, and remission of sins, are one and the same thing. My proposition, therefore, is fully sustained by this Scripture. If baptism has no connection with the remission of sins, why was Saul commanded to be baptized and *wash away* his sins?

If Mr. Brooks had been there, he would no doubt have said: "Hold on, brother Ananias; you are mistaken:

baptism is not for the remission of sins; brother Saul's sins were remitted three days ago, when he believed." But the inspired man of God, Ananias, told him what he *must do*—"be immersed and wash away his sins." [Time expired.]

Third Day.—Third Proposition.—January 30, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' SECOND REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: YOU have now heard Mr. Mathes more fully develop his uncharitable doctrine. He will not allow any one to be saved unless he is dipped in water. Now, I believe if we all do the best we can, we will all get to heaven, whether we are immersed or not. If we are holy in heart, we shall get to heaven, though we may never have been immersed, or baptized in any way. Baptism is not essential to salvation in any way; and Paul did not consider it *essential*. Hear what he says (I Corinthians i: 14): "I thank God that I baptized none of you." So you see, my friends, that Paul and my friend Mr. Mathes differ amazingly! Paul was not in for baptizing the people, but for preaching the Gospel; while Mr. Mathes goes in for baptizing everybody who will consent to go into the water with him. But this disagreement between them can be understood easy enough, when we remember that Paul and Mr. Mathes did not belong to the same organization. The apostle Paul belonged to the Church of Christ, and, of course, was right in his doctrine; while Mr. Mathes belongs to a different church—a *bogus concern*. Hence, Mr. Mathes is trying to destroy Paul's doctrine. But, mind you, he can not do it.

But Mr. Mathes gives it as his *opinion* that Wesley, Calvin, and Luther, may be admitted into heaven, though

he has no evidence from the Bible that they will. If not immersed, he says they could not be members of Christ's Church on earth. But he can not tell what may be their fate in the world to come; but he seems to have some sort of private opinion that they may get to heaven at last. I suppose, then, the case may be stated about in this way: His *faith* is, that they have all gone to hell; but his *opinion* is, that they may all get to heaven! Thus, you see that his opinion is at war with his faith. He makes a broad distinction between *faith* and *opinion*; but we make no such distinction—*my faith is my opinion*. I do not believe one way, and at the same time have a contrary opinion about it.

If I believed that water-baptism was for the remission of sins, I would go round the world and baptize every one that I could get my hands on, and thus save as many as I possibly could!

Mr. Mathes and his party are always preaching on baptism. In this they differ from the apostles, for they never preached on baptism. Paul did not preach about baptism to the jailer and his family, but simply told them to "believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and he and his house should be saved;" but said not one word to him about baptism.

Peter, on the day of Pentecost, said not one word about baptism in his sermon. If Mr. Mathes had been at Peter's side, he would have told the people, "Just be immersed, and all will be right." But Peter did not say so. In Acts xxvi: 17, we have what Paul was commanded to do in going to the Gentiles. He was to "open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God," that they might receive the forgiveness of sins. Not a word is said here about baptizing anybody. And yet forgiveness of sins is promised, and an

inheritance among the sanctified by faith, but not a word about baptism.

Now, I ask, if a man was turned from darkness to light, what would become of him if he was never immersed? I say that such a one would go to heaven without baptism. No doubt Mr. Mathes will disagree with me in this.

I now quote Ephesians ii: 8. "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Here the apostle says that we are saved "by grace, through faith," and says not a word about baptism; hence, sins are pardoned without baptism, and Mr. Mathes' proposition is not true.

Peter went down to the house of Cornelius, and preached the Gospel to them—in which he did not mention baptism—and they were baptized with the Holy Ghost—not water. Those who received the baptism of the Holy Ghost were pardoned, of course; yet they had not been baptized in water till afterward. Hence, baptism in water is not necessary to the pardon of sins.

I will now quote a passage from Mr. Campbell's debate with McCalla, as quoted by Mr. Rice in his debate with Campbell (p. 524). He says: "The water of baptism, then, *formally* washes away our sins. *Paul's sins were really pardoned when he believed; yet he had no solemn fledge* of the fact, *no formal* acquittal, *no formal* purgation of his sins, until he washed them away in baptism."

According to Mr. Campbell, then, sins are *really* pardoned when any one believes; but there is no *formal* acquittal of sins until baptism takes place. Now, what will my friend Mr. Mathes do? The great Alexander Campbell is against him, as well as the Bible. You will now see some squirming and twisting. It is very amusing!

Now, I say that the Gospel is one thing, and its ordinances is another and a very different thing. When we believe the Gospel, then it is that we obtain the remission

of our sins in *reality*. We are justified by faith only. And I am glad that Mr. Campbell agrees with me in this important position. Pardon is not dependent upon baptism, which is only an ordinance of the Gospel, and not essential.

But, according to Mr. Mathes, no one can be pardoned unless he is immersed. Now, what do you think of it, my friends? If he is right, your salvation and mine depend upon a third person. No matter how much faith we may have, no matter how much repentance, no matter how much we may pray, it will all avail nothing, unless we can get some one to plunge us into the water! And if we are so situated that we can get no one to immerse us, then, according to Mr. Mathes, we must go to hell! What an awful doctrine! I am surprised that a man of Mr. Mathes' information should teach such miserable stuff!

I will now read a passage from Galatians iii: 6: "Even as Abraham believed God, and it was accounted to him for righteousness." Abraham believed God, and it was imputed to him for righteousness. Not a word is said in this passage about immersion, or any other condition, in Abraham's righteousness. Abraham was pardoned when he believed, or he could not have been counted righteous before God. But, according to Mr. Mathes' doctrine, Paul was mistaken. Abraham did not have the remission of sins, and could not have been really righteous, as he was never immersed in water! Now you see what a contradictory system Mr. Mathes advocates.

Again: Mr. Mathes contradicts the Bible. He teaches that dipping into the water is God's plan of pardon. But Peter says: "Seeing that God put no difference between them and us, purifying their heart by faith." And again he says: "Seeing ye have purified your souls in obeying the truth through the Spirit." Thus Peter represents the purification of the heart by *faith*. But Mr. Mathes says,

not so—we are purified by immersion! Now, can't you see the contradiction"?

And, again, the Saviour says: "Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." Peter teaches that the heart is purified by faith only; and Jesus teaches that the "pure in heart shall see God." Therefore, faith is the only condition of salvation. This is the teaching of the Bible upon this important subject.

But Mr. Mathes and his brethren contradict all this, and teach baptism in order to the remission of sins; thus making immersion in water a necessary condition to the pardon of sins! But we all know that this can not be true; because such teaching would damn a large majority of mankind. The Methodists, Presbyterians, Quakers, Lutherans, Catholics, and all the heathen, will be lost, if the doctrine be true. But it is not true. [Time expired.]

Third Day.—Third Proposition.—January 30, 1868.

MR. MATHES' THIRD SPEECH—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT, MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I will read my proposition again, as my friend Mr. Brooks seems to have forgotten it, and some of you may have done the same thing. "Immersion, to a penitent believer, is in order to the remission of past sins."

From the reading of the proposition, you will see that the question before us is not one of *opinion*, but of *fact*. It is a question of divine appointment. It is not, therefore, to be determined by my *opinion*, or Mr. Brooks' opinion, respecting the salvation in heaven, of Washington, Jefferson, Clay, Webster, or any one else. What has God said? And, therefore, must be determined by an appeal to the New Testament. But, according to Mr. Brooks' last speech, one might suppose that it was a mere matter of opinion be-

tween us—whether Mr. Brooks or I had the greatest amount of charity.

But Mr. Brooks maintains that faith is the alone condition of pardon. But does not Mr. Brooks, and every person in this large assembly, know that if Mr. Brooks is right in his position, then all infants dying in infancy will be damned!—as they can not believe. He can not escape this conclusion by saying that faith is not predicated of infants; for he has committed himself fully on this subject, and can not now change it, or take it back. He asserted that infants are embraced in the great commission. "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned." If they are embraced in the commission, then all infants who die in infancy will be damned, because they do not believe.

Dr. Timothy Dwight, President of Yale College, and a leading Presbyterian divine, expresses my views upon the importance of baptism, in the following quotation from his "Theology:" "He who understands the authority of this (baptism) institution, and refuses to obey it, will never enter into either the visible or the invisible kingdom."

If a man knows his duty, and does it not, he will be lost. But I do not teach that any one will be lost for not being immersed, who was so circumstanced that he could not obey it, or who never had the means of learning his duty in this matter. But wherever there is an opportunity of knowing the will of God, and it is willfully and wickedly neglected, such persons will not be held guiltless. God requires no impossibilities of us. But infants are saved without faith, repentance, or baptism, or any other condition to be performed by them, or any one for them.

As to the salvation of the heathen, we need say nothing now, as they are not involved in the proposition. Those

of them who live up to the best light they have, and do the best their circumstance allows, without the Gospel, may probably be saved in heaven, though they can not be recognized as Christians in this world, as they have not obeyed the Gospel.

But Mr. Brooks quotes I Corinthians i: 14, to show that Paul laid no stress on baptism, or, rather, that he thanked God that the people were not baptized! But the language in its connection fails to sustain him. The apostle does not say that he had not baptized any of them, for he immediately mentions Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanas, as persons whom he had baptized at Corinth, and perhaps others, for he says, "besides, I know not whether I baptized any other."

But why does the apostle "thank God" that he had only baptized those whom he names? He gives the reason himself:—"Lest any should say that I had baptized in my own name." The church at Corinth had become divided about men: some were for Paul, some for Apollos, and some for Cephas. This the apostle decides to be *carnal*; and in view of the fact that a party were calling themselves by his name, he said, "I thank God that I baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, and the household of Stephanas," lest his enemies might have charged him with baptizing in his own name, to build up a party to his own honor.

But he does not thank God that the members of the church at Corinth were not baptized, for they had all been baptized. His remarks upon this subject are aimed at the parties in the church; not to undervalue baptism, as Mr. Brooks would try to make you believe. Paul's great and chief work was to preach the Gospel and defend it against its enemies, and, when necessary, he baptized too; but his companions in travel, no doubt, attended to the baptisms generally. But there is not the slightest intimation that

Paul regarded baptism unnecessary in order to the remission of sins, and admission into the church.

But Mr. Brooks does not like what I said about Saul's conversion. All I said about it was fully sustained by the narrative. If Saul's sins were forgiven him before his baptism, as Mr. Brooks affirms, three days before Ananias came to him to tell him what he *must* do, then I ask, why was he commanded to "Arise, and be baptized and wash away his sins, calling on the name of the Lord?" Why say anything about "washing away his sins," if his baptism had nothing to do with it? Neither Mr. Brooks nor any other man can give a reasonable explanation of this passage upon any other hypothesis than that Saul, like the penitent believers at Pentecost, was baptized "for the remission of sins." The passage needs no explanation; it speaks for itself. I ask Mr. Brooks if he will use the words of Ananias to Saul, or the words of Peter to the three thousand on Pentecost—"Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins"—when instructing penitent believers what they must do to be saved? I challenge him to do it. But I know that he will not dare to do it. It is a well-known fact that no Methodist preacher does so, and they dare not do it; for that would be an abandonment of their whole theory of conversion.

But Mr. Brooks says that Mr. Campbell, in his McCalla debate, admitted that Saul's sins were *really* pardoned when he believed, and before he was baptized. Certainly he did, and so would every Baptist preacher in the land. It is a sufficient answer to this, to say that Mr. Campbell was then a regular Baptist preacher, in full standing; and, of course, he advocated the Baptist view of it in his McCalla debate.

But Mr. Brooks quotes Paul's commission, and says that he "opened the eyes of the Gentiles, and turned them

from darkness to light," without saying a word about baptism to thorn. I ask him to say to this audience, whether Paul made disciples to Christ without baptizing them? He will not dare to say it. Why, then, does he parade Paul's commission to prove that he was not authorized to baptize, when he, and every Methodist preacher upon this platform, knows that in executing that commission he did baptize, and, of course, that he did preach baptism to them, or they would have known nothing about it.

But he says Paul did not preach baptism to the jailer and his family. I ask, then, why were they baptized the same hour of the night, if they were not taught upon that subject. But Luke says that "he spake to him the word of the Lord;" and that includes baptism, as it is in the word of the Lord. But he says that Peter preached not a word about baptism at the house of Cornelius. Now, this is most astonishing, when Luke says: "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." But, stranger still, he said that, on the day of Pentecost, Peter did not preach baptism to the people; when everybody knows that Peter did instruct them to "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Why will my friend make such statements.

I now call attention to Romans vi: 3: "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death." By this Scripture we see that baptism brings us into the death of Christ, where we come to the blood of Christ, and that in his blood we obtain the remission of sins.

Here the design of baptism is most clearly set forth. Without the death of Christ and the shedding of his blood, we could not be pardoned. But the apostle says that it is by baptism that we come into his death, and to his blood which was shed in his death; and hence, it is in immersion

that God has pledged himself to remit the sins of the penitent believer. I do not affirm that God *can not* remit sins without baptism; but I do affirm that he has promised to remit the sins of the penitent believer through immersion; and if he will pardon any one outside of his revealed plan, neither I nor Mr. Brooks know anything about it, and, therefore, we have no authority to preach it.

Mr. Brooks referred to the case of king Agrippa, and represented me as saying, if I had been there I would have made a Christian of him at once by immersion. Now, this misrepresents me. But, I suppose, if Mr. Brooks had been there, he would have said: "Pray on, king Agrippa, and perhaps the power will come down and make you a Christian." But the difficulty with king Agrippa was, to get his own consent to be a Christian. If this difficulty could have been overcome, there would have been no trouble in getting him to be immersed and become a Christian; but he was not ready to give up all for Christ.

Now, I ask Mr. Brooks to come up to the work manfully, and show, if he can, that these Scriptures do not sustain my proposition. I now ask your attention to Romans vi: 18: "Being then made free from sin." When were they made free from sin? Why, he says, "when ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you." John Wesley says, in his note upon this text, that by the *form of doctrine* referred to by the apostle, baptism is meant. There is no dispute on this among learned men. Then, if there is any meaning in the passage, it follows that in baptism we obey the *form of doctrine*, and we are *then* made free from sin. This fully proves *my* proposition.

I will now read Ephesians v: 25: "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." "Through a bath of water by

the word." This refers to baptism, as admitted by Wesley, McKnight, Doddridge, and the learned generally. This, then, teaches that the church is sanctified and cleansed through immersion.

Again: Colossians ii: 12: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him," *etc.* Now, mark the language: "Buried *with* him in baptism." and "risen *with* him." We come into Christ in our baptism. I ask, can we have the remission of our sins before we come into Christ, and rise with him? I want Mr. Brooks to answer, in his next speech. If not, then my proposition is admitted. I hope Mr. Brooks will not evade the issue any longer, but meet it squarely. If he says that baptism is not *in order to* the remission of sins, then let him take the position that *for*, in Acts ii: 38, means *because of*, and I shall be ready to attend to him. And let him show that faith is the only condition of salvation. We want light on the subject. We want him to show how infants of believing and unbelieving parents are saved without faith, if his position be correct—if infants are embraced in the commission, and faith the only condition of pardon and salvation. But, then, infants and idiots seem to be left out. Let Mr. Brooks go to work and define his position, that we may understand him.

Paul says: "For all the promises of God in him are yea, and in him Amen, unto the glory of God by us." (II Corinthians i: 20.) The promise of remission of sins is in Christ. How, then, can a man get the remission of sins till he comes into Christ? How, then, do we get into Christ, where the promise of remission of sins is? Paul answers (Galatians iii: 27): "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." In baptism, then, we put on Christ, and become the subjects of the promise of remission of sins,

I ask Mr. Brooks to say, if we can get *into* Christ with-

out baptism? If not, then he must admit that my proposition is true; and if he knows of any other way, let him develop it, and we will examine it candidly.

The gift of the Spirit, promised in Acts ii: 38, is not miraculous. But, if Mr. Brooks thinks that he has been baptized with the Holy Spirit, let him speak with tongues, and we will be convinced. Such powers always attended those who had this baptism in the apostolic age. The baptism of the Holy Spirit was not to forgive sin, but to confirm the mission of the apostles, and prove that Jesus was indeed the Christ.

Mr. Brooks has admitted that the reign of Christ commenced on the day of Pentecost, and that God the Father reigned before that time, during the "Theocracy;" but, then, he said, also, that Christ was in the church in the wilderness, directing and governing it. Here is a discrepancy in his statements; both can not be true. This shows how hard pressed he is.

But Mr. Brooks and his church claim two orders in the ministry, or clergy, as he calls the preachers. Now, this is all *assumption*. In the original Greek, this word rendered "clergy," means "God's lot," or "God's inheritance." It is applied to all Christians, and has no such meaning in the New Testament as is now generally applied to it. It properly means the people—the laity—and not an order of men above the membership. How, then, can my friend say that the preachers are the clergy? God's people are the real clergy; and it is a high *assumption* for Mr. Brooks to claim that the preachers are God's clergy. Too often these pretended clergy usurp authority, and lord it over "God's true clergy;" but their claim is *bogus*. The preachers are really servants of the true clergy—the children of God. [Time expired.]

Third Day.—Third Proposition.—January 30, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' THIRD REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: I will notice the last thing said by Mr. Mathes, first. He says that "clergy" means "God's lot." I care nothing about its original meaning. When I use the word clergy, I mean, regularly ordained ministers of the Gospel. And that is what we mean by it. We take words in their current use.

I claim that Mr. Mathes has misrepresented the Methodist Church in saying that they have no valid ordination. Mr. Wesley was a presbyter in the Church of England; and, as such, had a legal right to ordain other presbyters. And he ordained Dr. Thomas Coke, and the Doctor came over to the United States, and ordained Mr. Asbury. It is true, that Coke and Asbury were called bishops; but then, Mr. Mathes knows that presbyter and bishop, are two names for the same office in the New Testament. Therefore, all his flourish about our ordination amounts to nothing. I think he had better attend to his own case before he goes round finding fault with the Methodists. I have shown that he and his church have no valid baptism, and no ordination. They are not in God's house at all. They are *outside* entirely. Therefore, we do not recognize his right to lecture us about our ordination.

We do not profess to be under the old covenant, given at mount Sinai. We are under the first covenant, which was made with Abraham. Isaiah ix: 6, says: "Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given." Now, mark you, the prophet says, *is horn—is given*. This proves that Jesus was then present, and in the church in the wilderness. But I admit that he did not govern it *then*. He was the "angel of the church," and was in the church.

But on the day of Pentecost he commenced governing the church; but it was the same old church that had always

existed since the days of Abraham. Mr. Mathes seems impatient to come to the discussion of the *mode* of baptism. But I will inform him that we are not on that question yet. I will give him enough to do when we come to that proposition. He had better save his powder for the occasion, and not shoot it all away before the proper time, as he will need it all then.

But he says that we are baptized into death. But we can not be baptized into death. But, according to Mr. Mathes, we are baptized into *water*, not death. Now you see how inconsistent he is. But he says that in our baptism we are *planted*. I deny it. We are not planted in the water. This planting refers to the baptism of the Holy Ghost. But Mr. Mathes denies the baptism of the Holy Spirit. I believe in it. Now, all these passages quoted by Mr. Mathes, which speak of baptism as a *burial*, a *planting*, and a *rising*, refer to the baptism of the Holy Ghost. It is not a baptism that depended upon the aid of a third party for its accomplishment; but it is a spiritual baptism; and Mr. Mathes, with all his ingenuity and sophistry, can not make water baptism out of it any way he can fix it. *We* do not bury people when they are alive and kicking, but when they are dead. Yet Mr. Mathes would have us bury people while they are alive. Now, this is simply absurd, and I am astonished that Mr. Mathes should attempt to sustain so absurd a position. But he is compelled to do it, or give up his cause. Then, you see that all these passages have no reference to the pardon of sins through water baptism. And it is through the baptism of the Holy Spirit that we rise to walk in a new life.

The passage containing the directions of Ananias to Saul of Tarsus, to "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord," has no reference to the pardon of his sins. The passage is figurative; and meant the *figurative* washing away of sins in a cere-

monial sense, and had no reference to the *real* pardon of sins, as he was pardoned in *reality* when he saw the light from heaven, on his way to the City of Damascus.

Mr. Mathes says that Mr. Campbell was a regular Baptist minister at the time he debated with McCalla, and that he then advocated the Baptist view of the case. But I say that Mr. Campbell held the same view of the matter when he debated with Mr. Rice, at Lexington; therefore, the fact that he was a Baptist preacher at the time of the McCalla debate, has no significance.

The passage quoted by Mr. Mathes from Ephesians v: 25, which speaks of "the washing of water by the word," has no reference to water baptism, or the pardon of sins. The gentleman is entirely off the question. I do wish I could get him to stick to the question in debate. As to what Mr. Mathes has said was his *faith* and his *opinion* about the salvation of men, I need say nothing. It amounts to nothing; I want to hear no more of his *opinions*. As for myself, my *opinion* is *ray faith*, and my *faith* is my *opinion*, and they agree exactly. I don't believe one way, and hold an opinion directly opposite to it!

I have already quoted several passages to show that righteousness is by faith only, and many more might be quoted to the same effect, that I have not time to read. Now, with these Scriptures before us, we ask, if we are made righteous by faith, and then die without baptism, will we be lost? Will righteous men be damned simply for the want of immersion? Yet that is the position of Mr. Mathes and his party.

I will now read from 1 John v: 1: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." The apostle does not say, *will be* born of God when he is immersed into water! But he uses the present tense, *is born of God, now*. There is no time to get a single drop of water in; but just as soon as a man believes, he is born of

God. There is no future time about it. This shows that Mr. Mathes is mistaken in his proposition about immersion in order to the remission of sins. For, if a man is born of God the moment he believes, then faith is the only condition of pardon, and baptism in order to the remission of sins is false.

In the eleventh chapter of Hebrews the apostle shows that faith wrought in the ancient worthies. It was not of works, and not a word is said about immersion in the eleventh chapter, in reference to the justification of these Old Testament saints. In Romans xi: 6, we have the following: "And if by grace, then it is no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then it is no more grace: otherwise work is no more work." The apostle says it is not of works, but by grace. But Mr. Mathes makes it altogether of works. He says a man must be immersed before he can have the remission of his sins. But, I ask him, if a man dies in the faith of the Gospel, but without immersion, will he be lost? Has every man to be baptized before he can have the promise of salvation? Moses, and Abraham, and David, and thousands of others, died in faith, but were never immersed. Have they all gone to hell? Yes, they are all in hell, according to the teachings of Mr. Mathes! What a terrible doctrine Mr. Mathes and his party hold! According to his doctrine, nine-tenths of the human family, who have lived from Abraham to the present time, will be damned! Who can believe it?

I will now read Romans xii: 3, to show you that God *gives* faith, and hence, that even our faith is not of works, but a gift of God. The apostle exhorts, "To think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith." It is, therefore, God that *gives* us faith. It is, therefore, of grace. Justification, or pardon, is called by the

apostle, the "righteousness of faith," and it is, therefore, by grace, and not of works.

Then, what becomes of Mr. Mathes' doctrine of "baptism for the remission of sins?" It can not be true, because that would make salvation to be by works. Mr. Mathes told us that *eis*, in Acts ii: 38, meant *into*, or *in order to*. But I deny it. I affirm that the preposition *eis*, in this passage, means "*toward*" and not *into*, nor *in order to*. We may go *toward* anything, and still not get into it. You will have to try it again, brother Mathes.

But I repeat, that righteousness is not of works. This is what the Bible says, and I am satisfied with what the Bible says. I am sorry that Mr. Mathes uses so much sophistry. His twisting and turning, in the case of Agrippa, was remarkable. When a man has to resort to such twisting to get out of a bad place, and sustain his cause, I think his cause is gone up and lost. But Mr. Mathes can't help it. He has undertaken to manage a bad cause, and to do so in any degree of credit, he is forced to use such means to uphold his side. It is a pity for a man of so much ability and fairness as Mr. Mathes, to be compelled to defend such a bad cause.

Again I repeat, righteousness is of faith, and not of works—that is, not of immersion. Let the tree first be made good, and the fruit will be good also. I feel now that I have fully sustained myself on all the questions; and my brethren are satisfied with me and my defense of our side. And if Mr. Mathes has not met with a Waterloo defeat upon all the questions so far discussed, then I am much mistaken. I have proved that a man may be saved by faith alone, though he may never see a drop of water in the form of baptism. He will go to heaven without baptism as well as with it. Baptism is not for the remission of sins. Many have died in the triumphs of a living

faith, and gone to heaven, who never were immersed. So you all see, now, that Mr. Mathes is wrong. [Time expired].

Third Day.—Third Proposition.—January 30, 1868.

MR. MATHES' FOURTH SPEECH—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT, MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I now arise to close the argument upon this proposition, so far as I am concerned. I have been a good deal amused at the speech to which we have just listened. He labored hard to excite sectarian prejudice against me and my cause; but this was not argument. Indeed, I regard everything of the sort as a confession of weakness, and, I think, you will so regard it also. Mr. Brooks' opinions, nor my opinions, have anything to do in settling the question in debate. Whether certain persons have or have not gone to heaven, is a matter of no practical importance in this discussion. But we who are now living are deeply interested in knowing what God requires *us* to do in order to be saved.

I have given you the law of the Lord upon the subject of pardon, and Mr. Brooks has not been able to find a single Scripture, or a single example, contradicting my position. This is a virtual admission that my position is right. It is unanswered and unanswerable.

Mr. Brooks says that he uses the word "clergy" in its current acceptance—to mean the preachers—and he don't care what its Scriptural meaning is. Well, I suppose he does not care what the Bible meaning of the word is; and I am not sure but the audience will conclude, from this admission, that my friend cares as little for the Bible-meaning of some other words, such as "*build*" "*sect*" and "*baptism*;" but I will say to him that the people wish to know

the *Bible* meaning of all these terms, if he does not. Eighteen hundred years ago the word *clergy* meant "God's lot," "God's inheritance," "The people of God," and not a set of preachers, self-constituted rulers of "God's heritage."

But Mr. Brooks seems not satisfied with the statements he has made on the kingdom and throne of David. He certainly left the impression on the minds of the people that he meant the literal kingdom over which David and Solomon reigned as kings—that Christ was simply a successor of David, in the same kingdom, and upon the same literal throne. But nobody believes this, not even Mr. Brooks himself. Christ being of the "seed of David according to the flesh," is now seated upon the throne of David, within the meaning of the prophecies quoted; but not the same throne on which David sat. The "law was a shadow of good things to come." The kingdom and throne of David was a type of the kingdom of Christ, and Christ's kingdom is the anti-type. David's kingdom was literal and temporal; but Christ's kingdom and throne are spiritual, and not of this world. Everybody knows that this is the true state of the case. But enough of this.

Mr. Brooks told us, in his last speech, that Romans vi: 3-5, Colossians ii: 12, and parallel passages, have no reference to water baptism at all; but that the "baptism of the Holy Ghost" is meant. But, in so saying, he is against the religious world. Dr. James McKnight, on Romans vi: 4, says: "Christ's baptism was not the baptism of repentance, for he never had any sins; but 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." Again, on verse five, he says: "For seeing Christ and we have been planted together in

baptism, in the likeness of his death as occasioned by sin, certainly by being *raised out of the water of baptism*, we are taught that we shall also be planted together in the likeness of his resurrection."

I might quote from Clark, Wesley, Calvin, Luther, George Campbell, Benson, and a host of the best Paedobaptist critics and commentators, all agreeing with the above, from Dr. McKnight, and with me, but I have not time to do so now. But let me look for a moment at his strange notion of being buried in the Spirit. From Romans vi: 3-5, and Colossians ii: 12, we learn that all the Roman brethren and Colossians, with Paul himself, had been *buried* and *raised up*. They were raised up out of the same element in which they had been buried. If, then, they were buried in the Holy Spirit, then they were raised *out of the Spirit*. Such an idea is simply absurd. We can understand how a believer can be buried in water and raised out of it, as the entire learned world and the common sense of mankind understand these passages to mean; but we have no conception of how a believer can be *buried in the Holy Spirit, and raised out of it again*.

But, I tell Mr. Brooks that no one is now baptized in the Holy Spirit. This baptism was miraculous, and only occurred on the day of Pentecost, and at the house of Cornelius, at the opening of the reign of heaven among the Jews, and at the calling of the Gentiles. This baptism was in each case accompanied with the miraculous gift of "*tongues*." And at the house of Cornelius, after they received the Spirit's baptism, Peter commanded them to be baptized in water; thus showing that the spiritual baptism did not supersede the necessity of immersion in water.

But Mr. Brooks seems not to appreciate this, and teaches that the baptism of the Holy Ghost is continued down to the present day, and is all the baptism that is necessary. Thus, he would try to set aside water-baptism entirely.

But, if that is so, why did Peter command Cornelius to be baptized in water after he had been baptized in the Holy Spirit? "The legs of the lame are not equal." But did it never occur to Mr. Brooks, that no matter what the element is, *water* or *spirit*, the baptism is a burial in it, and *raised up out of it*; and, therefore, the action is IMMERSION, no matter what the element may be.

I wish that I could get Mr. Brooks to understand that remission of sins does not take place *in us*, *in* water, or at the mourning-bench; but is done *for us*, and done in heaven. But Mr. Brooks confounds the remission of the sins of aliens with that of citizens of the kingdom. Now, the pardon of sins in the two cases are not upon the same conditions. A penitent believer is pardoned when "he is immersed in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins," as I have abundantly proved to-day. But the child of God who sins, is not required to be "immersed for the remission of sins," but to confess and forsake his sin, and pray for the forgiveness of it. The law of pardon in the two cases must never be confounded.

I was really amused when Mr. Brooks introduced the case of Abraham, Moses, David, and other Old Testament saints, as examples of justification without immersion. He argued the question as though I had affirmed that no man since the creation of the world had or could be saved without immersion. Now, if he was sincere in that representation, then I have given him credit for more intelligence and Bible knowledge than he possesses. But I am sure that every man, woman, and ten years old child, in this large assembly, except Mr. Brooks himself, knows better. My proposition only refers to the law of pardon in the kingdom of Christ, and only embraces the period since the setting up of the kingdom and the publication of the law of pardon on the day of Pentecost. Baptism for the remission of sins was never commanded till then,

and, of course, no one was required to obey the law before it was given. No one during the personal ministry of Christ was required to obey the Lord in baptism, as it was not commanded till after the death of Christ. Thus, Enoch and Elijah, Abraham, Moses, Job, David, the penitent thief on the cross, and all the saints who lived and died before the setting up of the kingdom on the day of Pentecost, were saved without baptism. I hope Mr. Brooks will understand me now.

I read John iii: 5: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." All commentators agree with me, that the Saviour means "water baptism," by the phrase "born of water." "Born of the Spirit," means, *begotten* by the Spirit, and is equivalent to "begotten by the word of truth"—the Gospel. This begetting takes place first, producing faith and repentance, and then the birth of water follows. No one is a proper subject for the birth of water until he has believed the Gospel and repented of his sins. Then, having died to sin, he is buried with Christ in baptism, and rises to a new life. Thus he is born of water and of the Spirit, and becomes a member of Christ's kingdom. This text fully sustains my proposition.

In one of his speeches, Mr. Brooks quoted I John v: 1: "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ, is born of God." He said, with an air of triumph, "There is no immersion here; there is no time for even a drop of water to touch him. The moment he believes, he is born of God." It looks like a pity almost to spoil this argument, as my friend seemed to rely upon it with so much confidence to refute my position. But still I must take the wind out of his sails, and let him down; but I will do it gently.

The word *born*, in the passage, is from the Greek "*gennao*" Greenfield defines the word thus: "Spoken

of men, to beget, generate, as Matthew i: 2-16; of women, to bring forth, bear, give birth, to be born."

The rule, then, is this: if the parent noun is male, the word means to *beget*; if a female, it means *to be born*, to *bring forth*. Now, in this passage, "God" is masculine, and, therefore, the word should be translated *begotten*; and then the passage would read plainly: "All who believe that Jesus is the Christ, are *begotten* of God." How does God *beget* us? James says, "Of his own will beget he us with the word of truth." (James i: 18.)

This clears the subject of all difficulty. We are begotten of God when we hear the word of truth, the Gospel of our salvation, and "believe that Jesus is the Christ;" we are then prepared to go down into the water, and be "born of water." There is time enough then for us to be immersed after we are begotten of God. This passage is in perfect harmony with my proposition, and sustains me. And, I may add, that I am fully sustained in my criticism by Dr. McKnight, and the whole host of translators and commentators.

I will now briefly recapitulate, and close the discussion of the proposition, so far as I am concerned: 1. I proved that immersion was *in order to* the remission of sins, by quoting the great commission, as recorded by the four evangelists. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, and he that believeth not, shall be damned." We quoted Acts ii: 38, to show how the inspired apostles understood the commission, and that they did preach baptism on the day of Pentecost, *in order to* the remission of sins. I fully proved that *for*, in this passage, from the Greek *eis*, means *in order to*, or *into*. As an example, we quoted: "This is my blood of the new testament, shed for many, *for the* remission of sins." Here we have the same form of expression, "for the remission of sins." Did Jesus shed his blood *because* the people already had the

remission of sins? Certainly not; but it was shed *in order to* the remission of sins.

Mr. Brooks made no special effort to defeat me at this point, except by bold and reckless *assertions*, without a particle of truth to sustain him. He asserted that *eis*, in this passage (Acts ii: 38) did not mean *in order to*, but "*toward*" But no one could see how this criticism could help him any. "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, *toward* the remission of sins." According to Mr. Brooks' criticism, a man might not get into remission of sins by repentance and baptism: baptism would be only one step *toward* it. Then, when the Scriptures speak of Christians entering (*eis*) into heaven, it does not prove that they will actually get into heaven, but they will be one step *toward* heaven. But Mr. Brooks made a great failure on the preposition "*for*." You all saw it.

2. We illustrated the law of pardon by the case of Naaman the leper. He was commanded to baptize himself seven times in the Jordan. He did so, and was healed of the leprosy. It was not the water of Jordan that cured him; it was not the number of times that he dipped himself; but God cleansed him when he complied fully with the command of God. The virtue was not in the water, but in the authority of God. So in our baptism, the virtue is not in the *water*, nor is it in our faith and repentance; but God forgives our sins when we obey the Gospel as he has commanded. God has made remission of sins to the alien, under the reign of Christ, to depend upon the conditions of faith, repentance, and immersion in the name of Jesus Christ.

3. We quoted Romans vi: 3-5, Colossians ii: 12, and parallel passages, which prove that in our baptism we put on Christ. We proved that baptism is the "form of doctrine" referred to by Paul (Romans vi: 17), and that, in obedi-

ence to it, we are "made free from sin." The learned world says that *baptism in water* is the "form of doctrine," and Mr. Brooks admits it by failing entirely to answer me on this point. This, then, fully proves my proposition. His quibbling about Romans vi: 3-5, anal Colossians ii: 12, has already been answered, and fully exposed.

We proved, by the conversion of Saul, that baptism was divinely appointed in order to the remission of past sins. But Mr. Brooks attempted to turn away the force of the passage, "Arise, and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." He asserted that Saul had received the remission of sins on the road, three days before he was baptized. But it was a *bare assertion*, without a particle of evidence. Why did the Lord command him, by the mouth of Ananias, to "be baptized and wash away his sins," if he had no sins to *wash away*? No answer can be given to this, upon Mr. Brooks' hypothesis. It is too absurd to talk about.

Many of Mr. Brooks' side-remarks and irrelevant quotations of Scripture, we have not noticed in any way, as they had nothing to do with the real issue. I am now fully satisfied with my efforts on this proposition. I leave it for your consideration. No doubt Mr. Brooks will boast wonderfully of what he has done. But, judge ye. [Time expired].

Third Day.—Third Proposition.—January 30, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' FOURTH REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: YOU see now, my friends, that my friend Mr. Mathes has made a signal failure. He has exhausted himself, and said all he has to say, and all any man could say, in behalf of his proposition; and he has done the very best that can be done for his side of the

question. And Mr. Mathes is fully able to defend his system, if any man can do it: and you see what he has done. He has entirely failed to prove that water baptism is a prerequisite to the pardon of sins.

On this subject Mr. Mathes stands against the religious world. Christians of all orthodox denominations are against him, and all stand on my side. If, therefore, Mr. Mathes is right, then they are all wrong, and on the road to hell. The Baptists are no exception, as they do not immerse *in order to* the remission of sins, but *because of* remission. They believe a man must be pardoned before he is a fit subject for baptism. So, you see that the Baptists are on their way to hell with all the rest, according to the doctrine of my friend Mr. Mathes. Getting into the church has nothing to do with the pardon of sins. No external action can possibly have anything to do with the remission of sins. The idea is unreasonable.

Blessed is the man that has no works to do to obtain the pardon of his sins. The gentleman denies that any one is *now* baptized with the Spirit. He believes in the baptism of water, but not in the baptism of the Spirit. He denies that John iii: 5, where the Saviour says, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God," means the baptism of the Holy Ghost. So, now you see where the gentleman stands.

But he quotes Romans vi: 4, and Colossians ii: 12, to prove that baptism is for the remission of sins. But I affirm that these passages have nothing to do with water baptism, but refer to the baptism of the Holy Ghost; there is no water in them. It is a spiritual death, a spiritual grave, and a spiritual burial, which is referred to by the apostle. The apostle Paul is yet dead and in his grave in the sense of these passages. And so are all the Christians who we're living at Rome at the time the apostle wrote his letter to them. The apostle says, "We are

buried." But if the burial here spoken of is water baptism, as Mr. Mathes affirms, then Paul and all these brethren were actually under the water at the time he wrote. I know Mr. Mathes says it ought to be translated "*have been buried*" But I take the common version for it, and it says, "*are buried.*"

Mr. Mathes guesses that the "*form of doctrine*" spoken of in Romans vi: 17, means water baptism. But we do not want his guesses on this subject; we have enough guessing from him already—we want nothing to do with his guesses. His whole system is made up of guesses. He guesses that faith comes before repentance; and then he guesses that baptism is for the remission of sins. So, I affirm that he guesses it all the way through. It is all guess-work with him.

Mr. Campbell teaches that Saul's sins were pardoned when he believed, three days before he was baptized, and that his baptism was merely a *formal* recognition of the pardon of his sins, which he had *really* enjoyed for three days—ever since the light shone round about him on his way to Damascus. The fact that Mr. Campbell was a Baptist minister at the time, amounts to nothing. I care nothing about it, as he *virtually* admitted the same view in his debate with Mr. Rice.

The Bible says: "Blessed is the man that believes;" not "Blessed is the man that is immersed." It is the man who has faith, and whose faith is imputed to him for righteousness. Faith is the great moving principle of our justification. It is, first, repentance; second, prayer; third, faith; and the moment we believe, we are pardoned. Faith produces everything that is good. It is faith that works by love, and purifies the heart, and brings us into the enjoyment of remission of sins without a drop of water. Faith is the main thing, and not water baptism, as Mr. Mathes teaches. Baptism is of works, which has

nothing to do with righteousness. But faith makes it of grace. The Scriptures do not say, "Abraham was immersed in water, and it was counted to him for righteousness;" but, "Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness."

But Mr. Mathes has cited the case of Cornelius again. But I affirm that this has nothing to do with water baptism. They had been baptized with the Holy Ghost before the water baptism is mentioned. Their sins were forgiven when they were baptized with the Holy Ghost; and hence, water baptism, in this case, had nothing to do with the remission of sins.

The apostle Paul, in I Corinthians i: 14, as quoted before, "thanked God that he had not baptized any of them." But, if baptism was a matter of so much importance as Mr. Mathes seems to make it, how could St. Paul "thank God that he had not baptized any of them?" He could not have used such language as this. But, on the contrary, he would have been in for baptizing all of them, to save them from perdition.

In Acts, chapter xxvi, we find that St. Paul was commissioned as an apostle to go to the Gentiles, "to open their eyes, and turn them from darkness to light." But not a word was said to him about baptizing anybody. He was simply to open the eyes of the people. I ask, can a man who has had his eyes opened go to hell? Certainly not. Yet Mr. Mathes teaches that such will go to the devil, if they are not immersed in water.

God has put no difference between the Jew and the Gentile, purifying their hearts by faith; not by water. Hence, when St. Paul went to the Gentiles "to open "their eyes," he preached the Gospel to them upon the same conditions that it was preached to the Jews. It was not of works, but by grace through faith; not a drop of water in the whole arrangement; and, in his preaching, the apostle said

nothing about water, or any other work, as necessary to their salvation.

But Mr. Mathes teaches that the pardon of sin is suspended upon a work, and that to be performed by a third person; and that if a third person can not be procured to perform the act—to immerse the man in water—he must go to perdition for the want of it. Now, you see what an awful doctrine he advocates. I know he says that he sends no one to perdition; but I affirm that such is the tendency of his doctrine, and he can not escape it. It is a terrible doctrine, and I am surprised that Mr. Mathes does not see it, and give it up. But the doctrine I advocate will save all who have faith, whether they are baptized in any way or not. For pardon of sins takes place the moment a man becomes a believer. Now, I know you can all see the difference between us; and there is a great difference.

Mr. Mathes makes the remission of sins to depend upon the act of another, and, unless that other person can be got to perform the act of immersion for us, we must be damned on account of what the other person failed to do for us, and not for any neglect of our own. Such is his true position, stripped of all its dressing. But I hold that remission of sins is a matter between God and the sinner entirely. And this is the true doctrine.

The pardon of sins is entirely outside of all good works. A man can perform no work as a condition of the pardon of his sins; good works are the fruits of faith. I affirm that all any man is required to do to be saved, is simply to believe in Jesus Christ, and then pardon comes immediately.

I am not against Mr. Mathes and his church, as a people; but I am against their preaching. I love them as men, but I hate their doctrine; because, in my opinion, it is contrary to the Bible. I am satisfied that I have sustained my side, and that Mr. Mathes has failed to prove

his proposition. He has failed, not for the want of ability—for I frankly acknowledge his superior ability—but his cause is bad, and hence his failure. [Time expired.]

Fourth Day.—Fourth Proposition.—January 31, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' FIRST SPEECH—(45 MINUTES.)

PROP. IV. "The Holy Spirit does sometimes operate separate and apart from the written or revealed word of God." Affirmative, Mr. Brooks; negative, Mr. Mathes.

MR. PRESIDENT: I am glad to meet so many of you here this morning, and I expect we shall have a very pleasant time to-day. I know that Mr. Mathes and I will get along pleasantly, and I have no doubt the audience will feel interested in the discussion of this important question.

Mr. Mathes will contend that the Spirit only operates as it speaks through words. This position I will now examine. He can not make out his side of the proposition in so many words; and I frankly acknowledge that I can not prove my proposition in so many words. In this respect we stand on equal grounds; but I can make out my side in another way. The question we have under discussion to-day takes a very wide range: it takes in all time from the beginning of the world to the present time. I shall have a very easy proposition to prove to-day. I will first introduce what Mr. Campbell says on this question. He says: "The Spirit operates through the written oracles, and it exerts its influence in no other way." This is the position held by Mr. Mathes, and which he will attempt to maintain in the discussion of this question; but, mind you now, he will fail. But I can operate without saying a word; and, if I can operate without words, surely the Spirit of God can. I am a "Freemason," and I can, without saying a word, make myself known as such to every "Mason" in

this house; and in doing so I will use no words, but still I will operate on every Mason in the audience without words, and I will do it effectually.

But the negative of this question involves bad consequences, and this shows that the negative can not be true. If Mr. Mathes is correct, the heathen will all be lost, because they have not the word of God, through which alone the Spirit operates in the conversion of sinners, according to his teaching. But, according to my position, the Spirit operates without the written or revealed word of God; and, consequently, the heathen may be saved without the word of God. Idiots and infants will be all lost if Mr. Mathes is correct, for they can not understand or receive the written word; and hence, according to his teaching, the Spirit can not operate upon them, and, therefore, they must all be damned.

Mr. Campbell, in the Christian System, says: "No one knows God outside of the written word of God." If, then, no one knows God outside of the written word of God, then all infants, idiots, and all the heathen, will go to hell! For the Bible says: "God will take vengeance on those who know not God." Hence, according to Mr. Mathes, they will all be lost! This is an absurdity, and we have a rule of logic which says, "an absurdity in a proposition disproves it." Hence, my friend's position, you see, is already proved to be false—because it is absurd. But, that God does operate outside of his words and arguments, I will now proceed to prove, from the sacred Scriptures.

Now, let it be remembered that I am not denying that the Spirit does operate through the written or revealed word of God:—this I believe. But I deny that it always operates in this way. I affirm that it sometimes operates independent of the written word, and separate and apart from it; while Mr. Mathes says it always operates through the word in the conversion of sinners. Thus, you see, he

limits it to the word. I do not limit it. This is the difference between us. I will now show you, from the Bible, that God has operated outside and independent of his word.

I will first call your attention to Exodus xxxiv: 23, 24: "Thrice in the year shall all your men-children appear before the Lord God, the God of Israel. For I will cast out the nations before thee, and enlarge thy borders: neither shall any man desire thy land, when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice in the year." Now, I ask, how did God make the heathen *not desire their land* while the males went up to Jerusalem thrice in the year to appear before God? The land was defenseless, and very desirable. Did the Lord use words and arguments to keep the heathen off of this desirable property? No, he did not; and the heathen had not the written word of God among them. Yet he did keep them off. Mr. Mathes knows that God did not speak to them in words. Here, then, is a case where God operated upon the minds of the heathen without words.

Again: read Proverbs xxi: 1: "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord, as the rivers of water; he turneth it whithersoever he will." Now, if the heart of the king is in the hand of the Lord, how can it be necessary to use words to move it? It is not turned by words and arguments, but by the Spirit of God, without words and arguments.

In Exodus xiv: 8, we find that the Lord hardened the heart of Pharaoh, king of Egypt. Did the Lord speak words to Pharaoh, by which his heart was hardened? He certainly did not. How, then, did he harden the heart of this wicked king? I answer: God hardened Pharaoh's heart by the direct influence of his spirit, without any words spoken to him. But Mr. Mathes limits the power of God. He confines his power to words. This is a great sin!

Let Mr. Mathes now turn and read Psalms lxxviii: 41,

where an awful denunciation is denounced against the Israelites for turning back and tempting God, and limiting the Holy One of Israel. Why, Mr. Mathes does the same thing. He limits the Holy One to his word. And I tell you, my friends, it is an awful sin! His power is not confined to his words; he can exert his power in any way he chooses, and is not limited by his word, or anything else in his operations. I have no such contracted views of the power of God. And, mind you now, I have proved that he did not use words in turning the hearts of the children of men. I have, therefore, established my proposition; and, of course, Mr. Mathes is wrong, and his theory of the operation of the Spirit *false*.

I will now introduce Acts xvi: 25: in this text we have, first. "a great earthquake," so that the foundations of the prison were shaken; and all this was done without a single word being spoken. And, second, the jailer was operated upon without words or arguments. God did not speak a single word. But Mr. Mathes will contend that God can do nothing without words. He thus limits the power of God. Here is a plain case where God used no words, and yet performed a wonderful operation. So, now you see that Mr. Mathes is wrong in his position, and my proposition proved.

Again, I read Daniel v: 5: "In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote. Then the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another."

A writing was made upon the wall, but the king did not know the meaning of the words, for he could not read them. He only saw a part of the hand that did the writing. The king was greatly alarmed and agitated,

though not a word was spoken to him, and he did not know the awful meaning of the words on the wall. Hence, I argue, that sometimes God moves the minds of men without words or arguments; though I do not say he always does so. All I am contending for, is, that he does so operate without words or arguments *sometimes*.

I will now read II Kings vii: 6: "For the Lord had made the host of the Syrians to hear a noise of chariots, and a noise of horses, even the noise of a great host; and they said one to another, Lo! the King of Israel hath hired against us the kings of the Hittites, and the kings of the Egyptians, to come upon us."

In this case not a word was spoken, and yet the Lord operated upon the Syrian host, so that they arose and fled in the twilight, leaving their tents, their horses, their asses, and even their camp and provisions, as they were, and fled for their lives. Now, all this great effect was produced upon their minds without words or arguments.

If, without words or arguments, God could cause these heathen to flee from their camp, can he not, if he chooses to do so, operate on the hearts of sinners without the Gospel? I am sure you will say he can, and, therefore, my proposition is proved. It is fully made out. But I have another strong passage (Romans ii: 14): "When the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts," etc.

We see from this passage that the Gentiles do the work of the law, which is written in their hearts. They are a law unto themselves. The heathen know it is wrong to steal, to murder, to bear false witness, etc. I ask, how do they know it is wrong? I answer, because God has written it upon their hearts by the Holy Spirit, without words or arguments. Not a single word has been said to them.

Now, you see I have completely taken the wind out of Mr. Mathes' sails, and he is "*gone up*" This is a clear case against him, and his false position of "limiting the Holy One."

I will now call your attention to the conversion of Saul of Tarsus (Acts xxvi: 13): "At mid-day, O king, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me and them that journeyed with me; and when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice speaking unto me," etc. Here we have a light shining from heaven which knocked them all down, so powerful was it; yet not a word was spoken, or an argument used, until after they were knocked down. After they fell, then some words were spoken. But God knocked them down by a power that had neither words nor arguments in it.

Now, what can Mr. Mathes say to this? Every denomination differs from him and his party on this subject. But he and his brethren are like Ishmael: their hand is against every man, and every man's hand is against them. They are, therefore, Ishmaelites. But I will now introduce John i:9: "That was the true light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world."

I ask, how does Christ light every man that cometh into the world? There are thousands who never heard of Christ; yet he enlightens every one of them. Hence, he must do it by the Holy Spirit, without words or arguments. I suppose Mr. Mathes will say the passage is figurative. But, in this way he would explain it away entirely; he would have a figurative Christ, and figurative men, and all would end in a figure! But I say it is literal. Christ writes his law on the hearts of the heathen where the Bible has never gone; and it is not necessary to use words and arguments to do this writing upon the heart.

I will now quote Acts ii: 1, 2: "And suddenly there

came a sound from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting." All this occurred without a word being spoken, or an argument used. It was an operation of the Spirit without words. I know words were used afterward. I am not contending that the Spirit does not operate through the word; but that it does sometimes operate outside of the word, and independent of it. And I hope Mr. Mathes will not quibble here, but truly represent me in the argument. Here we have a great sound, and not a word or an argument used. This, you see, goes right against Mr. Mathes' theory.

I will now give you the case of John the Baptist (Luke i: 15): "For he shall be great in the sight of the Lord, and shall drink neither wine nor strong drink; and he shall be filled with the Holy Ghost, even from his mother's womb." He was filled with the Holy Ghost without words or arguments. It filled him when he was an infant, even before he was born, and, of course, before he could read the Word or understand it. But Mr. Mathes thinks he could not be filled with the Holy Ghost unless words had been spoken to him. I will now read Genesis xli: 1:

Pharaoh had a dream, and his spirit was troubled. Yet, I contend that God operated on his mind without words or arguments. But Mr. Mathes will contend that every Spirit puts forth all its power in words and arguments. But I have shown that this is not true, by the many cases that I have introduced. In this last case, God impressed upon the mind of Pharaoh a dream. How did he do this? It was evidently not by using words. Not a word was spoken to him to cause the dream; it was the Spirit of God operating *directly* upon his mind. This proves my proposition.

I will next quote I Peter v: 8: "Be sober, be vigilant; because your adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, walketh about, seeking whom he may devour." We find the

old Adversary the devil, going about, seeking whom he may devour. Did any one ever see the devil, or hear him speak, since the days of the apostles? Yet he is going around devouring people. But he does this without words. But Mr. Mathes would give the devil more power than he will allow God to possess. He says that the Spirit is confined to words and arguments; but the devil can influence men without either. I am astonished that such a man as Mr. Mathes should hold such absurd doctrine.

We are told that old Nick came up, in the days of Job, and that God had a conversation with him. God operated upon the devil, and the devil operated upon God. We find that the devil was then engaged in walking up and down in the earth; but he used no words to influence men to do evil. The next thing we hear of him is in the temptation of the Saviour, when he came up again as of old. He conversed with Jesus, and Jesus with him. And he has been going through the earth for a long time; but where is he now? And what is he doing now? If he operates by words alone, he is doing no harm; for he does not speak any words. The last heard of the devils, they got into the hogs, and the hogs were drowned in the sea. He can do no harm if he can not operate without words and arguments; for, who ever heard the devil speak? No one.

But God can operate with or without words and arguments. He is not confined in this way. If he can not operate without his word, then all the heathen will go to hell. All the children, also, will be lost, for they never heard any words of the Bible, and, therefore, must go to hell, as the Spirit of God can not operate upon their hearts without words. So you see that Mr. Mathes' doctrine will damn everybody, unless they get to hear some words of the Bible.

Now, I have made it clear that Mr. Mathes is in error upon this subject; and I have fully sustained my proposi-

tion. I am satisfied that I have done a land-office business! All the Scriptures that Mr. Mathes may quote will amount to nothing; he can't overthrow me. [Time expired.]

Fourth Day.—Fourth Proposition.—January 31, 1868.

MR. MATHES' FIRST REPLY—(45 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I presume you have all discovered that my friend Mr. Brooks has missed the proposition entirely! I am greatly astonished at him! He has labored to prove that God is *able* to operate without the Gospel. Now, this is a proposition that no one ever disputed. He has, therefore, been "*beating the air.*" The real question is, not what God is *able* to do, but what he *does* do now. How does the Holy Spirit operate, under the Gospel dispensation, in the conversion and sanctification of men? We are not discussing the miraculous demonstrations of the Holy Spirit in the past ages; but, *how* does the Holy Spirit operate now? What is his regularly established order of operation?

Most of the Scriptures he has quoted have no sort of reference to the question in debate, and, therefore, prove nothing in its favor. He has said nothing about the conversion of sinners, or the sanctification of saints; but I shall not allow him to dodge the real issue in this way. He must come square up to the work before him. Who is interested in knowing how God caused Pharaoh to dream about those poor cows? Was it an operation of the Spirit without the word? So Mr. Brooks thinks, though the Holy Spirit is not once named or referred to in the whole passage. But even if it were, still that would not be in point. Mr. Brooks has to prove that the Holy Spirit *does* operate without the word, and independent of it; not

what God did three thousand years ago, before the Gospel economy commenced.

When my friend quotes Mr. Campbell, he should quote enough to give the true meaning of the passage, and the application which the author intended. He knows that Mr. Campbell is speaking of the operations of the Holy Spirit in conversion and sanctification. He is not talking about what God *can* or *can not* do. He is not discussing the subject of miracles, but he is presenting what the Holy Spirit actually does in the conversion of sinners, viz: that the Holy Spirit always uses words and arguments in converting men to God; and, as no other way is revealed or promised, therefore, it is proper to say there is no other way, and no man is authorized to preach any other way.

But I am willing to go back to the beginning of the world. We find that the word and Spirit of God were not separated in the work of creation. The Bible says: "The Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." (Genesis i: 2.) But no light came until "God said, let light be, and light was." (Verse 3.) It was not, therefore, an operation of the Spirit, silent and unperceived, separate and apart from the word, but it was a work accomplished through the *agency* of the Spirit through the *instrumentality* of his word. And such was God's arrangement through the whole process of creation. God always *spoke* before anything was made. The Psalmist says: "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made; and all the hosts of them by the breath of his mouth." (Psalms xxxiii: 6.) "He spake, and it was done; he commanded, and it stood fast." (Verse 9.) The whole universe is a standing monument of the power which God puts forth through his word by his Spirit.

As light came when God *spake*, so now, under the Gospel dispensation, the Spirit enlightens the minds of men through the instrumentality of the Gospel, or word

preached; and there is no evidence that the Holy Spirit ever enlightened any one without the word of God. If Mr. Brooks knows of any such case, let him produce it, and we will examine it.

But Mr. Brooks declares, in advance, that all the Scriptures I may quote in meeting his arguments upon this proposition, will amount to nothing. But how does he know what I may quote? This is a miserable attempt to forestall public opinion by begging the question. It is evidence of weakness and *failure*. But Mr. Brooks has given the decision in advance, and the verdict, of course, is in his own favor. But I will remind him of a certain passage which reads, "Let him who putteth on his armor not boast himself, as he who putteth it off."

Mr. Brooks made quite a flourish over the quotation from Exodus xxxiv: 24. God promised, in some way, to restrain the heathen from doing mischief to the children of Israel while they were gone up to Jerusalem to worship. But what does this prove? There is not a word said about the Holy Spirit in the passage. Does my friend not know that God sometimes hinders men from committing crimes, and chastises wicked men and wicked nations by other wicked nations. But Mr. Brooks says that God did not *speak* to these heathen. How does he know? Some prophet may have sent them a message from God. But he says that he *thinks* God simply impressed their minds by the Holy Spirit, without any words or arguments. Yes, he *thinks*; but where is the proof? The Holy Spirit is not referred to in the whole passage. We are not debating what God can or can not do, but what the Holy Spirit *does do*. No one doubts the power of God to accomplish all his purposes. But Mr. Brooks has undertaken to prove that the Holy Spirit *does* operate separate and apart from his word. Let him address himself to the task he has taken upon himself.

But, if he says that the heathen received the Holy Spirit, and were restrained by it, he contradicts the Bible. Jesus says: "If you love me, keep my commandments; and I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may abide with you forever, even the Spirit of truth, WHOM THE WORLD CAN NOT RECEIVE." (John xiv: 15.) Let Mr. Brooks note this, "*whom the world can not receive.*" But Mr. Brooks seems not afraid to contradict Jesus! for he says the heathen *did* receive the Spirit, and were restrained by it. Which will you believe, my friends—Jesus, or Mr. Brooks? One or the other is wrong.

But he quotes the case of the hardening of Pharaoh's heart. I answer, that the Holy Spirit had nothing to do with it, so far as we are informed in the history of the case in the Bible. God *softened* the heart of the haughty king by the words which he put into the mouth of Moses and Aaron, and which they thundered in his guilty ears, and by the "*plagues*" which followed, and which were so many *arguments*; and his wicked heart was *hardened* in the same way, and by the same agencies. This, therefore, proves nothing for Mr. Brooks. The hearts of men are softened and hardened now, not by miracles, nor by the operation of the Spirit without the Gospel, but by the Gospel, and sometimes by afflictions, which are so many *arguments*. I knew a man who was sick nigh unto death; his heart was *softened*, he became penitent, and promised reformation. But he recovered, and his heart was hardened, and he went to swearing and drinking, as before. He thought he was going to die: then his heart was softened; but when he got well and he saw the immediate danger was past, his heart was hardened.

In all these cases, words and arguments were used. The goodness of God is a standing argument to lead men to repentance; every instrumentality employed to effect

men, may be regarded as so many arguments. But all this has nothing whatever to do with the question now in debate. But, even in such cases, Mr. Brooks fails to prove his proposition.

But Mr. Brooks quotes a passage from John, to show that "Jesus is the light of the world." Very well; we most cordially believe and indorse it. But what does this prove? Certainly, it comes not within a thousand miles of sustaining his proposition. How does Christ enlighten men? Why, simply as a teacher—he is the great Teacher. But I am surprised at Mr. Brooks for quoting this passage. It tells what Jesus *is* and *does*, but does not once allude to the Holy Spirit. Let Mr. Brooks come up to the work before him, and either prove what he has agreed to prove, or give it up. He has not touched the real issue yet.

The most important case which he has brought forward is the "handwriting upon the wall in the palace at Babylon." But what does this prove? Certainly it does not prove that the Holy Spirit operates separate and apart from the Gospel in the conversion of sinners. Belshazzar's alarm was not produced by the Spirit upon his heart. There is no evidence that the Holy Spirit was there at all. It is not once named or alluded to in the whole transaction. There was some strange writing on the plastering of the wall, which neither the king nor his nobles could interpret; but words were there nevertheless, and he was alarmed. Here we have words and arguments combined. This is exactly our position. But Mr. Brooks would give out the idea here, that we preach the word *alone* as the converting power. Now, every one knows that we teach no such doctrine. We do not preach word *alone*, Spirit *alone*, nor faith *alone*. We preach the whole Gospel, combining word, spirit and faith, and all the influences and instrumentalities that God has ordained. We do not expect to convert the sinner by the word *alone*, spirit *alone*,

or by anything else *alone*. The Spirit is the agent, and the word, or Gospel, the divinely appointed instrumentality. But Mr. Brooks preaches, with the full indorsement of the Methodist Church in Bedford, that men are sometimes converted by the Spirit *alone*. Let him prove it.

But Mr. Brooks seems to think he has found a case exactly in point. He says the Holy Spirit, on the day of Pentecost, was unaccompanied with the word. But let us see. The mere descent of the Holy Spirit on that day converted no one. It was miraculous, and was not intended to convert any one, while unaccompanied with the word. God has another way of converting men. "It pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." And we have no evidence that he ever converted any one in any other way since he was glorified. All the conversions on the day of Pentecost took place after they heard Peter's sermon. Then, and not till then, were any of them converted to Christ. Luke says: "And when they heard this they were pierced in their heart." This case, therefore, so far from sustaining him, destroys his proposition entirely.

But Mr. Brooks says that the Gentiles have the law written upon their hearts, and he concludes that it was so written by a mere *impression* of the Holy Spirit, without any words. Did Mr. Brooks, or anybody else, ever receive intelligence conveyed by writing upon the heart, or anything else, when no words were used, or characters representing words and ideas? They did not. Therefore, this case is against him. In fact, the Holy Spirit is not mentioned in the passage. Mr. Brooks must do better than this. He must produce some Scripture that mentions the Holy Spirit, at least.

But if Mr. Brooks is correct in his *opinion* that the law of the Lord is written upon the hearts of the heathen by the Holy Spirit directly operating upon their hearts, with-

rut the Gospel, then I ask, what advantage have Christian nations over the heathen? What advantage in having the Bible to read, if the Spirit does the work among the heathen without the word? Thus, you see, upon Mr. Brooks' hypothesis the Bible is a useless book, as the same lessons are written upon the heart by the Spirit *alone*. Certainly no advantage. The idea is preposterous.

The next case my friend brings forward to prove that the Spirit operates, in converting men, without the word, is the case of the jailer, recorded in Acts xvi. He says: "(rod sent a great earthquake down from heaven, and opened the doors of the prison, and alarmed the jailer." Now, here is something new. An earthquake coming down from heaven! Who ever heard of the like before! But we admit there was an earthquake, and that the prison doors were opened, and that the jailer was alarmed. But what has this to do with my friend's proposition? Why, nothing; unless he makes the earthquake and the Holy Spirit the same thing. We are not discussing the philosophy of earthquakes, but the work of the Holy Spirit in the conversion and sanctification of men. It was not the Holy Spirit that alarmed the jailer, and made him attempt suicide. But my friend seems to forget that the earthquake itself was a powerful argument, and prepared the jailer's mind to hear the words of eternal life. The Holy Spirit is not mentioned as operating on the jailer at all; though we admit that the Spirit did convince and convert him, through the word of the Lord spoken to hi in and his family by Paul. This example proves our position, and destroys that of my friend.

His theory is, that the Holy Spirit, without any words or arguments, impresses the minds of sinners, and thus converts them, independently of the word of truth. But, in the case of the jailer, the earthquake, the opening of the prison doors, etc., moved his fears, and he inquired what

he must do to be saved? The apostle then addressed words to him, and the Holy Spirit operated on his heart through these words, and he obeyed the Gospel the same hour of the night. Mr. Brooks must find better testimony than this, or his cause is lost.

But he also introduces the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, and says that "God knocked him down." How does he know? The Bible says, "And when we were all fallen to the earth," etc. Whether it was by the overpowering influence of the light, or as an act of profound respect, we are not told; though I am inclined to the latter opinion. It was a voluntary act of obeisance. It was customary, in the East, to fall on the face upon the earth in the presence of a superior. But, suppose he was *knocked down*; that proves nothing for Mr. Brooks, unless he can prove that the Spirit did the *knocking*, and there is no intimation of the sort in the passage. But neither the light nor the *knocking down* made him a Christian. He was converted three days afterward, after hearing words from the mouth of Ananias. Mr. Brooks is off the subject again. We are not debating about what God does through and by the truth, but what he does *outride* of the Gospel. Let him come up to the issue in the next speech, and give us something to the point.

But the most amusing thing in his last speech was Pharaoh's dream. Now, what has this wonderful dream to do with the conversion of men, under the Gospel? Why, it did not even convert Pharaoh, or any one else in his day. Suppose men did have peculiar dreams, under peculiar circumstances, in the olden times—does that prove that the Holy Spirit, under the Gospel, converts men by dreams, or in some other way unrevealed? By no means. His argument may be stated thus: Pharaoh had a dream, and in his dream he saw some very poor looking cows; therefore the Holy Spirit operates sometimes separately and

apart from the word of God. Now, what can be said to such logic? But the truth is, this Pharaoh was a very wicked man, and never had the Spirit of God.

But Mr. Brooks tells us that the devil is going about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour. Now, we admit this; but how does that prove that the Spirit converts men sometimes without the word? The case has no relevancy to his proposition. But he seems to be a good deal troubled about the manner the devil operates upon men, and seems to think that he operates by some direct influence upon the hearts of men. Now, this is all *assumption*. But I will give you a case or two that will show how the devil operates on men.

In the parable of the Sower, it is said that the devil "catches away out of the hearts" of some, the good seed, or word of God. He does this, evidently, by the agency of wicked men, who lend themselves to his service. Again: "Behold, the devil shall cast some of you into prison, that ye may be tried; and ye shall have tribulation ten days." (Revelations ii: 10.) No one supposes that the devil did *personally* lay hold of those Christians and cast them into some prison of his own. But he did it through the agency of wicked men—persecutors. But all this has nothing to do with the issue in debate.

The issue is a question of fact. The Holy Spirit either does or does not operate independent and apart from the word of God. Mr. Brooks has undertaken to prove that it does sometimes operate *directly* upon the hearts of men without the word of God. Let him no longer dodge the issue, but come to the point. We want to know what the New Testament teaches upon this point,

I will now read you a few Scriptures to disprove Mr. Brooks' position. "Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that

shall he speak: and he will show you things to come." (John xvi: 13.) The Spirit was to guide the apostles into all truth. *How?* By speaking to them in words. This has been God's way of communicating his mind to men in all ages. The words spoken by the Saviour to the apostles were the words brought to their remembrance by the Holy Spirit when he came and put additional words into their mouth; and by these words of truth men are converted and sanctified. In his prayer, Jesus says, "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." (John xvii.)

The Spirit was to "guide into *all truth*" not into something "outside" of the truth. This is, therefore, against Mr. Brooks' position, and entirely destroys it. In fact, he has virtually abandoned it himself! He has not given us a single Scripture that looks in the direction of his proposition, as no such proof exists. And he admits that my position is the correct one, by admitting that God's revealed or ordinary plan of converting men, is through the word of truth. And he has failed to show us any other plan. Hence, his cause is lost without remedy. [Time expired.]

Fourth Day.—Fourth Proposition.—January 31, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' SECOND SPEECH—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: I am here as a representative man. I have the honor to be the chosen representative of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Bedford. Mr. Mathes and myself each represent our respective churches; hence, we must not quibble. If we do, those listening to us will say that we are dishonest; and it will make a bad impression upon their minds. Mr. Mathes has been contending about the operation of the Spirit upon the hearts of men through the word, and their conviction, conversion, and

sanctification through the instrumentality of the Gospel. Let me remind Mr. Mathes that my proposition says nothing about conviction, conversion, or sanctification. We must stick to the proposition in debate.

I have been showing that God has operated upon men *outside* of his words and arguments; and I claim that if God once did this, he *can* do so again—he *can* do so *now*, if he chooses. But Mr. Mathes wants me to prove by the Scriptures that God so operates upon men *now*. This is very unreasonable in him to ask such a thing. The Bible was written long before the present time; hence they give us no testimony concerning what is done at the present time. I ask, then, how am I expected to know whether any one goes to heaven now, or not? Certainly not by the Scriptures, for they say nothing about any one going to heaven now. Yet, I believe people do go to heaven now, from what the Scriptures say, though they have been written ages ago. When Mr. Mathes was debating his proposition yesterday, he contended that "baptism was for the remission of sins" *now*, though it does not say so; yet, because the Scriptures said so in the days of the apostles, he contended that such was the case *now*. Now, in the same way, I contend that the Holy Spirit operates *now* without words and arguments, because it did so in former ages. Then I hope he will not again object to my cases that I introduce as proof, because they are not in the present time.

Mr. Mathes makes very light of Pharaoh's dream, as though it had nothing to do with the question in debate. He says Pharaoh saw some poor cows. How did he find that out? The account in the Bible says they were "*kine*." Mr. Mathes infers that they were cows. He *guesses* they were *cows*. Yet he will not allow me to guess at anything, but requires me to produce Scripture authority for all my positions. If I infer that the Spirit

now operates independently of the word, he objects, and says it is nothing but my unsupported *inference!* He is very unreasonable. Now, you see how he stands. He is not willing to allow me to guess and infer the proof of my proposition, though he is continually guessing things himself, and drawing inferences! He infers that the *kine* of Pharaoh's dream were "cows;" and I *infer* that, if God operated once, no matter in what age, without his word, he *can* do the same thing *now*.

Now, mind you, I do not deny that God does sometimes convert men through words and arguments. Upon this point I agree with Mr. Mathes. But, in addition to this, I am contending that God can operate *directly* in converting men, without any words or arguments. Mr. Mathes denies that the Spirit operates on the hearts of men in any other way than through the words and arguments of the Gospel. This makes the issue between us.

Well, when we preach to the people we operate upon them through the words that we speak and the arguments we use; and hence, the Spirit never comes to any one *directly*, or operate upon any one in any other way but by words and arguments, if Mr. Mathes is correct. But if this be so, there is no such thing as the operation of the Holy Spirit: it is all a delusion.

The Roman guard, at the tomb of Jesus, fell to the ground before a word was spoken. But I suppose Mr. Mathes will contend that it was not the direct operation of the Spirit that knocked them down—but the sight of the angel. But that is his inference again. But I *infer* that it was God's power put forth upon them, without words and arguments; and this sustains my position.

Mr. Mathes quotes John xvi: 13, to prove the correctness of his position as to the works of the Holy Spirit. But I will remind him that it is said, in the same connection, that the "Spirit, when he comes, shall reprove the

world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment." Yet my friend affirms that the world can not receive the Spirit! But how will he reconcile what he has said upon this subject with the statement of Jesus—that the "Spirit will reprove the world," etc.? How can the Spirit reprove the world, and yet the world not receive him? Let Mr. Mathes reconcile this, if he can.

Mr. Campbell says: "All the Spirit there is, is the word." And this is Mr. Mathes' theory. And you see it limits God in the exercise of his power to mere words and arguments. I deny the theory. God can put forth power without words or arguments, or any other instrumentality, whenever he chooses to do so. Mr. Mathes limits God. I do not limit him in the exercise of his power.

Saint Paul fell to the ground by a great power from heaven brought to bear upon him. But Mr. Mathes says he was not *knocked down*, but fell to the earth voluntarily, as an act of obeisance, and that there is no mention of the Holy Spirit in the narrative. Well, God was there, and the Bible says that "God is a Spirit." Paul was stricken down by the power of God, or the Spirit; yet there was not a word spoken. Here is the power of God put forth without any words. You see, now, that Mr. Mathes is mistaken; and the time is coming when Mr. Mathes himself will see and know that I am right in my position.

We find "the long-suffering of God is salvation," as said in II Peter iii: 15. We find, then, that God is not tied to words and arguments in the operations of his Spirit. It is the *long-suffering* of God that is salvation. He says so, and God regards his word as the apple of his eye. But Mr. Mathes labors to confine the operations of the Spirit to the word, and he calls upon me to give him an example of the operation of the Spirit *now* without words!

I tell Mr. Mathes now, as I have told him before, that it is impossible to comply with this request. Such an exam-

pic can not be produced from the Scriptures, as the Scriptures were completed long before any one now in existence was born. Such a demand upon me is a mere quibble: it is not meeting the question fairly. But this is only another evidence that he *can not* answer my arguments squarely.

God has never confined himself to words and arguments in the exercise of his power. But Mr. Mathes tries to get rid of my argument in the Belshazzar case; but he can not answer it. He says the Holy Spirit is not mentioned in the case at all, and that a hand was seen by the king as the mysterious writing was made on the wall. Well, that makes no difference. It is true, the Spirit is not mentioned in the case; but God's power was there, though only what seemed to be a part of a man's hand was seen. I have no doubt it was the Holy Spirit. But there was no language there. This greatly moved the king. God moved him, not *indirectly* through the hand and writing as agents, as Mr. Mathes contends, but *directly* by his Spirit.

As to the conversion of the jailer (Acts, chap, xvi), Mr. Mathes says: "The earthquake is not the Spirit." To this I reply, that the word of God is not the Spirit. So you see that we are even. But he says that he never before heard of an earthquake coming down from heaven. Well, this is a mere quibble; he could not answer my arguments, and, hence, resorted to this quibble about the earthquake. I don't care where the earthquake came from—there was an earthquake anyhow, and the jailer was operated on by the Spirit, as I believe, without words.

A person can be operated on by a mere look; a Mason, by a sign, can operate upon another Mason, and not speak a word. I can, by a Masonic sign, make myself known to every other Mason in the audience without speaking a word. The deaf and dumb can operate upon each other by signs, without a word being spoken.

Then, we ask, can not God operate also on the hearts

of men without words? If Masons can operate upon one another without words, and if the deaf and dumb can operate upon each other without words, can God not do the same? Certainly he can. The devil can deceive and destroy men without words; then, according to Mr. Mathes, the devil is greater than God, for he says that God can not operate without words and arguments.

Campbellism says: "God can only operate through his words and arguments." But I have shown that this is not true. But Mr. Mathes complains very much of the present tense, and wants me to prove that the Spirit operates independent of the word, *now*. How unreasonable!

But I want you to watch him to-morrow, when we come to discuss the next proposition, which he will affirm; and you will find him doing the same thing of which he complains so much of me to-day. I hope we shall hear no more complaints about the *tense*. If I prove that the Holy Spirit ever, in any age, operated upon men independent of the word, it ought to be satisfactory, and will be to all reasonable men and women. This I have fully proved, and will further establish before I am through with this proposition. [Time expired.]

Fourth Day.—Fourth Proposition.—January 31, 1868.

MR. MATHES' SECOND REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Brooks boasts that he is the chosen organ of the Methodist Church in Bedford. Well, I am glad that such is the fact. I fully recognize him as the embodiment of Methodism in Bedford, and honor him accordingly.

One thing in Mr. Brooks' last speech, I think, must have struck every one as very remarkable. He has raised a false issue, and spent most of his half hour in combating

what no one affirms; that is, he charges me with "*limiting* the power of God," and of maintaining that he *can not* operate in any other way than through his word. And, in opposition to this, he has labored manfully to prove that God *can* operate on men in any way he chooses, either with or without his word.

Now, every one knows that this is not the question at issue between us at all. As a mere abstract question of power, we admit, and so does everybody else, that God has all power, and *can* operate in any way that he chooses. The question is, not what God *can* do, but what he *does* do; what is his revealed plan of operating by his Holy Spirit. And another fact you must bear in mind, that Mr. Brooks and I agree, so far as my position is concerned. I maintain that God's revealed plan of operating by his Spirit in converting men, is through the Gospel—the word of truth. This Mr. Brooks admits; but he goes further, and affirms, in his proposition now under discussion, that he does sometimes operate by his Holy Spirit, independent of and without his revealed word, or Gospel. This I do not admit, and hence the debate upon this point. The real and only issue in this proposition is, not what God has done in past ages and dispensations, by earthquakes, visions and dreams, or by miracles; but *does* the Holy Spirit now operate in converting men independent of the word of God? Mr. Brooks affirms, but he has failed to give us any evidence that the Spirit so operates.

But he has told us of Pharaoh's dream, and "the hand-writing upon the wall," and some other cases like them, and then says he has proved that God did operate independent of his word, in ancient days; and if he did so then, he *can* do so *now*. Yes, he *can* do so now. But that is not the question. *Does* he do it? My friend has entirely failed to *prove* it.

But Mr. Brooks complains because I ask him to confine

himself to the language of his proposition: "The Holy Spirit *does* sometimes operate," etc. He says this is very unfair, and that I ought to allow him to go back to former dispensations. He says, if he is confined to the present tense of his proposition "*does*," he can prove nothing from the Scriptures, as they were completed before the present inhabitants were born. Now, is that not wonderful! But if he does not like the *present tense*, why did he put it in his proposition? But, to relieve him of all further trouble and anxiety in regard to the *tense*, I will just say, that I am perfectly willing that it shall extend over the whole period of the Christian dispensation, from the day of Pentecost—when the kingdom of Christ commenced on the earth—to the present time. If Mr. Brooks can bring any evidence, promise, or example, from the New Testament to sustain him, it will be considered within the range of the proposition.

But he wants to know how I found out that the *poor kine* that Pharaoh saw in his dream were cows? He says that neither he nor I know what kind of animals they were. He says that I *guess* at it, and then refuse to let him *guess* that the Spirit sometimes operates without the word.

I will answer by reading the definition of the word *kine* from Webster's unabridged, which he admits is the best authority in the world, viz: "Kine—Cows." So, you see I do not *guess* at it. I repeat, then, that Pharaoh saw *poor cows* in his dream. I do not object to Mr. Brooks' *guessing* as much as he pleases; but surely he will not ask us to receive his *guesses* as proof of his proposition. Mr. Brooks must presume greatly upon the ignorance of the audience if he expects them to allow him to prove his proposition by *guessing* and *inferring*. But I suppose he can do no better; indeed, I know he can get no testimony from the New Testament—it is all against him.

But Mr. Brooks says that, according to my position, the

Spirit never operates on any one, and that the operation of the Spirit is a delusion. I am surprised at such remarks. I maintain what the Scriptures teach—that the Spirit *does* operate, in the conversion and sanctification of men, through the instrumentality of the word of truth, the Gospel of our salvation. This he admits is the ordinary plan of its operation, as revealed in the Bible. But, because I do not admit his *inference* that the Spirit also converts men by a *direct* operation without the Gospel, he charges us with denying his operation altogether. But this audience will place the proper value upon all such small talk.

But he seems to think that he has found an example that is in point. He says that the Roman guard, at the tomb of Jesus, were caused to fall to the ground as dead men, and not a word was spoken. And what does he *infer* from this? Why, that they were knocked down by the *direct* operation of the Holy Spirit; and, therefore, that he operates on men in the same way now. But, unfortunately for this *inference*, the Spirit is not mentioned as an agent in the affair at all. Matthew says that "there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it. His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow: And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men." (Matthew xxviii: 2-4.)

Thus you see that Mr. Brooks' inference is *false*. It was the fear inspired in the guard, by the appearance of the angel, that paralyzed them, and they fell to the ground as dead men. The Spirit had nothing whatever to do with it. Mr. Brooks' *inference* is, therefore, a direct contradiction of the word of God.

I quoted John xvi: 13, which contains the promise of the Spirit to the disciples, and in which Jesus says, "whom the world can not receive." This quotation is directly

against Mr. Brooks; and how does he dispose of it? Why, by quoting another passage from the same chapter (John xvi: 8-11): "And when he is come, he will reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment," etc.; and attempting to get up a contradiction between the two Scriptures, and asking me to reconcile them.

But there is nothing to reconcile, as there is no contradiction. Is it not strange that Mr. Brooks, who is a professed believer in the truth of the Bible, should attempt to make out a discrepancy or contradiction in it? Such a work is usually performed by infidels. But he accuses me of affirming that the "world can not receive the Spirit." Yes, I do affirm it, because Jesus affirmed it. But Mr. Brooks can not see how the Spirit can "reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment," and still the world not receive him. Well, I will show you how this is done.

Jesus says, "When he comes he shall reprove (rather *convince*) the world," etc. The Spirit came on the day of Pentecost; then the work of *reproving* or *convincing* the world commenced. The world was there—Jews out of every nation under heaven—and they were together greatly wondering. The Spirit was in the apostles and guided them into all truth, "and they spake as the Spirit gave them utterance." The audience was the world, and the Spirit spake to them through the apostles, and convinced them and three thousand were converted on that day. The world did not receive the Spirit, but the Spirit reproved or convinced them by the Gospel, as preached by the apostles, under the guidance of the Spirit. So, you see that these passages are in perfect harmony with each other, and both fully sustain my position on the operation of the Spirit.

He next charges that Mr. Campbell says, that "all the Holy Spirit there is, is in the word," and he further charges that I hold the same views. Now, this is a mon-

strous misrepresentation of Mr. Campbell's and our true position. Neither Mr. Campbell nor myself, or any of my brethren, hold or teach any such absurd notion. Our true position is, that the Holy Spirit *does* operate through the word of truth—the Gospel.

As to the case of the conversion of Saul of Tarsus, he does not know certainly that he was *knocked down*, but he *infers* or *guesses* that he was. He says that he don't care if the Holy Spirit is not mentioned in the case. He *infers* it was the Spirit that did the *knocking down*, and if we do not admit his *inference*, he says "God was there," and that is the same thing, as the Scriptures say that "God is a Spirit." Now, the Bible speaks of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as three distinct personalities. But Mr. Brooks is not satisfied with this, and would confound the first and the third persons of the Trinity and make them one person. He is not a good Trinitarian. But all this does not touch the question. The Scriptures do not ascribe his falling to the earth to any particular cause. When he saw the light from heaven he fell to the earth voluntarily, and then words were spoken to him, and he was sent to Damascus to hear what he *must* do; and he was not recognized as a disciple till three days afterward, when Ananias taught him and baptized him.

But Mr. Brooks declares that he is right in his position, and that the time is coming that I will see and know that his position is right. How modest in his assumptions? But when will that time come, Mr. Brooks? Not until we get a new revelation and another Gospel. According to the revelation and Gospel that we now have, I know he is wrong; and every intelligent Bible-reader in the audience knows that he is wrong, and that he has utterly failed to produce any testimony that sustains his unscriptural proposition.

He next quotes II Peter iii: 15: "The long-suffering

of God is salvation." If any one can see how this passage proves that the Spirit of God operates directly upon men, independent of the word, I admit he is sharper than I am. I see nothing in it that looks in the direction of his proposition, and so I will pass it without further remarks.

Mr. Brooks thinks that the reason I demand Scripture testimony that the "Spirit *does* sometimes operate separate and apart from the word of God," is because I can not answer his arguments squarely. It will be time enough for him to complain of not being answered, when he really *makes* an argument. He has not yet made an argument that is in point; and yet we have fully met all that he has said.

But Mr. Brooks goes again to Babylon, and, after admitting that the Holy Spirit is not mentioned in the case, he gravely tells us that he *thinks*, or *infers*, that it was the Spirit that did the writing upon the wall. Yes, *he* does not doubt it—he thinks so. Certainly, Mr. Brooks *infers* it; and he thinks *that* ought to be satisfactory to us all! But he affirms that there was no language used on that occasion. This, however, is not correct, as there were words written on the plastering of the wall that were read and translated by Daniel.

We asked Mr. Brooks if he considered the earthquake at Philippi, where the jailer was converted, and the Holy Spirit the same thing? To this he replies: "The word of God is not the Spirit." This is a profound answer. No body contends that the "word of God is the Spirit." But, according to his argument on the jailer's case, the earthquake was the Spirit.

But Mr. Brooks has found what he regards as a complete vindication of his proposition, and a refutation of our position. He is a Freemason, and can make himself known to all the Masons in the room by signs, and without any words;

and that deaf and dumb persons can converse with each other by signs, without speaking or without words. Now, this is certainly a wonderful discovery. But has Mr. Brooks yet to learn that words are simply the signs of ideas; and, therefore, that Masonic signs, by which the mystic brotherhood can converse with each other, are, to all intents and purposes, *words*. And so the signs used by the mutes, all represent words and ideas. I have seen a whole class at the asylum praying by signs, which they denominate "the silent language." It is very solemn and impressive.

I am amazed that a man of Mr. Brooks' shrewdness should make such a ludicrous blunder as this. A man may utter words with his fingers as well as with his tongue. To make his case apply to his proposition, he must make his Masonic brethren understand him by the *direct* operation of his Masonic spirit upon them, without any words, spoken, written, or uttered by signs or gestures, looks or grips, of any kind. Let him do this, if he can. But we know he can not. But I think you will all agree with me, that a cause must be hopeless that requires such miserable quibbling as this.

But I am charged by my friend with maintaining that "God *can* only operate on men through his words and arguments." I affirm nothing of the sort. I say nothing about what God *can*, or *can not* do. I affirm that the Holy Spirit *does* operate in the conversion of men through the words and arguments of the Gospel. Mr. Brooks agrees to this, and says that the Spirit also "operates in the conversion of sinners without the words and arguments of the Gospel." This is the issue to-day; not what God *can* or *can not* do, but what the Holy Spirit *does* do. I hope Mr. Brooks will state the issue fairly, and not misrepresent me again. If he does, the audience will know how to appreciate it.

But he charges that my position gives the devil more power than God. He first *assumes* that the devil can operate by his spirit upon the naked spirits of the people without words, arguments, or any other instrumentality. Now, I deny that the devil can do anything of the sort; and Mr. Brooks has not and can not prove it. The devil always operates upon mankind through agencies and instrumentalities, so far as we know anything of his works, as I proved in my last reply. I do not limit the power of God by saying that he *can not* operate without his word in the conversion of men. Yet I do say, with Paul: "For I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, for it is the power of God to salvation to every one that believes." [Time expired.]

Fourth Day.—Fourth Proposition.—January 31, 1858.

MR. BROOKS' THIRD SPEECH—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: I am glad that we are getting along so pleasantly. Mr. Mathes is a very pleasant man, and a good and fair debater. Now, I expect, when this debate is over, that the Christian Record will claim a great victory over me. Mr. Mathes and his brethren always *whip* according to their own testimony; they are great people to debate with "the sects," and, if we are to credit their statements, in the Record and other papers, they never lose a battle, but always gain a glorious victory. Look out for the Record, and you will see it.

Dr. Fishback, of Lexington, a prominent member of my friend's church, wrote a book on Total Depravity, in which he takes the same ground on spiritual influence that I occupy, and is, therefore, against Mr. Mathes.

Now, if my friend's theory be correct—that the Holy Spirit only operates through words and arguments—then

all infants, idiots, and all the heathen will be damned. Now, you see what an awful doctrine my friend advocates. Infants,, idiots, and the heathen world, are not operated on by the words and arguments of the Gospel; and, therefore, they must go to hell. I do not say that Mr. Mathes believes this, but his system involves these terrible consequences, and, therefore, can not be true. But, according to the position that I occupy, none of these bad consequences follow. I believe that many will be saved in heathen lands, where the Gospel has never been preached. They will be saved by the work of the Holy Spirit on their hearts. Paul says: "They, having not the law, are a law unto themselves;" and they "show the work of the law written in their hearts," etc. Heathenism is not so great a light as the Gospel, and, therefore, we enjoy a better opportunity in Christian lands; but still, all the heathen who have the law written on their hearts, and who are operated on by the Holy Spirit without words or arguments, will be saved.

It is a great sin to limit the Holy One of Israel. But Mr. Mathes limits the Holy One by denying that the Holy Spirit ever operates on men except through words and arguments; therefore, Mr. Mathes commits a great sin!

I brought forward the case of the Syrian army at the siege of Samaria, who heard a noise and became alarmed and fled, leaving all their provisions and stores for the starving inhabitants. I proved by this case that God can operate upon men by the Spirit, without a word being spoken or an argument used. Mr. Mathes knew he could not answer this, and so he passed it by in silence, as he did twenty other Scriptures that I quoted. You all see the difficulties that surround him, and how his cause labors.

The earthquake was not the Holy Spirit, but it operated upon the jailer's heart, and made him know and feel that he was a lost sinner, and desire salvation. Yet it spoke

not a word to him. I don't care where the earthquake came from—whether it came down from heaven or came from some other place—and Mr. Mathes is welcome to all the capital he can make out of what I said about the earthquake coming down from heaven.

The light that "shone round about" Saul of Tarsus when Jesus met him on the way to Damascus, was evidently the Holy Spirit. It was a great light, and so operated upon the heart of Saul, and those who were with him, that they fell to the ground, or were *knocked down*; yet, not a word was spoken to him till after they were all down upon the ground.

The Holy Spirit operated upon the apostles, on the day of Pentecost, without a word or an argument being used.

John the Baptist was operated upon by the Spirit before he was born; and, of course, it was the Spirit *alone*, without any words or arguments.

Now, I hope Mr. Mathes will not dodge these Scriptures, as he has done, but come up to the issue manfully. He is in a very tight place, and if he can't get out on fair terms, why, he ought to acknowledge that he is wrong. But I do not suppose that he will do this; yet the audience see that he is wrong.

As to Pharaoh's dream, I will just say that I knew, of course, what was meant by the word *lane*. What I said was, that neither he nor I knew that they were females; he *guessed* at it—and you see he is a great man to *guess*; his religious system is made up of *guesses*.

I will now read I Corinthians xii: 7: "The Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." Now, we must take the expression "every man" in its broadest signification, to *mean* every man. But Mr. Mathes has got a sinking cause to maintain, and he will, no doubt, quibble over the word *every*. He will try to make you believe that every don't mean *every*, but only a *part* of mankind.

I will also read Acts, chapter viii: "The Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip." Did the Spirit speak to Philip? I am not willing to be confined to the new dispensation. I shall take the whole range from the creation to the present time, and Mr. Mathes can not confine me. Mr. Campbell says, in the Living Oracles, no one is converted except through words and arguments. Campbell and Rice went all over creation in the discussion of this proposition, and surely I may do the same.

But Mr. Mathes seems to think that he has nothing to affirm, as he is on the negative of the proposition. But I say he has something to do. He has something to affirm and prove, as well as the affirmative. Mr. Mathes says, "the world can not receive the Spirit." But I say the world can, and does receive the Spirit as a reprove. But how does the Spirit reprove the world? It may reprove a sinner, and still not save him. The Spirit reproves by making impression upon the heart, to bring them to see their lost condition; and, in this sense, the world receives the Spirit. Now, mind you, the manifestation of the Spirit is to *profit* every man.

King Balaam was reprov'd by the Spirit speaking through the mouth of the animal on which he rode. God went to arrest Balaam, but did not have to speak to him to reprove him. The world is reprov'd by the Spirit, and in this sense the world can receive it. The heathen are reprov'd, not by nature, but it is written on their heart by the Spirit. Will you believe me now? Saint Paul says it is written on their heart; so you see I am in good company. Does not God operate on the heathen without words or arguments? Most certainly he does; and the religious world agrees with me in this—except Mr. Mathes and his party. And my friend's system was a new discovery by Alexander Campbell. How the world is reprov'd by the Spirit, they can not understand; and, therefore, they *guess*

at it—just as Mr. Mathes guesses that Saul bowed down when he saw the light. But it was a great light, without any words or arguments, and the power was so overwhelming that it made him blind. This is a clear open-and-shut on Mr. Mathes. Now, you see what a fix he has got himself into.

As to the coming down of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, was it not the Spirit that sent the sound, like the sound of a rushing mighty wind? And all without a word or an argument! Then they began to speak with words, after the Spirit had operated upon them. This fully sustains my proposition.

Can Mr. Mathes not see it now? The heathen world needs such an operation to write the truth upon their hearts. According to Mr. Mathes, the heathen world will be excused in the day of judgment for not living Christians, as they have no access to the written word, nor the arguments of the Gospel. Would it be just in God to damn them, when they never heard the Gospel, and could not be converted without it?

But my system saves the heathen, and all infants and idiots, without words or arguments. All mankind are contaminated with sin, and are totally depraved, and must be lost unless they are rescued by the operation of the Spirit upon their hearts. The Spirit must operate upon the heart to take away their depravity.

I repeat, that Mr. Mathes' system involves the damnation of all infants, idiots, and the heathen. Can you believe a doctrine that involves such awful consequences. I think not. It can not be true. [Time expired.]

Fourth Day.—Fourth Proposition.—January 31, 1868.

MR. MATHES' THIRD REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: If my friend Mr. Brooks has any testimony or argument, why does he not offer it? He has again spent his half-hour in giving us his *opinion* about the salvation of infants, idiots, and the heathen. Well, suppose he is honest in his *opinions*; that is not testimony. What we want is something tangible. We want him to give us clear Scripture testimony, that the Holy Spirit has operated on some one, since the kingdom of Christ was set up, without the Gospel. This he has not done, and can not do, simply because no such operation has ever taken place. He has exhausted himself, and produced not one particle of testimony that partakes of the nature of his proposition. He seems to be aware of his failure, and, hence, he calls upon me to prove my position, and insists that I have something to prove on this question as well as he!

Well, I have proved my position fully, but this was not necessary, for he fully admitted it in his first speech. We have no controversy about my position, "that the Spirit does operate in the conversion and sanctification of men through the Gospel." No man who believes the Bible will deny it. But Mr. Brooks affirms that the Spirit sometimes does this work without the Gospel, and independent of the word of truth. This, then, is the issue. Why does he not quote some Scripture, then, where God has promised to operate on men under the Gospel of Christ, by the Spirit alone? But, finding no such promise, why does he not produce some clear example from the New Testament, among the thousands of conversions recorded there, where some one was operated upon and converted *by the Spirit alone*, without the Gospel? If he could pro-

duce such an example, it would settle the question. But no such example can be found, and he thinks I am very unreasonable for asking it. Why, then, does he not come out like a man, and acknowledge that he is mistaken, and give it up? This would be honorable.

But he refuses to be confined to the Christian dispensation, and says that I *can not* confine him—that Campbell and Rice went all over creation for testimony, on the same proposition, and he will do so too. But I tell Mr. Brooks that he has *confined himself*. He framed his proposition himself, and used the *present tense*—"The Holy Spirit *does* sometimes operate," etc. He can not take shelter under the Campbell and Rice debate. The proposition which Mr. Campbell affirmed in that discussion was this: "In conversion and sanctification, the Spirit of God operates on persons only through the word of truth." And in the discussion of this, Mr. Campbell never went out of the Christian dispensation for his proof, and never, except to expose Mr. Rice's quibbling. The truth is, every man is confined within the scope and meaning of his proposition. And Mr. Brooks says that the proposition we are discussing to-day is the same discussed by Campbell and Rice. Very well; then it not only confines us to the Christian dispensation for the proof, but it also confines us to the subject of CONVERSION AND SANCTIFICATION. He can not, therefore, dodge the real issue any longer.

I will now examine his Scriptures, as far as I have time. I begin with I Corinthians xii: 7: "But the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal." Now, Mr. Brooks aims to prove, by this text, that the Spirit, without the word of truth, operates on every man—that is, upon every man and woman, and infant, and idiot, including all heathen.

But, allow me to say that nothing of the kind can be

found in the passage. It does not even affirm that the Spirit operates upon any one, either *with* or *without* the Gospel. "The manifestation of the Spirit," was simply those spiritual gifts or miraculous powers bestowed upon the church in the beginning. "Every man," in the text, means simply every man in the church, and has no reference to the world at all. No respectable critic or commentator in the world understands this text as applying to the unconverted world, but exclusively to the members of the church. The plain meaning of the passage is this: The spirit was manifested in the primitive church by a great many spiritual gifts, such as speaking with tongues, the interpretations of tongues, healing the sick, etc. All these gifts were not bestowed upon any one member, but some were given to one and some to another, so that all the members participated in them, and all were benefited by them. "To profit withal," means, to benefit the whole body. Literally translated, it would read, "And to each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the benefit of all."

So, you see this text brings no relief to Mr. Brooks in his distress. It has no reference to anything contained in his proposition.

He next refers to the descent of the Spirit on Pentecost. And he thinks that, because there was a *sound* "as of a rushing, mighty wind," on that occasion, that, therefore, the Spirit operates independent of the Gospel in the conversion of sinners. The absence of proof in this passage must be manifest to all. The Spirit came to the disciples, not the world. And when the disciples were filled with the Spirit, they preached to the assembled thousands, and three thousand were converted that day, and added to them. But you will observe that not a single conversion was made until the Gospel was preached to them. This passage, therefore, fully sustains my position, and is directly against Mr. Brooks.

Mr. Brooks also refers to the case of "King Balaam," as he calls the wicked prophet. Well, we do not see why he brings up this ease, as it is directly in opposition to his views, as well as too far hack to prove his proposition. How was Balaam reproved on the occasion referred to? Why, not by the Spirit alone, but by *words spoken* by the dumb beast on which he rode. But I was amazed at the rashness of my friend Mr. Brooks, when he squarely contradicted the Lord Jesus Christ. It is most astonishing.

We had quoted the words of Jesus concerning the coming of the Holy Spirit (John xvi): "Whom the world can not receive." In reply to my argument based upon this declaration of the Saviour, Mr. Brooks says, "there is a sense in which the world *can* receive the Spirit." A more palpable contradiction could not be framed in the English language! Which will you believe—Jesus, who says "the world can not receive the Spirit," or T. S. Brooks, the mouth-piece of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Bedford, who says, "There is a sense in which the world *can* receive the Spirit?"

He seems not satisfied as to how the Spirit was to *reprove* the world of sin, etc., when he came; and *guesses* that the Spirit reproves the heathen by writing good impressions upon their hearts. Now, this is not only a guess, but it is a great mistake. The Spirit was in the apostles, and spake to the world by their mouth, and convinced three thousand on the first day, by words spoken to them by the Spirit. And the world is reproved or convinced of sin yet, just as they were in the beginning. On this subject we occupy apostolic ground, and we know we are right, and can not be wrong!

But Mr. Brooks thinks that the great light that shone round about Saul on his way to Damascus, was the Holy Spirit. This can not be so; for it is compared to the brightness of the sun, and was, therefore, a similar light,

only more intense. And the Holy Spirit enlightens and opens the eyes of the understanding; but this light made Saul blind, so that he had to be led into the city.

But if Mr. Brooks is correct in his theory, the heathen will all be saved; and are much better off without the Gospel than they would be with it. Without it, the Spirit writes conviction upon every heart; and with the Gospel, many would reject it, and be lost. Better, then, to be born in heathen than in Christian lands. Much better, too, that we should not send the Bible nor the missionary to them; but just leave the Spirit to his own work, in his own way, among the heathen.

Again: Mr. Brooks is harping upon the damnation of infants and idiots. In the debate on a former proposition, we showed, according to the Scriptures, that ample provision is made in the Gospel for all the infants and idiots, and not one of them will be finally lost. I do not believe the doctrine of total hereditary depravity, nor do my brethren. We believe in depravity, and think some men may become totally depraved; but not all men. But he says that Dr. Fishback, a distinguished minister of the Christian Church, wrote a book advocating total depravity. But I will inform my friend that Dr. Fishback was a minister of the Baptist Church when he wrote his book, and only became a member of the Christian Church toward the close of his life; and, therefore, we are not responsible for the doctrines of his book, whatever they may have been.

But Mr. Brooks' proposition can derive no support from the word of God, and hence, to fill up his time, he is under the necessity of introducing a great deal of irrelevant matter.

But perhaps I ought to examine the passage which occupied so much of my friend's attention in his last speech, viz: "For when the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by

nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing, or else excusing one another." (Romans ii: 14, 15.)

Mr. Brooks *infers* from this passage that the Holy Spirit goes to the Gentiles, and writes the law of God upon their hearts without any words. What a strange notion! When the Holy Spirit is not once mentioned or alluded to in the passage; and beside, the apostle tells us, very plainly, that they "do by *nature* the things contained in the law." That is, the Gentiles, who had not the law, had the light of nature to guide them, and by this light many of them practiced the morality taught in the law, which was enjoined upon the Jews, and by their moral conduct manifested the moral principles of the law which they had not, but which was written upon their hearts by nature, and their consciences thus enlightened by the light of nature and their reasonings with each other. I can not elaborate this matter now; but you all see that it proves nothing for Mr. Brooks. He says the Gentiles were enlightened by the Holy Spirit without words, and the apostle says that it was *nature*. Now, which will you believe? They can not both be right.

But I object to his proposition, because the Bible is against him in the following passages, and many others that might be quoted. John viii: 32: "And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." According to Mr. Brooks, the Holy Spirit sometimes makes people free, independent of the truth. Again, Acts iii: 23: "And it shall come to pass, that every soul which will not hear that prophet shall be destroyed, from among the people." It is, therefore, the words of Christ that must be heard in order to salvation. Acts vii: 51: "Ye stiff-necked, and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do always

resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye." Here, Stephen says that they resisted the Holy Spirit as their fathers did. Now, if we can ascertain how their fathers resisted the Spirit, we shall know how the Jews resisted it.

Well, we are not left to guess at it. We read from Nehemiah ix: 30: "Yet many years didst thou forbear them, and testifiedst against them by the Spirit in thy prophets," etc. Thus we see that they resisted the Spirit by refusing to hearken to the *words* of the prophets. Once more, Genesis vi: 3: "My Spirit shall not always strive with man." How did the Spirit strive with the antediluvians? Certainly through the preaching of Noah. Again, Acts v: 32: "We are his witnesses of these things; and so is also the Holy Ghost, whom God hath given to them that obey him." Thus you see the words of Christ must be obeyed, in order to receive the Spirit. Romans x: 17: "How shall they believe on him of whom they have not heard," etc. We must hear the words of Christ in order to faith and salvation. Acts viii: 29: "The Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot." It was not a mere impression, but the "Spirit *said* to" him.

Revelations xxii: 17: "And the Spirit and the Bride say, Come." The Spirit does not *feel* come, but *says* come by the Gospel. Again, Revelations ii: 29: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the churches." It is not the Spirit *without* words, but the Spirit operating through words.

From all these Scriptures we see very clearly that God's plan of operating on saint and sinner, by his Spirit, is through the instrumentality of the truths spoken in words. I am, therefore, right in my position upon this subject, and Mr. Brooks and his church are, emphatically, wrong.

We must preach the whole Gospel, as Peter did on the day of Pentecost, without leaving out any part of it.

"And when they heard this, they were pierced in their hearts, and cried out and said, men and brethren, what shall we do?" Now, you will observe that it was what they *heard* that affected them, and not the abstract operation of the Spirit, as Mr. Brooks would have you believe.

But I close at this point, and will hear Mr. Brooks once more on this proposition. [Time expired.]

Fourth Day.—Fourth Proposition.—January 31, 1808.

MR. BROOKS' FOURTH SPEECH—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Mathes has been trying to call away your minds from the main issue, and, unless you are on your guard, he will deceive you, for he is very plausible. What if I did say "King Balaam;" that was a very small matter for a great man like Mr. Mathes to complain about. He knew that it was a mere mistake. Of course, I know that Balaam was not a king, and I stated the case correctly; and I claim that it does sustain my position—of the operation of the Spirit without words and arguments. But I have no doubt the Record will come out in flaming colors, claiming a great victory over me on this proposition.

Mr. Mathes says that Dr. Fishback was a Baptist minister when he wrote his book on Total Depravity. Well, that may have been the case, but I know that Dr. Fishback was quoted by Mr. Rice, in the Lexington debate, as authority. And Mr. Campbell himself says, that "Children are depraved." Well, I infer, then, if children are *depraved*, they will be lost, if there is no operation of the Spirit *without* the Gospel. Yes, and the heathen will be lost too, upon the same ground. They have some light, but not as much as we have, and hence, we send them missionaries and the Bible, that they may have more light. The more light they have, the better.

This being my last speech on this proposition, I will now recapitulate:

I will first repeat the proposition: "The Holy Spirit does sometimes operate separate and apart from the written or revealed word of God," And I have proved this by the following texts of Scripting, and others: "For I will cast out the nations before thee, and enlarge thy borders: neither shall any man desire thy land, when thou shalt go up to appear before the Lord thy God thrice a year." (Exodus xxxiv: 24.) How did God take care of the families, and keep the surrounding nations off their land, while they were gone up to Jerusalem to worship? We showed that he must have done it by the Spirit, without words or arguments. "The king's heart is in the hand of the Lord as the rivers of water: he turneth it whithersoever he will." (Proverbs xxi: 1.) This was done, we argued, by the direct influence of the Spirit without any words.

"And Moses and Aaron did all these wonders before Pharaoh; and the Lord hardened Pharaoh's heart, so that he would not let the children of Israel go out of his land." (Exodus xi: 10.) We showed that he must have done so by his Spirit, as Pharaoh was a heathen. Also, "For the Lord had made the host of Syrians to hear a noise of chariots, and a noise of horses, even the noise of a great host," etc. (II Kings vii: 6.) How did the Lord make them hear this great noise that so alarmed them? We showed that it was by his Spirit, without a word being spoken; as the Syrians were heathens, and had not the words of God among them.

"In the same hour came forth ringers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace; and the king saw a part of the hand that wrote." (Daniel v: 5.) Mr. Mathes tried to make out that it was not the Holy Spirit that did this

writing; but it must have been the Spirit, or how could it have produced such a wonderful effect on the king? It is true, there were words written, but in a language that was not understood, and words can have no effect that are not understood. This, then, was clearly an operation of the Spirit without words, and proves my proposition.

I showed, also, from the conversion of the jailer (recorded in Acts xvi), that God operated on him by an *earthquake*, without saying a word to him. It is true that words were spoken afterward. But, the first operation was without words or arguments. I quoted, also, the following: "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves: which show the work of the law written in their hearts," etc. (Romans ii: 14, 15.) No words here.

We also introduced Saul's conversion (Acts xxii.) The light came first—mark this, my friends—first a "great light from heaven," but no words were spoken yet. But Mr. Mathes says, this light was not the Spirit at all. O, no! it was only a light similar to the light of the sun—only a little more intense, and made him blind for the next three days! I am surprised that a man of Mr. Mathes' ability should take such an absurd position; but I do not blame him for it—he is compelled to resort to such things to save a sinking cause. Did any of you ever know a man to go blind, and remain blind three days, by the light of the sun? Then, I am fully sustained by this case.

John says: "That was the true light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." (John i: 9.) But Mr. Mathes says, that "every man," in this passage, only means "every man who hears the Gospel." But I showed, conclusively, I think, that every man that comes into the world is enlightened to some extent by the Spirit; and I affirm that this is sometimes done without the words and

arguments of the Gospel. "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven as of a rushing, mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting." (Acts ii: 2.) Now, mind you, this was all before any speaking was done. And the Spirit operated on the apostles before a word was spoken.

John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Spirit from his birth. (Luke i: 15.) In his case the Spirit operated without words and arguments. By these Scriptures, and my arguments drawn from them, I have sustained the affirmative of this proposition. And, mind you now, I say "*sometimes does*" not *always*; for I admit that the ordinary plan of the operation is by words.

In the beginning, the Spirit of God moved upon the waters, unaccompanied by any words or arguments. And we showed that the old Adversary operates without words and arguments. Yet, Mr. Mathes argues that God can't do it! The devil gets over among the heathen, and, without words or arguments, he influences them to commit sin. But, according to Mr. Mathes, God can't follow him there by the Spirit, but is compelled to wait the slow process of Bible translation and missionary enterprise. In the mean time the devil has it all his own way there, till the missionary goes to them with the Bible. Why, according to this, the devil has more power than God Almighty, for he operates independent of words, and God Almighty can't!

I have quoted more than twenty texts to prove the affirmative of this proposition. Surely that is enough to prove any proposition that can be proved at all. Now, I want you to remember Saul's conversion. Christ could have come to him and spoken to him before he fell to the ground, but he didn't do it. The light came first, and operated so strong upon him that he fell to the earth, all before a word was spoken to him. Now, I *think* this light

from heaven was the Holy Ghost, sent to Saul to show him that he was a lost sinner; and the operation upon him was so powerful that he fell to the ground, or was *knocked down*; and after that, Jesus spoke to him. Now, with all his ingenuity and tact, Mr. Mathes can not explain this away. He will, no doubt, say that this light was figurative. But we must not have too many figures; it will not do.

And the case of Philip and the eunuch is a very strong case for my side, and Mr. Mathes has entirely failed to meet it; in fact, he could not. He did the very best that any man on his side could do; but it all amounts to nothing, as long as it is written: "And the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip; that the eunuch saw him no more." Now, let Mr. Mathes get out of this, if he can.

I know Mr. Mathes is a strong man and a gentleman, and if anybody can get out of a tight place, he is the very man to do it. I now close my arguments on this proposition. My time is not quite out, but I can not introduce any new matter here in my closing speech, and I will close by saying that I am glad that such good feeling prevails in the audience; and Mr. Mathes and I are getting along very pleasantly, and I am happy to say that Mr. Mathes is a very pleasant man. [Time expired.]

Fourth Day.—Fourth Proposition.—January 31, 1868.

MR. MATHES' FOURTH REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I now rise to close the discussion on this fourth proposition. I feel truly thankful that I have had the opportunity of discussing this important issue before this large and attentive audience. You, my friends, have listened patiently through the entire day, and I feel confident that you now understand our true position on the subject of the Spirit's opera-

tion in the conversion and sanctification of men. I am the more delighted with this because I and my brethren have been greatly misunderstood and misrepresented 'upon this important subject. Now you understand our true position, and have heard the very best that can be done to oppose it by a man who has made it his business for years to oppose us; a regular debater, who has been chosen for the occasion on account of his long experience and superior ability; a man who is acknowledged to be the best debater the Methodist Episcopal Church can bring forward in the State, standing "head and shoulders above all his brethren."

You have seen how completely he has failed to assail my position; in fact, you have heard him admit its correctness several times during the day. I think I may, therefore, claim that my position stands before you unassailed and unassailable, and that you understand it.

Let me state the real issue again. The proposition which we have been discussing to-day, and which Mr. Brooks has affirmed, reads thus: "The Spirit does sometimes operate separate and apart from the written or revealed word of God." The language is a little ambiguous, but it could have no practical importance, only as it applies to the conversion and sanctification of men under the Gospel dispensation. In this sense I have discussed it; and Mr. Brooks virtually admitted that this was the true sense of the proposition when he said that "Campbell and Rice, in the Lexington debate, discussed the same proposition we are now debating." And the proposition which they debated, stated definitely that it was the operation of the Spirit "in the conversion and sanctification of men."

My position is, that the Holy Spirit operates only through the truth—the Gospel—in the conversion and sanctification of men. And this I have proved by all the examples of conversion recorded in the New Testa-

ment. And I have challenged Mr. Brooks all day to bring forward an example showing that some one was converted since the descent of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, by the Spirit *alone* operating separate and apart from the written or revealed word of God; and you know he has entirely failed to do so. Indeed, he has admitted that this is God's *ordinary* way of converting and sanctifying men.

But, while admitting the correctness of my position as God's *ordinary* plan of doing the work, he denies that it is his *only way*; and affirms that "the Spirit *does sometimes* operate separate and apart from the written or revealed word of God." Here, then, all can see the *real issue* between us. My position is not denied, only so far as it recognizes no other plan. But I deny his position, that the Spirit operates independent of the word of God in converting and sanctifying men. In proving the separate, independent operation of the Spirit, Mr. Brooks has availed himself of the vagueness of his proposition, and has spent most of his time in talking about matters wholly irrelevant to the issue—such as "the handwriting" upon the wall at Babylon, Pharaoh's dream about the cows, the heathen being kept off the Jewish lands while the men were gone up to Jerusalem to worship, the adventures of Balaam, the earthquake that he *thinks* came down from heaven on the night that the jailer was converted, etc.

But every one must have seen the utter hopelessness of a cause that required such a strained effort. *Not* one of the examples brought forward proved anything in favor of his proposition. But I will notice some of his statements again, as he has repeated them in his last speech, in summing up.

1. I will first notice what he says about the heathen enjoying the light of the Spirit without the Gospel, or word of God. His argument, if it can be called an argument, proves too much for his theory. Let us look at it a

moment. He says that the Spirit of God enlightens every heathen and writes the law upon their hearts; yet, he says the light they have is not equal to the light enjoyed by us who have the word. Their light, as compared to the light we have where the written word of God is read, is like "starlight" as compared to the light of the sun. And hence, he argues the necessity of sending them the Bible and the missionary, that they may enjoy the sunlight!

Now, from this argument, every one can see that Mr. Brooks places the word of God above his Spirit—just as much above as the sunlight is greater than the starlight. The Spirit gives a little light, but the written word gives much more. But perhaps he did not see where his argument would lead him. But you all see that it proves too much for his theory.

But he insists that every man that comes into the world is enlightened by the Spirit, and quotes John i: 9, to prove it. John says, concerning Christ as the light of the world: "That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world." Now, I believe this most firmly. Christ is the Light of the world. The world is, in darkness, and can have no light except from him; therefore, the passage simply teaches, that every man who comes into the world, who is enlightened at all, receives the light from Christ, as there is no other source of light in the world.

But Mr. Brooks' interpretation of this text proves entirely too much for his system. The design of God in giving men the light, is to save them; and if he enlightens one man by the abstract operation of the Spirit, and saves him without the Gospel, then he will do the same for all men, as he is no respecter of persons. And if this text means the absolute enlightenment of every human being that comes into the world, whether in Christian or heathen lands, by the Spirit without the word of God, then the un-

conditional universal salvation of every human being follows, as a matter of course. This conclusion can not be avoided, if Mr. Brooks is correct in his application of this passage! But he is not correct, as we have fully proved. Jesus is the Light of the world as a great Teacher; and in teaching and enlightening every man that comes into the world, the Holy Spirit is the agent, and his word in the Gospel the instrumentality employed, as I have abundantly shown during the day.

My friend Mr. Brooks seems to be a good deal exercised about what he expects I will say in the Christian Record. It is quite amusing. Well, he need have no fears about the Record. If anything is said in the Record, it will be simply the truth. The Record will take care of itself.

But he tells us that Mr. Campbell teaches that children are depraved. But he failed to refer us to the book or page where he makes the statement. I know, however, that he did not believe nor teach the doctrine of total depravity, as held by Mr. Brooks and the sects generally. He believed and taught that human nature was, to some extent, depraved, but not *totally* depraved; but did not teach that infants were so depraved that they were in danger of being lost. But even if Mr. Campbell did believe the doctrine of total depravity, as taught at Princeton, that has nothing to do with the issue between Mr. Brooks and I to-day.

Mr. Brooks attempted to make a little capita] to-day by trying to make it appear that I was limiting the power of God. He represented me as maintaining that God *could not* operate on anything, or in any way, only through his word. Now this, as I have before shown, is a great mistake. It is not a question of *power* at all; but how *does* he operate by his Spirit on men, in converting and sanctifying them? How has he *promised* to do it? We have maintained, through this debate, that he does operate

through the instrumentality of his word in converting men—that this is his revealed plan of doing the work. This Mr. Brooks admits, but thinks God sometimes does the work by his Spirit, separate and apart from his word. But he has said all he could on the subject, and failed to give the case of a single individual who was converted to God, without the Gospel, since Jesus rose from the dead. His failure is, therefore, complete.

Miracles do not belong to the proposition; and, you remember, he has relied mainly upon a few miraculous cases, and not upon any direct testimony. The writing upon the wall, the earthquake at Philippi, the great light that surrounded Saul of Tarsus on the road, together with most of the examples brought forward, were miraculous manifestations of God's power, and prove nothing in favor of his affirmative. He might, with just as much propriety and consistency, have introduced every other miracle upon record in both Testaments.

The earthquake alarmed the jailer when he saw the prison doors standing open, but it did not convict him. But if the earthquake convicted the jailer, as Mr. Brooks contends, and if this was the operation of the Spirit without the word, then how did it happen that it led him to commit suicide! Does anybody suppose that the Holy Spirit ever led to suicide? Yet such was its effect upon the jailer, if his alarm was produced by the Spirit. But it was only an alarm from the earthquake, and fear of punishment by the government for letting the prisoners escape. He was neither convicted nor converted until Paul had preached the word of the Lord to him. Thus, you see, he can derive no support from this case, or any others like it. He has ransacked the whole Bible and exhausted himself, and failed to find a particle of testimony to sustain him. He feels his utter defeat, and hence speaks of what the Record will probably say about it.

If he would lay aside his prejudices, and post himself up a little, by a careful reading of the Scriptures, he would learn how God speaks by his Spirit. The Spirit was in the prophets and apostles, and they spake as the Spirit gave them utterance. Thus the world was convinced of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment. He admits that I am right in my position, and then complains because I will not admit that his position is right too. Jesus says a the world can not receive the Spirit," as we quoted before. This forever cuts off Mr. Brooks' theory of Spiritual operation.

But he has been combating a doctrine that no one believes nor advocates, a mere "man of straw," that he fixed up to show how completely he could demolish it; that is, that God *can* operate in no way, or upon anything, except through his word. This, however, I have already sufficiently exposed, and need not repeat it here. Most of my Scripture testimony has been passed over in silence by Mr. Brooks. He could not answer them, and, therefore, he did not attempt it.

His failure with his Masonic signs was most complete, and he never rallied on that point again. God always employs instrumentalities in accomplishing his purposes. We never preach the word alone, faith alone, nor the Spirit alone, nor anything else alone, for the salvation of sinners; but we preach the whole Gospel of Christ—the Spirit as the agent, and the word of God as the instrumentality; and then faith in Jesus as the Son of God, and obedience to him, as the conditions upon which the sinner accepts Christ as his Saviour. The Spirit, as the agent, commences the work by convincing the sinner through the Gospel, and carries on the work by sanctifying the Christian through the truth, and the Spirit consummates the work by raising the Christian from the dead, as Paul declares. (Romans viii: 11.)

Then all the little ones will be there, without the loss of one, raised from the dead by the energy of the Divine Spirit and voice of the Son of God, to join the bright millions around the throne; the sound of whose rejoicing will go up "like the sound of many waters, and like the noise of great thundering, saying hallelujah!"

In conclusion, my friends, let me ask you to divest yourselves of all prejudice, as far as you can, and consider the matter to which you have so attentively listened, in the light of the word of God, and then decide for yourselves in the premises.

I thank you, my friends, most cordially, for your good order and kind attention. [Time expired.]

Fifth Day.—Fifth Proposition.—February 1, 1868.

MR. MATHES' FIRST SPEECH—(45 MINUTES.)

PROP. V "IS immersion the Bible mode or action of Baptism." Affirmative, Mr. Mathes; Negative, Mr. Brooks.

MR. PRESIDENT, MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I will here repeat the propositions already discussed, that all may see, in a connected form, the ground we have passed over in this discussion. 1. I affirmed and, I think, proved that the church to which I belong is the church founded by Christ and his apostles; and, of course, that we are right as an organism. 2. Mr. Brooks undertook to prove that infants are proper subjects of baptism and membership in the Church of Christ. How well he succeeded in the attempt, you must decide for yourselves. But I think you will agree with me, that he made a complete failure. 3. I affirmed that "Immersion, to a penitent believer, is in order to the remission of past sins." And I feel confident that you will agree that I proved it fully from the word of God. 4. Mr. Brooks next affirmed and

tried to prove that the Holy Spirit does sometimes operate separate and apart from the written or revealed word of God. But he was not able to find a single example in the Bible where the Holy Spirit ever converted any one without the Gospel. And, of course, he failed. 5. I am to prove, if I can, that immersion is the Scriptural action of baptism, as commanded by Jesus Christ—the Head of the church.

This, my friends, is a very important link in the chain of propositions. What has the Lord commanded? We are all interested in knowing the truth upon this, and every other subject connected with the plan of salvation. And we ought to be candid and honest with ourselves, and not "handle the word of God deceitfully." I have an abundance of testimony, exactly in point, to prove my proposition to the satisfaction of all unprejudiced minds. The term "IMMERSION," does not occur in the common version of the New Testament, but its equivalent is there. I use the word *immersion*, in the proposition, as synonymous with *baptism*.

Baptism is a Greek word, with an English termination, transferred into King James' version. Its English equivalent is "*immersion*" as I shall show. We want to know what particular action Jesus required to be done when he said, in the great commission, "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved" (Mark xvi: 16), and parallel passages. What did he command to be done?

All agree that baptism is an ordinance of the New Testament, ordained by Jesus Christ. If, then, it is an ordinance ordained by Jesus Christ, we must go to the New Testament, and not to the Old—to Christ, and not to Abraham nor Moses—to learn what it is. And I am happy to know that there is no debate in the religious world as to the validity of IMMERSION. All denominations, Catholic and Protestant, except, perhaps, the Quakers,

agree that **(Rest of line was cut from hard copy)** fact that the Greek Church have, from the earliest antiquity, practiced exclusive immersion; and we may fairly presume, that they understand their own language. Roman Catholics admit that immersion was the apostolic practice. And Bishop Hughes once, in a discussion with a Presbyterian divine, charged that the Presbyterians took their *sprinkling* from the Catholic Church! And he said they did not claim Scripture authority for it, but tradition. He claimed that the Romish clergy, with the Pope as the successor of St. Peter, have the "keys of the kingdom of heaven," which gave them the authority to *change* the ordinance. And they did change it from immersion to sprinkling, as it was more convenient! But he admitted that immersion was the ancient way.

All Protestant denominations admit that immersion is valid baptism. The Methodist Discipline gives to the candidate, if an adult, the choice to be immersed, if he prefers it. We have no debate with Methodists, as to the Scripturalness and validity of immersion, but the issue is altogether on sprinkling and pouring. They believe too much! They make sprinkling and pouring equally valid with immersion. This we deny; and herein lies all the trouble, so far as the *action* is concerned.

I. My first argument will be drawn from the meaning of the word *baptizo*, which is the word always used to set forth the ordinance. It is a *specific* word, and always means the same thing.

Greenfield's Lexicon defines the word thus: "Baptizo—To immerse, immerge, submerge, sink, to wash, perform ablution, cleanse (Mark vii: 41, and Luke xi: 38); to immerse, baptize, administer the rite of baptism," etc.

DONNEGAN. "To immerse repeatedly into a liquid; to submerge; to soak thoroughly, to saturate; hence, to drench with wine," etc.

(**This line was cut from hard copy of book**) etc.

And with these lexicons, agree every lexicon of any note in the world. No standard lexicon of the Greek language gives *sprinkle* or *pour*, as any meaning of *baptizo*.

I will now introduce the testimony of some distinguished Paedobaptists, who fully sustain my proposition.

In 1857 I had some controversy with Mr. A. Wright, a Methodist preacher, upon this subject, in which I asserted that the word *baptizo* was never used in the New Testament, nor in the Greek classics, in the sense of sprinkle or pour. This Mr. Wright denied. Thereupon I addressed letters to several distinguished scholars, presenting the question to them. Among the number, I addressed one to Hon. Horace Mann, then President of Antioch College, to which he answered promptly, as follows:

"ANTIOCH COLLEGE, Sep. 15, 1857.
"ELDER J. M. MATHES—*Dear Sir*: There is no doubt that the "word *baptizo*, as used by the best Grecian authors, from Plato down, means to IMMERSE I think there is no doubt as to the earliest practice of Christ and his apostles," etc.

Horace Mann was a splendid scholar, and one of the most popular and successful educators in this country. He stood, religiously, with the Unitarians of New England, I believe. His testimony is, therefore, valuable.

Dr. ANTHON. "The primary meaning of the word is to dip or immerse; and its secondary meanings, if it ever had any, all refer, in some way or other, to the same leading idea. Sprinkling, etc., are entirely out of the question."

II. My second argument is drawn from the testimony of distinguished Pedobaptist writers:

NEANDER. "In respect to the form of baptism, it was in *conformity with the original import of the symbol performed by immersion*" etc.—*Neander's Church History*, Vol. I, p. 310.

Prof. MOSES STEWART, D.D., of Andover (Presbyterian): "*Bapto* and *baptizo* mean to dip, plunge, or immerse into anything liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note *are agreed in this.*"—*Stewart on Baptism*, p. 51.

JOHN CALVIN. "The very word *baptize*, however, signifies to immerse; and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church."—*Calvin's Institutes*, Vol. III, chap. 15, p. 343.

Dr. MCKNIGHT says: "Buried together with him by baptism. Christ's baptism was not the baptism of repentance, for he never committed any sin; but, as was observed (Preliminary Essays I) at the beginning, 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."—*Note on Romans vi: 4*.

JOHN WESLEY. Mr. Wesley's note on the same text is in point. He says: "We are buried with him." Alluding to the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion.

Again: Mr. Wesley says, in his journal: "Saturday, 21.—Mary Welch, aged eleven days, was baptized according to the custom of the first church, and the rule of the Church of England, by immersion. The child was ill then, but recovered from that hour."—*Wesley's Journal*, Vol. I, p. 20.

Again: On page 24, he says: "Wednesday, May 5.—I was asked to baptize a child of Mr. Parker's, second bailiff of Savannah; but Mrs. Parker told me: 'Neither Mr. Parker nor I will consent to its being dipped.' I answered: 'If you certify that your child is weak, it will suffice (the Rubric says) to pour water upon it.' She replied: 'Nay, the child is not weak, but I am resolved it shall not be dipped.' This argument I could not confute.

So I went home, and the child was baptized by another person."

Dr. WALL. "This (immersion) is so plain and clear, by an infinite number of passages, that, as one can not but PITY the weak endeavors of such Paedobaptists as would maintain the negative of it, so we ought Jo disown and show a dislike of the *profane scoffs* which some people give to the English anti-Paedobaptists [Baptists], merely for the use of dipping; when it was, in all probability, the way by which our blessed Saviour, and, for certain, was the most, usual and ordinary way by which the ancient Christians did receive their baptism."

Dr. GROTEUS. "That baptism used to be performed by immersion, and not by pouring, appears both from the proper signification of the word and the places chosen for the administration of the rite (John iii: 23; Acts viii: 38); and, also, from the many allusions of the apostles which can not be referred to sprinkling. (Romans vi: 3, 4; Colossians ii: 12.)" Page 23.

Dr. WHITBY. "It being expressly declared here (Romans vi: 4, and Colossians ii: 12) that we are buried with Christ in baptism, by being buried under the water; and the argument to oblige us to a conformity to his death being taken hence, and this *immersion being religiously observed by all Christians for thirteen centuries*, and approved by our church; and the change of it into sprinkling, even without any allowance from the Author of this institution, or any license from any council of the church, being that which the Romanist still urges to justify his refusal of the cup to the laity—it were to be wished that this custom might be of general use, and aspersion only permitted, as of old, in cases of the clinici, or present danger of death."

The above, from Dr. Whitby, is very important. It not only sustains my proposition, that immersion is the Bible action of baptism, but it goes further, and asserts that

"immersion was religiously observed by *all* Christians for THIRTEEN CENTURIES." And the audience will bear in mind that Dr. Whitby was an Episcopalian. I quote none but Pedobaptist authority. And while these men, perhaps, all thought that sprinkling and pouring would do, yet they all agree with me, that "immersion is the Bible action of baptism."

We maintain that the word *baptizo* is a specific word, and does not mean either to sprinkle or to pour. To say that sprinkle or pour is in this word, is to *assert* that it means nothing definitely—it is to "darken counsel by words without knowledge." For thirteen hundred years, according to the great Dr. Whitby, the change of immersion to aspersion was only allowed where there was great danger of death, and even that, he admits was without any allowance from the Author of the institution. Has the Author of the institution given his consent, since the thirteenth century, to have immersion changed to aspersion? If not, and Mr. Brooks will not claim it, how dare any man sprinkle a person and call it baptism?—and even do that in the awful names of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It is monstrous!

But these sick-bed sprinklings were only considered valid if the person died. If he lived, his sprinkling was regarded as doubtful. All church history shows that such persons were not considered eligible to hold office in the church—as in the case of Novatian, who was aspersed on a sick-bed, and afterward aspired to be a bishop; but was rejected, because his sprinkling was not regarded as valid.

But Mr. Brooks says, if my proposition be admitted, it would unchurch the whole Pedobaptist world; and he thinks this would be very uncharitable. But this objection amounts to nothing. The Pharisees objected to the teaching of Christ and the apostles upon the same ground. "If this doctrine be true, then who can be saved?" But the

doctrine was true, notwithstanding. And when Paul preached at Ephesus the first time, the same objection was urged against the Gospel he preached, by Demetrius and the Silversmiths. "Asia and all the world worship the goddess Diana." But this man, "Paul, says there is another king, one Jesus;" and if he is right, then we are all wrong. His doctrine, therefore, can not be true! And so they attempted to put him down by mob violence. Still the Gospel was true. If men are wrong now in the matter of baptism, it is their own fault, and God's truth can not be made to sustain error, because a large number have embraced the error. "Let God be true, though every man be found a liar." If, therefore, the truth unchurches men, it is no fault of mine.

So far as the action of baptism is concerned, the Baptists hold the same doctrine. And my friend Mr. Brooks has *indorsed* the Baptist Church as orthodox on the subject of the *design* of baptism. I hold in my hand a volume entitled, "Manual of Baptism." It is a valuable work, published by the "American Baptist Publication Society," edited by "G. S. BAILEY." Its statements and quotations will be admitted as good authority in this discussion, as my friend says that the Baptists stand with him, and against me, in this debate. On the question, when was immersion changed to sprinkling by law, the Manual quotes from the *Edinburgh Review*, by EDWARD BREWSTER, which says:

" The first law for sprinkling was obtained in the following manner: Pope Stephen II, being driven from Home by Astolphus, king of Lombards, in 753, fled to Pepin, who a short time before had usurped the crown of France. While he remained there, the monks of Cressy, in Brittany, consulted him, whether, in case of necessity, baptism performed by pouring water on the head of the infant would be lawful. Stephen replied that it would. But though the truth of this fact should be allowed—which,

however, some Catholics deny—yet pouring or sprinkling was admitted only in cases of necessity. It was not until the year 1311 that the Legislature, in a council held at Ravenna, declared immersion or sprinkling to be indifferent. In this country (Scotland), however, sprinkling was never practiced in ordinary cases till after the Reformation; and in England, even in the reign of Edward VI, immersion was commonly observed. But during the persecution of Mary, many persons, most of whom were Scotchmen, fled from England to Geneva, and there greedily imbibed the opinions of that church.

In 1556 a book was published at that place, containing the form of prayers and ministrations of the sacraments, approved by the famous and godly-learned man, John Calvin, in which the administrator is enjoined to take water in his hand and lay it on the child's forehead. These Scottish exiles, who had renounced the authority of the Pope, implicitly acknowledged the authority of John Calvin; and returning to their own country, with John Knox at their head, in 1559, they established sprinkling in Scotland. From Scotland this practice made its way into England, in the reign of Elizabeth, but was not authorized by the established church." (Page 26.)

Professor Moses Stewart says, again: "The passages which refer to immersion are so numerous in the Fathers, that it would take a little volume merely to *recite* them." (Page 147.) "But enough. It is a thing made out—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." (*Stewart on Baptism*, p. 149.)—Professor Stewart was a Presbyterian Doctor of Divinity, as all know.

It is absurd to say, "I baptize by sprinkling;" that is,

I immerse by sprinkling a few drops of water on the head; or, as Calvin ordained, by laying the wet fingers of the priest "upon the forehead of the person."

III. My third argument is drawn from the language of the Holy Scriptures: "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." (Romans vi: 4.) This settles the question—baptism is a "*burial*;" it does not matter what the element was: the action was a *burial*. It could not have reference to the baptism of the Spirit, because they had been buried in the element, whatever it was, and had been raised up out of it, and were then living separated from it. If it were the Spirit, then they had been buried in the Spirit, and raised up out of the Spirit, and were separated from the Spirit. But it is a well-known fact that all the fathers, and all the great reformers, critics, and commentators of all denominations, stand with me upon this passage, and understand it of *water baptism*. Again: "Buried with him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." (Colossians ii: 12.) This passage is precisely parallel with the one just quoted from Romans vi: 4, and is so regarded by all commentators. The point is clearly made out, from these two Scriptures, that the "Bible action of baptism is immersion," or a burial with Christ.

The most learned and pious Paedobaptists who have ever lived and wrote, acknowledge that Christ was immersed in the Jordan by John, and that immersion was the practice of the apostles and first Christians, and that these passages sustain it, with many others that we shall quote before we are through.

IV. My fourth argument is drawn from the circumstances surrounding the baptisms recorded in the New Testa-

ment, such as the *places where* they baptized. John baptized in the river Jordan—"In the Enon near to Salem, because there was much water there." Lydia and her household were baptized in the river at Philippi, by the side of which they were converted. So the jailer and his family were evidently baptized in the same river the night of their conversion. In every instance where baptism was performed, the circumstances were all favorable to immersion; and, as immersion is the meaning of the word, the conclusion is inevitable that immersion was the practice of Christ and the apostles, and my proposition is true.

We want to satisfy all inquiring minds as to the "BIBLE action of baptism." All are interested in knowing that. We desire to get back to the "old paths." We want to stand on the Jerusalem platform, on which the model church was organized. When we stand upon that platform, then we know that we are right, and can not be wrong—we stand upon a rock. But Mr. Brooks may say that immersion is *inconvenient*. Well, suppose it is; that does not change the question: it is not a question of *convenience*, but of Scripture authority and apostolic practice.

God did not send his Son into the world to establish a religion suited to man's convenience! The religion of Jesus Christ has undergone no change since it was established on earth, but remains the same to-day that it was in the beginning. Men may change their own systems, they may improve upon their own inventions, but not upon the Christian religion. What Peter and the rest of the apostles, by the use of the "keys," bound on earth, was then "bound in heaven," and no man may set aside the divine order to set up their own inventions. It is rebellion against God and the authority of Jesus the Christ. [Time expired.]

Fifth Day.—Fifth Proposition.—February 1, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' FIRST REPLY—(45 MINUTES)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am glad to meet so fine an audience here this morning, and I am glad to find my friend Mr. Mathes in so pleasant a humor. But I must say that I am sorry that he referred to the other propositions. I think he feels that he has been defeated upon all the other propositions, or he would not have referred to them now. I believe I would be willing to leave it to a vote of the outsiders. I have no doubt they would decide in my favor, and against Mr. Mathes. But the work he has got on his hands to-day, is, to prove that "immersion is the Bible action or mode of baptism."

He seems to think that he is going to have a very easy time of it; but, mind you now, I am going to give him something to do. He and his church practice immersion *only*, and make war upon all the sprinklers. But I will show that he has no foundation; that he and his church are off the track, and that, unless they get on the track, they will be lost. And I now give Mr. Mathes and his party warning, that I expect to prove by Mr. Campbell that *mode* is not in the word at all! But I do not care whether it is action or mode—no action is in the word "*baptizo*" No one can tell, from the word "baptize," what the *action* or mode is. It is the *thing done*, and not the *mode* of doing it, that is commanded in baptism.

But Mr. Mathes has garbled Greenfield, in the definition of the word "*baptizo*." He did not read it all. Greenfield gives, as the Bible meaning of the word, "to wash, perform ablution, cleanse, to moisten;" and this may be done without immersion. But Mr. Mathes is at war with all the authorities. *Baptizo* is not a specific term, as he asserts, but it is a *generic* term. I hold in my hand a book

containing the definition of *baptize* by eighteen standard authors. Liddell and Scott, as well as Robinson, define it, "to immerse, to wash." Ainsworth, Scapula, and Groves, sustain me; and with the aid of these great lexicons I take the immersion fort! I have thrown a bomb-shell into Mr. Mathes' fort, which has blown it up!

I admit that it sometimes does mean to immerse; but I will show from the Bible use of the word—"to wash, to cleanse." Dr. Carson, one of the greatest men the Baptist Church has ever produced, defines "*baptizo*"—to dye, by sprinkling as well as by dipping. He says, "*Baptizo* always means to dip," but he admits the lexicons are all against him in this! Yes, he acknowledges that the learned world are all against him in his position! Now, you see, my friends, that Mr. Mathes has lost his cause. Dr. Carson, the learned advocate of the immersion theory, has killed it by admitting that all the lexicons are against him; and yet Mr. Mathes comes in here and quotes the lexicons to sustain him; but it is of no use. Dr. Carson says the lexicons are all against him!

But Mr. Mathes and his party have made a translation to suit themselves. They could not prove their dipping from the common Scriptures, and so they have gone to work to make a new translation to help them out. But I deny that the dippers are competent to make a translation of the Bible. They have too much prejudice to engage in such a work—the people have no confidence in their learning and ability for such an undertaking.

Mr. Mathes has garbled the testimony of the witnesses he has introduced and read. He must take all a witness says, if he takes a part. He quotes Wesley to prove immersion; but he knows that Wesley also believed that sprinkling was taught in the Bible. If he takes anything said by Wesley and Clark on the subject of baptism, he

is bound to take it all. He can not take a part, and reject the balance of their testimony.

I now affirm that the mode, or action, can not be determined by the Scriptures—in fact, no *mode* is taught in the New Testament. Dr. Clark, in his commentary on Matt. iii: 6, says: "In what form baptism was originally administered, has been deemed a subject worthy of serious dispute. Were the people dipped, or sprinkled? For it is certain *bapto* and *baptizo* mean both." Now, you see, Dr. Clark is with me, and against Mr. Mathes. *Bapto* and *baptizo* mean both to dip and sprinkle.

John Schmidt, in Holland, started the practice of immersion, and all immersionists are compelled to admit him as the founder of immersion! All admit that baptism is a *washing*. Noah Webster's Pictorial Dictionary is the best authority in the world, and he defines baptism thus: "The application of water to a person, as a sacrament or religious ceremony, by which he is initiated into the visible Church of Christ. This is usually performed by sprinkling or immersion." He takes the meaning from its Greek root. Now, mind you, Mr. Mathes is against Noah Webster; and Dr. Carson admits that all the lexicons are against him. So, you see, he is gone up! Now, don't you all see it?

But my friend Mr. Mathes knows more than Noah Webster and all the learned world! What cares he about lexicons and human authority? He and his brethren can set them all aside, without any trouble, to establish their favorite *plunging!* But he quotes Romans vi: 3-5. But this proves nothing for his proposition. Paul does not say "baptized into water," but "baptized into *death*." He does not say "planted in water," but "planted in the likeness of his death." Mr. Mathes takes the passage literally, as to the "burial." But if he makes one part literal, he must take it literally all through. But I say it is a

figurative baptism. It is wrong to bury live folks. A person must be dead first, and then buried afterward.

Mr. Mathes says that immersion was the practice of the apostles and Christian Church for THIRTEEN HUNDRED years, and has tried to prove it. But I say that no one ever discovered that immersion was Scriptural baptism, until the Reformers found it out! And the learned world is against them! My friend talks about the Greek and Latin churches. But I say there is no such distinction—the Greek and Latin churches are all one church. In reading from the lexicons, Mr. Mathes relies upon the *heathen classics*; but I have no use for "*heathen classics*." I introduce God Almighty's classics, and I can prove sprinkling and pouring by God Almighty's classics.

Benedict, in his History of the Baptists, says that the Greek Church did sometimes use sprinkling and pouring in cases of sickness and great danger of death. I have proved that immersion is not a *specific* term. God immersed the world by *pouring* and *sprinkling*. Immersion is a consequence of our action, but is not a specific term; it is sometimes used as a specific, and sometimes as a generic term; but in the Bible it is always used in a generic sense. I will now show the difference between a specific and a generic term.

If I say I *traveled* to New York, the word "*traveled*" is a *generic* term, and does not decide how I made the journey—whether I traveled on foot or horseback, by railroad or steamboat, or whether I made the trip in a balloon; but if I say I *walked* to New York, the word "*walked*" is a specific term—it shows exactly how the journey was made.

So *baptize* is a generic term, and determines nothing as to the action by which the thing is done. The command may be obeyed by sprinkling, pouring, or immersion. It is the *thing done*, and not the manner of doing it, that is contained in the word baptize.

So, you see now how my friend Mr. Mathes has failed to make out his case; and if he has so signally failed, no one else need try it. He is a strong and powerful man. He stands at the head of his church in Indiana, and can sustain his absurd dogmas if any man can do it. But he has failed. He commenced this morning as though he expected to have a very easy time of it. But I will give him plenty to do. Mr. Mathes' brethren have boasted that he would use me up on this dipping proposition; but I will show them where they stand. The proposition can not be proved. The word "immersion" does not occur in the Bible. How, then, can he prove it? I am surprised at a man of his talents and ability to undertake it. [Time expired.]

Fifth Day.—Fifth Proposition.—February 1, 1868.

MR. MATHES' SECOND SPEECH—(30 MINUTES)

MR. PRESIDENT: My friend Mr. Brooks has now given us the very best and strongest arguments he and his church have to offer against immersion. He has gone over the whole field, bringing in a little here and a little there, and repeating some of it several times. And about all that we shall hear from him hereafter, on this proposition, will be a repetition of what he has now said.

He complains because I had quoted Romans vi: 4, on a former proposition. I quoted it on the *design* of immersion before; and I now quote it to prove that immersion is the Bible *action* of the ordinance. He again charges me with lampooning the sects for their sprinkling and pouring. Now, this is a great mistake, and only proves that he is not acquainted with my style of preaching. I lampoon no one, but reason with them out of the Scriptures, as an honest and earnest man, to show them their errors.

He charges me with garbling Greenfield's Lexicon, because I did not read all that he said. I did quote his definition of the word, but omitted some of his remarks and examples, as they did not affect the meaning. But Mr. Brooks declares that Greenfield's first definition, "to dip, to immerse," etc, is "Pagan Greek;" and that the meaning of the word *baptizo*, according to "God Almighty's Greek," is, "to cleanse, to wash, to purify." But who made him a judge of Pagan Greek, and God Almighty's Greek? It is a monstrous assumption!

But he says that "buried *by* baptism," does not mean "in water;" that it shows instrumentality, and baptism is the agent, or instrumentality, by which we come into the death of Christ. Now, I will destroy this little criticism by saying that the Greek preposition in this text is *dia*, which means *through*, and not *by*, as we have it in the common version. Then the passage would read, "Buried with him *through* immersion into death." But let him tell us how a man can be *buried by sprinkling into death*, and then I will attend to him. I am not sure that I understand his interpretation of the text. It certainly was in very bad taste for Mr. Brooks to make such a flourish over his imaginary victory upon this proposition. I think every sensible lady and gentleman in the audience will take his boasting as proof-positive that he is defeated, and that he deeply feels it. We do not find fault with Mr. Brooks, or any one else, because he or they differ with us; and, therefore, we lampoon no one on account of his errors, but try to reform him.

But Mr. Brooks says that the meaning of *baptizo*, according to God Almighty's Greek, is, "to wash, to cleanse, to purify;" and that this implies no particular *action*, but is the *result* of an action. Now let me reduce this to an absurdity at once. It is universally admitted that the meaning of a word, substituted for the word itself, will make good

sense, and convey the same idea as the word itself. We "will, therefore, try his definition of *baptizo* by this rule, and see how it will read.

"Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be PURIFIED of him." "And Jesus, when he was PURIFIED, went up straightway out of the water." (Matthew iii: 13, 16.) How do you like this, my friends? The Son of God *purified* or *cleansed*, in the Jordan, by John! The moral sense of every one recoils at the very thought of it. It is monstrous! Yet such are the terrible straits into which men are driven when they attempt to evade the plain truth.

Again, he gives "*moisten*" as the meaning of "baptism." Let us try this by the same rule. "And John was *moistening* in Enon, near Salem, because there was much water there." "I indeed *moisten* you with water, but he shall *moisten* you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." What think you, my friends, of a man being "*moistened* with the Holy Ghost and with fire." Perhaps Mr. Brooks can explain. But he says, syllogistically, baptism is a washing. Sprinkling, pouring and moistening, are a washing; therefore, sprinkling, pouring and moistening, are baptism.

The following is just as good logic, and proves just as much: A man is an animal; a rabbit is an animal;—therefore, a rabbit is a man, or a man is a rabbit.

But Mr. Brooks tells us that "Webster's Pictorial Dictionary" is the very best authority in the world. He failed to tell us whether it is the *pictures* he relies upon, or the *definitions*. Now, the truth is, that Mr. Webster is not giving us the Bible use and meaning of language, but only the *usus loquendi*—that is, the meaning of the words as commonly used and understood among the people who speak the English language. In doing this, his definition of baptism is correct. The current use of the word, both in Europe and America, by Paedobaptists, is, to immerse, sprinkle, pour, or moisten; to christen. But Webster does

not claim this to be a definition of the original word "*baptizo*" as used by Christ and the apostles; and, therefore, it proves nothing. We might just as well receive the testimony of any Pedobaptist preacher in the land. Mr. Webster was an Episcopalian.

But he quotes Dr.- Carson as agreeing with him. Will he take all the witness says on the point for which he quotes him? He says, time and again, that I must do this. His witness proves too much for him; for he affirms that the word *baptizo* means to immerse, and nothing else. But we shall refer to Dr. Carson again.

It was amusing to hear Mr. Brooks quoting Dr. Adam Clark against me. Now, it is well known that Dr. Clark was one of the fathers of the Methodist Church—yes, a Methodist preacher—yet he is so hard pressed for argument, that he actually quotes him to prove his sprinkling. What would this intelligent audience think of me if I were to quote from the writings of Alexander Campbell, Walter Scott, or any other of my brethren, to prove immersion to be the Bible action of baptism? Why, you would say these are not competent witnesses, because they are too much interested. And you would justly conclude that I was crowded to the wall. But even Dr. Clark proves too much for Mr. Brooks, as he says that it means to immerse, as well as to sprinkle, and Mr. Brooks denies it.

But my friend Mr. Brooks is a great man. He says that "he can whip a cornfield-full of such men as Dr. Philip Doddridge." I have no comment for such language. Of course, he could whip Dr. Doddridge, just as he is whipping me—by frothy declamation and unsupported assertions of what he has done and what he is going to do. He could whip the apostle Paul in the same way.

We will now read, in testimony, a passage from the great Reformer, Martin Luther: "The term baptism is a Greek word; it may be rendered into Latin by *mersio*—when we

immerse a thing 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 immediately to be drawn out again; for the etymology of the word seems to require it."—*Luther's Works*, Vol. I, p. 72.

BISHOP BURNETT says: "They (the primitive ministers of the Gospel) let them into the water, and, with no other garments but what might cover nature, they first *laid them down in the water*, as a man is buried in a grave, and then they said the words, '*baptize thee in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.*' Then they raised them up again, and clean garments were put on them; from whence came the phrases of being baptized into Christ's death, of being *buried with him by baptism into death; of being risen with Christ, and of our putting on Christ; putting off the old man, and putting on the new man.*"—*Burnett on Thirty-nine Articles*.

Now, nothing could be more definite than this in support of my proposition. And, remember, this man was a bishop of the Episcopal Church. The truth is, Mr. Brooks, in opposing me on this proposition, is against the learned world and the common sense of mankind. But he cares not for learned men. He "can whip a cornfield-full of them."

Tertullian is the first of the fathers who mentions infant baptism; and he lived and wrote about the close of the second century. Of the manner of baptizing in his day, he says: "The person, in great simplicity, is let down into the water, and, with a few words said, is dipped."—*Manual*, p. 107.

John Wesley, in his notes on Colossians ii: 12, says: "Which he wrought in you when ye were as it were *buried with him in baptism*—the ancient manner of baptizing by immersion, is as manifestly alluded to here as the other manner of baptizing by sprinkling or pouring of water is."

(Hebrews x: 22.) Here are two ways of baptizing stated by Mr. Wesley. Immersion he calls the ancient manner; and he calls sprinkling or pouring "the *other* manner." Well, the ancient manner is the Bible manner, and that is what we want, and that is immersion, according to Mr. Wesley, the father and founder of the Methodist Church.

Another unanswerable argument in favor of the apostolic practice of immersion is, that John and the apostles selected places to baptize which were always favorable to immersion.

Calvin says: "The word baptize, means to immerse; and it is certain that immersion was the practice of the ancient church." Calvin, Wesley, Luther, Clark, and the early reformers and the learned world are with me on this proposition, and against Mr. Brooks and his church, without a single exception.

The places selected by John to baptize the people were the "river Jordan" and "Enon, near Salem, because there was much water there." No need of selecting such places if his practice had been *sprinkling*. I once debated with a Methodist preacher who actually took the position that Enon was simply a big spring, and that John held a sort of camp-meeting there that he might have the use of its pure water for drinking and cooking purposes, and for their animals! But this is all *assumption*. Matthew says: "He was *baptizing* in Enon, *because* there was much water there."

Lydia, and the women of her household, were baptized in the river, on the bank of which they were converted to Christianity. The jailer and his household were baptized, doubtless in the same river, as they went out to baptize, and then returned to the jailer's house. Damascus was situated on the waters of the Abana and Pharpar; and Saul "rose forthwith," at the command of Ananias, and was baptized in one or the other of these rivers.

But Mr. Brooks says that dip is a specific term, but immersion is not. This is a grand discovery, worthy the

genius and talents of my friend Mr. Brooks. Now, we have always regarded "to dip" and "to immerse," as synonymous terms, which might be used as convertible terms; both are specific. A command to *dip*, can not be obeyed by sprinkling. Nor can the command to *immerse* be obeyed by *sprinkling*. They each imply and require a specific action.

Indeed, the Greeks had three distinct words, all specific words, to denote the specific actions of immersion, sprinkling and pouring; and these words were never confounded. *Baptizo* was the specific word for *dip* or *immersion*; *ran-tizo* was the specific word for *sprinkle*, and never meant anything else; and *cheo* was always the word used when the simple command was given to pour; it was specific, because it required a specific action.

He says the word "*travel*" is analogous to *baptizo*, and is *generic*. But we fail to see any analogy between the two words. Ride and walk are specific terms, and imply specific actions. A command to *walk* could not be obeyed by *riding* or *flying*. Nor could a command to *ride* be obeyed by *walking*. Just so, a command to immerse can never be obeyed by either *sprinkling* or *pouring*.

But Mr. Brooks refers to the baptism of the Holy Spirit on Pentecost, and says that God's mode of baptizing is *pouring*. Why, then, does he contend for sprinkling? He surely ought to be satisfied with God's mode, and he says that "God's mode is *pouring*." According to his own argument, then, he is wrong in his sprinkling.

But I deny that the baptism of the Spirit consisted in the *pouring*. The pouring was only a circumstance necessary to the baptism. God poured out his Spirit on them, as they were all in one house, and he continued to pour "till it filled all the house where they were assembled." Then, and not till then, was their baptism complete. They were then wholly overwhelmed, or *immersed*, in the Holy

Spirit. If Mr. Brooks will go and do likewise—that is, continue to pour the water till the person is completely overwhelmed, or immersed—I will have no further debate with him on the subject.

But it is recorded in Acts x: 44, "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost *fell* on all them which heard the word." Why does not my friend Mr. Brooks say that God's mode of baptizing is "*falling!*" In one case the Holy Spirit was *poured* out upon them (Acts ii), and in the other case *it fell* on them. If the *pouring* was a "mode of baptism" at Pentecost, *the falling* was another "mode of baptism" at the house of Cornelius. Let Mr. Brooks try his hand again. Perhaps he may change his mind, and take the *falling mode*.

But one of the most remarkable statements I ever heard was made by Mr. Brooks, when he declared that "no man could possibly know certainly how baptism was performed by reading the Scriptures; that Jesus, in giving the command to baptize, used an ambiguous word that was not, and could not be, understood by the apostles who were sent out to do the work." One who can deliberately make such a statement must have a very low conception of the wisdom and love of Jesus, to charge him with giving a command that could not be understood by those to whom it was given, and who were to execute it; and that no man now can know definitely what *action* the command of Jesus required to be done, and, consequently, that Mr. Brooks does not know. How, then, dare he oppose me? How does he know that immersion was not the action commanded, and sprinkling and pouring, human inventions? And this, I am sure, is the state of the case. But Mr. Brooks acknowledges that neither he or anybody else knows. He is only guessing at it! And the audience will remember this statement, and measure all he may say hereafter by it. [Time expired.]

Fifth Day.—Fifth Proposition.—February 1, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' SECOND REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: I have got my way of boasting, and Mr. Mathes has his way. But he thinks there is no use of boasting, and complains that I boast too much. I charge Mr. Mathes with garbling the testimony of witnesses. Did he not garble the dictionaries? Noah Webster is not a mere English lexicographer, as Mr. Mathes asserts; he goes back to the original root of the language. And Noah Webster says baptism means "an application of water to introduce one into the visible Church of Christ." So you see, now, the water is applied to the subject, and not, as Mr. Mathes has it, the subject applied to the water, by plunging him into it.

But Mr. Mathes says that, in my position on the subject of baptism, I stand opposed to all the standard lexicons and the common sense of mankind. But I say that it is him that is against the lexicons and the common sense of mankind. I am in harmony with Noah Webster's Pictorial Dictionary, and all the dictionaries. If I was to take all Dr. Carson says upon this subject, he must take all Mr. Wesley says. Now, you see where he stands. Dr. Carson says: "I am aware that all the lexicons are against me when I affirm that *baptizo* means to immerse." So, you see, all the lexicons are against Mr. Mathes; but they are all with me.

NOW, mind you, I have quoted eighteen lexicons to prove my position; so you see I am in harmony with the learning of the world. I can whip a cornfield-full of such men as Dr. P. Doddridge, McKnight, George Campbell, and others, when they are wrong and I have the truth on my side. This is what I meant by saying that "I could whip a cornfield-full of such men." But Mr. Mathes has attempted to make my position look ridiculous by substi-

tuting the meaning of the word, as I have given it, for the word itself, in sundry passages. Well, I will now try his definitions by the same rule.

Mr. Mathes says baptize means "to immerse, to dip." Then, substituting his meaning for the word itself, we would have the following: "In those days came John the Immer-ser," "John the dipper." Now, don't that sound ridiculous! Yet such is Mr. Mathes' logic. How much more consistent it sounds to read, "John the purifier," "John the sprinkler," or "John the pourer," "John the moist-ener." Or, to take another example, "One Lord, one faith, one *sprinkling*? not "one *immersion*."

But I take the position that *baptizo* does not mean *action* at all. It does not, therefore, mean either to plunge, pour, or sprinkle. It means *the thing done*. This relieves the subject of all difficulty. Baptism is not an action, but the result of an action. The *thing done* is baptism, and may be accomplished by the application of water in any way to a proper subject, either by sprinkling, pouring, or dipping, though neither are commanded.

The word "travel," as I said before, is a *generic* term, and embraces all the modes of traveling. I am commanded to *travel*. This leaves me free to choose the *mode*. I may ride, walk, go by steam, or in a balloon; no matter *how*—I obey the command provided I *travel*, and the manner of doing it is wholly indifferent. So, baptize fixes no particular action; it is also generic, and the manner of doing it is indifferent. To pour or sprinkle, are specific terms. These two terms represent the same mode, only one is more copious than the other. We say the rain *pours*, while it is really sprinkling.

But Mr. Mathes relies on the Bible, he says, to prove his proposition. Well, what does this word *baptizo* mean in the New Testament? Why, Mr. Mathes and his dipping friends have gone to work and made a new translation of

the word of God, to suit themselves. What meaning have they given to this word in their immersion Bible? Why, they have translated the word "*to endure*," "*to undergo*" I hold in my hand the Bible Union Testament, in which the words "*endure*" and "*undergo*" are given as the meaning of *baptizo*. Now, let us apply Mr. Mathes' rule of substitution, and see what perfect nonsense it will make: "John the undergoer," "John the endurer." The "people were *undergoed* of John in Jordan." "And when he saw many of the Pharisees coming to his *undergoing*" So, you see how his own translation of the New Testament destroys his proposition, and proves it to be false.

But Mr. Mathes quotes Romans vi: 4, and Colossians ii: 12, again, and seems to regard these as in some sense sustaining immersion. Whether Paul means a literal or figurative death, in these celebrated passages, I will not now say. I want him to say, and then I will attend to him. I will now quote Ezekiel xxxvi: 25: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." No guessing here, brother Mathes. He *guesses* that all those baptized by the apostles were immersed in the rivers and pools of the country. But it is all guess-work. He knows nothing about it. But here we have a clear prophecy upon the subject. The Lord, by the prophet, decides the question as to the *mode* of baptism under the Gospel. He says: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you," etc. What is the use, then, of being put under the water, when God says the mode of application is sprinkling; and that in this sprinkling they will be made ceremonially clean, and have their sins washed away. Now, mind you, I do not admit that sins are washed away in sprinkling; but it is the outward sign of the inward grace—the baptism of the Spirit in the heart.

But Mr. Mathes argues that sprinkling is not a washing of the whole body. But I will prove that it is. On a

certain occasion a woman came to Jesus and poured a box of precious ointment upon his feet. (John xii: 1-7.) Now, this was acknowledged by the Saviour as the anointing of the whole body for burial, though it was only poured on his feet.

I will now give you another unequivocal text from the prophet Isaiah (chap. lii: 15): "So shall he sprinkle many nations."

Now, this is a prophecy concerning Christ and the Gospel dispensation, and shows that God's manner of baptizing, under the reign of Christ, would be *sprinkling*. No guess-work here. "He shall sprinkle many nations." So, when all nations were called in to share in the Gospel, the initiatory rite was sprinkling, and the prophecy was fulfilled. What then is the proper mode of baptism under the Gospel? God the Father being judge, it is SPRINKLING. And you remember that I proved that sprinkling and pouring were the same modes, only one is more copious than the other.

God poured out his Spirit on them on the day of Pentecost. He did not *plunge* them in the Spirit. When John said, "I indeed baptize you with water," he did not mean "I *plunge* you in water." The action was one thing, and effect or result was the baptism, and a very different thing.

I will now examine what brother Mathes says about John baptizing in Enon. Brother Mathes, you know, is a great man to answer questions in his Christian Record. His brethren send up their questions to him when they want more light, and he gives them the desired information. In fact, he is the oracle of his church, of whom all his people inquire. Some one sent to Mr. Mathes a question in reference to this famous Enon, and the "much water there," and he answered at some length in his Record. I will read his answer. [Reads it in full.] Now, this is a very good answer, and I do not particularly object to it

The much water there, he considers copious fountains, where all the facilities for immersing a great multitude were present. I think this was another *guess*. Still there might have been an abundance of water there for the purposes of immersion, and still no immersion performed. But Mr. Mathes ridicules the idea of John holding a camp-meeting at Enon, and using the water of these springs for cooking and drinking purposes. But this was most likely the case. A great multitude assembled there, and they remained together for days, or perhaps weeks, waiting upon John's ministry. Such a multitude must, necessarily, eat and drink; and their beasts, too, would need water; and these fountains of Enon were exactly suited to such an emergency.

But we read that "These things were done in Bethabara, beyond Jordan, where John was baptizing." (John i: 28.) Now, Bethabara was a town, and John was baptizing in the *town*, and not in the Jordan at all. This is, I presume, the place where John first baptized, and John says that Jesus went "into the place where John at first baptized; and there he abode." (John x: 40.) Now, if John immersed in the river of Jordan, then Jesus went into the river and abode there. That would have been impossible; therefore, John baptized in the town, and not in the river. [Time expired.]

Fifth Day.—Fifth Proposition.—February 1, 1868.

MR. MATHES' THIRD SPEECH—(30 MINUTES)

MR. PRESIDENT: It is said "the last shall be first, and the first last." I will, therefore, notice the last of my friend's reply first. He admits that the long extract which he read from the Christian Record is all right, and a good answer to the question as to Enon and "the much water there."

But he has discovered a serious difficulty in what is said of John baptizing at Bethabara, beyond the Jordan. He *guesses* that John *first* baptized at Bethabara, which, he *guesses*, was a considerable distance from Jordan, or any other stream of water. He says, if John was immersing in Jordan, or any other stream, then, when "Jesus went into the place where John at first baptized," he went into the river, or other stream or fountain, "and abode there;" that is, "lived under the water!"

Now, let me remove my friend's difficulty at once. According to the best authority, Bethabara was a small village, in the times of our Saviour, situated on the bank of the river Jordan, at the celebrated ford mentioned in Judges vii: 24; where, in the times of Gideon, the two princes of Midian were taken and slain by the Ephraimites. John took his position at this celebrated ford, as it was easy of access from all parts of the country, by reason of the roads leading to the ford. And the little village on the bank of the river gave name to the place. Nothing was more natural than that John should do his preaching in the village, and do the immersing in the Jordan. And when Jesus is said to come to the place where John at first baptized, and abode there, nothing more is meant than that Jesus came to this little village on the bank of the Jordan, where he doubtless had some personal friends, and where, in all probability, he was himself immersed by John, and there he abode for a time, in a sort of seclusion from the furious mob who sought to lay hands upon him.

If Bedford was situated on the bank of White river, and we were to preach in the meeting-house and immerse in the river, it would be proper to say that I preached and baptized in Bedford. Every one would understand that we immersed in the river.

I will now notice what Mr. Brooks says about Dr. Carson. Mr. Brooks has several times accused me of garbling

the testimony of witnesses; but I affirm that he has garbled the testimony of Dr. Carson in the most shameful manner. With Dr. Carson's book in his hand, he garbled his testimony so as to make the impression that Dr. Carson admitted that all the lexicons were against him in giving immersion as the meaning of *baptism*! Now, you will be surprised when I say that Dr. Carson makes no such admission, nor anything like it. [Reads at length from Dr. Carson.]

Dr. Carson takes the position that *baptizo* means to IMMERSE, and means nothing else; that it has no secondary meaning. In this he says: "I am aware that all the lexicons are against me." In what are they against him? Not in giving "to immerse" as its first meaning, for they all do that as well; but in this, simply: all the lexicons give secondary meanings, and figurative meanings, to the word; and Dr. Carson denies that it has any secondary meaning, but always means to immerse.

Now, what confidence can any man have in a man who will thus willfully garble and pervert the testimony of an important witness?—and that, too, with the book in his hand from which he pretends to quote! I think you would not be willing to trust him in any statement he might make, with an example such as this before you. It is most astonishing impudence!

But Mr. Brooks says, God's mode of baptism is *pouring*. Yes, when God baptized the world, in the days of Noah, he poured out the water, which resulted in a flood, and the world was immersed. The pouring was not the flood—baptism—but a circumstance necessary to it. So God *poured* out his Spirit when he would baptize the disciples at Pentecost; but he continued to pour until it filled the house where they were assembled, and was truly an immersion in the Holy Spirit. The pouring was not the baptism; nor was it a mode or action of it. It was an

immersion. They were entirely overwhelmed in the divine element.

But Mr. Brooks has brought forward two passages from the prophets to prove his sprinkling. I will now examine them, and show that neither of them have any application to the subject of Christian baptism. The first is Ezekiel xxxvi: 25: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean," etc. Now, whatever this *sprinkling* may refer to, it has no reference to Christian baptism. The prophet has been describing the wickedness of the Jewish people, the loss of their land and city at the fall of Jerusalem, forty years after the death of Christ and the establishment of his reign at Pentecost. And, after the long, dark night of their dispersion among the heathen, the prophet says: "For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," etc. When is this sprinkling to be done? Why, when the Jews are gathered out of all countries where they have been scattered. And that time has not yet come; the *sprinkling* is yet future. I pause not now to inquire what it *does* mean; but I have proved that it *does not* mean Christian baptism, as it has not yet been instituted, and will not be until the Jews return to their own land from their long dispersion of eighteen centuries.

The other passage is Isaiah lii: 15: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." Mr. Brooks seems to think he has found in this passage proof-positive that sprinkling is the divine mode or action of baptism. But, unfortunately for him and his argument, Dr. Adam Clark, a leading Methodist divine and commentator, has ruined the whole thing by a criticism upon this text. Has Mr. Brooks ever read Clark's Commentary? Or does he think that he could whip a cornfield-full of such men as Br. Clark? But let us hear what the Doctor has to say about this sprinkling.

Dr. Adam Clark says that the original word, from which our translators have given us "sprinkle," in the common version, means TO ASTONISH!—and that the passage ought to read: "So shall he ASTONISH many nations." That is, the stupendous miracles of the Saviour were to astonish the nations; and he immediately adds: "The kings shall shut their mouths at him: for that which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider."

There is, therefore, no allusion in either of these passages that has any reference to baptism. And as Mr. Brooks has brought forward no other Scriptures to disprove my position, I have a right to claim that he has made a complete failure.

But Mr. Brooks denies that the Greek Church understand and speak the Greek language; and, therefore, he thinks that their practice of immersion proves nothing. While it is, perhaps, true that all who are embraced in the Greek Church do not speak or even understand the Greek language; yet, as Greece proper is embraced in it, and the creeds and canons are all printed in that language, it is fair to presume that they generally understand it—not the ancient Greek in which the New Testament was written, which has ever since been considered a dead language; but modern Greek, which bears a very striking analogy to the ancient. And as immersion was the practice of the whole church, both Eastern and Western, up to the time of the final separation between the Greeks and Latins, Rome and Constantinople, and as the Greek division have ever since continued to practice immersion, as their Greek ancestors did before them, it is at least good circumstantial evidence in my favor, and that is all I introduce it for.

But Mr. Brooks reiterates the startling declaration, that we can not understand from the language of the great

commission what action is to be performed in obeying the command of the Saviour! In fact, he says that Jesus did not intend to be understood as teaching any action! If that be so, then I suppose a man might obey the command to be baptized, without performing *any action at all*. Will Mr. Brooks tell us how that could be done? If no action is contained in the command, there is no disobedience if we perform none. And, again, if no action is commanded, how does Mr. Brooks, or any other man, know that he has been Scripturally baptized? And yet he talks about going to the Bible to prove the *mode*! How can he prove anything by the use of a word which he acknowledges he can not understand? I am astonished that any man should charge the Saviour with giving a command that could not be understood, and yet requiring men to obey it.

But, one thing has always struck me as very strange and inconsistent in the teaching and practice of Mr. Brooks and his church. They deny that immersion is Bible baptism, and teach that Jesus never commanded it. And yet they are frequently seen at rivers and streams of water—the Jordans and Enons of the country—immersing their members! And what is most remarkable—with uplifted hand they will say, "I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," and then immerse the candidate. Now, if immersion is not the thing which Jesus commanded to be done when he said, "Go teach the nations, baptizing them," how dare they immerse any one and call it baptism? Again, how dare they do it in THE NAME of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, if it is not commanded? Is it not using the name of the Lord in vain? Nay, more: is it not sinful, being done without faith? Is it not *forgery*?—as it is attaching the name of the Lord to an institution which they say he has not authorized! I call Mr. Brooks' special attention to this matter. We want no dodging.

But my friend Mr. Brooks charges that, in the Bible Union version of the New Testament, *undergo* and *endure* are given as the meaning of *baptizo*. Now, this I deny, and ask him to produce the proof.

He says that live people should not be buried. Certainly not. A man must die to sin before he is a proper subject of immersion.

I will now introduce the case of the eunuch. Philip took a seat with him in the chariot, and preached unto him Jesus. "And they came unto a certain water, and the eunuch said to Philip, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" Philip answered and said, "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest." And the eunuch said, "I believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." The confession was satisfactory; the chariot was stopped, "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," etc. (Acts viii: 36-39.)

Now, this is a clear case of immersion. "They both went down into the water, both Philip and the eunuch." That was not necessary if he was only to be sprinkled. And they came up out of the water after Philip had baptized him. And I am here reminded of a picture that I have of the baptism of the eunuch. I hold in my hand a book on baptism, by Professor Wood. Here is a picture of the baptism of the eunuch by Philip [exhibiting it to the audience.] You see the eunuch is on his knees in the road, and Philip standing over him pouring water on his head out of a horn, or something of the kind. Now, this picture, and some others like it in this book, are better proof of sprinkling than anything Mr. Brooks has been able to find yet.

But I call upon Mr. Brooks to bring forward one plain case of baptism by sprinkling, or a plain precept for the

practice. I know he can not do it, because it is not in the Bible. But I hope he will try it.

I affirm that *immersion* is the meaning of the word *baptizo*, and with me agrees the learned world. Then, when Jesus commanded baptism, he commanded *immersion*; and, of course, nothing is baptism within the meaning of the command of Christ, if the *act* of immersion is wanting.

But Mr. Brooks thinks that Saul was baptized on his feet, in the house of Judas, in the city of Damascus. Let us see. Saul had been three days without sight, and fasting. Ananias came in to him and restored him to sight, and said: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. And he arose forthwith, and was baptized." There was every facility for immersion in Damascus; and as the command to be baptized was equivalent to "be immersed," there is no reason to suppose he was not immersed.

If Ananias sprinkled him, there was no need of his rising up from where he was sitting; and, therefore, the very fact that he had to rise up, is evidence that something more had to be done—that he had to go to some suitable place of water to be immersed. [Time expired.]

Fifth Day.—Fifth Proposition.—February 1, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' THIRD REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Mathes contends that water baptism represents the burial and resurrection of Christ; and, therefore, must of necessity be an immersion of the whole body in water. This he tries to prove by Romans vi: 4, and Colossians ii: 12: "Buried with him in baptism." He says that baptism is a *monumental* institution. I read from the Christian Record his answer to a question pro-

pounded to him by one Elijah White, a little preacher with whom I am well acquainted. Brother White asked what was the difference between the baptism of John and that commanded by Christ in the great commission? After describing John's baptism as an *immersion*, and the baptism of Jesus by John, Mr. Mathes says:

"John also baptized the people with the 'baptism of repentance for the remission of sins.' But he immersed by the authority of his commission from God, but not in the name of the Lord Jesus.

"But after Jesus rose from the dead, he commanded the apostles to preach the Gospel to every creature, and to immerse all who believed; and all was to be done in his NAME, because 'all authority in heaven and in earth was now given to him; therefore, the disciples immersed the believers *in the name of the Lord Jesus, into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.*'

"The action was the same in both, to-wit: IMMERSION; and both were for the remission of sins; but they differed in the NAME in which they were administered. John's immersion looked forward to the immersion of Christ; but the immersion commanded by Christ looks back to his burial and resurrection from the dead, and is a monumental institution, commemorating these wonderful events, as the Lord's Supper is a monumental institution commemorating the death of Christ for our sins."—*Christian Record* for 1867, p. 180.

Now, I deny that baptism is *monumental*, or that it represents the burial and resurrection of Christ. I deny that immersion is the meaning of baptism. I admit that *baptizo*, *does not mean* to sprinkle or to pour, nor does it mean to immerse. It simply means *the thing done*, and has no reference to the manner of doing it. This I illustrated by the word "travel."

But Mr. Mathes comes in with a very grave charge

against me. He says that I was guilty of shamefully garbling the testimony of Dr. Carson, one of my Baptist witnesses. I did not introduce Carson as a witness on the mode, as I know he is against me on the mode of baptism. But I read Carson only for the sake of his admission "that all the lexicons were against him in his position." I take all that the witness says upon the point for which I introduced him.

I admit that in Pagan Greek the word *baptizo* means to *immerse*, and the lexicons so render it; but in God Almighty's Greek it does not mean to sprinkle, pour or immerse, but *the thing done*; while the manner of *doing* it is a matter of perfect indifference. But if baptism is immersion, why is it called a "*washing*?" Mr. Mathes introduced John Wesley, Martin Luther, John Calvin, and a host of others, to prove his dogma of immersion, because they all say that *baptizo* means to immerse. But, at the same time, they all thought that sprinkling and pouring were valid forms of baptism also. Will Mr. Mathes take all his witnesses say upon the whole subject? Of course, he will not. Then, why does he complain of my manner of quoting from Dr. Carson?

But there is another little matter that I wish now to attend to. [Taking the Bible Union Testament in his hand.] I stated, in my last reply, that Mr. Mathes and his party had made a new translation of the New Testament to suit themselves, and that, in doing so, they had given "*undergo* and *endure*" as the meaning of baptism. This statement, you all remember, Mr. Mathes denied, and called on me for the proof. So I will now furnish it. I read from the Bible Union version (Luke xii: 49): "I am come to send fire on the earth; and what will I if it be already kindled? But I have an immersion to undergo; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." I will also read Mark x: 38, in the same version: "And Jesus said to

them: Ye shall indeed drink the cup that I drink, and endure the immersion which I endure," etc.

Now, you see what a fix my friend Mathes has got himself into. He denied the correctness of my statement, and I have now fully proved it. In the common version it reads: "I have a baptism to be baptized with," and in the Bible Union translation: "I have an immersion to *undergo*." In the common version, Mark x: 49, reads: "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." They have given *undergo*, in Luke, as the meaning of baptism; and *endure* in the quotation from Mark. I really do feel awful at this perversion of the word of God! I would rather LIE than do such a thing! Indeed I would!

I will now examine what Mr. Mathes has said about "Bethabara beyond Jordan," and John baptizing there. Mr. Mathes is probably right in saying that Bethabara was a village at the ford of Jordan, on the river bank, but he has entirely failed to prove that the baptizing was done in the river. I deny it, and call for the proof. But Mr. Mathes objects to my interpretation of Isaiah, chap, lii: "So shall he sprinkle many nations." And he quotes Dr. Adam Clark against me, who says that the translation is bad—that the original word, in the text translated *sprinkle*, means to "*astonish*" and not to *sprinkle* at all! And, therefore, that the passage should read: "So shall he ASTONISH many nations." I expected him to quote some Scriptures to disprove my position; but I suppose he has none to quote, and so falls back on Dr. Clark.

Now, I don't care a cent what Dr. Clark or any other man says. I take the text as it stands in our good old Bible—King James' version. That is good enough for me. But I am really surprised that Mr. Mathes should speak of Dr. Adam Clark as a Methodist commentator! Meth-

odist, indeed! Why, Mr. Mathes certainly does know what every intelligent man in the country knows: that Dr. Adam Clark, John Wesley, Charles Wesley, and Benson, the commentator, were none of them Methodists. Not one of these men ever belonged to the Methodist Episcopal Church. What they say is, therefore, no authority with us. We care nothing about them.

But Mr. Mathes has tried to make out that the passage I quoted from Ezekiel, chap, xxxvi: "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," refers to the final gathering of the Jews to the land of Palestine, which is an event yet future, and, therefore, does not mean Christian baptism. But I deny it. It was fulfilled at Pentecost, when the three thousand Jews came into the church and were baptized. Their baptism was the "sprinkling of clean water upon them." But if the Jews are to have "clean water sprinkled on them" when they return in the last time to their own land, why have Jews or Gentiles to be immersed now? Sprinkling is certainly the proper mode.

But he says that Jesus was immersed in the river Jordan, and *came up out of the water*; and has quoted Dr. McKnight and others to prove it. But I deny that he was baptized in the river. It was *near by* or *at*. But he says that Philip and the eunuch "both went down into the water, and that Philip then immersed the eunuch, and they both came up out of the water." Now, this is all guess-work. Suppose they did both go down into the water and both come up out of the water again; that don't prove that the eunuch was immersed. Philip might have sprinkled or poured a little water on his head. But how far did they go into the water? Brother Mathes don't know; they might have stopped at the margin. He guesses that Philip immersed him, but he can't prove it! Now, the strong probability is, that the eunuch was sprinkled by Philip.

But I have another clear case of sprinkling to which I will now refer. It is Hebrews x: 22: "Let us draw near, with true hearts, in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from our evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." Thus you see that *sprinkling* is God's *mode* of baptism; and my friend Mr. Mathes can't dodge it.

But Mr. Mathes says that the baptism of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost was a complete immersion, as it filled the house where they were sitting. But Joel says of this baptism: "And I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh." Here we have God's mode of baptism again. "I will pour out of my Spirit." This was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, as Mr. Mathes admits. Then the baptism of the Holy Ghost was by *pouring*, and not immersion.

As to the baptism of the three thousand, Mr. Mathes guesses that they were immersed; but why don't he prove it. All the circumstances were against the idea of immersion. We don't read of any of them having on wet clothes, or going to some private room to change clothes; though all these little matters would have been attended to if they had been immersed; and we should reasonably have expected Luke to have recorded them. But, as he says nothing about them, we conclude there was no immersion performed on that day. But the three thousand were all baptized right there in the house. They needed no change of clothes, as there was no immersion performed. These circumstances prove most conclusively that their baptism was not an immersion.

Now you see, my friends, where my friend Mr. Mathes stands. I have taken his camp; and I see, from the down-cast looks of his friends, that they have given it up—they surrender. Their strong man is defeated and a prisoner, and their hopes of victory are gone. You have now heard all his arguments, as he has but one more speech on this

proposition, and, according to our rules, he can bring in no new matter in his closing speech. What will the dippers do now? [Time expired.]

Fifth Day.—Fifth Proposition.—February 1, 1868.

MR. MATHES' FOURTH SPEECH—(30 MINUTES)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: YOU have now heard all the arguments that my friend Mr. Brooks has to oppose to my proposition; and I think you will agree with me that he has utterly failed to successfully assail my proposition. I admit, if noise and rant, and great swelling words, boasting of what he has done, would prove anything, I certainly should have been used up several days ago. But before this enlightened audience, such stuff will pass at its true value.

But I will first of all attend to the case of "undergo" and "endure," from the Bible Union Testament. I presume that I did not fully gather my friend's remarks, at first, upon this subject. I understood him to assert that I and my friends had made a new translation of the Scriptures to suit ourselves; and that, in doing this, we had given *undergo* and *endure* as the meaning of the Greek word *baptisma*. With that understanding I denied it, and challenged him to the proof. In his last reply he has attempted to make good his assertion, by bringing up two passages precisely alike in grammatical construction. In each of these passages the word baptism is repeated in a very peculiar way. "I have a baptism to be baptized with." It is like this: we say the rain rains, the snow snows. Now, if I should say the "rain falls," or the "rain pours," who would say that I was *giving falls* or *pours* as the meaning of the words rain and snow. No one. Or, take another example: Suppose Mr. Brooks had written me a letter before he came to this debate, and had said, among other

things, "I have a punishment to be punished with." And suppose I should report him as saying: "I have a punishment to *undergo*" or, "I have a punishment to *endure*;" would any sensible man say that I had misrepresented him, or that I was giving *undergo* and *endure* as the meaning of the word punishment? Certainly not. Just so the Bible Union in their version. Instead of saying: "I have a baptism to be baptized with," as we have it in the king's version, they say: "I have an immersion to undergo." Thus, instead of repeating the word, they use *undergo* and *endure*. All commentators agree that Jesus refers here to the "baptism of suffering." And in view of that terrible scene of suffering, these words *undergo* and *endure* are well chosen to carry out the idea expressed in this terrible immersion of suffering. If I understood Mr. Brooks, he has utterly failed to make it good. And I assert again that the Bible Union does nowhere give *undergo* and *endure* as the meaning of the Greek *baptisma*.

It is not true that I and my friends have made a new translation to suit our peculiar views of baptism; but it is true that for more than twelve years the very best scholars in Europe and America have been at work making a faithful version of the word of God—not to suit anybody's peculiar views, but to give the pure word of God as dictated by the Holy Spirit. And this movement has not been confined to one denomination; but the most learned and purest men of some seven Protestant churches were engaged in the work, many of them Paedobaptists.

I now return to Romans vi: 4, Colossians ii: 12: To be "buried with Christ in baptism," is to be buried in water, and raised up out of it again, to walk in a new life. This is the interpretation given to the passage by all the reformers, from Martin Luther down to the present time, and by all commentators of any note of all Protestant denominations. Yet, in the face of this universal agreement

of the learned world, Mr. Brooks tells us that it means some sort of a figurative burial into the spiritual death of Jesus Christ. But he failed to inform us how this is done. What a monstrous doctrine is this!—The spiritual death of Jesus Christ! Who ever heard of such a thing before? It is absurd and heretical.

But he denies that baptism is a monumental institution. Let me prove it further. Paul says: "God be thanked, that ye were the servants of sin: but ye have obeyed from the heart that form of doctrine which was delivered you." (Romans vi: 17.) The doctrine of Christ is his death, burial, and resurrection. The form of the doctrine is that institution which all who believe the doctrine are required to obey, namely: Christian baptism. The form must resemble the doctrine. And Jesus ordained baptism as a monumental institution, to show to all the coming ages his burial and resurrection—as the Supper is monumental, and "shows forth the Lord's death till he come." Again (I Corinthians xv: 29): "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not? why are they then baptized for the dead?" Dr. McKnight paraphrases the passage thus: "Else what shall they do who are baptized, to set forth the resurrection of the dead, if there is no resurrection?" If there is no resurrection, why are believers immersed to show their faith in the burial and resurrection of Christ? Immersion brings us into the likeness of his death, and shows our faith in that great fact. And our resurrection from the watery grave sets forth the resurrection of Christ from the tomb. It is a great monument, more durable than marble or brass, to commemorate the burial and resurrection of Christ.

Neither sprinkling nor pouring can be "the form of the doctrine." There is nothing in them to represent the doctrine; therefore, they can not be right.

I have no interest in this matter, only a common interest with all others in being right. I have no human system to maintain, and, therefore, take the truth just as I find it in the Lord's word.

Mr. Brooks has entirely failed to answer my question, why he and his brethren will immerse, using the awful names of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, while they teach that there is no example for it in the New Testament, and that Jesus never commanded it. He may attempt to answer it in his last speech, when he knows I will have no opportunity to examine his answer.

He admits that Bethabara, where John first baptized, and where Jesus abode, was in the neighborhood of Jordan. But he thinks the Greek prepositions *en* and *eis*, do not mean that he actually baptized in the river. Upon the same parity of reasoning, when we read, "Blessed are they who do his command, that they may have right to the tree of life, and enter in through the gates into the city," we may conclude that we shall get into the neighborhood of the city; but *into* (*eis*) will not take us in.

Mr. Brooks tried his hand on the case of Philip and the eunuch; but you all know that he made a perfect failure. I really think he had better get my picture of the baptism of the eunuch; it is better than anything that he can bring against immersion. These pictures have a powerful influence. I heard of an old lady once, who was sure that John baptized the Saviour by pouring water on him from a horn. She said she could prove it by the Bible. And, taking down the old family Bible, she turned to a picture of the baptism of Christ, which represented the matter just as she had stated! She exclaimed, "I told you it was in the Bible." By all means, we advise Mr. Brooks to get Prof. Wood's book, and exhibit the pictures—they are definite, and come right to the point. I will loan him the book if he desires it.

Recapitulation.—I first made an effort to show what the thing was that Jesus commanded to be done. We proved, from the great commission given to the apostles, that all believers are to be baptized. It is very important, therefore, that we should know definitely what *act* the Saviour commanded, when he said: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." We contended, and think we fully proved, that the Scriptural *action* of baptism is IMMERSION.

1. But, in answer to this, my friend Mr. Brooks said that the word baptize was a generic term, and meant no action in particular. That it was not a word of *mode* or *action*. He said that no man could learn from the command what action it required; that the Saviour used a generic word with design, so that no one, not even the apostles, could understand anything about the mode or action! In a word, his effort has been to unsettle everything and prove nothing. According to his arguments, the Gospel is the most unmeaning and indefinite system in the world,—all is in the dark!

2. Our second argument was the unanimous testimony of a vast number of standard lexicons, all prepared by Paedobaptists; yet all agreeing in this, that *baptizo*—the Greek word always used in some of its forms to express the ordinance of baptism—means to IMMERSE. While some of the lexicons give secondary and figurative meanings to the word, all, without a single exception, say it means—1. "To dip, to immerse," etc.

To this overwhelming argument, Mr. Brooks put in a sort of indefinite general *denial*, and quoted from some little book, compiled by some Pedobaptist, some secondary and figurative meanings from eighteen lexicons, and particularly did he rely upon Webster's "Pictorial" Dictionary. But the main argument with him was, in his own classic style: "These lexicons are defining Pagan Greek; but I am giving the meaning of God Almighty's Greek."

Thus trying to make the impression that the Greek of the lexicons was entirely different from the Greek of the New Testament; than which nothing can be more false. But it was virtually conceding that the lexicons sustained me in my position.

3. I proved, from the writings of the Christian fathers, that immersion was the universal practice from the apostles down, for several centuries. The argument drawn from the fathers, he has not attempted to answer in any way, only by a little quibbling that amounted to nothing.

4. I proved, from the writings of all the early reformers, such as Luther, Calvin, Beza, and all the great lights, such as John Wesley, Philip Doddridge, James McKnight, Bishop Burnett, and a host of others, that immersion was the practice of the apostles and primitive church, and that the word *baptizo* means to IMMERSE.

To this argument he replied by reading other extracts from some of the same men, showing that they also recognized sprinkling and pouring, as practiced in their day, as baptism in some sense. This, while true, only proves that they were inconsistent—believing one thing and practicing another—but it by no means invalidates their testimony for immersion. But, when crowded to the wall, and seeing no chance to escape, he cried out, "I care not what they say. I can whip a cornfield-full of such men!" And then he repudiates Wesley, Clark, and Benson, saying, "they never were members of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and we, as Methodists, are not bound by anything they have said."

5. I proved, by Dr. Wall, a Pedobaptist historian of great eminence and authority, that immersion was the practice of the apostles and of the church for thirteen centuries, except in cases of great danger of death, when aspersion was granted, but that such clinic baptisms were not regarded as full and valid; and the person so *aspersed*

was not permitted to hold any office in the church without rebaptism.

And how has he met this important argument? Why, simply by letting it alone. He has not even attempted to answer it in any way!

G. I proved, from the Scriptures, that the proper action of baptism is *immersion*; by such passages as these (Romans vi: 4, Colossians ii: 12): "Buried with him in baptism," which I argued could only be done by *immersion*. And you all remember how he turned, and twisted, and quibbled over these passages. He finally denied that water baptism was referred to at all; and guessed that the apostle meant a "*figurative burial into the spiritual death of Jesus Christ!*" But he stands alone in this. It is an unsupported quibble, without reason or Scripture to sustain it.

7. We showed, from the history of all the baptisms mentioned in the New Testament, that immersion was the practice, as the word baptize means immerse, and all the circumstances surrounding each case shows that immersion was performed in every case. The only answer he attempted to this unanswerable argument, was to quibble a little about the baptism of the three thousand, because no mention is made of their going to a private room to change their clothes, or nothing is said in the history about *wet clothes*. He also said that the prepositions, *into* the water, and *up* out of the water, did not necessarily prove that the baptism of Christ, or of the Jews who came to John, took place in the river of Jordan—it might have been in the *neighborhood* merely. And the eunuch may not have gone into the "certain water" at all, but only at, near by, or in the neighborhood of the water. Now, every one knows that there is no serious argument in such quibbling. Why, according to this, all certainty of our getting *ink* heaven is destroyed. We may get into the *neighborhood*

of heaven. The wicked will not certainly be cast *into* hell, but they will be cast to the neighborhood of the place. How preposterous!

8. As to Mr. Brooks' little criticism upon the expression "*are buried*" in Romans vi: 4, I need only say that the word in the original is "*sunetaphamen*" which is in the aorist tense, and should be rendered "*were buried*" and not *are*, in the present tense. Mr. Brooks may not understand this, but the apostle did, and every scholar knows it.

We know we are right, not because we are infallible, for we claim no infallibility; but we know it from the universal testimony of the learned world. No one denies that immersion is valid baptism. The controversy is about sprinkling and pouring. And we know we are right because we stand where the apostles and first Christians stood, believe as they believed, and practice exactly as they practiced. We are, therefore, right, and can not be wrong. [Time expired.]

Fifth Day.—Fifth Proposition.—February 1, 186S.

MR. BROOKS' FOURTH REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: NOW Mr. Mathes has finished his argument in favor of immersion, but he has failed to prove it. He has quoted a great many Scriptures, but not one of them says *immerse*. I am not against immersion. I admit that a person who is immersed, is validly baptized. I don't deny that immersion is *a mode* of baptism; but not the *only* mode. Here is the trouble: my friend affirms that immersion is the *only* mode, or *action*, as he calls it. This I deny, and contend that sprinkling and pouring are also modes of baptism; and I have fully proved it.

Baptism is a *washing*. If the feet are washed, it is the

same as if we washed all over, as the Saviour taught; therefore, sprinkling even a few drops of water upon the head, is a *washing*, and is as perfect as if the whole body were plunged in water. Pouring is a *to washing* also, and, therefore, sprinkling and pouring are *modes* of washing, which is baptism. Baptism represents the influence of the Holy Ghost, which is a divine *pouring*; and, therefore, the mode of baptism should be *pouring* also. I do not believe that immersion is a *Bible mode of baptism*.

As to what Mr. Mathes says of the Bible Union translation, I have only to say: *Undergo* is used by them, instead of *baptized*, in one place. And it does not matter what are the peculiarities of the passage where it occurs. I say, if it means it in one place, it means it in every place in the New Testament. And so you see that my friend's criticism amounts to nothing.

He says that he has proved, by the whole body of standard lexicons, that the word *baptizo* means, "to dip, to immerse." I admit that the lexicons do so define the word generally; but *that* is PAGAN GREEK, and proves nothing in this discussion. But this question must be settled by God Almighty's Greek, as found in the New Testament; and *there* it means, "*to wash, to cleanse, to purify,*" etc.;—not our bodies to be buried under the water or plunged in the rivers and ponds of the country! Water baptism is a type of Holy Ghost baptism; and as the Holy Ghost was poured on in baptism, so the water should be poured on in baptism. I have now demolished all he has said, and have proved that sprinkling is the proper mode.

Dr. Carson admits that all the lexicons are against him in maintaining that *baptizo* has no other meaning than *to immerse*. I have all the learning and common sense of the world on my side. I have proved that God's manner of baptizing is by sprinkling and pouring. In this mode he baptized the nations. Isaiah says: "So shall he sprinkle

many nations." But Mr. Mathes quotes from Dr. Adam Clark to prove that the original word, in this text translated "*sprinkle*," means no such thing; but means, "TO ASTONISH." I suppose he made this quotation and criticism just to *astonish* you with his learning and research; but all this amounts to nothing. We care nothing for Dr. Clark's criticism. I have as good a right to my opinion as Dr. Clark.

I have demolished my friend's citadel. But Mr. Mathes says that our baptism, by sprinkling and pouring, is no baptism at all—that we are all unbaptized, and out of the Church of Christ.

But, mind you, this is a slander upon the great Head of the Church, when he says we are not baptizing the people Scripturally. Romans vi: 4, is either a literal or a spiritual death. Do we die as the Lord died on the cross, literally? There is no analogy in this. No one pretends that we die *literally* when we are baptized. We are not *plunged* into the cross! It must be spiritual death. Christ was always dead to sin. So we must die to sin; we are then buried or planted in the likeness of Christ's spiritual death. No water in these passages—Romans vi: 4, Colossians ii: 12. It is simply a baptism into spiritual death, and a resurrection to spiritual life. It is the baptism of the Holy Ghost.

I am awfully afraid that my friend Mr. Mathes is not dead in the sense of the text. I am afraid he will be lost! Unless he repents, and quits teaching his false doctrine, he is certain to be lost. I have tried to set him right, and get him on the track; but he still persists in his course, and I am afraid he is "given over to hardness of heart and reprobacy of mind, to believe a lie and be damned." But I have done my duty with him.

If we are to understand the passage *literally* (Romans vi: 4), then persons must die literally before they are

proper subjects of baptism! But it is a spiritual death, and figurative burial. Baptism does not embrace any mode or action. Bury, does not express any definite mode or action. A person may be buried face down, head foremost, or any way so he is buried. The Holy Spirit does the work on the sinner's heart, in converting him; and as the Holy Spirit was poured out on the people on the day of Pentecost, and baptism was the result, so the mode of pouring or sprinkling clean water upon the people results in baptism. Now, mind you, it must be "clean water," not *muddy* water—not such muddy water as my friend and his brethren frequently plunge the people in. If the Jews come back under the new dispensation, then they will have clean water sprinkled upon them; for God promised it by the mouth of the prophet Ezekiel. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean." Hence, the baptism commanded in the commission was to be a *sprinkling*. And the three thousand who were baptized on the day of Pentecost were *sprinkled*.

But my friend Mr. Mathes *guesses* that they were all immersed. But this is all guess-work with him; he has been guessing all the time. But he has not proved it, and he can not. Now, Peter commenced preaching at nine o'clock on the day of Pentecost. Allow him one hour to preach, and we have ten o'clock. Then it must have required considerable time to have heard the experiences of three thousand persons, or to have taken the confession, as my friend does. It would certainly have taken two hours to have got through with this. Then we have twelve o'clock, and nobody baptized yet. Next, they hunt up water. The Jews hated the Christians, and, of course, would not allow them to use their public nor private pools. The brook Cedron was about the only chance, as Jordan was too far off, and the brook most likely dry, or very low, at the time. But suppose they went to the brook—they would not

have had more than three hours to have clone all the immersing in; and, of course, it could not have been done in so short a time—it was impossible. So, you see it was all guess-work with Mr. Mathes.

As to the baptism of the eunuch by Philip, Mr. Mathes has exhibited a picture of the scene, which represents Philip as pouring water out of a horn upon the head of the eunuch as he is kneeling in the road by the side of his chariot. The picture may be true or false. We know that Philip baptized the eunuch, because it is so recorded; but no man can tell *how* he did it. Though, as immersion is not a Scriptural mode of baptism, we are sure that Philip did not immerse him; and, as sprinkling and pouring are Scriptural modes of baptism, it is most likely the eunuch was baptized in one of these modes.

But Mr. Mathes has several times urged me to tell why we Methodist preachers will denounce immersion as an unscriptural practice, not commanded by Christ, and without any divine authority, and still practice it on some occasions, and doing so in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit? I forgot to answer this in my last speech; but it will answer just as well now, as it is a matter of not much importance no way.

I answer, then, while it is true that we do consider *immersion* as an unscriptural ceremony, and do not believe that Jesus ever commanded it, or that the apostles ever practiced it, still we do sometimes find a person who thinks immersion is right, though they wish to live in the Methodist Church. WE, THEREFORE, AS REGULAR MINISTERS IN THE REGULAR APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION, DO NOT THIN THAT WE INCUR GUILT WHEN WE TRUN ASIDE TO IMMERSE SUCH PERSON. I hope this will be satisfactory to Mr. Mathes and his friends.

Mr. Mathes referred to the baptism of Lydia and the jailer again. He guesses that Lydia was immersed in the

river; but he didn't prove it. And he thinks the jailer and his family were also immersed in the same river. But how does he try to prove it? Why, because "he brought them out" of the jail, he thinks they took them away off to the river. But this does not prove that they were immersed, or that they were out of the prison at all. If Paul and Silas left the jail that night, and went away to the river to immerse the jailer and his family, and slipped back into jail before morning; and when the magistrates sent an officer to inform them that they might go away, and they refused to leave the jail till they would "come themselves and fetch them out"—I say, if these things were so, then the apostles acted the hypocrite! But this was not so. They never left the prison that night. They only came out of the inner prison, into the outer apartment, where they preached, had their stripes washed, and administered the rite of baptism to the jailer and his family; and as it was all done in the prison, it was most likely performed by sprinkling or pouring, and not by immersion.

But Mr. Mathes still insists that Saul was *immersed* in Damascus. But let me examine this case a little. Saul was in the house of Judas, in the city of Damascus, fasting and praying, and had been three days in that condition, and without sight. Ananias came into the room where he was, most probably sitting or lying down. He laid his hands on him and restored him to his sight, and said to him, "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. And he arose forthwith and was baptized."

Mr. Mathes argues that, as he thinks the word baptize means to *immerse*, and as Damascus was favorably situated upon the rivers Abana and Pharpar, that, therefore, Saul was immersed by Ananias. But this is only his opinion. He guesses at it. But as he was baptized as soon as he came to his feet, I think he was baptized standing on his

feet in the house of Judas. This is my guess, and I have as good a right to *guess* as Mr. Mathes; and I guess he was baptized by sprinkling or pouring. [Time expired.]

Sixth Day.—Sixth Proposition.—February 3, 18C8.

MR. BROOKS' FIRST SPEECH—(45 MINUTES.)

PROP. VI. "Wherefore that we are justified by faith *only*, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." Affirmative; Mr. Brooks; Negative, Mr. Mathes.

MB. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am happy to appear before you this morning to affirm the Ninth Article of our Discipline. Mr. Mathes, having failed upon all the other propositions, will no doubt try to make a little capital out of this little word *alone*, or *only*. But now, mind you, in this he stands alone. He says there are six hundred denominations, and his sect makes six hundred and one; but all the six hundred stand with me upon this important subject, and against my friend! The Baptists are with us; the Presbyterians are on our side, and against Mr. Mathes. He and his party stand *alone* against the religious world. If this word *only* had not been in it, he would never have consented to debate it.

The Minutes of the Bedford Baptist Association hold that we are justified by faith *alone*. So you see the Baptists are with me, and against Mr. Mathes. I will give you the definition of Faith, from Mr. Webster: "Trust in God, accompanied with belief in revelation; trust in Christ as a Saviour." And as this is a theological debate, I use the word in its theological sense. We have already debated it in this sense, when discussing the design of baptism.

I will now give you Mr. Mathes' order of pardon. It is—
1. Faith; 2. Repentance; 3. Immersion; 4. Pardon, or

justification. But our order is—1. Repentance; 2. Prayer; 3. Faith, and 4. Pardon, or justification. On the grounds of our faith only, God imputes righteousness to us. I will prove this by the following Scripture (Acts xx: 21):

"Testifying, both to the Jews and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." Here you see that repentance comes before faith in the divine order. So you see that Mr. Mathes and his party are off the track; but I will try to put them on the right track. But Mr. Mathes and his brethren misconstrue Peter's discourse on the day of Pentecost; but I will take him to Peter on the occasion of his preaching to the Gentiles, and to St. Paul, as I want to get Mr. Mathes and his church on the track.

This question is a very important one—it is fundamental. If I prove that Mr. Mathes is wrong on the subject of justification, his whole system falls. Everything hinges upon the doctrine of justification by faith *only*. Let us, then, hear Peter to the Gentiles. He says: "Who-soever believeth in him, shall receive the remission of sins." (Acts x: 43.) This is God's plan of pardon, and has been the same under all dispensations. It is by "faith only." Peter put Cornelius and his family on the track, as they were all pardoned by faith only, without a drop of water.

Abraham was on the track, as it is said (Gen. xv: 6), "Abraham believed in the Lord, and it was counted to him for righteousness." No works here. My proposition says that we are justified by faith only." No contradiction here—but perfect harmony. Mr. Mathes says the Gospel was never preached till the day of Pentecost. But this is a contradiction of the Bible! Saint Paul says: "The Gospel was preached to Abraham." It was preached also to the Jews and to Noah, and was always the same; only they looked forward to Christ, and we look back to him by

faith. Therefore, I say that God's plan of justification and imputed righteousness, is the same now that it has always been under all dispensations.

I will now cite you to Luke xviii: 13, 14: "The publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto heaven; but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner. I tell you, This man went down to his house justified rather than the other." But Mr. Mathes says he ought to have been immersed! But Jesus says: "He went down to his house justified," because he believed! Yet Mr. Mathes and his brethren lampoon the sects, because they teach sinners to pray. So you see they are entirely off the track.

But I deny that there are any such persons as "penitent believers." It is an absurdity; there is no such thing mentioned in the Bible. Every man is an unbeliever until he is pardoned. But I will now prove that faith is imputed for righteousness, without works. (Romans iv: 9): "Cometh this blessedness then upon the circumcision only, or upon the uncircumcision also? For we say that faith was reckoned to Abraham for righteousness." Here Abraham is spoken of simply as a believer, and he was justified by faith only. No works in his case.

But my friend wants to bring God in debt by doing good works, so that God may justify him by works. But in this he is off the track again; and, I tell you, if we are off the track on the subject of justification, we are ruined. And if Mr. Mathes and his church are off the track on this subject, they are ruined. It all turns upon this. But works are entirely excluded from the account. Paul says: "To him who worketh not, but believes"—doth not undertake to work in order to procure pardon or justification.

Now, I admit that we are required to do good works after we are justified, but not before; pardon is promised upon the condition of faith only: the moment we have

faith, we are justified. But the question is, *how* are penitent sinners justified? This is what we are talking about, and not the justification of Christians. I am here as the mouth-piece of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Bedford, and they are not ashamed of me; they are proud of me and my efforts on this occasion, as I am here to defend my church.

But if faith is imputed for righteousness without works, then it must be by faith *alone*. But I thank God that the Baptists and Presbyterians are all with us on the track, on this proposition. But Mr. Mathes and his church are all off the track, and not one of them will ever be saved, except it be on the plea of ignorance! But I can not admit the plea of ignorance, as the Bible is here, and they can read it; and, therefore, have no excuse for their ignorance. Now let us hear Saint Paul again. He says:

"That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ; that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith." (Galatians iii: 14.) Every man is, therefore, a righteous man, and receives the blessing promised to Abraham, as soon as he believes. It is, therefore, by faith *only*. "Not of works, lest any man should boast."⁵ (Ephesians ii: 9.) Thus, you see that Saint Paul is against my friend Mr. Mathes; for he declares that "it is not of works." And, mind you now, we are not talking about the justification of Christians, but of penitent sinners. This is what we have before us in the proposition. God's method of doing this is, to impute our faith to us for righteousness, and not on the ground of anything done by us.

But I understand that Mr. Mathes' brethren preached this all over last night at the church. They are not satisfied with the way the debate is going, but are trying to fix it up every night. Well, let them go on. I am good for the whole of them, with the truth on my side. I am will-

ing to leave it to the outsiders; and I know they will pronounce it a success on my part, and a Waterloo defeat on the part of Mr. Mathes.

Mr. Mathes quotes John Wesley to help him out; but everybody knows that Mr. Wesley never was a member of the Methodist Church; and, therefore, he is no authority in this discussion. He lived and died in the communion of the Church of England. So I shall not trouble myself about what Mr. Wesley says.

But my friend Mr. Mathes will quote Saint James. O, yes; he will demolish us at once! But I don't want him to garble Saint James. But Mr. Wesley says, in his sermon on Justification, that "We are justified the moment we believe." God requires no works to be performed by a penitent sinner, in order to his justification; he *can't do* any works. God justifies by faith *alone* (Romans iv), as he did Abraham, by faith without any works at all. Mr. Mathes will try to make you believe that my proposition contradicts Saint James; but I tell you that there is no contradiction. Saint James, Saint Paul, and our Discipline, are all in harmony, as I will prove before I am through.

Now, you see that my friend is wrong; and if he and his church don't get on the track they will be lost. But I will get them on the track if I can.

Mr. Campbell says: "Immersion is the consummating act" in the process of conversion. He will not allow any one to be saved who is not immersed.

But we teach that, in the order of conversion, the first thing is repentance, and the second prayer. But my friend and his party deny this order of pardon, and contend that *immersion* is the condition of pardon. Now, you see what an awful doctrine my friend advocates. If he is right, then all unimmersed persons are on the road to hell. I do not say that Mr. Mathes believes this, but such is the awful consequence of his doctrine; and, therefore, it can

not be true. But the righteousness of Christ is imputed to us the moment we believe with all the heart. God imputes our faith, not our repentance, to us for righteousness. But let my friend quote Saint James if he dare, and I will take the dust out of his system, and expose him. I will show what Saint James means. He is talking about the justification of the *Christian*; and Saint Paul is speaking of the justification of the penitent sinner. All were baptized with the Holy Ghost when they believed and were justified. Can a man in the state of nature bear good fruit? [Time expired.]

Sixth Day.—Sixth Proposition.—February 3, 1868.

MR. MATHES' FIRST REPLY—(45 MINUTES)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I am truly happy to have the privilege, through the good providence of God, to appear before you this morning under such favorable circumstances. The proposition we have under discussion to-day, is one in which we are all deeply interested. And I am glad that my friend Mr. Brooks has come up to the 'work this morning in good trim, and confident of his ability to sustain the doctrine of his church. He boasts wonderfully of what he has done, and of what he is going to accomplish to-day. But it occurs to me that he is boasting too soon. "Let him who putteth his armor on not boast as he that putteth it off." It is always a sign of weakness and defeat for a man to be boasting of his victory before the contest is ended. But I am perfectly willing to leave the whole matter to the good sense and sober judgment of the people who hear us.

But I agree with my friend Mr. Brooks as to the importance of this proposition. The great Martin Luther says: "The doctrine of justification by faith is the test of

a standing or falling church; if she is right at this point, she is not likely wrong anywhere; and if wrong on this subject, she is not likely right in anything." I agree with him, and I wish the people to remember it; if he fails to sustain his proposition, his whole system is lost without remedy.

But he thinks I will try to make capital out of the little word "*only*" and that I would not have debated the proposition if this word *only* had not been in it. Well, in this he is right. No man but an infidel would take the negative of this proposition if this word "*only*" were not in it. The whole issue lies in the word *only*. I and my brethren all believe in the doctrine of "justification by faith," as the Bible clearly teaches. Let the audience bear this in mind. But Mr. Brooks misstates the Scriptural order of justification, as we teach it. It is—1. To *hear*; this involves the necessity of preaching the Gospel. The preaching of the Gospel sets forth the love of God to man, as seen in the gift of his Son. The grand proposition to be believed is, "That Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." And when the testimony concerning Christ is believed by the sinner, he has the second item in the divine order, "faith." 3. Repentance; which grows up out of faith. 4. Confession of Christ with the mouth. 5. Immersion into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. 6. Justification, or pardon of sins. 7. The Holy Spirit, the Spirit of adoption.

Faith changes the heart from the love of sin to the love of God. Then repentance changes the life, and immersion changes the state. But Mr. Brooks says that the Methodist order is—1. Repentance; 2. Prayer; 3. Faith; 4. Justification. Now, this is plain and very explicit. But the idea that repentance comes before faith, is a philosophical *absurdity*; and prayer without faith, equally monstrous! But Mr. Brooks teaches that a sinner who

never heard of the name of Jesus, must repent and pray before he has any faith. Now, the apostle says: "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," and "without faith it is impossible to please God." Therefore, God is not *pleased* with the repentance and prayer that is without faith. Nay, more: such repentance and prayer is positively sinful, because it is not of faith. Every one can see the absurdity of Mr. Brooks' position. It is clearly opposed to reason, common sense, and the Bible; and, therefore, *false*.

But Mr. Brooks has virtually given up at least three-fourths of his proposition. He admits that all infants and idiots are saved, or justified, *without* faith. And he admits that all Christians are justified, not by faith *only*, but by faith and good works. This is virtually giving up the proposition. The proposition covers the whole ground of justification, and my friend can not dodge the real issue in this way. But Mr. Brooks quotes the following Scripture to prove that repentance comes before faith: "Testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, repentance toward God, and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts xx: 21.) Now, so far as the Jews were concerned, they had sinned against God, in whom they had faith; and they were required to repent of their sins against God, and believe on Christ, in order to justification. But the fact that repentance is mentioned a few times before faith, is no evidence that it stands before faith in the divine order. But I will now prove that the proposition is *false*.

Justification is ascribed in the Bible to some nine causes:

1. We are said to be "*justified by knowledge*" (Isaiah liii: 11.) "He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his KNOWLEDGE shall my righteous servant justify many." This is a prophecy concerning Christ, and was fulfilled when the Gospel was preached on

the day of Pentecost, and ever since. But we are not justified by knowledge *only*.

2. We are "*justified by faith*" "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God," etc. (Romans v: 1.) But not "*by faith only*"

3. We are said to be "*justified by his blood*" But not by *blood only*. (Romans v: 9.) "Much more then, being now justified by his blood, we shall be saved from wrath through him."

4. We are said to be "*justified in the name of the Lord*" (I Corinthians vi: 11.) "But ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus," etc. Then justification is not *by faith only*, as Mr. Brooks and his church affirm. Every one can see this.

5. We are said to be "*justified by the Spirit*" (I Corinthians vi: 11.) "But ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God." Not by Spirit *alone* nor *faith only*.

6. It is *God that justifies*. (Romans viii: 33.) "Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth." But he does not justify *one* without conditions. But if God justify, then it is not by "*faith only*."

7. We are "*justified by works*." (James ii: 24.) "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Thus you see that the apostle James contradicts my friend Mr. Brooks squarely. Mr. Brooks and the Methodist Episcopal Church affirm that we are "*justified by faith only*" And James says, "*by works a man is justified, and not by faith only*." Now, what do you think, my friends, of a preacher, or a church, that will, in the most direct and palpable manner, contradict an inspired apostle? It is monstrous!

But Mr. Brooks says that his proposition has nothing to do with the justification of Christians, but he says the

sinner is "justified by faith *only*" But I reckon he will hardly contend that the harlot Rahab was a Christian. She was evidently a sinner. But James says, "Likewise also was not Rahab the harlot justified by works when she had received the messengers and had sent them out another way?" This ruins my friend's cause entirely. But let us hear James a little further: "For as the body without the Spirit is dead, so faith without works is dead also." (James ii: 26.) The apostle James contradicts and utterly overthrows and destroys this proposition of the Methodist Episcopal Church.

Paul and James are talking about the same justification, and are both right and in perfect harmony. Paul says we are "justified by faith," but not by faith *only*. James says "we are justified by works," but not by works *only*; but faith and works are both necessary. I hope my friend Mr. Brooks will attend to this matter in his next.

But if Mr. Brooks is right, how can he avoid the salvation of devils! He says, the moment one believes, he is justified by faith *only*. But the apostle says "the devils believe and tremble." Yet devils are not justified. Repentance is a condition, and devils do not repent. Thus, Mr. Brooks has had his proposition swept away without remedy. But he talks a good deal about the faith of Abraham. But Abraham's faith had steps in it, and these steps *were* his obedience to the commands of God. And we enjoy the blessing, and become the children of Abraham, not by faith *only*, but by faith and obedience to God—by walking in the steps of Abraham's faith. Abraham was "justified when he offered up Isaac."

8. We are said to be "*justified by the resurrection of Christ*" (Romans iv: 25.) "Who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification." Then we are not justified by faith *only*.

9. We are said to be ^a justified by grace." (Romans

iii: 24.) "Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Jesus Christ." Here Mr. Brooks and the Methodist Church are flatly contradicted again; for if it is "by grace," it is not "by faith only." But Mr. Brooks tells you, that if repentance, confession, and immersion, be admitted as conditions of justification, then the idea of justification by faith would be destroyed; and quotes Romans iv: 2, and Ephesians ii: 9. "Not of works, lest any man should boast." But Paul, in these passages, is not talking about the obedience of the Gospel as conditions, but the works of the law, which he declares had become dead by the body of Christ. No one now contends for justification by works *alone*, nor by the works of the law, but by faith and the obedience of faith, which is nowhere classed with "*good works*."

But I will notice my friend's order of pardon again. He says, it is—1. Repentance; 2. Prayer; 3. Faith; and, 4. Pardon, or justification. But suppose a man has never heard of the name of Jesus the Christ; how would he repent, or pray? Paul seems to have anticipated this debate, and furnished an argument with design to overthrow this miserable absurdity. He says: "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?" (Romans x:14.)

Repentance is a sorrow for the past, and a turning away from it. How is it possible for one to be sorry for having sinned against a being which they do not believe in, and of whom they have not heard? It is preposterous. But suppose such an one should pray; it would be prayer *without faith*, and, as such, it would be sinful. For the apostle says, "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." But for what does Mr. Brooks and his brethren teach such a man to pray? Why, he says, "pray for faith;" that is, he must

pray *without* faith *for* faith. But the apostle James says, of the man that prays without faith for anything, "For let not that man think that he shall receive anything of the Lord." (James i: 7.) Such a prayer for faith as Mr. Brooks would teach the sinner to pray, would not only be sinful, but it would never be answered, according to James. The blind man that had been healed by the Lord, understood this matter much better than Mr. Brooks and those whose mouth-piece he is. He said, "Now we know that God heareth not sinners; but if any man be a worshiper of God, and doeth his will, him he heareth." (John ix: 31.) But Mr. Brooks says this man was mistaken—God will hear sinners *without* faith.

But, worse for my friend, his older of pardon destroys his proposition; for, if repentance and prayer are necessary in order to faith and justification, then justification is not by faith *only*, but by repentance, prayer and faith. I press all these arguments and testimonies home upon the attention of Mr. Brooks, and hope we shall hear at least an *attempt* to answer them.

But I object to his proposition further. 1. Because it contradicts the commission. Jesus says: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." Now, every one can see that the Lord required something more than faith. He required baptism—immersion—and that is the reason that I and my brethren preach it. The conditions laid down here by the Lord himself, were faith and baptism; and, therefore, Mr. Brooks and the Discipline are wrong.

2. And Paul contradicts Mr. Brooks. He says (I Corinthians xiii: 2): "Though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing." But my friend says, or seems to say, Paul, you are mistaken; we are saved or justified by *faith only*; and, therefore, charity has nothing to do with it! How presumptuous!

I shall not allow my friend to dodge the real issue. He must take the proposition as it stands, covering the whole ground of justification to saint and sinner; for such is its obvious meaning. But as I have two or three minutes more, I will introduce Luke x: 25-27. In answer to the lawyer's question: "What shall I do to inherit eternal life? Jesus said to him, What is written in the law? How readest thou? And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind," etc. But if my friend had been there, he would have said to the lawyer: "We are justified by faith *only*, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort; do this, and you shall live."

But, again: Jesus taught that no man could be justified, or recognized as his disciple, unless he would "deny himself, and take up his cross and follow him." But the position of my friend sets this all aside, and declares that the moment a man believes, he is justified by faith *only*.

But once more: Faith itself is a work (see John vi: 28 29): "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." Thus, you see that my friend has got himself into trouble. His proposition not only compels him to contradict the Lord and his apostles, but it destroys itself. Faith itself is a work. [Time expired.]

Sixth Day.—Sixth Proposition.—February 3, 1808.

MR. BROOKS' SECOND SPEECH— (30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Mathes complains of the way I have of boasting. But I think he boasts too. Mr. Camp-

bell boasted as much as Mr. Rice, in their great Lexington debate. The apostle Paul boasted as much as any of us. And when we say that "we have passed from death unto life, we are boasting." So much, then, for my friend's complaint about boasting.

But I will now attend to what my friend has said on the proposition. And, first, I ask, can we be saved if we are off the track? I answer, we can not. And I have proved that my friend Mr. Mathes and his church are off the track, and I have been trying to get them on. But I will advise them no more, as they are unwilling to take any advice from me. But I am willing to leave it to the outsiders and our brethren. They are impartial, and can weigh arguments. You may laugh and grin now, but I will make you laugh on the other side of your mouths before we are through.

Mr. Mathes says that my statement of the conditions of pardon, as he holds it and teaches it, is not just right. He says the order is—1. Hear; 2. Believe; 3. Repentance; 4. Confession; 5. Immersion; 6. Pardon; 7. Holy Spirit. Well, the matter is now before you, and I will attend to it.

But, in opposition to this, I affirm that justification is by faith *only*; and that righteousness is imputed to us upon the ground of faith *only*. But Mr. Mathes objects to my order of pardon, because I put repentance and prayer before faith. He says if this be so, then justification is not by faith *only*, but by repentance, prayer and faith. But I tell you that repentance and prayer are both implied, and must exist before faith; but they are not conditions of justification. Except a man repent, he never can believe the Gospel, But I believe that faith is the *only* condition of justification, or salvation.

But my friend quotes the commission, and thinks it is against my proposition. But, according to his theory, im-

mersion is essential to pardon. A man may believe, repent and pray, and, unless he is immersed, he will not admit that he is pardoned. Now, can't you see that such a system will damn nine-tenths of the human family? No system can be right that involves such awful consequences. Good works are the conditions of salvation to the Christian. Jesus says: "He that endures to the end, the same shall be saved." That is, shall be saved in heaven at the end of his race on earth. But this has nothing to do with the justification of the penitent sinner. This is the matter we have on hand, and I want Mr. Mathes to attend to the real issue.

But Mr. Mathes says, the Gospel order is—believe, repent, confess, be immersed, and then be pardoned, or justified. But, to be consistent, he ought to ask every one who comes forward, to make the good confession: "Have you been feeding the hungry, clothing the naked?" etc. And then wash all their sins away in immersion! Mr. Mathes makes no difference between the justification of the sinner and the Christian. We want to get the tree good first, and then we expect good fruit. What are we to do? No external works are required for this.

But Mr. Mathes contradicts the Scriptures. Abraham was justified long before Isaac was offered up. Isaac was twenty-five years old when he was offered up. Yet Mr. Mathes tries to make you believe that Abraham was justified when he offered up Isaac! He says that his faith was imputed to him for righteousness when he offered up Isaac. But Saint James does not say so. Saint James is speaking of him as a religious man; but Paul is speaking of him before he became religious. Abraham was justified as a sinner, by faith, forty years before he offered up Isaac; and he was justified as a good man when he offered his son Isaac upon the altar.

Was Saint James a sinner when he wrote this epistle?

Certainly not; yet he says: "I will now show you my faith by ray works." These were the works of a religious man. Men must have something more than *historical* faith—he must have *saving* faith, that works by love and purifies the heart. For forty years Abraham had been a religious man, and justified by faith *only*. He then, as a religious man, added to his faith works, when he offered up his son Isaac. Works are necessary to perfect the faith of a Christian.

Saint James refers to the fifteenth chapter of Genesis, where God made the covenant with Abraham. And he was called the friend of God then, and not at the time of the offering up of Isaac. All the prophets were justified by faith, just as we are justified. To justify, is to acquit from guilt, to treat one as innocent. And this is declared by Paul to be by faith. Yet my friend Mr. Mathes teaches that a man must not only repent and believe, but, unless he is immersed, he can not be saved!—He teaches that a man must believe, repent, make the good confession, and be immersed—all before he can be recognized as a Christian! How *absurd!*

Now, Peter says to Christians: "Add to your faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience," etc. When people are on the track, they are kept on by adding these things to their faith. When God justifies penitent sinners, it is by faith *only*; while he justifies religious men by good works, or religious acts. We see in the case of Abraham how a religious man is justified.

Every Christian is converted as Abraham was, as recorded in Genesis xv. When you believed in the Lord by a faith of trust, you were justified, and afterward you are required to perform good works. So Abraham was justified by faith *alone*; and, forty years after, as a religious man, he performed a good work in offering up Isaac. If

Mr. Mathes is on the track, he is not justified to-day as he was at first. Then he was justified by faith, and now he is justified by good works—such as publishing the Christian Record, and all his other good works.

But Mr. Mathes contends that faith *alone* is dead faith, and can justify no one. But this is only true when applied to the Christian. If he performs no good works, his "faith is dead, being alone," as Saint James teaches. But this is not true of the penitent sinner. His justification is by faith *alone*. But what sort of faith is my friend contending for? Why, simply, the belief of the written or revealed word of God. But, I tell you that this is not the faith that justifies. That is the faith of devils. It is a mere historical faith, and has no power in it. I want nothing to do with such a faith as that. But Mr. Mathes teaches that a man must believe in all the items to which he says justification is ascribed in the Bible, and then obey the Gospel before he can be justified! What abominable nonsense. [Time expired.]

Sixth Day.—Sixth Proposition.—February 3, 1868.

MR. MATHES' SECOND REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: I am very "much gratified to see so many present to hear these great matters discussed, and to find so much good-feeling and kindness among the people. We are now fully under way, and you have now heard about all that my friend Mr. Brooks has to offer in defense of his proposition. I was very much amused at his course in his last speech. He was evidently confused, and in his zeal to say something, he got on the wrong side of his proposition. He concedes one-half the ground, and seems almost ready to give up the other half also. He admits that Christians are justified on the ground of works; and

infants, without either faith or works. But his proposition requires him to affirm that "justification is by faith *only*." This covers the whole ground of justification, and he can not avoid the conclusion.

But I call special attention to the point he has made. He says *faith alone*, in a Christian, "is dead, being *alone*;" but "*faith alone*" in the sinner, is *alive*, without any act of obedience to Christ; and that the moment the sinner believes, he is justified, or pardoned. If this be so, the faith of the sinner is stronger and better than the faith of a Christian. But my friend quotes John xx: 31: "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." But this text, so far from proving justification by faith alone, refutes him. He says the mere belief of the written word of God, is historical faith, and amounts to nothing. In fact, he told us that such was the faith of devils, and he wants nothing to do with it. But, in the above passage, John says: "But these are written that ye- might believe," etc. But the *belief* here spoken of, is the belief of what was "*written*" and, according to Mr. Brooks, is nothing but mere *historical* faith, and amounts to nothing.

Yet John teaches that through this belief of the written word we obtain life through the name of Jesus; but not by faith *alone*. The belief of the Gospel always involves the obedience of faith. And with this agrees Paul (Rom. v: 2): "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace," etc. Here faith is the means of access into the grace of God; therefore, we are not justified by faith only, but by faith and grace. But my friend Mr. Brooks has failed to meet my argument drawn from the prophecy, "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many." He saw that he could not answer it on his own hypothesis, and, therefore, passed it over in silence. Now, every one can

see that if the prophet was correct in this statement, and we are justified by the knowledge of Christ, then we are not "justified by faith *only*."

But we find the same doctrine taught in the parable of the sower (Matthew, chap, xiii):

"But he that received seed into the good ground is he that heareth the word, and understandeth it." And Paul shows the necessity of the knowledge of God, when he says, "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the *knowledge* of the truth." (I Timothy ii: 4.) Here knowledge is connected with salvation; and this proves that it is not by faith *only*. Again, Paul says: "Yea doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the KNOWLEDGE of Christ Jesus my Lord." (Philippians iii: 8).

Now, the truth is, and I am surprised that Mr. Brooks and his brethren have not discovered it long ago, that if we would understand this great subject of justification, we must hear all that the Spirit has said upon this point, and put it all together; we then have the knowledge, the faith, the blood, the name, the Spirit, the grace, and the works. Taken altogether, we have the glorious system of justification that the Infinite One has ordained. But to select one of these causes, and say, as Mr. Brooks and his brethren say, "We are justified by faith *only*," is a very low and groveling view of the subject, and is false, as it contradicts the Bible!

But Mr. Brooks says that I *guessed* at it, when I said that Paul referred to the works of the law, in Romans iv: 12-16. Let us see. I do not guess anything about it. Paul says these works are the works of the law. He says: "The law worketh wrath." (Verse 15).

But Mr. Brooks says that there can be no good fruit till the tree is made good; that is, that there can be nothing good performed by the sinner till after his justification!

According to this hypothesis, neither repentance nor prayer are good fruit; because, he says, they must *precede* faith and justification! Well, if they are not *good*, then they must be *evil* fruit. Thus you see that Mr. Brooks and the Methodist Episcopal Church actually teach that repentance and prayer, both of which they say must go before faith and justification, are *evil fruit*, and, therefore, sinful! Now, what confidence can you have in a system of doctrine that is made up of such monstrous and dangerous heresies!

Mr. Brooks boasted again that he is the "mouth-piece" of the Methodist Church in Bedford. Well, I am happy to know that such is the fact; and we now see what sort of defense of this doctrine they can make through their "mouth-piece." He has exhausted himself, and used up all the arguments that can be brought in on that side. Has he proved that we are "justified by faith *only*?" You know he has not. Indeed, the very Scriptures upon which he has relied, have proved his proposition to be *false*. In his last speech he seemed aware that all was lost, and made but little effort to save it, and, in his confusion, he occasionally got on the wrong side of his proposition. All saw this.

But I was shocked to hear my friend Mr. Brooks call "baptism for the remission of sins" an *abominable doctrine*! I wonder that he was not afraid to use such terrible language in reference to the Gospel preached by the apostle! It is monstrous! Peter said to the three thousand: "Repent, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." Ananias said to Saul: "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." Jesus himself said: "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he can not enter into the kingdom of God." But in the face of all these Scriptures,

and many more like them, and the voice of all the primitive fathers, the early reformers, and of Mr. Wesley, the _ father of Methodism, Mr. Brooks calls it "abominable doctrine!" I will just hand him over to your just rebuke, as I can not do it justice!

Mr. Brooks again repeats, for the twentieth time, that I and my brethren are off the track, and tells us that we will all be lost if we don't get on the track! How modest! But what does he mean by the *track*? If he means the Methodist track, we admit that we are not on it. But will he say that no one can be saved unless they join the Methodist Church? Then, what becomes of all the other sects? Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians and Catholics, are all off the Methodist track. Will they all be lost unless they get on Mr. Brooks' track? But I and my brethren are on the apostolic track. We stand on the same foundation with the apostles; preach, believe and obey the same Gospel; enjoy the same witness of the Spirit, which gives us a knowledge of remission of sins through the blood of the everlasting covenant; and, therefore, we know that we are right, though we are not on the Methodist track.

But the Lord himself contradicts my friend most palpably, in Matthew xxv: 34, 35. Speaking of the final judgment, Jesus says: "Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand, Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world: for I was a hungered, and ye gave me meat; I was thirsty, and ye gave me drink; I was a stranger, and ye took me in," etc. Thus it will be seen that we shall not be justified at the judgment-seat of Christ by faith *only*; and, therefore, my friend's proposition is false.

But Mr. Brooks affirms that Peter put Cornelius and his friends "on the track without a drop of water!" But let us see how this was. Peter was sent for to tell them "*words* by which they should be saved." Peter came and

preached Jesus to them, and while he was preaching, the Holy Spirit, in his miraculous gifts, was poured out upon them, to show that God had granted repentance unto life to the Gentiles. And when Peter saw this, he said, "Who can forbid water, that these should not be baptized who have received the Holy Spirit as well as we? And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." Thus we see that Mr. Brooks is mistaken. Cornelius and his friends were baptized in water, just like all others converted in that age.

But the following text shows that my friend's proposition is not true: "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." (John xii: 42.) Now, according to Mr. Brooks, these rulers were all justified the moment they believed on him—by faith *alone*. But Jesus condemns them because "they would not confess him openly;" and tells them that they "love the praise of men more than the praise of God."

In the commission, as recorded by Luke, the Saviour says, "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem." This commission began to be executed on the day of Pentecost. Peter stood up with the eleven, filled with the Holy Spirit. He had the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The multitude were pierced in the heart, and inquired, "What shall we do?" The Holy Spirit, by Peter's mouth, answered and said to them: "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 Spirit." Remission of sins and justification are the same thing; so, you see that their justification, or remission of sins, was not by faith alone—but by faith, repentance and baptism, in the name of Jesus Christ.

And as it was preached on that day in Jerusalem, so, according to the commission, it must be preached in all the world. Consequently, Mr. Brooks' proposition is false. This is the law of pardon. The prophet said, more than six hundred years before the coming of Christ: "The law shall go forth out of Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem." It was fulfilled on this great day of Pentecost, and remains in full force and virtue to-day, and will never be changed till the Lord shall come the second time, without sin unto salvation. [Time expired.]

Sixth Day.—Sixth Proposition.—February 3, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' THIRD SPEECH—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT: Mr. Mathes calls me the "mouth-piece" of the Methodist Church in Bedford. Well, I am happy to say that I am the mouth-piece of the Methodist Church, and they are proud of me and my efforts. And my friend Mr. Mathes is the representative of his church in Bedford, and no doubt they are well satisfied with him and his course in this debate. Therefore, we are even in this respect.

Mr. Mathes complains of the way I speak of him and his party as being "off the track," on the way to perdition. But you remember the extract I read from the "Western Preacher," in which Mr. Mathes says that "sectarianism is heresy." But he is not willing to have others speak of him and his party in the same manner.

I defend the proposition in the sense the Methodists believe and preach it; that is, the justification of the penitent sinner by faith *only*. We claim no merit on account of our own works or deserving; our own works are nothing but filthy rags! Paul says: "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy

he hath saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Spirit." (Titus iii: 5.) This sustains my proposition. But to show that I am debating the proposition in the sense in which it is used in the Ninth Article of our most excellent Discipline, I will read the article: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings Wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." From this, all can see that justification of penitent sinners is the subject of this Ninth Article, and not justification in general, as *my* friend Mr. Mathes tries to make you believe.

I am astonished at Mr. Mathes for bringing in the salvation of infants. He knows that infants are not embraced in the proposition at all. We are not discussing the justification of infants, but God's plan of justification for adults—the means of bringing us into the enjoyment of God's righteousness by faith.

On the day of Pentecost, Peter did not say a word about faith; but the first thing he commanded them to do, was, to "repent." So we teach. First, repent; second, prayer. So. you see now, that we preach as Peter did on the day of Pentecost. But I will now read Romans iii: 25: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God." The point in this passage is, that it explodes Mr. Mathes' doctrine of immersion. He puts in works in order to enable him to get in immersion! Saint James is speaking of the justification of Abraham as a good man; and Mr. Mathes confounded the justification of the penitent sinner with that of a Christian, or a good man. A sinner can not perform a good work. Baptism is a work, and, therefore, baptism is not for a penitent sinner.

I can prove that unless a man takes the Lord's Supper, he is dead. Jesus says, "Except ye eat the flesh and drink the blood of the Son of man, ye have no life in you." God gives the penitent sinner faith, and then he is justified, and becomes a good, religious man. Galatians iii: 16: "Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ." Abraham was a righteous man forty years before he offered up his son Isaac. He was justified first as a penitent sinner; and forty years after, as a righteous man, he was justified by works, when he offered up Isaac.

Now, mind you, my friends, I am defending our Ninth Article, as we believe and teach it in the Discipline, and in our own public ministry. Paul says: "And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed." (Galatians iii: 8.) But Mr. Mathes is not satisfied with this, and so he adds immersion. He will not allow any one to be justified, no matter how much faith he may have, unless he is immersed. I have, I think, now fully sustained my proposition.

What was preached to Abraham? It was the Gospel of Christ, and not the law of Moses. Paul and Peter will put you on the track; and Saint James will instruct you how to keep on it. Peter did not say a word about baptism at the house of Cornelius. They were baptized with the Holy Ghost. This brought them on to the track, without water baptism.

The baptism with water is not for the remission of sins, as Mr. Mathes teaches; but is only the initiatory rite, through which we enter into the visible church. It is one thing to get the pardon of our sins, and another thing to enter into the visible church. Faith *only* is the condition of pardon; and through baptism we enter the church.

I think Mr. Mathes has not sustained the negative of this proposition. He is an able man, and enjoys the unlimited confidence of his brethren; he is the oracle of his party in Indiana. I do not say this as a mere compliment; it is my honest conviction, and I shall speak of him in the same way when I return home. I have had a good many debates, and I am free to acknowledge that Mr. Mathes is the most perfect gentleman I ever met in debate. He has been fair, honorable and candid. And I am happy that he acknowledges my ability to do justice to my side of these questions. He calls me "*a walking library*" and a "*sharp man.*"

Saint James speaks of the righteousness of the law; but it does not follow that all things under the law are done away. It is not required that we should do all things commanded in the law, in order to be pardoned. If that were required, no one could be saved, as no one can do all things commanded. We must not depend upon anything we do for pardon, as no act of ours has anything to do with our justification. The penitent sinner is justified by faith *only*; but the Christian by good works.

Now, you see the fix Mr. Mathes has got himself into. He has entirely failed upon this subject, and, failing at this point, his whole system is destroyed. If he can not maintain his side of these issues, no living man can do it. He has left nothing undone that could effect the proposition; but he has failed, and his cause is lost. [Time expired.]

Sixth Day.—Sixth Proposition.—February 3, 1868.

MR. MATHES' THIRD REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: Mr. Brooks seems to think strange that I have urged on him the terrible consequences of his dogma *of faith alone*. He says

the sense in which he is discussing the proposition, is, the justification of the penitent sinner, and that he uses the terra justification as meaning remission of sins. And we showed him and this large audience that if his premises were correct, and his other doctrine of total depravity true, then the doctrine of infant damnation would follow as a consequence, as no infant can exercise faith!

But how does he attempt to answer this? Why, he says the proposition only involves the justification of adults, and that the salvation of infants is not embraced in it! But, you all remember, when we were discussing the proposition that "baptism is in order to the remission of the sins of the penitent believer," that Mr. Brooks declared that my proposition involved the damnation of infants, as infants could not believe, repent, and obey the Gospel. It was of no use that I told him that the salvation of infants was not involved in the proposition, as it expressly said, "to the penitent believer." He went on as eloquently as ever, declaring that my proposition damned all infants who died in infancy. But to-day the boot is on the other leg, and he assures us that infants are not embraced in the proposition. He says we are not debating about infants at all, but adults. Thus he takes back all he said about infant damnation since this debate began.

But my friend Mr. Brooks complains because I am discussing the subject of justification in its application to all men, and insists that it is only to be discussed in reference to the penitent sinner; and he thinks it is used in this sense only in the Ninth Article of the Discipline. But let us see: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." So reads the whole of

the Ninth Article. But, so far from sustaining Mr. Brooks, it destroys his proposition; for, if it is by the merits of Christ alone, it can not be "by faith *only*." This you can all see. I claim, therefore, that he has abandoned the grounds upon which he set out this morning, and that his cause is hopelessly ruined!

But he is again harping upon Abraham's justification, and insists that Paul was speaking of one kind of justification, and James another kind! But this is all guess-work with him, and is untrue. But he declares again that I and my brethren are off the track, and must come on, or be lost. That is, I suppose, we must all come and join the Methodist Episcopal Church. Well, I suppose we should then be on the Methodist track. But neither Mr. Brooks nor his brethren claim that the Methodist Church is the Church of Christ, and divine! They know it is a human institution; and, therefore, if we were to join the Methodist Church, we should leave the *divine* and go to the *human* organization! But, as I have shown, the apostle James says that "we are not justified by faith *only*." And even the Methodists themselves do not act upon this principle of faith *only*. They believe in good works. Why, then, contend for such an absurdity? Change the Article.

But my friend Mr. Brooks says that it is his opinion that the harlot Rahab was rather a good sort of a woman. Now, is not this amusing. He thinks! Now, everybody knows that the term "harlot," as applied to this woman, fully establishes what her character was. But she was not justified by faith *only*, but she added to her faith works. "She received the spies, and sent them out another way." But the proposition of "faith only" is utterly exploded and overthrown by the language of James, who declares that "a man is not justified by faith only." Mr. Brooks and this Ninth Article of the Methodist Discipline is thus

squarely contradicted. It is monstrous that a man will get up before an enlightened audience, and flatly contradict the Scriptures. But this Mr. Brooks has done. And you all see it. And he is the representative of his church.

But Mr. Brooks refers again to what I said on the subject of *heresy*, in my sermon in the "Western Preacher," and has tried to impress upon your minds that I accused all the sects of drunkenness and adultery. Now, every one knows that I did nothing of the kind. But I did say that *heresy* is classed with drunkenness and adultery, as "works of the flesh." (See Galatians vi.) And as sectarianism is *heresy*, there would be just as much propriety in speaking of "evangelical adultery," "evangelical drunkenness," etc., as "evangelical sects."

But my friend Mr. Brooks has discovered that faith was not commanded at Pentecost. Now, this is a sheer quibble. They had all heard the Gospel preached by Peter and the rest of the apostles, and believed—and, believing, they were prompted to inquire what they must do to be saved. Peter did not command them to believe, because they already believed, and according to my friend's proposition, they were all justified in the sense of pardon, before they inquired what they must do. But if that was so, how came Peter to command them to "repent, and be baptized for the remission of sins?" Were they to repent *because* their sins were pardoned? This was the case, if Mr. Brooks is correct; and then every one since ought to repent—be sorry—because their sins are forgiven! What nonsense!

But Mr. Brooks seems greatly surprised that I should call *faith itself* a work. He says that "it is only a work of the mind to believe God." Very well; that is giving up the point. It is a work, if it is a work of the mind; but still the organs of our bodies have a good deal to do in

this work of faith. Jesus calls it a work (John vi: 28); therefore, the question is settled. *Faith* is a *work*.

In speaking of the design of preaching the Gospel, Paul says: "I am not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ; for it is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." (Romans i: 16.) And again: "But now is made manifest, and by the Scriptures of the prophets, according to the commandment of the everlasting God, made known to all nations for the obedience of faith." (Romans xvi: 26.) These Scriptures show conclusively that justification was not to be enjoyed upon the condition of *faith only*, but by faith and obedience to the Gospel; and, therefore, my friend's proposition is false, and, according to his own admission, failing at this point, his whole system is lost.

But he quotes Galatians iii: 26, with an air of triumph. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." But why did he not read the next verse also? But it would have ruined his theory. But I will quote it for him. "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Jesus Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for ye are all one in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." (Galatians iii: 26-29.)

Now, this passage forever destroys his whole theory of faith alone! They came into Christ and were justified, not by faith *only*, but by faith and obedience they were "baptized into Christ," and thus became children of God—Abraham's seed, and "heirs according to the promise."

I was very much amused when my friend referred to the case of Agrippa, to prove that we are justified by faith only. Why, he has got on the wrong side of his proposi-

tion. Paul said to Agrippa: "I know that thou believest." Very well. According to Mr. Brooks, Agrippa was already justified by faith *only*, and a Christian. But neither he nor Paul so understood it. The king said: "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." Then, of course, he was not a Christian, though a believer. And Paul said: "I would to God that not only thou, but also all who hear me this day, were not only almost, but altogether such as I am, except these bonds." So Paul did not regard him as justified. This passage destroys Mr. Brooks' proposition entirely. The king had faith, but was not yet a Christian, because he had not obeyed the Gospel.

Mr. Brooks has several times referred to the conversion of the jailer. I now introduce it to show that his doctrine of faith alone *is false*. Paul "preached the word of the Lord to him and to all that were in his house." Then they were in the jailer's house, and not in the prison, and all were capable of hearing the word and of believing it; consequently no infants were there. "He took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes, and was baptized he and all his straightway." This proves that they preached baptism to him and those of his house. And we have no account of any rejoicing till he brought them into his house after the baptism had been performed; then "he rejoiced, believing in God, with all his house." That is, every member of his family believed and rejoiced with him; consequently, there were no babies there.

I have now introduced a vast amount of testimony to show the falsity of the proposition, and I know that this intelligent audience sees and appreciates the fact that Mr. Brooks has utterly failed to sustain himself upon this or any other of his propositions in this debate. I have clearly shown that justification is ascribed to some nine causes in the Bible; and, therefore, that it is *untrue* to affirm that we are justified by any one of these causes *only*, or *alone*.

It is not by faith *alone*, repentance *alone*, baptism *alone*, the blood of Christ *alone*, grace *alone*, the Spirit *alone*, or anything else *alone*—but by all these causes combined.

Now, *my* friends, we ought to be honest with ourselves. This is the turning point. "If we are right on this subject, we are right everywhere; and if wrong here, we are wrong everywhere else," as says the immortal Luther, and subscribed to by Mr. Brooks.

But Mr. Brooks puts repentance and prayer before faith, and a poor sinner repenting of his sins without faith in Christ! Yes, and praying, without faith, for faith! But, according to him, both the repentance and the prayer are sinful, because the Scripture says: "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." And such repentance and prayer would not be pleasing to God, for, "without faith, it is impossible to please God." How dare any man, as the representative of his church, advocate such monstrous doctrine!

When I was young, I heard a Calvinist Baptist say that, "In the best prayer that the sinner could make, there was sin enough to damn a world!" So you see what the Baptists think of my friend's theory of "prayer before faith."

I and my brethren maintain the true Gospel way of justification. We take the whole system of salvation as given us by our Lord through his inspired apostles; and, therefore, we have nothing *alone*,—neither faith *alone*, repentance *alone*, prayer *alone*, the Spirit *alone*, the *blood alone*, the grace *alone*, nor baptism *alone*,—but all together. And we know that we are right, and can not be wrong, as we take the system just as we find it in the Lord's blessed word; and we do not stop to quibble over the question, can not God save the sinner in some other way? While we do not limit the power of God, yet, with us, the great question is—HOW has the Lord promised to save us? What has he commanded us to do in order to the remission of sins? We know that is safe, while all else is unsafe and dangerous.

But my friend Mr. B. asks what good baptism can do a penitent sinner? I will answer by giving the case of Naaman the leper. He was a great captain, and very popular, but had that loathsome disease, the leprosy, and he went down to the prophet of God to be healed of his disease. The prophet told him to go to the Jordan and baptize himself seven times, and he should be healed. But, like my friend and thousands of others, he thought it would do him no good, and exclaimed, "Are not the waters of the Abana and Pharpar rivers of Damascus better than all the waters of Israel? May I not wash in them and be clean?" He wanted to substitute the Abana and Pharpar of his own country for the Jordan of God's appointment! But he finally dipped himself seven times in the Jordan, and was healed. Did the water cure him? No, indeed; God healed him when he obeyed the command.

So Mr. Brooks and his brethren say: "We can't see in the water any virtue; and if there is, we think sprinkling and pouring will do just as well!" Thus they would substitute the Abana and Pharpar of their own invention, in the place of the Jordan of God's appointment — Immersion. [Time expired.]

Sixth Day.—Sixth Proposition.—February 3, 1868.

MR. BROOKS' FOURTH SPEECH—(30 MINUTES)

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I now rise for the last time in this discussion. I and my friend Mr. Mathes are good friends, and will remain so. Indeed, I regard Mr. Mathes as a perfect gentleman, and I shall so speak of him when I go home among my friends. He has been perfectly candid and fair in this discussion. But Mr. Mathes still insists that justification, in our Ninth Article, embraces the Methodist Church only—that "we," in the

proposition, means *we* the Methodist Church. I am perfectly astonished that a man of Mr. Mathes' talents and learning should make such a blunder. No, indeed; it means "we," all mankind. I will read the entire article as it stands in our Discipline, and you will see that I am right in my construction of it: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort."

But Mr. Mathes says that he admits that there are good and pious Methodists, Presbyterians, and Baptists. Now, you see that he has set his foot in it; for if the Methodists are good people and pious, why does he hold us up to ridicule and contempt all over the land? You see now what a fix he has got himself into.

But he argues that faith itself is a work. Then I ask, what are we debating about? But I understand that faith, in the passage quoted, means simply a *mental* work, and not a bodily work. Mr. Mathes seems to lay great stress upon the justification of the harlot Rahab. Now, she may have been a very good and pious woman, for anything that we know. The fact that she is called a "harlot," does not prove that she was a bad woman. Not one in five hundred who confess that Jesus Christ is the Son of God, can do so intelligently. But Mr. Mathes will just have people make this confession and be immersed, no matter whether they understand it or not, and he promises them remission of sins. What a dangerous theory! But this is their practice. But our process is as already stated: first, the sinner must repent, and then pray; they must ask God for faith, not for pardon. But Mr. Mathes says this is absurd. But we say that God will help the sinner to repent by his divine grace; and then the penitent sinner can pray for faith.

But Mr. Mathes denies that faith is the *direct* gift of God. I am surprised at him. Paul says: "For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God." (Ephesians ii: 8.) Now, you see my friend has contradicted the Bible again, for Paul here says that faith is the gift of God. If saving faith is just to believe that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God," upon the testimony recorded in the Bible, then I have no saving faith. I was converted on a sick-bed; I was very low, and was given up by my physician and friends to die. I prayed to God for saving faith, and he answered my prayer and gave me faith, and pardoned all my sins, and "poured out on me the power from on high," just as he did upon Cornelius and his household, and I shouted and praised God. And this is the way that all orthodox denominations hold it. Now, if this be so, you can all see that Mr. Mathes and his church are wrong.

But Mr. Mathes confounds what Saint Paul says of the sinner, with what Saint James says of the Christian. This is all the trouble; and I am surprised that I can't get him to see it. The Christian's faith works by love, according to James, and produces good work, such as Abraham performed when he offered up Isaac. But the penitent sinner is justified by faith *only*. To simply believe the written or revealed word, is not saving faith. It is dead faith. I want nothing to do with it. If Abraham had been a penitent sinner, then Saint James would have spoken of him, as Saint Paul did concerning justification.

Saint James evidently refers to Genesis xv: 6: "Abraham believed God, and he counted it to him for righteousness." He was not at that time called "the friend of God." He was only converted then; but in II Chronicles xx: 7, here Abraham is first called the "friend of God." His justification as a penitent sinner is referred to. (Gen-

esis xv: 6.) But he was not justified as a Christian for some time after, when he offered up Isaac.

Josephus says that Isaac was twenty-five years old when Abraham offered him up. Paul says: "But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness." (Romans iv: 5.) So you see that Saint Paul teaches justification without works; and, therefore, it must be by faith only. But this refers to the justification of penitent sinners.

But my friend Mr. Mathes goes back to Pentecost again, and affirms that the three thousand Jews converted on that day were not pardoned until they were immersed. I have no argument for those who think that they can be baptized with the Holy Ghost, and still not pardoned. I said nothing about the jailer since we commenced this proposition; yet Mr. Mathes brings it in. But I shall not take time to notice his argument drawn from this case. I stand up to prove that we are saved by faith only; not by an historical faith—a mere belief of the written or revealed word of God, which is a dead faith—but by a living faith, which is the immediate gift of God in answer to prayer.

I call attention again to the Ninth Article. It is not *we* Methodists, *we* Presbyterians; but it is *we* mankind. And we find Abraham justified as a penitent sinner by faith only, and justified as a Christian by faith and works together. There is a wide difference between *historical* faith, and justifying faith that saves the sinner.

I am now through with the argument on this proposition, and now leave it all with you. According to the rules of the debate, my friend Mr. Mathes can introduce no new matter in his closing speech; so, you have now heard all his arguments against it, and I think you all see that he has entirely failed to prove his doctrine. He has labored faithfully to prove it, and has done as well as any

one on his side could have done. I admit his talents and ability; but still he has failed to sustain himself in this discussion, on account of the weakness of his cause.

I am but an humble minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and if I can handle him so easily, you see he would have no chance if he were to fall into the hands of one of our great men. But we have got through the discussion with the best of feelings. I have the very best feelings for Mr. Mathes. He has acted the gentleman throughout, and I shall bear with me to my home a grateful remembrance of his kindness and gentlemanly bearing toward me and my brethren. And I mean no empty compliment when I say this. I speak the honest convictions of my heart, and shall always speak of him in the same way.

I thank the Moderators for their kindness and forbearance during the debate. I think we have given them very little trouble. [Time expired.]

Sixth Day.—Sixth Proposition.—February 3, 1868.

MR. MATHES' FOURTH REPLY—(30 MINUTES.)

MR. PRESIDENT, MODERATORS, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: I now rise to close this discussion. And I will first notice what Mr. Brooks, as the organ of the Methodist Church in Bedford, says about "dead faith." He says that the faith of the sinner is *dead*, because it is *historical* faith—that is, the belief of the written word of God. But I answer, there is no dead faith but that faith which is *alone*—that is, without a corresponding exercise. But my friend has repeatedly asserted that the apostle James is speaking about the faith and justification of Christians, and not sinners. Well, if that be so, then the *dead* faith that James speaks of is the faith of a Christian, and not a sinner. It is simply "dead, being alone." So, you see

that this reference to James destroys all he has said about Abraham being justified as a Christian. But I have already proved that the saving and justifying faith consists in believing, with all the heart, upon the divine testimony as found in the written word of God, that "JESUS IS THE CHRIST, THE SON OF THE LIVING GOD."

John says: "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." (John xx: 30, 31.) Yet this is what Mr. Brooks calls "*dead* faith." It is monstrous!

All that my friend Brooks could find to say in answer to my argument drawn from the justification of the harlot Rahab, was, that he *guesses* the "harlot" was a good and pious woman before she sent out the spies another way. Yes, he *guesses!* What right has he to make such a guess? James calls her a "harlot." Does that signify that she was a virtuous and pious woman?

But Mr. Brooks says that he wants nothing to do with "*historical faith*"—which is, a belief of the written word of God! He may have very little to do with such a faith; but Paul, as well as John, in the passage already quoted, differs widely from Mr. Brooks. Paul says: "So, then, faith came by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." But Mr. Brooks objects, and says this is nothing but historical faith, and can do nobody any good, and he wants nothing to do with it! I am, indeed, astonished at his recklessness!

You remember that I crowded upon his attention, time and again during the day, that according to his theory of conversion, the sinner committed sin every time he prayed, without faith, for faith! and that his repentance was sinful, as it was done without faith; and the apostle says: "What-

soever is not of faith, is sin." But he has entirely failed to answer me in any way. He has paid no attention to it. Well, I do not blame him for the failure. He could not answer it. It admits of no answer. But I do blame the Methodists for trying to maintain such a miserable absurdity.

I will now notice the Ninth Article of Religion in the Discipline. Mr. Brooks claims that, by the pronoun "we," in the Article, is meant all mankind. But we will read the Article again, and see, if we can, what it does mean: "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore that we are justified by faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine, and very full of comfort." Now, according to Mr. Brooks, "we"—all mankind—"are counted righteous before God for the merit of our Lord," etc.; "wherefore that we (all mankind) are justified by faith only," etc. Why, Mr. Brooks has turned Universalist! He has given up the doctrine of his church, because he could not defend it, and has actually turned Universalist: and now boldly affirms that "*all mankind* are accounted righteous before God," and that *all mankind* "are justified by faith only!" Why, this includes infants too! and makes the damnation of infants, dying in infancy, certain!

But what is the obvious meaning of the language? The *we*, in the Article, simply means *we* Methodists, and all others who are counted righteous before God, and justified by faith only, and can, in no proper sense, be applied to all mankind. But in quoting the first part of this Ninth Article, he has destroyed his proposition. For, if we are accounted righteous *only* for the merit of Christ, it is not "by *faith only*." Thus you see, my friends, that Mr. Brooks has destroyed his proposition, and turned Universalist, to escape from the consequences of its destruction!

But Mr. Brooks charged me with denying that faith is the gift of God. He is greatly mistaken. There is a sense in which faith is the gift of God. God has given us his Son to die for us, and has, through the prophets and apostles, given us the divine testimony concerning him, as we find it *written* in the Bible; and he has given us our eyes to see, and our ears to hear, and our hearts to feel, and our understanding to decide and receive the testimony. Faith is, therefore, the gift of God in this sense: that he has given us all the means necessary to produce it, and our ability to exercise it. God gives us our daily bread, and we are directed to pray for it too; but he gives it to us as he does faith, through a process of means which he has ordained, and not *directly*. So, faith is not the *direct* gift of God, but comes by hearing the word of God.

My friend Mr. Brooks thinks I lay entirely too much stress upon this little word *only*, in his proposition. It is a very little word, and he feels astonished that I should attach so much importance to it! But I tell you, my friends, these little words are sometimes exceedingly important. The whole issue on this proposition is involved in this little word *only*. No doubt my friend would be better pleased if I would not crowd him on this *little word only*. But I can not let him off so easily. He has pledged himself to it, and the Methodist Episcopal Church in Bedford have put him forward to defend it, and they must take the consequences.

I remember another occasion, when a distinguished personage used a very little word with awful effect. When God placed our first parents in the garden of Eden he gave them the privilege of all the fruit in the garden but one tree in the midst of the garden; and concerning that, he said: "In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt surely die." The devil approached our Mother Eve, and preached to her upon the subject of the forbidden fruit and the con-

sequences of eating of it. "And the Serpent said unto the woman, Ye shall *not* surely die." God had said in the prohibition: "Ye shall surely die." And the Serpent only put in one little word, and said, you shall *not* surely die. It was a very little word; yet, mark the result: Eve believed the preaching of the Serpent, and eat of the fruit under the impression that she would *not* die, and she gave to her husband and he did eat; and our whole race were ruined in a moment by this little word "*not*" No, indeed; we do not lay too much stress upon this little word "*only*" We want no additions to the word of God of *nots* and *onlys*; but we want it as God has fixed it, and then we know it is safe.

Thus you see, my friends, that Mr. Brooks has utterly failed to bring even one passage of Scripture to prove his proposition that has any reference to the subject embraced in it. His proposition is, therefore, lost; and, failing at this point, his whole system lies in scattered ruins. "Being wrong here, he is wrong everywhere."

I called his attention specially to Galatians iii: 26, to the manner of "putting on Christ." "As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." This proves that the "faith *alone*" doctrine is false. But he has failed to notice it. He knew he could not answer me on that text; so he was prudent enough to say nothing about it.

I was very much interested in my friend's experience and miraculous conversion, as he detailed it to us in his closing speech. He tells us that, being sick nigh unto death, and having no faith in Christ, he repented and prayed for faith; and that the Lord heard and answered his prayer, though offered without faith; and that God poured out the Holy Ghost upon him, just as he did at the house of Cornelius, and that he shouted and praised God! This was indeed a wonderful conversion. But, if I remem-

ber right, when the Holy Spirit was poured out on Cornelius and his house, they "spake with tongues." [Turning to Mr. Brooks, he asked him:] "Mr. Brooks was you enabled to speak with other tongues that you had not learned?"

Mr. BROOKS. "Yes, sir, I was."

Mr. MATHES. "What tongues were they in which you spoke?"

Mr. BROOKS. "They were the tongues of Canaan, sir."

[Mr. Mathes, resuming his speech, said to the audience:] You have now heard the statement of Mr. Brooks. What do you think of him and his wonderful conversion? Any man in this day who will make such pretensions, is not to be reasoned with. He has gone out of the pale of reason and common sense, and can no longer be considered a fit subject for Scriptural argument. He claims INSPIRATION. I may say, with Jacob, "The Lord was in the place, and I knew it not."

But he says the proposition does not include infants nor Christians, but sinners only. This shows what desperate straits a man can be driven to when he finds that he has a bad cause to manage. You remember, all of you, how hard he tried to prove that the pronoun "we," in the proposition, means "*we, all mankind*" Now, it don't mean infants nor Christians. I wonder if infants and Christians are not a part of *all* mankind. The truth is, Mr. Brooks and the audience all see that his cause is hopelessly ruined in this discussion. Luther's test of a standing or falling church, is the doctrine of "justification by faith." He says: "If wrong here, she is wrong everywhere." Apply this test to Mr. Brooks; and he can not object to such application, as he indorsed it this morning. I say, apply this test to him, and his whole system is lost beyond the hope of resurrection. He has quoted a good many Scriptures, but not one that looks in the direction of his prop-

osition. And so, failing here, his whole theory of justification lies in ruins. And I see, by the countenances of his friends, that they all feel it.

I am satisfied with the result of this discussion, and so are my brethren, so far as I know. Mr. Brooks, I know, is regarded by his preaching brethren as an able debater—perhaps the best debater in the Conference.

During this discussion, I have had no theory of my own to maintain. I have simply contended for God's plan of justification, as I find it laid down in his blessed word. Truth, and not victory, has been my object. If I am wrong to-day, I wish to be right to-morrow. My motto is, "Let God be true, and every man a liar." And I would regard that man as my friend who would show me my errors, if I have them, and teach me the truth. You, my fellow-citizens, have patiently listened to us as we have discussed these great issues during the last six days; and good order and good feeling have uniformly prevailed in the large audiences that have greeted us every day of the discussion. I rejoice that it has been so.

We are all traveling rapidly from time to eternity, and should be honest with ourselves, and not be carried away with prejudice, so that we could not receive the truth. But we should candidly weigh all the facts, testimony and arguments, and decide for ourselves in favor of the right, and against the wrong. The Lord help us all to do our duty, that when the Lord comes, we may hear the welcome, "Well done, good and faithful servant; enter into the joys of thy Lord."

In looking over this large and deeply-interested audience, I am deeply impressed with the thought, that before very long we shall stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, to give an account of our stewardship to God.

It is said of a distinguished Grecian General, Xerxes perhaps, that, while looking over the largest army ever as-

sembled upon the plains of Greece, he was seen to weep; and when asked the cause, he said that he wept because, in less than one hundred years every one of that vast multitude would be dead and in their graves! It was enough to make him weep. But I may say now, that in less than fifty years, every one in this large assembly will have passed away—passed down to the dark and silent grave. What a sad thought. The cruel spoiler is among us, and we must go to death, and to the house appointed for all the living. Lord help us to be also ready.

I thank the congregation most cordially for their good order, and regular, patient attendance upon the discussion. Some of you differ with me, but I hope I have not become your enemy by telling you the truth. I have not aimed to wound the feelings of any one, but to convince all by speaking the truth in the love of it.

And I thank the Moderators for their gentlemanly bearing and patient attention. They have presided over this discussion with distinguished ability. They are all legal gentlemen, and in giving six days of their time in this way, they have made considerable sacrifice.

The Lord bless you all, and finally bring us all to his everlasting kingdom, is my prayer. Amen. [Time expired.]

MATHES' PUBLICATIONS.

WORKS OF BARTON W. STONE.

A neatly-bound volume of some 408 pages; a valuable addition to any library. Price, by mail..... \$ 1.25

THE WESTERN PREACHER.

A splendid volume of thirty Sermons by distinguished Christian Preachers. Price, by mail \$ 2.25

MORRIS LETTERS.

Being a review of Bishop Morris' book on the "Polity of the Methodist Episcopal Church." Neatly bound in cloth, containing some 180 pages. Price.....50 cts.

MATHES AND BROOKS DEBATE.

Being a debate of six days between J. M. Mathes, of the Church of Christ, and T. S. Brooks, of the M. E. Church; held in Bedford, Ind., from January 28 to February 3, 1868, on "Baptism and kindred subjects." Price..... \$ 1.25
By mail, \$1.50.

THE CHRISTIAN RECORD.

A Religious monthly, of 48 pages. Price, \$1.50, *in advance*. \$15.00 for eleven copies.

All orders must be accompanied with the cash, and addressed to "Elder J. M. Mathes, Bedford, Lawrence county, Indiana."

J. M. MATHES.

BEDFORD, IND., October 1, 1868.

THE CHRISTIAN RECORD.

THIS old and reliable periodical, edited and published by Elder J. M. MATHES, Bedford, Lawrence county, Indiana, will enter upon its third volume, *new series* (XXVI volume from the beginning), in January next. At that time we shall enlarge it by the addition of sixteen pages, making it a forty-eight paged magazine. It will be issued on the 15th of each month, and will be one of the largest and cheapest papers among us; and we shall aim to make it the best. We bring to the work the experience of many years in the editorial management of the *Record*, and shall be aided by many of the very best scholars and writers in the Christian Brotherhood.

The *Christian Record* was established by us in 1843, and is, therefore, the oldest periodical now published among us, except the "Harbinger." And we offer its entire history, extending over a quarter of a century, as a *guaranty* that it will be conducted upon principles of honor, prudence, and fidelity. It will advocate Christianity as taught in the New Testament, in theory and in practice.—No Creed but the BIBLE; no name but CHRISTIAN; no bond of union but THE WORD OF GOD; no Master but JESUS.

In carrying out our purpose, we invoke the blessing of God, and the co-operation of all our brethren and sisters in the land. In the great State of Indiana alone, we have a brotherhood of some 80,000; and out of that number we certainly ought to have a circulation of 8,000—that is, one subscriber to ten members. This we think would leave margin enough for all the other papers taken. And we

THE CHRISTIAN RECORD.

shall have some 2,000 perhaps from the other States and Territories, making our circulation, for 1869, TEN THOUSAND COPIES!

With such a list we should "thank God, and take courage." Brethren and sisters, shall we have the ten thousand? The number can be made up in one month, if you *will* it, and are disposed to make a little effort to obtain them. Will you do it? I trust you will. We appeal to every brother and sister in the land, and every elder and preacher, to aid us in the great work. Make up the best lists you can, and send us the result by the 1st of December next, so that we may have some idea of the size of the edition to print for January, 1869; and to these lists additions may be made at any time afterward.

TERMS:

Single copy \$ 1.50, *in advance*.
Eleven copies, 15.00, *in advance*.

And at the same rate for a larger number. Remit by mail, at our *risk*, when the sum is \$5 or less. If more than \$5, procure a Postal money order, or Bank draft, at our expense. Address us thus: "Elder J. M. Mathes, Bedford, Lawrence county, Indiana."

J. M. MATHES.

BEDFORD, IND., October 1, 1868.

CHRISTIAN HYMN-BOOK.

SMALL EDITION. (Pearl, 48mo)

Arabesque	\$ 60	Per dozen	\$ 6 00
, gilt back and burnished edge	70	"	8 00
, gilt edge	80	"	8 40
Imitation Turkey, gilt edge	1 10	"	10 00
Turkey Morocco, gilt edge	1 50	"	12 00
Turkey, with gilt clasp	2 00	"	19 00

MEDIUM EDITION. (Brevier, 24mo)

Sheep Binding	\$ 90	Per dozen	\$ 8 70
Arabesque	1 10	"	9 90
, gilt back and burnished edge	1 26	"	11 25
, gilt edge	1 40	"	12 00
Imitation Turkey, gilt edge	1 60	"	14 40
Turkey Morocco, gilt edge	2 00	"	18 00
Turkey, with gilt clasp	2 75	"	24 75

LARGE EDITION. (Pica, 12mo)

Sheep Binding	\$2 00	Per dozen	\$18 00
Arabesque	2 50	"	22 50
Imitation	4 00	"	36 00

Shipped by mail, PREPAID at the retail price.

When ordered by the dozen add for postage—80c for small, \$1 40 for medium, and \$3 00 for large.

If I flourish, are a few of a large number of similar commendations in the new Hymn Book.

Pres. R. Milligan—"I regard it as much the best compilation extant."

Elder P. S. Fall—"I take pleasure in recommending it to our brethren generally. [Hymns are manifestly] excellent."

Prof. Geo. Aug. Williams—"I acknowledge its superior merits—it excels."

Elder David Walk—"We think it decidedly the best Hymn Book extant."

Dr. W. H. Hopson—"I authorize to express my approval of the book in any terms you please [likely to have] effect."

Elder Isaac M. Allen—"The best book by far, we have ever had, or are likely to have."

Elder J. S. Hayes—"The best Hymn Book I ever saw."

Dr. J. J. Parkerton—"I consider it in all respects unexceptionable."

Miss W. Leonard—"It fully meets our present wants. I most heartily commend it."

Elder W. A. Belding—"I wish to express my admiration for the new book."

Elder W. C. Rogers—"Very much superior to any collection of Hymns."

Elder C. J. Reasoner—"I cordially express my approbation of the work."

Elder W. C. Hackett—"The best book of the kind I have met with."

Prof. Richardson—"An admirable collection of Hymns, superior to any known to me."

Prof. C. I. Loom—"In every respect one of the best in the English language."

Prof. J. W. McGarvey—"I have no doubt it is the best Hymn Book extant."

Elder Wm. Baxter—"This is high praise," (referring to Br. McGarvey's words) "but I believe to be true."

Elder Jas. Challen—"The best Hymn Book I have ever seen."

Prof. G. T. Carpenter—"We consider it emphatically the work of psalmody for the brethren."

Elder A. D. F. Fillmore—"Let it be adopted by the brethren every-where."

SMALL BOOKS IN NEAT PAPER COVERS.

VALUABLE FOR CIRCULATION.

A Brief Treatise on Prayer.

By Prest. R. Milligan. 10 cents. \$1 per dozen. On fine paper, in fine cloth, 50 cents.

Principles and Objects of the Religious Reformation.

As plead by A. Campbell and others. By R. Richardson. 10 cents, for per dozen.

Salvation from Sin,

Or, What must I do to be Saved? By Dr. J. P. Walsh. 10 cents. \$1 per dozen.

"Life and Death."

By A. Campbell. A refutation of Materialism and Modern Sadduceeism. 10 cents, \$1 per dozen.

Christian Experience,

Or, Sincerity Seeking the Way to Heaven. A Dialogue. 10 cents. \$1 per dozen.

The Union Movement.

A dialogue, showing the only possible ground of Christian Union. 10 cents. \$1 per dozen.

True Method of Searching the Scriptures.

By President Fanning. Paper, 15 cents; cloth, 30 cents.

McLean on the Commission of Christ and his Apostles.

Paper, 30 cents. Same by mail.

Six Letters to a Skeptic.

By Alexander Campbell. 57 pp. Price, 6 cents.

Spiritualism Self-condemned.

By Isaac Errett. A very valuable tract, with a neat cover. Price, 6 cents.

All on this page in paper covers, by mail, for \$1.

Address,

H. S. BOSWORTH,

Cincinnati, O.

A Commentary on Acts

Of Apostles, with a revised version of the text. By J. W. McGarvey. Price, \$1.50. Same by mail.

The Organon of Scripture,

Or the Inductive Method of Biblical Interpretation. By J. S. Lamar. In this volume a very important subject is discussed with great ability. Profound in thought, yet the work is admirably adapted to the capacity of all readers, and all should read it. Price, by mail, \$1.40.

Bible Dictionary.

For general use in the study of the Scriptures; with 250 engravings, 5 maps, and chronological and other tables. 534 pages, large 12mo.; will be sold for \$1.50; postage, 28 cents. A remarkably valuable work for the price.

The Western Christian Preacher.

A book of original Sermons and Discourses by eminent Christian preachers. Edited by Elder J. M. Mathes. Price, cloth, 42. Same by mail.

The New Testament.

Translated from the original Greek by H. T. Anderson. Arabesque, \$2.75; cloth, \$2.50; small edition, 50 cents.

Cruden's Concordance to the Holy Scriptures.

By which any verse in the Bible may be readily found by looking for any material word in the verse. To which is added the significations of the principal words. A Concordance to the proper names of the Bible and their meaning in the original. Price, \$2; postage, 40 cents.

Mosheim's Church History.

806 quarto pages; sheep binding. \$5.

Clark's Commentary.

Complete. 4 vols. \$18.

Clark's Commentary on the New Testament.

2 vols. \$9.

WORKS OF A. CAMPBELL.

The Christian Baptist.

This important work can not be superseded by any subsequent publications. Seven volumes in one, containing 670 double-columned pages. Price, in cloth, \$3; arabesque, \$3.50; by mail, 25 cents extra.

The Christian System.

In reference to the Union of Christians and the restoration of Primitive Christianity. By A. Campbell. Price, by mail, \$1.40.

Christian Baptism.

With its Antecedents and Consequents. By Alexander Campbell. Price, \$1.40; same by mail.

Campbell and Purcell's Debate.

On Roman Catholicism. A new edition of this very able discussion is ready. Price, \$1.40; same by mail.

Campbell and Owen's Debate.

On all the Systems of Skepticism, Ancient and Modern. Complete in one volume. This will always remain a leading work on the Evidences of Christianity. Price, \$1.50; same by mail.

Familiar Lectures on the Pentateuch.

Delivered before the Morning Class of Bethany College during the Session of 1859-60, by Alexander Campbell: also short extracts from his sermons during the same session; to which is prefixed a sketch of the life of President Campbell, with a fine steel portrait. Edited by W. T. Moore. Price, \$1.75; same by mail.

H. S. BOSWORTH, Publisher,

103 Main St., Cincinnati.